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INTRODUCTION

The question of Lucian's influence in the Renaissance has long been of interest to scholars, for upon it depend vital problems of literary development and cultural values. Was it he whose works were responsible for the reintroduction of ironical writing, for instance, and on whom did the satirist make the deepest impression? And why was an author so flippant as he prized in an epoch of generally serious moral purpose such as the Italian Quattrocento?

The first contribution in the field was made by Richard Förster, in a speech delivered on the Kaiser's birthday in 1886 (published in Archiv für Literaturgeschichte, XIV, 1886, pp.337-363). He later supplemented these rather cursory remarks with a more detailed study of the motif from De Calumnia 5 in 'Die Verläumdung des Apelles in der Renaissance' (Jahrb. der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen, VIII, 1887, pp.29-56 and 89-113). Next came P. Schultze's 'Lucian in der Literatur und Kunst der Renaissance' (Bericht über das Schuljahr, Dessau, 1905), though once again only a brief article, concentrating more upon the artistic influence than the literary.

In 1907 the first specific study appeared, Caccia's Luciano nel Quattrocento in Italia, but the subtitle (Le rappresentazioni e le figurazioni) shows the limits of the monograph, which is only concerned with the presentation of Lucian's dialogues on stage and their representation in art. The scheme of the "tesi di laurea" mentioned in the Avvertenza (pp. III-IV) covering the whole field, seems never to have been fulfilled, for in 1914 came out a second volume, Note su la fortuna di

1 Where full references are not given, the works mentioned may be found in the Bibliography, under the name of the author.
Luciano nel Rinascimento. Le versioni e i dialoghi satirici di Erasme da Rotterdam e di Ulrico Hutten. This deals generally with the XV and XVI centuries in a preliminary essay and specifically in the second part with Erasmus' translations and imitations, and Hutten's dialogues.

Other contributions during this period are three articles by Theodor Distel on the twelfth Dialogue of the Dead as translated by Johann Reuchlin and Ringmann Philesius, and F. Poland's Reuchlin's Verdeutschung des 12 Totengespräch des Lukian. In the 1920's a number of studies appeared which concerned Lucian's role in the Northern Renaissance. First were A. Bauer's articles on Lucian and Hutten, and the Dialogi septe festivi candidi. These were followed by Olga Gewerstock's Lukian und van Hutten in 1924, and Martha Heep's Die Colloquia Familiaria des Erasmus und Lukian, in 1927. The history of the Apelles painting from De Calumnia 5 was examined for its literary manifestations in the Quattrocento by Rudolph Altrocchi in 1921, and in 1927 F.G. Allinson gave some brief indications of Lucian's influence in his Lucian Satirist and Artist, pp. 130ff.

Ludwig Schenk's Lukian und die französische Literatur im Zeitalter der Aufklärung which appeared in 1931 gives some brief indications about Lucian in the French Renaissance, and R. Warwick Bond wrote in the same year on 'Lucian and Boiardo in "Timon of Athens".' But the largest contributions during this period were those of C.R. Thompson. In 1937 he completed his Princeton University Ph.D. thesis Lucian and Lucianism in the English Renaissance: an introductory study. This deals only very generally with the XV century, concentrating on Erasmus and More. In

2 His remarks are, regrettably, also inaccurate, e.g. p.50: "Pontano ... wrote in Latin verse some dialogues of the dead after the Lucianic fashion": p.51: "Nicholas Leonioeno ... also made Latin versions of some of Lucian's dialogues", and so on.
1940 part of this appeared as a monograph entitled The translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More, while his researches are further represented by an article on Erasmus' translation of the Longaevi and a note on the date of the first Aldine Lucian.

Interest in the subject was revived after a decade by E.P. Goldschmidt's 'The first edition of Lucian of Samosata' in 1951. Some corrections were made to this by J. Ruysschaert in 1953. The major development at this time was, however, the spate of studies dealing with Lucian's influence in Renaissance Spain. The first step had, it is true, been taken as long before as 1935, by Otis H. Green, but between 1951 and 1955 M. Morreale sparked off new work with a series of articles on Lucian and Quevedo, as well as the ancient author's impact upon two anonymous pieces (El Crótalon and El Scholástico). S.E. Howell also wrote on Lucian in El Crótalon in 1955. A. Vives Coll led up to the first full study of Lucian in Spain in another article on Quevedo (1954). His Luciano de Samosata en España (1500-1700) appeared in 1959. A further paper, dealing with the judgements made upon Lucian throughout the period dealt with in his book, was published in 1968.

Further work on Lucian in the Northern Renaissance has since appeared in F. Le Roux's study 'De l'Ogmios de Lucien à l'Ogmios de Dürer', Ph. Becker's 'Clément Marot und Lukian', and C. Robinson's edition of Erasmus' translations of Lucian.

It will be clear from this résumé that very little work has been done on Lucian in the Quattrocento. Caccia's monograph represents only a very small part of the picture, and in a footnote in Note (p.7, n.1) the author recognises this: "Su le rappresentazioni e le figurazioni derivate da Luciano nel Quattrocento in Italia è uno studio di N. Caccia ... che dovrà essere rifuso ed entrare in uno studio complessivo su Luciano nel Rinascimento". So complete a survey as Caccia suggests still remains to be done, though I have attempted here to present as full as
possible a history of Lucian in the Italian Quattrocento.

In the absence of any substantial contribution to the specific field in view, a few words are required about the approach which has been adopted here. The impact of an author in any age depends upon his availability, and, if his works are in a foreign tongue, in addition upon expertise in that language or efficient translations which are readily available to a receptive audience. It depends too upon the reputation of the author, and still more upon the contemporary reading and interpretation of his works. Accordingly, the reader will find the thesis arranged so as to present this vital information before any attempt is made to investigate the debt owed to the Syrian satirist in the sphere of original literature. Chapter One gives information of a bibliographical nature (manuscripts, translations, editions), while Chapter Two deals with Lucian's reputation and popularity, the current interpretation of his writings, and the general reasons for the scope and number of translations. Chapter Three examines the history of individual works and their interpretation during the period under scrutiny. Chapter Four is concerned with Lucian and Leon Battista Alberti, and Chapter Five with his impact on other Italian writers of the Quattrocento. The general conclusion includes a conspectus of the information presented in the body of the dissertation.
CHAPTER I

MANUSCRIPTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND EDITIONS
OF LUCIAN IN ITALY IN THE QUATTROCENTO

I: Greek manuscripts  p. 1

II: Translations: A. Latin  

  B. Italian  p. 45

III: Editions, in and before 1500  p. 57
I: Greek manuscripts of Lucian in the 15th century in Italy

Lucian was not an author who was rediscovered dramatically during the Renaissance. His works came to Italy during the general upsurge of interest in Greek literature at the end of the 14th, and the beginning of the 15th century, precisely because he had a place in the canon of authors used by Byzantine teachers, and because these were the true begetters of sound Greek studies in the West.\(^1\)

Being part of the canon ensured easy accessibility, and there was no shortage of manuscripts of Lucian's works, even if complete copies were rare.\(^2\)

It is impossible to date precisely the first appearance of a Greek manuscript of Lucian in Italy, but the earliest Latin translations must be put at least before 1403,\(^3\) and this makes it likely that Manuel Chrysoloras brought one with him in 1396, although the only other evidence for this is the interest shown in Lucian by some of his pupils, which could have arisen at a later date. Guarino da Verona translated two of Lucian's works while in Constantinople between 1403 and 1408,\(^4\) and, though he did not bring a manuscript back with him, he was expecting to be sent one,\(^5\) and did, in fact, possess one at the time.

---

1 He is mentioned by Chrysoloras in a letter to Salutati, c. 1396, (Novati, IV, 2, p.338); in a discussion on the question "Why should the study of Greek not spread to Italy?", Lucian is among a number of classical authors cited, to whom Greek was a foreign tongue.

2 Only four complete copies are mentioned - one by Aurispa (see p. 2), one among Bessarion's books (see p. 4), and two in Lascaris' list of Lorenzo de' Medici's books (see p. 4).

3 See below pp. 12-13 for a discussion of these.

4 See below p. 17-18.

5 Sabbadini, 'Epistolario', II, pp.678-9; the letter dated c.1410 is from one Isidorus, who says (p.679): ἔγεις δὲ ἀμα ἢ οὐν γε τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βοηθείᾳ καὶ τῷ τού ζέενου ἐξαραστέως.
of his death. He had probably received this by the time he translated the *Parasitus*, in Venice, between 1415 and 1419. Antonio Corvinelli left two manuscripts of Lucian among the Greek books which he willed to La Badia in Florence in 1425.

Among the first to possess a complete manuscript must have been Giovanni Aurispa, who mentions *risus et seria omnium Luciani* in his list of books brought back from the East in 1423. This he must have kept long enough to use for his translations, though he no longer had it when he died. His travelling companion on this trip from Greece, Rinuccio da Castiglione, may also have owned a manuscript at this early date. Francesco Filelfo, who also studied in Greece, certainly returned in 1427 with a Lucian, for in a letter to Traversari he lists among his finds *aliqui sermones Luciani*. By the time of his death in 1481, he possessed two copies, one of them perhaps written by himself. Francesco Barbaro owned a manuscript sent to him by Iohannes Simeonachis, the protopope of Crete, teacher also of Rinuccio da Castiglione. Its

---

6 Omont, 'Guarino', p.79. No.15 in the list is Lucianus; this has now been identified by Diller, p.318, with Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 86,7 Aug.fs. (Wittek 180), containing 43 works out of 78.

7 See below p.18. *Parasitus* is in fact the first piece in the ms.

8 Blum p.104, No.29, now Bib.Medicea Laurenziana, Conventi Soppressi 77, containing 58 works, and 88, containing 43 (Wittek 29 and 30). The two together contain 64 genuine works and 2 spurious ones in addition. See below p.8.

9 Sabbadini, 'Carteggio' p.13 in a letter to Ambrogio Traversari.

10 It is not on a list of his mss compiled at his death; Sabbadini, 'Biografia' pp.157-167. Sabbadini, 'Scoperte' I, p.47 has a low opinion of Aurispa's scholarship: "L'A. non fu molto studioso dei suoi codici...egli era invece tutto inteso a mercanteggiarii". A propos of Aurispa and Lucian, Bib.Med. Laurenziana, Conv.Soppr.71 contains a fragment of Dial.Deorum 21 on f.245: on the next page is an autograph epigram of Aurispa. After him, if the ms. was in fact his, it belonged to Antonius Bichus. (Wittek 28. Rostagno & Festa, p.147)

11 His version of *Dialogus Mortuorum* X may date from around this time; see below p.27.

12 Traversari, XXIV, 32 (vol.II, p.1010), dated 13th June (1428).

arrival in Italy can only be approximately dated by Barbaro's death in 1454, but he probably received it much earlier.\textsuperscript{14}

Other humanist collectors obtained Lucians from unspecified sources. Giannozzo Manetti (died 1459) owned Vat. Palat. Gr.174, containing 74 works.\textsuperscript{15} Poggio used a manuscript to translate Asinus, which contained other works of Lucian, but does not say whether it was his own or not.\textsuperscript{16} Aeneas Sylvius, if the ascription on the manuscript may be trusted, was the owner of Escurial Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo, R.III.11, containing 17 works, which went to Spain perhaps even before his death. It has a note on f.117\textsuperscript{V} Alfonso Castellonius D.D. ex Bibliotheca Picolomini Cardinalis Senensis, which would date its acquisition between 1456, when he was raised to the Cardinalate, and 1458, when he became Pope.\textsuperscript{17}

Other great bibliophiles substantially increased the number of Lucians. In the catalogue of Greek books obtained for the Vatican by Nicholas V (died 1455), four manuscripts are mentioned.\textsuperscript{18} Three more were added by Sixtus IV, by the 18th June 1475.\textsuperscript{19} The inventory of Cardinal Bessarion's books, made in 1468 when they were left to S. Marco in Venice, gives a
list of six Lucians, one of them complete. 20

Later in the century, the inventory of Georgius Valla's library reveals two manuscripts, one of which is certainly Modena, Bib. Estense (U.9.10, containing the Dialogi Deorum, the other perhaps ibid. (M.9.9, containing the Soloeista). 21 Rafaello Reggio, Professor at Padua University from 1482, annotated, and probably owned Vat. gr. 1322, containing 44 works. 22 Pico della Mirandola (died 1494) had four Lucians in his library. 23 Lorenzo de' Medici, according to the list given by Janus Lascaria owned five manuscripts, two of them complete, one of them in two sections of different material. 24 This probably accounts for the mention of six distinct manuscripts in the 1495 inventory.

---


22 Nolhac, p. 173; "Orsini nous apprend que c'est le célèbre Rafaello Reggio" who annotated Wittek 151.

23 Kihre, p. 150. No. 218, p. Thineus Loicrus ... Luciani amoris ...; p. 244, no. 933, Lucianus graecus, Luciani dialogi greci ...; p. 293, no. 1610, ... et Luciani dialogi nonnulli; p. 296, no. 1672, Luciani dialogi nonnulli.

24 Müller, p. 373 (a list of Lorenzo's mss. from Vat.gr. 1412) f. 37b Λουκιανού τα πάντα συγγελματα β (B.Laur. 57, 28 or 46?); f. 37b διάλογον του Λουκιανου μέρος β, και μέρος π (B.Laur. 57, 6? But this was owned by Filelfo.) p. 374, f. 38a Λουκιανού συγγελματα β (B.Laur. 57, 13 or 51? But 57, 13 was owned XV - XVI. by Georgius Vespucius, who owned B. Laur. 57, 6?) p. 375, f. 39a Λουκιανού τα πάντα συγγελματα β Müller's identifications with existing mss., it may be seen, are not secure.
of the Medici Library. 25

At each of the great centres of learning, libraries were being set up throughout the fifteenth century. Often, humanist collectors left their books to swell these foundations. We have seen that Corbinelli's manuscripts came to La Badia in Florence after his death, and that Bessarion's were bequeathed during his lifetime to S. Marco in Venice. Nicholas V and Sixtus IV enriched the Vatican's store of classical material immensely, while the books of Lorenzo il Magnifico swelled the Medici collection. Similarly, it seems that Guarino's manuscripts stayed for some time after his death in Ferrara, though they do not appear to have become part of Ercole I's library. 26 All these collections held copies of Lucian, and most were at the disposal of scholars in their vicinity. Thanks to notices left in the Vatican catalogues, we may even catch a glimpse of their borrowing activity. At the very beginning of Nicholas V's pontificate, a considerable number of the Greek manuscripts in the collection were lent to Isidore, Cardinal of Russia. The date given is May 10th 1447, and among the books there appears Item Lucianus, heroica Philostrati in papyro. 27 Isidore, it seems


26The list of Guarino's mss. (published in Omont, 'Guarino') indicates that they are nunc Ferrariae, but the date of the document is uncertain. Diller, p. 318 says that they were in the Ducal library at Mantua until 1630.

27Milntz & Fabre, p. 339-340: Sładn. mandavit mihi Cosme confessori E.S. tradi et liberari libros grecos sequentes quos concessit ad usum vite Remi dni Cardinalis Rutheni, postea prefate bibliotece restituendos, then the date and list.
was a keen student of Lucian. Even if he is not the same man who had some years earlier promised a manuscript of his works to Guarino, he certainly was responsible for writing supplements to Vaticanus gr. 90 and 947, and for the transcription of Vat. gr. 914. On 23 November 1455, Franciscus Aretinus (Francesco Griffolini), who translated several of Lucian's works, borrowed some manuscripts from Nicholas' collection, among which may have been a Lucian. On 9 May 1485, one Petrus Certaldus borrowed from Sixtus IV's library, *librum grecum ubi sunt quaedam opera Luciani*. He returned it on the 14 January following.

Impetus was given to Greek studies in the early Quattrocento, once an interest was established, by easy access to the treasures of the Eastern libraries, and by friendly relations between Greek and Italian scholars. Several of the manuscripts noted above came to Italy by the personal donation of a Greek friend or teacher. The unification of the Eastern and Western Churches brought Bessarion, whom we have encountered as a great manuscript collector, and Isidore of Russia, who was both a scribe and a student of Lucian, Cardinalates in the Roman Curia. But it was, above all, the fall of Constantinople in 1453 which ensured, by stranding many of the Greeks already in Italy, and driving others to seek refuge there, that the studies then so strong would not fail from lack of teachers or books.

A number of manuscripts can be seen to have belonged to, or been written by, these Greeks in exile. Madrid, Bib. Nacional 4769, containing *Tyrannicida*, has an index in the hand of Constantine Lascaris.  

28 Wittek nos. 136, 146 & 143; Vat. gr. 947 contains 29 works, no. 914, 9.
29 Müntz & Fabre, p. 316; the ms. reads Lucrini, but the collator suggests that it may be Luciani. For Aretinus' translations, see below pp. 36-39.
30 Müntz & Fabre, p. 295.
31 Wittek 44; Yriarte, I, p. 164.
Rhosus, a member of the Aldine academy in Venice, wrote Bib. Med. Laurenziana, 32, 48, containing 17 works, ibid. 57, 46, containing 18, and Goerlitz, Milische Bibliothek 12, containing 59. Michael Apostolius (1422-1480) and his son Aristobulus Apostolides (1465-1535) wrote Vatican, Suppl. gr. 205, containing 4 works. Georgius Hermonymus of Sparta wrote Paris, Bib. Nationale 1638, containing 5 works. Cosmas Hieromonachus finished writing Venice, S. Marco 435, containing 79 works, at Rome on the 22 June 1471. Bartholomaeus de Columnis (da Chio), the printer, wrote a supplement to Vat. gr. 949, containing 2 works. Scribal activity, however, was not confined solely to Greeks. Filelfo, we have seen, may have written Laurenziano 57, 6 while Bartholomaeus Comparinus of Prati (floruit 1484), wrote Laurenziano 57, 29, containing 6 works.

It is impossible to state precisely the number of separate manuscripts of Lucian in circulation at this period, but the above evidence allows the establishment of a minimum figure. The items noted in library lists and catalogues of large foundations are clearly distinct, and amount in number to 21, the acquisition of 15 of which dates certainly before 32. Geanokoplos, p. 55, n. 5 died c. Feb. 1498. Wittek, 16, 24, 34.


34. Wittek 82.

35. Wittek 170. Date, Vogel & Gardthausen, p. 236.


37. Wittek 21. Date from Cosenza, s.v. Comparini, Bartolommeo. In addition to the mss. listed, the Xc. codex British Museum, Harley 5694, belonged to one Johannes Chalceopylus, Constantinopolitanus in the XVe., before passing to Antonio Seripandi (died 1539). (Wittek 40. Thompson, E.M., I, p. 15). I have been unable to discover whether or not Chalceopylus was in Italy.
On the other hand, at least 23 of the manuscripts still extant can be traced either by their scribe or their owner to the Italy of the Quattrocento, and this gives a safer guide. Some indication of the true figure may be gleaned from the fact that of the extant manuscripts at least 55 are XV century, while in all 111 originate from the period 1300-1500.38

It is, however, feasible to give a more precise statement of the evidence of Lucian's availability provided by datable manuscripts than has been done before. C. Robinson, following Dr. Bolgar, stated that 65 works were available by 1425, 83 by 1459, and by 1475 the complete corpus.39 The figures were taken from the manuscripts of Corbinelli, who left them to La Badia in 1425, that of Giannozzo Manetti, who died in 1459, and the Vatican catalogue of 1475, which mentions seven manuscripts of Lucian's 'works'. In fact, as we have seen above, the two Laurentian manuscripts of Corbinelli (Conv.Soppr.77 and 88) contain between them 66 works, not 65, and two of these are spurious. The figure 83 for Manetti was an error in Stevenson, and should read 74, though three of these are spurious. The Vatican catalogue is too vague for us to judge if all the works were contained there, and should not be used for a precise statement of availability, as Aurispa's mention of his manuscript in 1423 also should not. The figures from Corbinelli give us 64 genuine works available by 1425 at the latest, and collation of these two manuscripts with Manetti's gives us 72 by 1459. A further collation of these three manuscripts and Pal.gr.73, Barbaro's manuscript, indicates that the 6 missing genuine works were available.

38 Figures established by collation from Wittek.

39 Robinson, p.363; Bolgar, p.480.
by 1454. All 78 genuine works were, then, available in the Greek by
1459 at the latest. If we accept that Guarino's manuscript was sent
to him before he translated *Parasitus*, we may also say (collating this
with Corbinelli's manuscripts) that 69 of the genuine works were available
in Greek by 1425. This figure must be raised, moreover, to 71, since two
of the works missing in the Guarino/Corbinelli selection are *Timon* and
*Charon*, which had been translated before 1403 in Florence. 40

Great store was still set by the possession of manuscripts, and
people still sought them even when the text was available in print. 41 It
was, nevertheless, the *editio princeps* by Laurentius de Alopa, Florence
1496, which imposed for the first time a standardisation on the size of
the corpus, not present in the manuscripts. All of the works published
in the edition of Jacobits, 42 except *Nero* and *Epigrammata*, are present,
and it is worth noting that doubt is cast upon the authenticity of both
*Philopatris* and *Charidemus*. 43 The editor of this text was, says Legrand,
Janus Lascaris, who had worked in the years previous upon other editions
from the same press. 44 The evidence for this is not, however, given in
the volume itself, which appears with only the date in the colophon. It
comes from a letter written by Marcus Musurus to Lascaris as a dedication
for the Aldine edition of Pausanias in 1516. The passage quoted by Le-
grand in support of Lascaris' editorship leaves little doubt that his
conclusion was correct, referring as it does to several notable products

---

40 See below pp. 12-16.

41 Alberto Pio bought Georgius Valla's manuscript in 1499 (Bertoni, p.144,
n.1); John de Monacis, a Venetian, sought to buy a Lucian around the
same time (Geanokoplos, p.51, n.33).

42 Lipsiae, 1836-41.

43 After *Philopatris* is the note ὁ δ' ὁδὸς ὁ δ' ὁδὸς δοκεῖ εἶναι τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ
and after *Charidemus* οὕτως ὁδὸς δοκεῖ τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ.

(Gnomac), p.42 (Apollonius Rhodius). See note 45 below.
of Alopa’s press, and one in particular to which Lascaris and Alopa had both actually put their names.\textsuperscript{45} The success of the volume must, however, be in part doubted, for there were enough copies of the original edition still left to persuade the Giuntine press to use them in a combined edition with the works of Philostratus in 1517.\textsuperscript{46} Nonetheless, the fact that Aldus produced an edition so soon after Alopa as 1503, tends to suggest that the remaindering of the editio princeps was due to other causes than the unpopularity of the Syrian’s works.

\textsuperscript{45}Catalogue B.M., VI, p.668. "The title is printed from the same type as that of the Philostratus published by Filippo Giunta, Florence 1517, with the addition of the words \textit{LOKIANOY - LUCIANI OPERA ...}".

\textsuperscript{46}The Apollonius edition appeared in 1496 (Legrand I, pp. 42-3). The editio princeps of the Greek Anthology was published with preface by Lascaris and colophon mentioning Alopa in 1494. Legrand I, pp.29-38.
II: Italian translators and translations, Latin and vernacular in the
XV century

Greek studies, even at the high tide of the Renaissance, were always the interest of a comparatively small minority. But within that minority there was, in XV century Italy, no shortage of translators of Lucian, through the medium of whose versions his works might become more generally known. In the list which follows are mentioned versions by at least two different anonymous writers, together with those of fourteen scholars whose names have come down with their translations, many of them well known for other things. To the body of vernacular translations the main contribution was made by one man, Nicolao Leoniceno, with two others providing a single version each.

Interestingly, out of 159 works in the corpus, the Quattrocento produced Latin versions of only 34, while Leoniceno's Italian translations add a further 20 which do not seem to have been Latinised at this period. Versions may, of course, have been lost, but by and large this figure reflects the scope of contemporary interest in Lucian fairly.

Most worthy of note is the content of the Quattrocento selection. More will be said of this below in Chapters II and III, but meanwhile the reader will notice the preponderance of works in Latin versions with some overt moral content. Most remarkable is the total of four separate translations of De Calumnia, though Charon is a close second with three. In the Italian versions the selection seems slightly less dictated by the

47 Bolgar, p.458.

48 Counting the collections Dialogi Mortuorum etc., singly, Verae Historiae and Phalaris as two works each, Saturnalia as one work, not three, and excluding Halcyon, Epistulae, Philopatris, Charidemus, Nero, Epigrammata and Saltatores.
search for precepts, but De Calumnia is still represented by two translations, and almost all the Latinised works find a place. The direction of Quattrocento interest may perhaps be most briefly indicated by the example of Aurispa's 'translation' of Dialogus Mortuorum XII. His version, materially altered to pronounce and uphold the humanist values learned from Classical antiquity, is that which finds its way into Italian translations. In the Latin text it is, on a count of manuscripts, by far the most popular work of 'Lucian' during the whole period.

The following list is as far as possible chronological. Dating criteria and other relevant information is set out for each translator after the incipit and explicit of preface and translation.

A. LATIN

(1) Bertholdus - Timon

_Incipit:_ Timon: O Jupiter amabilis, hospitalis, amicabilis, vestalis, fulgurator, adiurabilis, collector nubium, tonitruum opifex et si quid aliud te altisoni poete vocant, presertim cum tuo ad eorum carmina favore indigent -

_ExPLICIT:_ sed nec incruenti, nec vulneribus sine.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Contained in the following mss:- Florence, B. Laurenziana, S.Croce, Plut. XXV, sin.cod.IX,f.77 (Bandini, 'Codd.mss.Lat.' IV,p.189: according to Sabbadini NAV XXX, p.239, it begins f.83): Vat.lat.989,ff.81v-90v ('Codd. Vat.Lat.',II,i,pp.464-466. This ms. may have belonged to Coluccio Salutati; Ullman,pp.184-5): Bergamo A.II.33,f.64 (Sabbadini, NAV XXX, p.238,n.1): Brescia, Queriniano,B.II.21,ff.85v-99 (Sabbadini, NAV XXXI, p.260; Kristeller,I,p.34): Padova, B. Antoniana, Scaff.1,N,19 (Josa,p.61).

Contained in the following incunabula:- Georg Lauer, Rome, c.1470 (Hain, 10269): Simone Bevilaqua, Venice, 1494 (Hain 10261): Ulrich Scinsenzeler, Milan 1497 (Hain, 10262): Johannes Baptista Sessa, Venice, 1500 (Hain, 10263).
The date of the translation cannot be exactly determined, but the subscription to Laurenziano, S. Croce, 25, sin. cod. 9, gives 26 May 1403 as the date of transcription, and a letter from Antonio da Romagno to Pietro Marcello, Bishop of Ceneda (1399-1409, died 1429), which mentions the dialogue, is dated 16 January 1403. It may be even earlier than this, for the rubricator sheet to Georg Lauer's Rome, c.1470 edition of translations, which gives the translator's name as Bertholdus, also supplies the identity of the dedicatee, Peregrino de' Zambeccari, Chancellor of Bologna, who was still alive in 1399, when he made his will, but "died soon after 1400". Nothing further is known, however, of Bertholdus, except that a Lutianus ex greco per Bertholdum was owned by Duke Borso d'Este. Even Sabbadini had searched in vain to identify him.

The translation is, according to Sabbadini, in the style of the Chrysoloran school. It became the standard version in the printed texts of the century, although its partner in the Laurentian and Vatican manu-

---

50 Bandini, 'Codd. mss. Lat.', IV, p.189. MCCCCIII 26 Mai scripta sunt hec. Frater Thedaldus tunc vacans. This scribe was Tedaldo della Casa, who left his books to S. Croce in 1406. (Goldschmidt, p.12).

51 Sabbadini, NAV XXX, P.228: the relevant passage is - nunc denique cum Timone tuo paupere modo divite, facetiis elegantia, lepidis gravia, seria ioci misceo.

52 This sheet, originally published by Sabbadini, NAV XXXI, pp.260-261, correcting his previous remarks in NAV XXX, p.219-221, was republished in ignorance of Sabbadini's second article by Goldschmidt (facing p.10). This fact was noted by Ruyschcaert in some remarks on Goldschmidt's article. The rubric reads: hoc Luciani opus per me Bertholdum ex greco translatum tibi de Zambeccariis mitto oratorum inclite peregrine, ut ex correctione tua et labore meo, aliqua eternitas oriatur. On the date of his will, see Sabbadini, NAV XXX, p.220; of his death, Goldschmidt, p.12.

53 Bertoni, p.216; entry 28 in the library inventory, Die Sabati XI ms. Julii 1467.

54 N.A.V., XXXI, p. 261.

55 N.A.V., XXX, p. 221; he prints a section of the translation at pp.238-239 of that article.
scripts, the anonymous Charon, came under sufficient criticism to merit a revision, Bertholdus finally met a similar fate in the withering words of Erasmus, addressing a new version to Ruthall in 1506.

(ii) Anonymous - Charon

Incipit: Mercurius: Quid rides o Charon? vel cur relicta cimba in hanc lucem venisti, nequaquam inter superos versari consuetus? Charon: Desideravi o Mercuri, videre quales res vitae sint queve agent in ea homines quibusque indigi omnes ad nos descendentes plorent; nullus quippe sine lacrimis transnavigavit-

Explicit: - de Charone vero nullus est sermo.

The sole evidence for dating this version is the subscription to the S.Croce manuscript, mentioned above with reference to Bertholdus,

---

56 See below p. 16, n.64.

57 Is est Luciani dialogus quo vix alius lectu vel utilior vel iucundior, versus quidem ille iam pridem ab alio necio quo, sed ita versus ut interpretes hoc modo demonstrare voluisse videatur, sese neque Graece scire neque latine; neque temere adeo quis suspicetur, eum interpretatem subornatum esse ab iis qui Luciano male volunt. Robinson p.488.

58 The first section of this version was transcribed by R. Sabbadini, N.A.V. XXX, p.239-241, from Florence, Bib.Med.Laurenziana, S.Croce, Plut. XXV, sin. cod. IX, f.92 (Bandini, 'Codd.mss.Lat.', IV, p.189, says it begins on f.86); a shorter excerpt of the version is given by Willmanns & Bertalot, pp.495-6; the explicit is given by Bandini, loc.cit. In the S.Croce ms. it follows the translations of Timon by Bertholdus, as also in Vatican, Lat.989, f.90v-96v (Salutati's ms.). Other mss.: Venice, Bib.Marciana, XIV, 220(4196) - begins Quid agis ... but continues as this version (Kristeller, II, p.267). Lat.3171, also begins Quid agis ... (Kristeller, II, p.317. Lockwood, p.99, n.1, notes this and the Venice ms. as copies of the anon. version). Also: Parisinus Lat.6142, f.60; Vat. Ottobon, 1267, f.69-73 (Willmanns & Bertalot, pp.494-5).
which sets it before 26 May 1403. The translation is according to Sabbadini, closer to the Greek than that of Bertholdus, though it, too, has lapses. This, and the fact that it is found in a separate transmission from the Timon, as well as together with it, argues for a distinct author.

No indication of the identity of the translator is to be found in any of the codices. But, since the version is early, one may conjecture, with Willmanns and Bertalot, that it was the Johannes Petrus Bracchus of whom Gesner, in the Bibliotheca Universalis, said:

traduxit duas Demosthenis Orationes: Et Luciani Dialogos quodam. 60

Oudin identified him with Petrus de Braco, natione Italus patria Placentinus, cuius aetas mihi incerta est, celeberrimus in Decretis Doctor, circa annum 1380 floruisse mihi videtur, quantum conjici potest ex inspectione manuscriptorum ejus operum. 61

Firmin-Didot adds that he was a contemporary of Leontius Pilatus. 62 Willmanns and Bertalot mention that he was sacri palatii auditor et Innocentii VI (1352-1362) capellanus, but say that G. Mazzuchelli ("Scrittori d'Italia", II, 4, 1698) and others have cast doubt upon the identification of the canonist with the translator. 63

It remains, nevertheless, one of the two earliest versions. The fact that it was never printed must be attributed to the revision of

59Sabbadini, N.A.V. XXX, p.221.
60Willmanns & Bertalot, p.496. Gesner, f446v.
62Didot, p.xxix.
63loc. cit. n.60.
Rinuccio Aretino, and the harsh words he used of it in presenting his new translation. 64

(iii) Guarino da Verona (1374-1460)

(a) De Calumnia

Clari viri Guarini Veronensis in calumniam Luciani ad Iohannem

Quirinum ordinis patricii prohemium

Incipit: Animadverti saepe mecum, Quirine pater-

Explicit: ...ea quoque plane licebit ex legendis intueri

Translation incipit: Gravis profecto res ignorantia est et multorum malorum hominibus causa, utpote quae nonnullam rebus caliginem infundet ipsamque veritatem obsuscet et cuiusque vitam involvat umbris ...

65

(b) Muscae collaudatio vel explicatio

Preface: Guarinus Veronensis R° patri domino Scipioni Mainenti episcopo Mutinensi dignissimo.

Incipit: Animum superioribus diebus adverti, pater optime -

Explicit: - quam laudantis laudatio

64 Lockwood, p.96: Seraphius Urbinas had drawn his attention to it: Ia nuper cum Luciani philosophi apud graecos sui tempore clarissimi quendam legeret dialogum qui inscribirat Caron latinum nescio quo interprete iam diu factum me pro mutua inter nos consuetudine rogavit ut illum sui gratiam emendarem corrigeremusque, quoniam exstarent quam multa eo mendoza quod ad sententias explicandas ut plurimum eset opus Sibyllae interprete. Ego vero ... dialogum illum cendi ... quam ... minime miratus sum si parum aut nihil latine intelligi poterat, quoniam non conversus sed maiori ex parte confusus ac perversus erat ...

65 Sabbadini, 'Epistolario' I, p.6-7: he does not give the explicit. Mss. (additional to those given loc. cit.): Milan, Bib. Ambrosiana, M.4 (Kristeller, I, p.334); Modena, Bib. Estense, lat.20 (Kristeller, I, p.377); Venice, Bib. Marciana, 498 (1919) (Kristeller, II, p.214); Belluno, Seminario Gregoriano, 29 (Kristeller, II, p.495). This version was not printed in the XV century.
Translation:

Incipit: Musca quidem adeo inter volucres pusilla est -

Explicit: - elephantem e musca fecisse videar. 66

(c) Parasitus

Preface: Guarinus Veronensis cl. v. Petro Donato

archepiscopo Cretensi, sal. pli.

Incipit: (in anapaests) V eterem Draconem sive Solona -

Explicit: (line 7) Curasque graves solare ioco.

Translation:

Incipit: Quid iam Simon inquies ex ceteris ... 67

In the prefatory letter to De Calumnia, Guarino says that the version represents the first-fruits of Quirinus' cultivation quas eo gratiores habere debess quo a longinqua magis regione et alienigenis lectae sunt. In a letter to the same person in 1416 he mentions eam ... orationem quam olim ex Luciano ad te misi (referring to this piece), and in the same year he lists for Bartolommeo da Montepulciano his works,


67 Sabbadini, 'Epistolario', I, p.222 cites Agostini, "Scrivitori Viniziani", II, p.151, as his only authority for the preface; Agostini, he says, took it "da un cod. cart. miscell. in 8° nella libreria dei Ss. Giovanni e Paolo in Venezia". This cod. has recently been noted by Prof. Kristeller (II, p.251). It is Marc. lat. VI, 134 (3565), whose superscript begins: Dialogus Lucii Apuleii in quo disputando concluditur Parasiticam artem esse (Agostini gives concluditur disputando): Agostini continues - ac illam dignitatem aeteris praestare artibus. De greca in latinias litteras versus per Guarinum Veronensem ad Petrum Donatum archiepiscopum Cretensem. Sabbadini also cites the source for the title to the preface as Agostini. I have taken the incipit for the version from Kristeller, I, p.211 (Florence, Bib. Riccardiana, cod. 952, ff.35-52) where the superscript reads: Quid ars sit ea quam parasiticam vocant, Collocutores Tychiades philosophus et Simon parasitus. This version was not printed in XV century.
among which we find Calumniarm Luciani, breve sane opusculum, in quo prima posui tirocinia. On the strength of this evidence, the version can be fixed within the period of Guarino's studies at Constantinople (1403-1408). Sabbadini dated the prefatory letter Constantinopoli 1405-06 c. 68

The Muscae collaudatio, although not dedicated to Scipio Mainente until around 1438-40, can also be assigned to this period from a remark made by Guarino in that dedication: inter versandum seadas nonnullas amoenum quoddam occurrit opusculum quod dum linguae graecae rudimenta pridem exercere coepti iuvenilis quondam lusit aetas. His own title for the piece is Muscae laudes. 69

The Parasitus is dated by Sabbadini to the period of Guarino's stay in Venice (1414-1419). Donati's accession to the episcopacy of Crete gives the terminus post quem of 1415, while a reference to the version in a letter of Sicco Polenton gives a terminus ante quem of 1419. 70

In the catalogue of Pico della Mirandola's library appears the entry: Lucianus contra imperitum multos libros ementem quem transtulit G. Veronensis. Since no such version is attested elsewhere, or survives in any manuscript now extant, it is permissible to conjecture that the entry may be at fault in citing Guarino as the author. This mistake

---

68 Quotations from Sabbadini, 'Epistolario' I, p. 7; I, p. 126 (dated by Sabbadini, from Padova); I, p. 104. For this and Muscae collaudatio and Parasitus see also Sabbadini, 'Scuola' p. 125.

69 Sabbadini, 'Scuola', p. 125 says it was sent in 1438; in 'Epistolario', II, p. 406 (source of the quotation) he sets the later date.

may be explained by the fact that another Guarino, Guarino Camers, (1450-1537) also known as Varinus Phavorinus, produced versions of Lucian, and of this work in particular. 71

Guarino's translations seem to have gained favour, at least among the humanists. They are mentioned by Francesco Barbaro, in a list of Greek versions by Leonardo Aretino and Guarino. 72

(iv) Giovanni Aurispa (1372-1460)

(a) Dialogus Mortuorum XII

Preface: Ad Baptistem Caputdeferro romanum civem ordinis militaris virum praetorem Bononiae ab Aurispa translatio ex Graeco in Latinum Dialogi Luciani a Libanio emendati de comparatione Alexandri Hannibalis et Scipionis.

Incipit: Cum in rebus bellicis semper, ceteris vero animi virtutibus -

Explicit: - apud inferos de praestantia certant

Translation:

Incipit: Alexander: Me, o Libyce, praeponi decet; melior equidem sum -


72 Quirini, II, p.188, no.CXXVII: Leonardi Aretini et Guarini Veronensis ... ope et opera et ingenio factum est, ut multa scitum pulcherrima a nostris locundae legi quantque ab Tacrate, Platone, Demosthene, Xenophante, Plutarcho, Luciano grece didicerant.
Explicit: - neque hic quidem spernendus est. 73

(b) De Amicitia (Toxaris)

Preface: Ad Leonallum Estensem et Ludovicum de Gonzaga
adulescentes illustres Luciani de amicitia Aurispa.

Incipit: Amicitiam exhortantimihi, quae bona ex ea
nascentur, quas laudes habeat, inprimis dicere par
esse videbatur -

Explicit: - at exordium dictionis Mnisippo datur.

Translation:

Incipit: Mnisippus: Quid ais o Toxari? Facitis rem divinam
Oresti et Pyladi vos Scythae, deosque illos creditis?

Explicit: - si tales amicos nactus fueris qualis tu nobis esse
videris prassenti oratione. 74

73 Förster, 'Libanius', p.221-3: I have completed the superscription from
the three mss. used by Förster in publishing the preface (Gieszen, 1256;
Marciana, Lat. class. XIV, cod. cxxviii; Marciana, Lat.class. XIV, cod.
cxlv), but it varies in other mss. Sabbadini, 'Carteggio', p.174, gives
other sources as - Magliabechiana, XXI, 9; Monac. lat. 7888; Class. di
Ravenna, 186; Guaraniano 47 di S. Daniele del Friulii; Laurenzianna,
Ashb. 1657. A comprehensive list of the mss. of this version would take
up too much space here: Kristeller alone mentions 75 separate mss., and
these are only uncatalogued codd. in Italian libraries. Printed in the
following incunabula:- (i) (Laur., Rome) c.1470 (Hain 10269): (ii)
(Leonardus Achates, Venice) (Fava, p.157, no.347) or (Padua) (Catalogue
B.M., VII, p.926), 1482 (Hain 10276): (iii) (Piero Brun/Juan Gentil, Seville,
c.1492) (Haebler, I, pp.174-5, no.372): (iv) S. Bevilacqua, Venice, 1494 (Hain,
10261): (v) U. Scinzenzeler, Milan, 1497 (Hain, 10262): (vi) N. Lepe, Avignon,
1497 (Hain 10268): (vii) J.B. Sessa, Venice, 1500 (Hain 10263): (viii)
Jacob Thanner, Lipsiae, 1500 (Hain, 10274): (ix) s.l., typ. et a. (Hain
10275, As 10276, but wrongly ascribed to Guarino): (x) s.l., typ. et a.
(Balling, p.204, no.1583).

74 Sabbadini, 'Biografia', p.62 n.1, quotes the superscription from Vat.
Barber. 2709 (now Ottob.1592, xxx, 25; Kristeller, II, p.448). Bandini,
'Codd. ms.Lat.', III, p.270 transcribes some of the preface, and the
incipit and explicit from Laurenzianna, Gadd.Fluit.LXXIX, suppl. cod. xvi,
f.61v. I have used Ms.Balloil College, Oxford, 315, ff.30v-44, which has
better readings in the preface (ex ea not ea, videbar not videbatur as
Bandini loc. cit.). I have also seen the version in Ms.472, Corpus
Christi College, Cambridge (ff.294-373), which is mutilated at the
beginning. Sabbadini also mentions Rimini 154: Kristeller - Milan, Bib.
Ambrosiana J.33, (I, p.294; anon.): ibid., T.39, f.3r-44v (I, p.343;
with pref.): Viterbo Bib. Capitolare 25, formerly d.51, f.2 (II, p.305;
with pref.): Vatican, Rossiano 336 (IX, 26) (II, p.465; with pref.): ibid.,
Chis. S.v.8, f.1-15, fasc. 10 (II, p.490).
The "translation" of the twelfth Dialogue of the Dead, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter III, was made while Aurispa was in Bologna in 1425, and dedicated to the then papal governor, Baptista da Capodiferro. The latter's presence as governor in Bologna at this date is confirmed by the state archives for that year, while the place of translation is indicated both by the reference to hic ives in the prefatory letter, and by a letter sent to Tommaso Fregoso (Jamensia) in 1426 enclosing the version, where Aurispa states cum Bononiae esses comparationem quandam famosissimorum ducum de greco, in latinum transtuli. 75

The version of De Amicitia may be dated, from a letter of Antonio Panormita which mentions Amiciciam Luciani nuperrime ab Aurispa siculo ex graeco latinam factam, before August 1430. The translation was not printed in the XV century, but Duke Ercole of Ferrara was among those who owned a copy of it. 76

Although these two versions are the only ones attributable to Aurispa of those XV century translations still extant, there may have been more, since Bartolommeo Fazio says of him in De Viris Illustribus opuscula nonnulla Luciani, ac Xenophantis librum in latinum traduxit. He may, however, be speaking inaccurately. 77

75 Sabbadini, 'Biografia' p.31,n.1, and pp.187-8: summed up in 'Carteggio' p.174. The date 1425 is perhaps not quite accurate. Aurispa was in Bologna 1424-5: in a note on letter xiii, 'Carteggio', p.22, Sabbadini says that the reference there to the translation of a clarum opus from the Greek may be to Dialogus Mort. xii, yet he dates this letter "second half of 1424". The letter to Fregoso is no.xxviii, 'Carteggio', p.45.

76 Sabbadini, 'Biografia', dated the version 1432 (p.62, n.1), but later decided on 1429 or 1430 ('Carteggio', p.175), because he had in the meantime established the date of Panormita's letter as August, 1430 (though in 'Ottanta lettere', p.58 he puts it in November, 1430). See Resta, 'Epistolario', p.225, no.476. Ercole's copy is listed in Bertoni, p.244, no.256.

77 Mehus, p.19.
(v) Lapo da Castiglionchio, Junio (c.1405-1438)
(a) De fletu
(b) De somnio

Preface (to both): Ad beatissimum patrem et dominum Eugenium, sanctae romanae ecclesiae Pontificem summum, Lapic Castelliunculi praefatio

Incipit: Vetustissima consuetudo fuit, beatissime pater -

Explicit: - pro tua clementia et facilitate experiri patiare

De fletu. Incipit: Operae pretium videtur esse quae in fletibus a multitudine fiunt -

Explicit: omnium esse opinetur.

De somnio. Incipit: Cum primum essem ad pubertatem aetate ipsae prorectus -

Explicit: nullius gloria antecellit. 73

(c) De longaevis
(d) Patriae laudatio

Preface (to both): Ad doctissimum ac religiosissimum virum dominum Gregorium Corarium apostolicae sedis prothonotarium.

Incipit: Luciani dissertissimi viri nuper libellum, quem de longaevis edidit -

Explicit: benigne inter tuos annumeres.

73 Luiso, pages 276-285 of his article deal with the translations, giving dates, substantial portions of the prefaces, incipits and explicits, and ms. sources. For De Fletu and De somnio, see p. 276-8; Mss: Magliabechiano, xxiii, 126, f.101: Laurenziana, lxxix, inf.13, f.145: Paris lat., 1616: Vat. lat. 3570: Comune di Rimini, 154: Florence, Riccardiana 149 (of which I have a microfilm), f.1.
De longaevis: Incipit: Somnium est hoc quoddam. Iussus ego longaevo hominum tibi muneri mitto —

Explicit: — augustissime Quintille, in alio libro explicabo

Patriae laudatio:

Incipit: Patria quidem nihil esse dulcius

Explicit: nam patriae nomen ignavia fortitudinem

commutat. 79

(e) Demonactis vita

Preface: Ad clementissimum virum dominum Aloysium episcopum

Tragurie nse, Lapi Castelliounculi praefatio in

Demonactis philosophi vitam incipit:

Incipit: Cum ab eximias virtutes et singularem eruditionem tuam —


Translation:

Incipit: Debuit profecto nostra setas viros claros litterisque

et memoria celebrandos —

Explicit: — qui haec ipsa legerit, facile iudicare poterit. 80


(f) De sacrificiis

(g) De tyranno

Preface (to both): Ad doctissimum et disertissimum virum
Baptistam Albertum, Lapi Castellianculi in Luciani opusculum prooemium

Incipit: Nec satis scio, nec si sciam ausim profiteri -

Explicit: - scribendo ac periclitando posteritati et gloriae serviamus

De sacrificiis:

Incipit: Quae in sacrificiis celebratibusque deorum templo adeuntes -

Explicit: - hominum insaniam est solitus.

De tyranno:

Incipit: Post duos a me tyrannos une die, iudices, interfectos, hunc iam senio confectum -

Explicit: - omnibus ministerium praebuit. 81

(h) De Calumnia

Preface: Ad clarissimum virum dominum Johannem Reatinum apostolicæ camerae clericum, Lapi Castellianunculi praefatio in Luciani libellum de calumnia feliciter incipit.

Incipit: Perquirenti mihi diu, cum tibi latine aliquid interpretari vehementer cuperem -

Explicit: - ad tuum arbitrium libentissime referemus

Translation:

Incipit: Quam pernicioso res inscitia sit et quot mala ab illa nascentur hominibus -

Explicit: - splendore quodam patefactis atque illustratis. 82

The main contemporary evidence for dating these versions is that of Vespasiano da Bisticci in his life of Lapo in "Vite d'Uomini Illustri": essendo la corte di Roma a Firenze, cominciò a tradurre opere di Luciano e Plutarco. Taking this as his starting point Luiso dates the individual pieces as follows: De fletu and De somnio, 1434; Demonactis vita between 1434 and August 1437 (date of the dedicatee's accession to the rank of archbishop); De sacrificiiis and De Tyranno (not the Cataplus, but the declamation Tyrannicida) between 1436 and 1438; De calumnia between 1434 and 1438. 83 These versions were not printed in the XV century.

(vi) Rinuccio da Castiglione, Aretino. (c. 1395-1456 or 1457)

(a) Charon

Letter: Magnifico Domino L. de Columna Rinucius felicitatem

Incipit: Caloribus proxime superioribus -

Explicit: - ad meliora tempora reserva.

Preface: Luciani dialogus qui inscribitur Caron latinus per Rinutium denuo factus ad reverendissimum patrem dominum Iohannem Cardinalem Morinensem.

Incipit: Seraphius Urbinas vir utriusque iuris interpres -

Explicit: - Mercurius iam loquitur cum Carone.


83 Vespasiano’s comment, II, p.228. Luiso, pp.276-285 for dates and for detailed reasoning.
Dialogi argumentum:

Incipit: Demum ille Caron -

Explicit: - sic inquienia.

Translation:

Incipit dialogus cuius interlocutores primi sunt Mercurius et Caron: Mercurius: Quid rides, O Caron, et quid apud superos relict a cymba venisti qui non sis solitus intueri lucem?

Caron: Ego quidem O Mercuri iamdudum optavi res hominum actuque videre -

Explicit: - ante obitum tamen verbum de Charone faciunt nullum. 84

(b) Dialogus mortuorum X

Preface: Luciani opusculum latinum per Rynucium factum et primo prohemium ad Bonacursium CANDICUM.

Incipit: Saepe et multum ea mecum cogitavi quae hac temporum clade -

Explicit: Lucianum audiamus sic dicentem.

Translation:

Necricus dialogus Carontis Mercuriique.

Incipit: Audite quo quidem pacto nostra se negotia habeant -

Explicit: - rotas scilicet et lapides ac vultures, atque vitam cuisquae examinari necesse est. 85

---

84 Lockwood, pp. 94-97. To his list of printed sources, I can add: Foitier, c. 1498, Jehan Bouyer and Guillaume Bouchet; Gates, No. 3269 (Pressmark Inc. 5. D. 7.1. (4310)), pp. 549-550.

85 Lockwood, pp. 97-100. The mss. of this work divide into two classes, the worse of which omits the preface to Bonacursius Candidus, and attributes the version to Auriapa.
(c) Vitarum venditio

Letter: Laurentio Columnae Rinutius prosperitatem

Incipit: Diebus superioribus una cum litteris meis -

Explicit: - Vale et me tibi commenda.

Preface: Luciani dialogus qui insribitur philosophorum illustrium vitarum venditio latinus per Rinucium factus ad Seraphium Urbinatem eximum utriusque iuris interpretem. Incipit et primo prohemium.

Incipit: Luciani dialogum qui inscribitur -

Explicit: - ipsam iam accedamus.

Argumentum:

Incipit: Nundinas Atticas cum nundinatores -

Explicit: Iupiter Mercurium sic alloquitur.

Translation:

Incipit dialogus cuius interloquutores sunt in primis Jupiter et Mercurius praeter hos vita et mercator: Tu quam primum dispone sedilia atque venalitium modo -

Explicit: - si prae senti cum pecunia modo venerit emtor. 86

Lockwood assigns the version of Dialogus mortuorum X to the period of Rinuccio's studies in Greece, between 1415 and 1423, because it is dedicated to a Cretan, and because the preface refers to his teacher, Iohannes Simeonachis, another Cretan. 87 This is supported by the early dating of manuscript Venice, Bib. Marciana, 498 (1919), put by Lockwood around 1425, and by Kristeller around 1427. 88 The fact

86 Lockwood, pp.101-102. This is the only one of the three versions which was not printed in the XV century.

87 Lockwood, pp.51-2.

88 Lockwood, p.97; Kristeller II, p.214.
that parts of the preface are modelled directly on that of Guarino
to *De Calumnia* might be taken as further evidence for an early date.
Ravaglì, however, conjectured from the phrase *hac temporum clade*, that
it was done after 1434, date of Eugenius IV's flight from Rome.

The versions of *Charon* and *Vitarum venditio* are assigned by
Lockwood to the period 1440-1443, when Rinuccio was looking for a
patron. *Charon* is certainly after December 1439, since Jean Lejeune,
the dedicatee, did not become Cardinal until that date; but it might
have been written at any time between then and his death in September
1451. Ravaglì assigned the *Vitarum venditio* to 1430, or just after,
but on Lockwood's evidence this is impossible, since it was done after
the *Monodiae*, which refer to the death of a certain Laurentius, who was
still alive at the Council of Ferrara in 1438. Willmanns and Bertalot
put the version of *Charon* between 1449 and 1452 because of a reference
in the preface to the plague. This, if correct, would postpone the date
of *Vitarum venditio* also, since it too was composed during a period when
the disease was flourishing.

A further translation, belonging to this period, but no longer
extant, is conjectured by Lockwood from the evidence of the preface to
Rinuccio's translation of Hippocrates' *Epistolae ad Damagetum*, where he
says: *his brumalibus noctibus locupletissimos testes excitavi eosque in
Latium transmisi, scilicet Lucianum, Platonem, atque Pythagoram*. The

---

89 Noted by Mercati, *S.G.*, p. 313.
90 F. Ravaglì, "Rinuccio da Castiglione fiorentino", in *Miscellanea Francesco
91 Lockwood, pp. 53-4.
92 Lockwood, *loc. cit.* (Ravaglì, *op. cit.* , I, p. 40)
93 p. 496.
prefaces of Charon and Vitarum venditio state specifically that they
were done in summer. 94

Again there is a contemporary reference to these versions, this
time in Paolo Cortesi's De hominibus doctis, providing evidence of their
currency in humanist circles. 95

(vii) Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459)

(a) Asinus

Preface: Poggii Florentini, in comoediam Lucii de Asino, ad
Cosmam de Medicis, praefatio.

Incipit: Cum quondam qui de asino aureo inscribitur Apuleij
legissem -

Explicit: - cum eris ociosus domi, et vacuus ab reipublicae curis

Translation: Lucii philosophi Syri comoedia quae Asinus intitulatur.

Incipit: Cum in Thessaliam ubi quaedam mihi paternae rationes erant -

Explicit: - ac vix tandem in patriam redierim salutem consecutus. 96

94 Lockwood, p.54. Charon (p.96): his immens caloribus. Vitarum venditio:
his proximis caloribus (p.101).

95 Tum etiam latine Lucianum explicaverunt Rinuccius et Christophorus Romanus.
Galletti, p.229.

Corсинiana 2092 (43 D 38 olim 1831) f.3v-68: Vatican, Vat. lat. 3154; ibid.5
Vat. lat. 5201, f.56-88v: ibid. Vat. lat. 1794: Florence, Marchese Roberto
Venturi Ginori, 16 (olim 17), f.64: San Gimignano, Bib. Communale 137, (A V 7)
in the following incunabula:- (i) Bevilaqua, Venice, 1494 (Hain 10261):
(ii) Scinsenzeler, Milan, 1497 (Hain 10262): (iii) N. Lepe, Avignon, 1497
(Hain 10268): (iv) Sessa, Venice, 1500 (Hain 10263): (v) Ludwig Hohenwang, Augsburg, c.1477 (Hain
10264?): (vi) Henricus Eggestein, Argentiniae, c.1475 (Reichling, no.603,
Fasc.ii,p.63.No.(v) and (vi) are both in Niclas von Wyle's German
version.
(b) Jupiter confutatus

Preface: Poggios pl. salutem d. Thome serezano viro cl.

Incipit: Verti nuper in latinum maxime te hortante parvulum

Luciani dialogum -

Explicit: quantum facetissimi hominis sententiis tribuendum esse

videatur. Vale.

Translation:

Incipit: Cynicus (sic): Equidem IUl?iter nequaquam molestus ero
tibi -

Explicit: Reliqua autem forsan soire me prohibent fata. 97

No exact date can be ascertained for the Asinus, though Walser puts
it around 1450-1451. 98 The Jupiter Confutatus, however, must be some-
what earlier, since the dedicatee, Tommaso Parentucelli da Sarzana (1397-
1455) became Pope in 1447. Since no ecclesiastical title is mentioned in
the dedication, it may well stem from the period of his early Greek
studies under Rinuccio, that is, around 1428, when his original works
begin to show an acquaintance with Lucian's works.99

There is one more version which Walser and others have included
among the literary productions of Poggio, but whose authenticity must be
called into question. The superscription of codex Vaticanus Palatinus
Latinus 1552 reads as follows: Lucianus de veris narrationibus tum
perlatis e greco in latinum per optimum eloquentissimun virum pogium
poetam (f.220r). The translation, however, and the preface, are those
attributed elsewhere to Lilius Castellanus. The error is attributable
to the presence of several of Poggio's own works in the same manuscript.100

97 Ms.: Vatican, Vat. Lat. 3082, f. 98v-102v (Kristeller II, p. 316 has no page
reference). See appendix for transcription of preface, taken from micro-
film copy.
98 Walser, p. 231.
99 See below, Chapter II, p. 72-3.
100 Walser, loc. cit. repeats the error. Kristeller II, p. 394 & 590, the ms.
contains Poggio's Facetiae, De Nobilitate, and some letters. I have
checked the attribution from a microfilm copy of this part of the ms.
(viii) Lilius Castellanus (fl.1441)

De Veris Narrationibus

Preface: LUCIANI poete et oratoris de veris narrationibus libelli duo. A lilio castellano de greco in Latinum traducti et in primis eius ad Marcum Pistoriensem epistola.

Letter Incipit: Bene ac decenter autemisti Marce pater -

Explicit: - eorum libellorum rationem lucidius teneas.

Prologue: Lilii Castellani in Lucianum prologus ad verendis.

p.L. op. Romane Ecclesie Cardinalem.

Incipit: Si plures dignitati tue debent verendissime pater -

Explicit: - et a proposito frustraretur. Incipit igitur.

Translation:

Book I: Incipit: Egressus olim ab Herculeis columnis et in Hesperium oceannum delatus -

Explicit: - haec quidem quae in insulari pugna gesta sunt.

Book II:

Incipit: Interea non iam ferens ego meam in ceto moram -

Explicit: - Caetera autem quae in terra subsequentibus libris amplectar.

By 1475, the date of the edition from which the above incipits and explicits are taken, this format was established for the translation. But of the manuscripts mentioned in note 101, only one has both of the prefaces; the rest, the earliest of them written in 1455, have only the second, addressed to Ludovicus Patriarch and Cardinal of Aquileia. Where the name of the translator is given, it is given as Lilius Castellanus.

It would be difficult, from this evidence, to date the version with any precision. But luckily there exists a further manuscript, which provides an exact date. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, ms. V.A. 18 has superscription, preface, incipit and explicit as follows:

Luciani de veris narrationi pusz opusculum traductum a Lilio Tyfermate anno domini 1441. (f.72r).
Quemadmodum apud ais qui aut in agone certant -
huiusmodi nullatenus credere. (f.73r).
Egressus olim ab herculiis columnis - haec quidem in insulari
ruga qua gesta sunt. FINIS DEO GRATIAS. (f.87r).102

Two things are immediately obvious, that the preface is a direct version, from the Greek, unlike that addressed to Ludovicus in other manuscripts, and that the translation only covers book I. Since the date, 1441, is so much earlier than the earliest manuscript which contains the preface to Ludovicus, one may conjecture that Castellanus made the translation without a dedicatee in mind, then, having found one, added book II and adapted the original preface to his own ends.

Lilius Castellanus, or Tyfernas (the ancient name for Citta di Castello, as Bartolomeo Fazio tells us in De viris illustribis),103 was, according to Malagola, a member of the court of Alfonso d'Aragona at Naples.104

102 Kristeller I, p.412. The information given here is taken from a microfilm copy of the work.
103 Mehus, p.25.
104 p.6.
This translation may not have been the only example of his Lucianism. Bartolommeo Fazio tells us that Gregorius Tifernas ex Luciano nonnulla in Latinum convertit. But since there is no trace, except in this reference, of translations of Lucian by Gregorius, one may perhaps surmise that Fazio's information was wrong, and that the translations in question were done by Lilius.

(ix) Jacobus Mucius Perleo, Ariminensis (Jacopo Perleoni da Rimini, Fl. 1453)

Reviviscentes sive Piscator

Preface: (f.15r) Jacobus Mucius perleo Ariminensis Seraphio Urbinati iurisconsultissimo sal.pl.d.

Incipit: Polycletus quum adhuc adulescens esset -

Explicit: (f.16r) pro luciano audentarij nomen eum sibi comutasse quod nomen ab ipsa audentia inclinatum est. Vale.

Translation: (f.16r) Luciani dialogus qui inscribitur Reviviscentes sive Piscator

Incipit: Cede cede execrabilem frequentibus saxis cede glebis cede testis cede concideque profanum fustibus -

Explicit: (f.38r) Sed quocunque ierimua paucis quidem sertis inustionibus vero perquammultis opus fore certe scio.

Finis. 107

105 Förster, 'Lukian' p.356, n.3 mentions cod. Taurin 942 as containing a translation of DIALOGA MORTUORUM X by Lilius Castellanus, but a glance at the description of this ms. in Pasini, Pars Altera p.291 shows that the attribution is mistaken and that the version is in fact that of Rinuccio.

106 Mehus, p.25.

107 Ms. Paris, B.Nat.Lat. 8729 (8671), f.15r-38r. See Appendix for a transcription of the preface.
Jacobus Mucius Perleo, Ariminensis, brother of Petro Perleoni (a friend and correspondent of Filelfo and Biondo) was a teacher of Greek and Latin at Bologna. The source of this information is Biondo’s Italia Illustrata, the final revision and publication of which in 1453 gives us a convenient floruit for Perleo.  

Perleo’s translation is found in a miscellaneous XV century manuscript, containing mostly versions of classical authors by Rinuccio. Though the manuscript is undated, the preponderance of works by this Aretine scholar suggests that Perleo’s translation is roughly contemporary with his activity, that is between 1430 and 1457. The dedication to Seraphius Urbinas moreover, whom we know to have received Rinuccio’s translation of Vitarum Auctio around 1450, to have suggested the retranslation of Charon about the same time, and to have been a fairly prominent literary figure in Florence in the 1430’s, substantiates this conjecture. Perleo’s floruit (1453) is in line with the above indications, though it gives no help in the fixing of a more exact date for his translation.

---

108 Biondo, p.347: Petrusque Perleo Ariminensis... Jacobus frater suus Bononiae .... Italia bonis literis implenda pro viribus enituntur. Date of publication, Masius p.53. A letter from Biondo to Petro Perleoni 5th Jan.1444 (published Herschel, pp.227-8) mentions Petro’s account of a fight with Jacobus: this may have been his brother, and if so it is the only other reference to him which I have found.


110 For Rinuccio see above p.25f. Thomas Seneca mentions Seraphius as one of the learned men to whom he applies, when in Florence, for advice on scholarly matters, in a letter dated 1434. Hall, p.102.
(x) Cristoforo Persona (1416–1485 or 1486)

(a) De navigatione vel tiranno. (Cataplus)

Luciani viri clarissimi fabula de navigatione vel tiranno,
cuius interlocutores sunt Charon Clotho Mercurius Radamanthus
Megapentes Ciniscus et Nicillus mortuus lucerna et lectus denuo
translata per venerabilem patrem Cristoforum personam. Romanum
Priorem in S. Balbina.

Incipit: Charon: Missa istaec faciamus o Clotho, cymba vero
hec iam pridem nobis disposita est -
Explicit: - eorum memor que vivens gesserit.

(b) De venditione vitarum

Eiusdem Luciani per eundem translatus tractatus de venditione
vitarum cuius interlocutores sunt Venditor Mercurius Emptor
Philosophus.

Incipit: Dispone tu sedilia et scamna et appara locum venientibus -
Explicit: - huismodi vitas sumus vendituri.\(^{111}\)

The rubric sheet to the edition of Georg Lauer, Rome c.1470 is the
only evidence for the attribution of these particular versions to
Persona. But we do know, from Paolo Cortesi, that he did translate Lucian.\(^{112}\)

The terminus ante quem for the versions must be the date of the two
early editions in which they are first found, that is around 1470, but

---

\(^{111}\) Rubrics are taken from the sheet published by Sabbadini, N.A.V. xxxi,
pp.260-2 and by Goldschmidt, p.10. Incipits are taken from photographs of
the copy of this edition in the John Rylands Library, Manchester (no.
17383). No ms. of these works is known. Printed in the following in-
cunabula:- (i) Lauer, Rome, c.1470 (Accurti, no.92, pp.47-8; Ruysschaert,
pp.161-2. Hain. 10267??); (ii) Lauer, Rome, c.1470 (Hain. 10269), Gold-
schmidt, (iii) Bevilaqua, Venice, 1494 (Hain. 10261); (iv) Scinzenzeler,
Milan,14,97 (Hain. 10262); (v) Sessa, Venice, 1500 (Hain. 10263).

\(^{112}\) De hominibus doctis, Galletti, p.229.
there is no reason why they should not be some time earlier. There
exists the possibility that they were specifically written for Lauer’s
press, since they appeared first in a separate volume.\textsuperscript{113}

Goldschmidt noted that the words \textit{denuo translata} preceding the
version of \textit{Tyrannus} could not be verified, as no other Latin translation
of this work exists prior to that of \textit{Persona}.\textsuperscript{114} Two possibilities occur:
that the words refer not to a Latin version, but to the Italian one of
Nicolao Leoniceno, which may have been produced about this time;\textsuperscript{115} or,
more probable, that the rubric has confused the dialogue to which the
words belong, and they should appear before the \textit{De venditione vitarum}.
This had been translated by Rinuccio either between 1440 and 1443, or
1449 and 1452, dates which would supply a \textit{terminus post quem}, if only a
rough one, for at least this version.\textsuperscript{116}

(xi) \textit{Francesco Griffolini (c. 1420-1484)}

(a) \textit{De calumnia}

ILLUSTRI PRINCIPI IOANNI VIGORNIAE COMITI. FRANCISCUS ARETINUS

SALUTEM

Preface: Incipit: Hanc Luciani de calumnia orationem princeps

\textit{illustris} -

Explicit: - quid tantus et maximi apud gracos nominis de
tam teterrimo vitio senserit intelligas.

LUCIANI ORATIO DE CALUMNIA.

\textsuperscript{113} See Accurti, \textit{loc.cit.}

\textsuperscript{114} p.16.

\textsuperscript{115} See below p.54.

\textsuperscript{116} Goldschmidt, p.17, wrongly attributed this version to Rinuccio, but
Ruysschaert, p.161-2 corrected his error.
Incipit: Res profecto gravissima est ignorantia et multorum malorum humano generi auctor quae tanquam caligo quaedam rebus infusa et veritatem et uniuscuiusque -

Explicit: - nec locum rebus a veritate illustratis inveniret. 117

(Friedrich Creussner's edition of this piece, Nuremburg, c.1475, prints another letter, preceding that to Ioanni Vigorniae Comiti. This letter appears separately in the British Museum, ms. Arundel 154, f.41v.

Francisco Pellato Patavino Iurisconsulto Clarissimo.

Franciscus Aretilus salutem dicit.

Incipit: Vereor Francisce vir humanissime -

Explicit: - cognitu quam utilissima, Vale amicorum optume. 118)

(b) Dionysus

Incipit: Quando dionisius (sic) ad indos exercitum duxit (f.1r) -

Explicit: - Silenus recte erat propicius suis. (f.2r)

(c) (H) Armonides

Incipit: (f.2r) Armonides tibicen quaesivit -

Explicit: (f.3r) - formidabile magnorum olimporum victori.

(d) Scytha vel Conciliator

Incipit: (f.3r) Non primum Anacharsis venit -

Explicit: (f.5v) - et placidum mare ac portus propinquus.

(e) De sacrificiis

Incipit: (f.5v) Que quidem in sacrificiis agunt stolidi, Et in Celebritatibus -

Explicit: (f.7v) - Ille vero ut deploret ignorantiam.

117 Taken from ms. St. John's College, Cambridge, 61 (c.11), f.105r-112v.

118 Taken from Creussner, Nuremburg, c. 1475. ('Catalogue B.M.', II, p. 447).
The identity of Francesco Aretinus or Francesco Florentinus has been a matter for much dispute. Förster claimed these versions for Francesco Accolti of Arezzo, while Altrocchi attributed the De calumnia to both Accolti and Francesco Griffolini, although there is, in fact, only one version in the sources which he quotes. The problem was solved by G. Mancini, who took up the question of identity with reference to the dedication to Franciscus Aretinus of Epistulae Septem Epimenidis Diogeni by L.B. Alberti. He demonstrated that since Arezzo was in Florentine territory there was no difference between Aretinus and Florentinus, that

---

119 These versions I discovered when I received photographs of ms. 5445, f.1-15, Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, which appears in the 'Tabulae Bib. Pal. Vindob.', vol.IV, p.126, as Saturnalia excerpta interpretis Francisci Florentini (XV century).

Accolti was a jurist, and though versed in humanist matters, was not a professional as was the translator of *De calumnia*, that Francesco di Mariotto, otherwise known as Francesco Lippi or Griffolini, was a professional humanist, and that he was Aretine by birth, though in exile because of his father's betrayal of the city to Piccinino.¹²¹

The dedicatee of *De Calumnia* was John Tiptoft, Count of Worcester, who came to Italy before 1460. The version presumably dates from before his return to England in 1461.¹²² For the other pieces, the only evidence of their authorship is the entry in the manuscript catalogue cited in note 119. There is no indication whatever of their translator in the parts of the manuscript which I have seen. Nevertheless, we know from the catalogue of Nicholas V's library that Francescus Aretinus borrowed a manuscript of Lucian on the 23 November 1455 and, if he is the author, these pieces may well have been done about that time.¹²³

(xii) Petrus Balbus (1399-1479)

(a) *Dialogus mortuorum* XIII

Petri balbi in dialogum alexandri et diogenis prefatio ad Guillermum mamullum. (f.146r)

*Incipit*: Petisti a me dilectissime vir -

*Explicit*: (f.147r) - amicis morem gerere studeam

Alexandri excellentissimi et diogenis quam humiliumi dialogus

*Incipit*: Diogenes: Quid hoc o Alexander et tu quoque (e) vita migrasti -

*Explicit*: (f.150r) - et saepue quemadmodum dixi bibe.

¹²¹ 'Nuovi' p.328-334. Also 'Francesco Griffolini', Firenze, 1890, p.30ff. (I have not been able to consult this).

¹²² Weiss, 'Humanism', pp.112-122; pp.114ff. for his travels to Italy. Other information, Weiss, 'Tiptoft', pp.157-64; p.158 for the date of his return.

¹²³ See above, note 29 and p.6.
(b) **Dialogus mortuorum VI**

Petri balbi prefatio super traductionem dialogi platonis et tempsionis (sic) ad Bartholomeum gallinam. (f.150v)

**Incipit:** Ego mitto ad te gallina suavissime dialogum -

**Explicit:** (f.151r) - summis copiis replebo. Vale.

**Translation:**

**Incipit:** (f.151r) Iustum-ne hoc est o pluto me quidem e vita obisse -

**Explicit:** (f.153v) - o tecrite diutissime vivas.

(c) **Dialogus mortuorum XVI**

Petri balbi prefatio super traductionem dialogi diogenis et herculis ad pauperem nicolaurn scholarium preceptorem.

**Incipit:** (f.154r) Poete quanto in honore tum arud nostros -

**Explicit:** (f.156v) - petitioni tue iam morem gessisse: vale.

**Dialogus diogenis et herculis**

**Incipit:** (f.157r) Diogenes: Nunquid hercules ipse est -

**Explicit:** (f.159v) - Homerum atque huiusmodi fabulas deridens.

Although in the complete Latin edition of Lucian, edited by Jacob Micyllus (M. Voscosanus, Paris, 1546) two of these versions are attributed to Ponticus Virunius, all the manuscript evidence points to Petrus Balbus, bishop of Nicotera and later Tropea, as their author. They were printed in three XV century editions, but these, since the first of them was issued in 1494, fifteen years after his death, do not help to date the

---

124 The information given here comes from a microfilm copy of Palermo, Bib. Nazionale ms. I.C.9, (Kristeller, II, p.29). For Dialogus mort. xiii, two other mss. exist, also attributing the version to Petrus Balbus: Montecassino, Bib. della Badia 864, f.107-114 (Kristeller, I, p.395; the reading is albi); Palermo, Bib. Commune, 2 Qq.C.79 (Kristeller, II, p.27). Printed in the following incunabula: (i) Bevilaqua, Venice, 1494 (Hain, 10261); (ii) Scinzenzeler, Milan, 1497 (Hain, 10262); (iii) Sessa, Venice, 1500 (Hain, 10263). See Appendix for transcription of prefaces.
versions. The terminus ante quem must, therefore, be the date of his death in 1479. 125

(xiii) Antonio Pacino da Todi (f1. 1440)

(a) De sacrificiis

PROHEMIUM IN OPUSCULO LUCIANI DE SACRIFICIIS E GRECO IN LATINUM

SERMONEM CONVERSO PER ANTONIUM TUDERTINUM AD NOBILEM IUVENEM

RODULPHUM LOTTUM FLORENTINUM CIVEM FELICITER INCIPIIT. (f.82v)

Incipit: SOCRATES CUM INTERROGARETUR quid iocundissimum esset -

Explicit: (f.82v) - multamque hominum stultitiam ostendit suscepisse

EXPLICIT PROHEMIUM. TRACTATUS INCIPIIT. (f.83r)

Incipit: SICUIUS stultitiam insanientium hominum in his rebus quas in re divina celebritatibusque -

Explicit: (f.85r) - eorum ignorantia alter stultiam (sic) deploret

(b) Patriae laudatio

ANTONII PACINI PROHEMIUM IN OPUSCULO LUCIANI DE LAUDIBUS PATRIE

PER EUM E GRECO SERMONE IN LATINUM CONVERSO AD NOBILISSIMUM IUVENEM

PETRUM PAZUM CIVEM FLORENTINUM FELICITER INCIPIIT. (f.85r)

Incipit: ULYXES HYTACUS QUEM SUMMA PRUDENTIA virum ferunt devicta troya longo errore multa maria peragravit -

Explicit: (f.85v) - et quandoque me ad te maiora datum daturum expectes.

EXPLICIT PROHEMIUM. TRACTATUS INCIPIIT FELICITER. (f.85v)

Incipit: CUM IAM DIU OMNIA IUDICIO ASSENSUM sit sua patria -

---

Explicit: (f.87r) - Nam patriae nomen ex ignavo fortem sibi comparat. 126

Antonio Pacino, like Lapo, was a pupil of Francesco Filelfo, and probably contemporary with him, to judge from Filelfo's comparison of the two: Antonius Tudertinus, qui etsi auditor fuit meus, tamen Lapo longe inferior. Of his literary production Paolo Cortesi said: Antonius Tudertinus non tam scribendo fuit probabilis, quam litteris Graecis eruditus, and in general his reputation was not high. 127

These versions, if not made directly in competition with those of Lapo, may, nevertheless, be dated around the same time, since one of the dedicatees, Pietro Pazzi, was converted in his youth to humane studies by Niccolo Niccoli (who died in 1437) and is spoken of as juvenis in the dedication. 128 Further works which fall in the same period indicate this time as his floruit. 129

(xiv) Antonius Rossius (f1. 1480)

Phalaris I and II

Luciani viri eloquentissimi orationes pro tauro eneo phalaridis
dicando per Antonium Rossium e greco in latinum traducte ad R.D.Car.

Spol. Prefatio Antonii. (f.1r).


127 For Filelfo see Zeno, I, p.359: pp.358-360 for other information on Pacino. Also Weiss, 'Humanism', p.52. Cortesi, De hominibus doctis, Galletti, p.230. For further bibliography on Filelfo see Benadduci.


129 Consolatoria dedicated to Niccolo d'Acciopacio, d.1447 (Zeno, p.360). Translation of Gregorius Nazianzenus, de virtute, dedicated to Eugenius IV (Vat. Lat. 3082; Kristeller, II, p.316).
Incipit: NE Eo viderer reverendissime domine oicio penitus abuti -
Explicit: (f.1v) - amplumque ut aiant munus aligandum exiguum
instaurabit

ORATIO PHALARIDIS (f.1v)

Incipit: Misit huc nos viri delphii princeps -
Explicit: (f.6r) - honestare ne cunctemini.

Oratio sacerdotis delphici. (f.6r).

Incipit: \Nullo hospitio viri delphii teneor cum agrigentinis -
Explicit: (f.8v) - dedicare iudicatus fuit.\textsuperscript{130}

Antonius Rossius, or Rufus, (Antonio Rossi) was a Florentine.
The manuscripts which contain the version are all XV century, but it
cannot have been sent to its dedicatee, Rafaelle Riario, before 1477,
the date of his elevation to the purple as Cardinal of St. George by
Sixtus IV. Since Riario held this office until 1521, the terminus ante
quem must be set as 1500.\textsuperscript{131}

(xv) Severus, Monachus Cisterciensis

De Astrologia

Incipit: De ceo deque sideribus scribere ea quidem legere agnoverior ... 

This version appears in manuscript Livorno, Biblioteca Labronica,
Armadio CXII, Palchetto 3, n.26, f.248-260, which is dated XV-XVI century.
It may well be, therefore, outside the limits of this study. The only
guide to dating it more precisely is the fact that Severus was the teacher
of Alphonsus Petruccius, who became a Cardinal under Julius II (1503-1513).

\textsuperscript{130} The information given here is taken from a microfilm copy of ms. Parma,
Bib. Palatina 27, f.3-8v. (Kristeller, II, p.43). Also contained in
Venice, Marciana 86 (4036); Viterbo, Bib. Capitolare 44 (Kristeller II,

\textsuperscript{131} See Cosenza, s.v. Rufus, Antonius; Riario, Raphael.
But this, at best, only gives a vague *floruit* for Severus, and an even vaguer date for the version. 132

(xvi) Anonymous

(a) De Calumnia

Incipit: Gravis et molesta res est ignorantia et multorum malorum hominibus causa tamquam caliginem quandam infusionis rebus et veritatem obscurans et uniuscuiusque vitam obumbrans.

Explicit: - profugeret illustratis rebus a veritate.

(b) Laus muscae

Incipit: Musca est sic minima volucrum ut possit cum muscellis et culicibus comparari: sed tanto magis quantum ipsa ab ape relinquitur.

Explicit: - secundum proverbium ex musca elephantem facere

(c) Charon

Incipit: Mercurius: Quid rides o Charon? Quidve relicta cymba insolens admodum ad haec nostra venisti?

Charon: Desideravi o Mercuri quae in vita sunt cognoscere.


These three versions first appeared in the volume of translations from Lucian published in Venice by Simone Bevilaqua, 1494. There is no indication of their authorship given in that edition or in the later


133 This information is taken from the text of Bevilaqua, Venice, 1494, *De Veris narrationibus* etc. These versions also appear in Scinzenseler, Milan, 1497, and Sessa, Venice, 1500.
editions in which they are printed.

The subscription to the edition runs as follows:

Haec lege plena iocis: immistaque seria ludo:
quando relaxandi cura tibi est animi.
Luciano ex graeco plures fecere latina:
collecta hinc illinc pressaque Bordo dedit.

On the following page is a deposition by the said Benedictus Bordo, requesting permission to print the book, with a copyright guarantee of ten years. Below that is the grant of permission and the guarantee of copyright. The elegiac gives Bordo only as the editor of the volume, but he may well have decided, in collecting together the versions for publication, that the available translations of these three works were in some way unsatisfactory. This may have led him to commission new versions, or even to do them himself. As in the case of Cristoforo Persona's translations, the fact that no manuscript of the versions survives may indicate that they were made specifically for the edition.134

134 See above p. 36.
B. **Italian**

1. **Asimus**
   **Incipit:** Me ne andava una fia.ta in Thessalia (f.3).

2. **Timon**
   **Incipit:** Giove amicabile hospitale sociale domestico ... (f.33)

3. **De Calumnia**
   **Incipit:** Grave cosa e la calumnia ... (f.49)

4. **Navis seu Vota**
   **Incipit:** Non diceva io chel sarebe piu facil cosa ... (f.57)

5. **Gallus**
   **Incipit:** O Gallo traditore Giove ti possi occidere ... (f.71)

6. **Icaromenippus**
   **Incipit:** Se ben mi ricordo el furono da terra ... (f.85)

7. **Menippus**
   **Incipit:** Dio ti salvi o portico o casa mia ... (f.98)

8. **Cataplus**
   **Incipit:** Or su o Cloto la nave gia bon tempo ... (f.107)

9. **Parasitus**
   **Incipit:** Che vuol dire o Simone che cada ... (f.117)

10. **Deorum Concilium**
    **Incipit:** Non mormorati piu o dei e non vi parlati ... (f.133)

11. **Dialogus mortuorum X**
    **Incipit:** Vui haveti inteso come stiano le cose ... (f.138)

12. **Jupiter Confutatus**
    **Incipit:** Giove, io non ti daro noia ... (f.141)

13. **Jupiter Tragoedus**
    **Incipit:** Che gemi tu o Iove e parli fra te medesimo ... (f.147)

14. **Muscae laus**
    **Incipit:** La mosca e tanto piu picola ... (f.164)

    (with title: Laude della mosca)
15. *Somnium sive vita Luciani* (with title: *Insogno over vita di Luciano*)
   \[\text{Incipit: Apena che io haveva lasciata la scuola ... (f.167)}\]

16. *Dialogus mortuorum XII* (with Auri'spa's alterations)
   \[\text{Incipit: Io ti debio precieder o Africano ... (f.172)}\]

17. *Dialogus mortuorum XIII*
   \[\text{Incipit: Che a dir questo o Alexandro (f.175v)}\]

18. *Dialogus mortuorum XIV*
   \[\text{Incipit: Hora o Alexandro tu non poi ... (f.177)}\]

19. *Dialogus meretricius II*
   \[\text{Incipit: Tu sei per maritarte ... (f.179)}\]

20. *Dialogus meretricius V*
   \[\text{Incipit: Nui intendiamo di te ... (f.180v)}\]

21. *Dialogus meretricius VI*
   \[\text{Incipit: Chel non sia cussi grave cosa (f.182)}\]

22. *Dialogus meretricius VII*
   \[\text{Incipit: Di o Musario se mai ritroveremo ... (f.183)}\]

23. *Dialogus meretricius VIII*
   \[\text{Incipit: Colui o Chrysima el qual non e geloso ... (f.185)}\]

24. *Dialogus meretricius XIV*
   \[\text{Incipit: Hora tu mi serri di fuori ... (f.186)}\]

25. *Dialogus meretricius X*
   \[\text{Incipit: El non vien piu a vederti ... (f.187v)}\]

26. *Dialogus meretricius I*
   \[\text{Incipit: O Thai tu conosci bene ... (f.189)}\]
The above is a list of the contents of the Vatican manuscript Fondo Chigi L.VI. 215, as given by Kristeller, II, p. 488, but with the normal Latin titles added. In addition to these works, the manuscript also contains two more pieces. One is commonly ascribed to Lucian in this period, L.B. Alberti's Intercoenalis, Virtus dea (f.25ff); the other is Maffeo Vegio's Philalethes (f.285ff). The contents of the codex are substantially the same as those of several printed editions of the XVI century, which are the following:

(a) Proverbii De Mes//ser Antonio Cornazano in Fa//cecia et//Luciano//
De asino aureo vulgari et historia // ti nuovamente stampati.
Stampata nella inclyta citta di Venetia per Nicolò/Zopino e Vincenzo compagno. MCCCCXXIII. A di XXII Agosto.


The editions (b), (c), and (d) are essentially reprints one

136. Rossi, loc.cit.
137. Rossi, loc.cit.
138. Taken from a copy in the library of King's College, Cambridge.
from the other. None of them contains the translation of Asinus to be found in the manuscript, or the versions of Dialogi meretricii I and XI also found there. But leaving aside these three pieces, and disparities in the order in which they appear, the main differences between the printed editions and manuscript are the following:

The incipit of Dialogus mortuorum XII in the manuscript is:

Io ti debio precieder o Africano, but in the editions it becomes:

A me o Africano convien essere preposto, pero che piu eccellente sono.

Rossi adds that the versions are only the same from: non haverebbe potuto fare gran facende, prehendendo l'Italia senza effusione di sangue, et sott.pmettendomi l'Africa insino a Cades. The incipit of Veriae Historiae in the manuscript is: Si come li Atheniesi li quali ..., while in the editions it becomes: Costume e dei combattenti. Rossi adds that the versions are only the same from: in convivio se cignavano, et se porgevano de bever lun l'altro, e lor soli levandossi da sedere andavan passeggiando per la selva, in the middle of book two.

The version of Asinus contained in (a) was done with one eye on the Latin translation of Poggio, and one on the Greek text. Despite certain divergences, this is still recognisable as the same text as that contained in the Chigi manuscript. Such discrepancies as exist between


141. Tincani, pp.299-300. He reproduces a portion of the beginning and the end of the version from the 1523 text pp.293-298; he did not know of the earlier ms. The acquaintance with the Greek may be demonstrated by the correction of Poggio's tunicam for koiròv. Rossi, E.p.363.
the two texts are mainly attributable to the preference of the edition for readings from Poggio's translation. Rossi noted two points at which the reading of the Chigi manuscript had been replaced with a direct translation from Poggio, even though the manuscript reading was nearer to the Greek. The reason for this emerged when he noted an error incorporated into this text, the name Larcio for Lucio, whose source was neither the Chigi manuscript nor Poggio himself, but the 1494, Venice (Simone Bevilacqua) edition of Poggio's translation, where the reading Larcium occurs.

What seems to have happened is that the editor of Asinus did his emendation from the 1494 Latin text, in many cases swapping good readings for bad, perhaps assuming that the printed text was less likely to be faulty than the Chigi manuscript. The same procedure was followed in the editions of I Dilettevoli Dialogi. In the 1494 edition the preface of Lilius Castellanus to Verae Historiae had been set aside, and a new version of the Greek itself substituted. This substitution was made also in the Italian editions, Costume e dei combattenti being an exact equivalent of Mos est athletarum. The first section of Dialogus mortuorum XII was, we have seen, also altered. Since the manuscript and the editions both relied on Aurispa's augmented version anyway, this change


Poggio: Existimabam illam quae asinum dilexisset molto maiorem in homine voluptatem sumpserat. 1523 ed.: Ne ancho io refutai existi­mando che havendo lei amato lasino, molto piacere dovesse pigliare del huomo. Chigi ms: Ne anche io refutai stimando esser cosa digna de odio e de reprensione che quello asino lo quale tanto era sta­diretto possia che dovenuto fusse homo tanto se reputasse delicato che la sua amorosa depretiasse.


144. Not the incipit of Castellanus' original version, see above p.32. The Chigi ms. incipit is not that of Castellanus' preface to Ludovicus either, see above p.31. Rossi, E.p.363, says Leoniceno used Poggio's version of Ver.Narr. presumably he meant that in Vat.Palat.Lat.1552, which, we have seen, above p.33 is, in fact, that of Castellanus.
had less point. That the altered section did follow the 1494 text is shown by a further disparity between edition and manuscript noted by Rossi. The Greek, *tines de éste*, which Aurispa translated as *Qui estis*, appears in Chigi manuscript as *Chi siati vui*. But in both the 1494 edition and the 1525 edition it becomes singular, in the former *Qui es tu*, and in the latter *Chi sei tu*.

The question of attribution remains. The Zoppino edition of 1523 gives the translator of *Asinus* as Boiardo, but we have seen that the version printed by him is fundamentally identical to that of the Chigi manuscript, which also contains the works printed in the 1525, 1529, and 1535 editions of *I Dilettevoli Dialogi*. Rossi says that it is possible that Zoppino had a manuscript which attributed the work to Boiardo. It seems more likely, however, that he took it from the same manuscript which he used for *I Dilettevoli Dialogi*, and that his attribution to Boiardo was a conjecture, based on the fact that an Italian version of Apuleius by Boiardo, in which the ending of *Asinus* was substituted for the original, had appeared from his press in 1518. His feeling was, presumably, that Boiardo must at some time have translated the *Asinus* in order to have been able to make the substitution.

It seems clear, however, that he need only have known the version in the Chigi manuscript, as Rossi has established that he knew its version of Timon. The manuscript seems to date well before 1479, when we know that the copyists in Ferrara were waiting for the final part of the Apuleius. According to Rossi, it bears the arms of the Este family, as they were between 1452 and 1471, the reign of Borso. The catalogues of the period do not, however, mention such a manuscript until the reign of Ercole I.

Who then was the translator of these versions? No name is mentioned in the manuscript, and the first edition of *Dilettevoli Dialogi* was published, unlike the *Asinus*, without any ascription. Since both texts are extremely likely to have been taken from the same manuscript, Zoppino's silence on the matter of authorship in 1525 strengthens the view that his ascription of the *Asinus* to Boiardo was a conjecture. The name of Niccolo da Lonigo (Nicolao Leoniceno) first appears in the edition of 1529, at which time Zoppino must have received new information about their authorship. Certainly the attribution is reasonable. Paolo Giovio in *Elogia virorum litteris illustrium* says of him that his *Dionis ... Historia, et Luciani Dialogi, vernacula*

148. Rossi, *Ep.365-369*; he sets passages from the Greek text beside their equivalent in the versions of Bertholdus, the Chigi ms., and Boiardo's *Timone*.

149. Rossi, *Ep.365* refers to a letter dated 1 March 1479, in which Andrea de le Vieze writes to Duke Ercole that la coda is still missing from the Apuleius.


151. Bertoni, *p.236 no. 28, 242 no. 195, 245 no. 307*. In all three entries the *Asinus* is mentioned in the same ms. as other works of Lucian: (i) *Asino doro in vulgare apena coperto de brasilio stampato*; etiam ditto Luciano et fabule greche. (ii) *Fabule de creci in vulgare tradutte ... e aseno d'oro*. (iii) Luciano et Asino doro in uno volume in carta buona coperto de brasilio.
It seems clear, however, that he need only have known the version in the Chigi manuscript, as Rossi has established that he knew its version of Timon. The manuscript seems to date well before 1479, when we know that the copyists in Ferrara were waiting for the final part of the Apuleius. According to Rossi, it bears the arms of the Este family, as they were between 1452 and 1471, the reign of Borso. The catalogues of the period do not, however, mention such a manuscript until the reign of Ercole I.

Who then was the translator of these versions? No name is mentioned in the manuscript, and the first edition of I Dilettevoli Dialogi was published, unlike the Asinus, without any ascription. Since both texts are extremely likely to have been taken from the same manuscript, Zoppino's silence on the matter of authorship in 1525 strengthens the view that his ascription of the Asinus to Boiardo was a conjecture. The name of Niccolo da Lonigo (Nicolao Leoniceno) first appears in the edition of 1529, at which time Zoppino must have received new information about their authorship. Certainly the attribution is reasonable. Paolo Giovio in Elogia virorum litteris illustrium says of him that his Dionis ... Historia, et Luciani Dialogi, vernacula

---

148. Rossi, Ep. 365-369; he sets passages from the Greek text beside their equivalent in the versions of Bertholdus, the Chigi ms., and Boiardo's Timone.

149. Rossi, Ep. 365 refers to a letter dated 1 March 1479, in which Andrea de le Vieze writes to Duke Ercole that la coda is still missing from the Apuleius.

150. Rossi, Ep. 361, n.5.

151. Bertoni, p.236 no. 28, 242 no. 195, 245 no. 307. In all three entries the Asinus is mentioned in the same ms. as other works of Lucian. (i) Asino doro in vulgare apena coperto de brasilio stampato; etiam ditto Luciano et fabule grecche. (ii) Fabule de greci in vulgare tradutte ... e aseno d'oro. (iii) Luciano et Asino doro in uno volume in carta buona coperto de brasilio.
loquentes lingua, Herculi latinarum litterarum imperito mire placuerunt,
and we know also from Pandolfo Collemaggio's Specchio d'Esopo and
Boiardo's Timone that Lucian was a favourite at Ercole's court in
Ferrara. We may conjecture that the versions were done before Ercole's accession in 1471, and
stamped with the crest of Borso as a matter of course, although they
were intended for Ercole.

(ii) Bartolomeo della Fonte (1445-1513)

De Calumnia

PROEEMIO DI BARTHOLOMEO FONTIO CALU MNIA DI LUCIANO A LO
EXCELLENTISSIMO HERCOLE DUCA DI FERRARA

Incipit: Di tanti vitii da' quali la natura humana e del
continue oppressata -

Explicit: - et a l'intendere più aperto.

FINISCE IL PROEEMIO. INCOMINCIÀ IL LIBRO DE LA CALUMNIA DI LUCIANO

Incipit: QUANTI MALI de la ignorantia naschino, di qui
facilmente si può comprendere, che la verità
naschondendo -

Explicit: - chome quella che le chose de la verità quasi da
uno certo splendore alluminate raguardarebbe.

The dedication and text appear in Berlin-Dahlem,
Kupferstichkabinett (ehemals Staatliche Museen) codex 78.C.26,

152. Giovio, 'Elogia', p.133. For Specchio d'Esopo, see Collemaggio, pp. 87-100; Lucian appears as one of the characters already familiar to Ercole. Boiardo's Timone was dedicated to the Duke; Boiardo, II, p.473.

153. Cosenza, s.v. Leonicenus, Nicolaus.

154. I have unfortunately been unable to consult D. Vitaliani, 'Vita e opere di Nicolao Leoniceno', Verona 1892; p.217ff, has an account of the translations, and it may well contain additional information.
(formerly Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 416), 1r-24r, which is preceded by a half-page miniature entitled APPELIS PICTURA DE CALUMNIA. Förster remarked that the manuscript bore the arms of Duke Ercole I of Ferrara, and was probably the same one mentioned on page 22v of the Libro della guardaroba di Ercole I (preserved in the Modena archives) under the date 1472, 26 Luglio as:

Libretto uno piccolo in carta bona vulgare in proua Scripto e miniato alantiqua cum certe figure depinte sup una de le custodie chiamato Bertolamio fontio de Calomnia lutiani cum asse chuperte de brasilio stampado, cum duo azulì de otton che fo presentato al prefacto n.3. In Bartholommeo's insistence that it is his own work Il quale io in effecto, et non in dexti, fedele interprete ho traducto, acciochè et a leggere sia piu grato, et a intendere piu aperto, may perhaps be seen a reference to the earlier version of Nicolao Leoniceno, who relied in several of his translations on previous Latin versions. He seems to suggest that Ercole would know the work, but only in an inferior translation. This would provide further evidence of the early date of Leoniceno's work. 157

(iii) Anonymous

Dialogus mortuorum XII (with Aurispa's additions)

Questione tra Annibale cartaginese, Alessandro di Macedonia e Scipione Africano Romano, mosse appresso Minos giusto giudice,

155. Described, with bibliography, photograph of the miniature, proemium, and incipit/explicit of the text by Trinkaus, pp. 132-133.

156. 'Verlumpung' p.36. See also, Caccia, 'Luciano', pp. 81-82.

157. Quotation from the proemium, see Trinkaus, p.133.
di tre, quale di loro doveva essere preferito, di greco in latino per Messere Giovanni Aurispa. E prima comincia a parlare Annibale.

**Incipit:** Annibale, de qua cosa e che io sia antiposto a te, perché certamente io sono migliore di te. 

**Explicit:** e Alessandro sia il secondo, e il terzo Annibale, pero che certamente chostui non e da essere dispregiato.

This version which, according to Rossi "appare più antica di quella del Leoniceno", was published in 1868 by C. Minutoli, and is the subject of a chapter in Gravino's study of XV century vernacular Italian translations. This latter showed that it was based on Aurispa's version, but that since certain mistakes were made in transliteration which could only have originated from someone unfamiliar with the Greek, Aurispa himself could not have been its author. He added to this internal evidence to prove that it was translated directly from the Latin version. The wide diffusion of this translation in manuscripts indicates further the popularity of Aurispa's augmented version.

---


159. Explicit from Florence, Bib. Nazionale Centrale, Palat. 545. ('Ind. e Cat.' IV, vol.ii, p.105). Other mss.: ibid., Palat. 51 ('Ind. e Cat.', IV, vol. i, p.56); Laurenziana, xliii, cod.xxvi; Riccardiana, 1105 ('Ind. e Cat.', XV, p.125). Kristeller mentions 14 more mss.

160. Rossi, p.361, n.7. Minutoli, Lucca, 1868; cited by Gravino, p.116. I have been unable to consult this work or to establish a more accurate reference. Gravino, chapter IX, pp. 115-120.
di tre, quale di loro doveva essere preferito, di greco in latino per Messere Giovanni Aurispa. E prima comincia a parlare Annibale.

Incipit: Annibale, degna cosa e che io sia antiposto a te, perche certamente io sono migliore di te. 

Explicit: e alessandro sia il secondo, e il terzo annibale, pero che certamente chostui non e da essere disprezato

This version which, according to Rossi "appare più antica di quella del Leonceno", was published in 1868 by C. Minutoli, and is the subject of a chapter in Gravino's study of XV century vernacular Italian translations. This latter showed that it was based on Aurispa's version, but that since certain mistakes were made in transliteration which could only have originated from someone unfamiliar with the Greek, Aurispa himself could not have been its author. He added to this internal evidence to prove that it was translated directly from the Latin version. The wide diffusion of this translation in manuscripts indicates further the popularity of Aurispa's augmented version.


159. Explicit from Florence, Bib. Nazionale Centrale, Palat. 545. ('Ind. e Cat.' IV, vol.ii, p.105). Other mss.: ibid., Palat. 51 ('Ind. e Cat.', IV, vol. i, p.56); Laurenziana, xliii, cod.xxvi; Riccardiana, 1105 ('Ind. e Cat.', XV, p.125). Kristeller mentions 14 more mss.

160. Rossi,E·p.361, n.7. Minutoli, Lucca, 1868; cited by Gravino, p.116. I have been unable to consult this work or to establish a more accurate reference. Gravino, chapter IX, pp. 115-120.
III: Editions of Lucian produced in Italy in, and before, 1500

(i) Dialogi Tyrannus, Vitarum auctio latine (interprete Christophoro Persone) (Romae, Georgius Lauer, c.1470). f.la ( ) HABON Missa istae faciamus o Clotho ... f.20a, l.15ff ... et qui in venditionibus et emptionibus in mercaturis in cauponis commorentur huissamodi vitas sumus vendituri. f.20b. vacat.

Accurti, pp. 47-48, no. 92. (Hain 10267?). Ruyschaert pp. 161-162 argues that this antedates the edition described by Goldschmidt (pp.7-20), since, "it seems more likely that the edition of the two dialogues should have preceded the one of six ... it no doubt met with such success that Lauer decided to bring out a new edition, adding to it a group of translations of other dialogues which he had by him" (p.162).

(ii) Dialogi VI: Charon; Timon; Palinurus; Alexander, Hannibal, and Scipio; Tyrannus; Vitarum Auctio. (Romae, Georgius Lauer, c.1470). f.la vacat. f.lv. Bona fabula hec; que loquitur nobis tot utilia ... f.80 ... vitas sumus vendituri.

Hain 10269. Described by Goldschmidt. He gives the works in the above order (p.2). Hain lists them thus: Charon, Palinurus et Charon, Scipio, Charon et Vitarum Auctio, which is inaccurate. The copy in the John Rylands Library, Manchester (17383) has the works in a different order, as follows: Charon; Timon; Tyrannus; Vitarum Auctio; Palinurus; Scipio. (I owe this information to the Keeper of Printed Books; I have checked it from photographs of the text). That the order of the pieces was intended to be as described by Goldschmidt may be seen from the rubric sheet to the edition, published facing p.10 of his article. (Also previously by Sabbadini, NAV XXXI pp. 250-251). Either the Rylands copy is misbound, or it may represent another edition.
The translators are: Charon, Rinuccio; Timon, Bertholdus; Scipio, Aurispa (wrongly attributed by the rubric to Leonardo Aretino); Tyrrannus (Cataplus) and Vitarum Auctio, Cristoforo Persona (Goldschmidt's mistaken attribution of this Vitarum Auctio to Rinuccio was corrected by Ruysschaert). The other work is Maphaeus Vegius' Dialogus de foelicitate et miseria, printed here as Lucian's, with Rinuccio's cover letter (from Charon) to Laurentius Columna as its preface, misplaced after Scipio.

Two XV century editions are known which ascribe it correctly (William Caxton, Cologne, 1473, "Ten Dialogues", Hain 6107: Guillaume Le Signer, Milan, 1497, Vegius' Opera. Goldschmidt, p.14), but it was by no means uncommon to find it attributed to Lucian (e.g. Florence, Bib. Nazionale Centrale, ms Conventi Soppressi G.5. 865, f.31v-40v, where it appears as Rinuccio's translation; also Verona, B. Capitolare, CCXXV (354), f.36v-39v (excerpt); Vat., Fondo Barberiano Lat. 64 (VIII,64) olim 1412 (vii), (ix) and (x) below. Kristeller, I, p.160 II pp. 295, 442).

The introductory verses (for a full discussion of them see Chapter III, pp.428-30) probably originate from ms. Milan, Bib. Ambrosiana, Fondo Trotti 390, f.23v, where, as here, they precede the Rinuccio version of Charon (Kristeller, I, p.350). This may have been Lauer's source for Palinurus also, for it appears here at f.34v-58v attributed to Lucian.

(iii) De Veris Narrationibus libelli duo lat. interprete Lilio Castellano. f.1a. LUCIANI POETE ET ORATORIS: DE VERIS NARRATIONIBUS Libelli duo: A LILIO CASTELLANO DE GRECO IN LATINUM TRADUCTI, ET INPRIMIS EIIUS EPISTOLA AD MARCUM PISTORIENSEM. Completum et impressum est praesens opusculum in Civitate Neapoli per Arnaldum de Bruxella die VI Marcii MCCCCCLXXV Serenissimo domino Ferdinando Sicilias et cetera Rege Anno sui decimo octavo.
The first piece is from book one of L.B. Alberti's *Intercoenales*, and is generally known as *Virtus dec.* (Text in 'Opera Inedita', pp. 132-135; also in Garin, 'Prosatori', pp. 640-644).

Publishers and copyists for a long time accepted its attribution to Lucian without demur (e.g. Faelli, Bologna, 1497 Censorinus ... Lucianus Dialogus Virtutis cum Mercurio a Carolo Marsuppino Aretino conversus. A copy exists in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge -
Last piece: Tabula quinte pum et foliorum libri Luciani de veris narrationibus translati ex greco in latinum per Lilium castellanum ad honorem Veren. in xco pms dni Latin Card, de ursos apostolici cameralarii.

Hain 10259: Oates, no. 2512, p. 423. I have examined this volume.

(iv) De Praecedentia Alexandri, Annibalis, et Scipionis interprete Aurispa, f.1a vacat. f.1b. Opusculum de presidencia alexandri, hanibal, et Scipionis traductum ex greco in latinum per aurispam, f.4a. Finitum est hoc opusculum die secunda Ianuarii, Anno Mille quadringentesimo octoagesimo secundo.

Hain 10276. 'Catalogue B. M.' VII, p. 926 suggests that it was printed at Padua. Fava, no. 847 p.157, thinks it was the work of Leonardus Achates, in Venice. I have examined this volume.

(v) Libellus de virtute conquirente latinum per Carolum Aretinum.

Lutianis philosphi libellus de Virtute conquirente in quo introducuntur Mercurius accitus a Virtute petens quid ipsa velit: et illa factum exponit suum; traductus a Graecio in Latinum noviter per Carolum Aretinum. Lutianis philosphi greci de funerali Pompe per Rinutium traductus.

Hain 10272. Reichling, V, p. 178 (see Lockwood, p.99) thought it might be the work of Antonius Zarotus, Mediolani, 1490, although it appears without date or name of printer.

The first piece is from book one of L.B. Alberti's Intercoenales, and is generally known as Virtus deg. (Text in 'Opera Inedita', pp. 132-135; also in Garin, 'Prosatori', pp. 640-644). Publishers and copyists for a long time accepted its attribution to Lucian without demur (e.g. Faelli, Bologna, 1497 Censorinus ... Lucianus Dialogus Virtutis cum Mercurio a Carolo Marsuppino Aretino conversus. A copy exists in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge -
374), but the Basel edition of 1563 no longer did so. For a full discussion of the piece, see below Chapter IV.

The translation of Dialogus mortuorum X which follows is in Rinuccio's version.


f. Aii. Primus//Luciani poete et oratoris de veris narrationibus libelli duo a//Lilio Castellano de greco in latinum traducti in primis eius//ad Marcum Pistoriensem epistola. Explicit feliciter opus D. Siculi diligenter ac accuratissime emendatum acque Venetiis impress//sum per Philippum Pincium Mantuanum die vigesime novembris anno domini a nativitate MCCCLXXXXIII. Laus deo.

Hain 10260. 'Catalogue B.M.', V, p. 495. I have examined this volume. The text is the same as that of no. (iii) above.

(vii) f.1a. Luciani de Veris Narrationibus. Luciani de asino auro (sic).


Luciani Scaphidium. Luciani Palinurus. Luciani Charon.


Luciani Virtus Dea. Luciani in amorem. Luciani Timon. f.1b.

vacat. f. 2a. Clarissimi Luciani//Philosophi ac Oratoris de veris//narrationibus pro//oemium ... Impressum Venetiis per Simonem bevilaquam//anno domini MCCXXIII die XXV augusti.

Hain 10261. 'Catalogue B.M.', V, p. 519. (I have examined this volume, and the copy in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, no. 18978).

In addition to the works indicated on the title page anonymous translations of De Calumnia and Muscae laudes also appear. These are followed by the epigram Ad lectorem, beginning Haec lega plena iociis, and a request for permission to publish, together with the deed of copyright. This deed tells us that the request was made by Benedictus Bordo: Intellegens
maximum fructum utilitatem et voluptatem consecuturam ex eorum lectione.

The order is as on the title page, except that Scipio appears after Tyrannus (Cataplus), and before Scaphidium (Dialogus mortuorum X).

The poem heroica in amorem, which follows Virtus Dea, is in fact, an anonymous version of the first idyll of Moschus. The translation of Charon is a new one, neither that of Rinuccio, nor the anonymous version of the S.Croce ms. Other works previously unpublished are the three Dialogi Mortuorum, Diogenes (xiii), Terpsion (vi), and Hercules (xvi), the work of Petrus Balbus. The translation of Verae Narrationes is that of Lilius Castellanus, except for the preface, which has been restored from the Greek, and now begins Mos est athletarum. Asinus is in Poggio's version, Tyrannus (Cataplus) and Vitarum Auctio in Persona's, Scaphidium in Rinuccio's, Scipio in Auriapa's, and Timon in Bertholdus'. The Palinurus is Maffeo Vegio's Dialogus de Poelicitate et Miseria.

(viii) ΛΟΥΚΙΑΝΟΥ ΕΝΟΣΕΑΤΕΩΣ ΔΙΑΛΟΓΟΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΕΝΟΥΤΝΙΟΥ ΗΤΟΙ ΒΙΟΕ ΛΟΥΚΙΑΝΟΥ.

Ἐν φλωρεντία ἔτει ΧΙΛΙΟΣΤῶ ΤΕΤΕΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΣΤῶ ἘΝΕΝΟΧΙΩ ΕΚΤῶ.

(1496)

Hain 10258. The first edition of Lucian's works in Greek.

Printed by Laurentius de Alopa, Florence. Edited by Janus Lascaris (see above, p.9-10 for a fuller discussion). Of the supposititious works only Nero, actually by Philostratus, and the epigrams apart from eis τὴν ἑδυντο βιβλον are missing.

(ix) Luciani de veris narrationibus, Lucianus de asino, Luciani philosophorum vite ... (etc. as in no. vii). Impressum Mediolanti per magistrum Uldericum Scinzenzeler A.D. MCCCCXCVII die XII Martii.

Hain 10262. The text is exactly the same as that printed by
Bevilaqua, and the edition is therefore probably pirated. This perhaps gives some idea of the popularity of the versions, whose translators are given above (no.vii). 'Catalogue B.M.'; VI, p.771.

I have examined this volume.

(x) Luciani de Veris Narrationibus, Luciani de Asino etc. (as no.vii, and no. ix); then are listed De Calummia, Laus Muscae, and other contents of the other two editions not set out on their title pages. Impressum Venetiis per Joh. bapt. Sessam a.d. MCCCCC die vero XXXI Iunii.

Hain 10263. 'Catalogue B.M.'; V, p.482: I have examined this volume. The text is that of Bevilaqua, this time with a complete list of contents. It is printed in two columns. At the end appear two poems as well as the epigram Ad lectorem. The first, by Thomas Regazola, begins Endimioneum lunae phoebique duellum, the other is entitled Carmen de morte horrendum. (See chapter III, p.159, and p.138 for a discussion of them). Since Bordo's original privilegium appears, it is difficult to say whether or not the edition was legitimate.

(xi) De praecedentia Alexandri, Annibalis, et Scipionis (interprete Guarino Veronese). f.1a Guarini Veronensis Epistola/(.) Um in rebus bellicis semper, ceteris vere ... No date, printer, or place mentioned. (XV century?).

Hain 10275. Related by Hain to no. 10276 (no. iv above), an edition of 1482. This is presumably the earlier of the two, if they are connected, since the mistaken attribution was corrected in that edition, to read Aurispa, not Guarino.

(xii) HYSAOGGA LEONARDI ARETTINI ... followed by LUTIANI PHILOSOPHI GRAECI DIALOGUS DE FUNERALI POMPA PER RINUTIUM TRADUCTUS.
If selection is noticeable in the numbers and content of translations available in manuscript, it becomes even more sharply defined in the case of the editions of Latin translations. Only fourteen genuine works were presented to the public between 1470 and 1500, with three spurious pieces also appearing. The most popular, on a count of its printings, was once again Aurispa's *Dialogus Mortuorum XII*, published in six of the eleven editions. *Tyrannus (Cataplus), Vitarum Auctio, Verae Historiae, and Dialogus Mortuorum* each appeared in five editions, *Charon* and *Timon* in four, *Asinus, De Calumnia, Muscae Laudes, Dialogi Mortuorum VI, XIII* and *XVI* in three. Of the suppositious works printed in incunabula of Lucian Vegio's *Palinurus (De foelicitate et miseria)* appeared four times, *Alberti's Virtus Dea* the same number, and *Moschus' first Idyll* three times. A conspectus of these printings is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genuine</th>
<th>Spurious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asinus</td>
<td>vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charon</td>
<td>ii, vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Calumnia</td>
<td>vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogus Mort. VI</td>
<td>vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogus Mort. X</td>
<td>v, vii, ix, x, xli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogus Mort. XII</td>
<td>ii, iv, vii, ix, x, xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogus Mort. XIII</td>
<td>vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogus Mort. XVI</td>
<td>vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscae Laudes</td>
<td>vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon</td>
<td>ii, vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tyrannus (Cataplus)</em></td>
<td>i, ii, vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vitaer Historiae</em></td>
<td>iii, vi, vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vitarum Auctio</em></td>
<td>i, ii, vii, ix, x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

LUCIAN'S REPUTATION AND POPULARITY IN THE ITALIAN QUATTROCENTO

I. Popularity in Byzantium and the XV century. p. 64

II. Reputation in the XV century. p. 75

III. General reasons for the scope and number of translations. p. 85
I. Popularity in Byzantium and the XV century.

The history of Lucian's works between his death and the beginning of the Byzantium epoch is not well documented, for there is little evidence of the reading and imitation of his writings. Apuleius may have used the Dialogi Marini in his Metamorphoses, and the letters of Aelian and Alciphron (late 2nd/early 3rd century) show signs of borrowing, while the nearest to clear imitation are the two satires of Julian the Apostate (d.363), Misopogon and Caesares. His reputation may be judged from other indications. Philostratus had ignored him in his history of the sophists, and he had been mentioned by the fourth century Eunapius only to be pinpointed for a lack of seriousness. To Isidore of Pelusium (360 – c.435) he was just one more example of that ambition and greed for power which incites one man to sneer at another's values. His satire of the gods, mentioned specifically by Isidore, was what had precisely disqualified him from being called in as evidence against them for Lactantius (d.325). Nonetheless, if the narrowing of educational cultural interests at this time left little room for the praise and imitation of his works, they were at least preserved.

The first comments which we read upon their folios in the Byzantine era reflect the post-Iconclast subservience of education to the dictates of the Church. At a time when literary studies were once

---

2. For Apuleius see Drew; for Alciphron and Aelian, Carugno A and B; for Julian, Wright, pp. 420-510 and pp. 344-414.
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2. For Apuleius see Drew; for Alciphron and Aelian, Carugno A and B; for Julian, Wright, pp. 420-510 and pp. 344-414.

again beginning to emerge after a century of persecution along with the images, we clearly see in the scholia, the earliest work of Basilios, archbishop of Adada in Pisidium (floruit 870) and Arethas, archbishop of Caesarea (floruit 907), the results of a rigid prophylaxis against dangerous pagan ideas. For it was only under the wing of orthodox belief that classical studies were once again countenanced. In such circumstances some statements of Lucian's could not remain unanswered. One example is Peregrinus II, where to Lucian's sceptical description of the early Christians the scholiast replies οἶδα λησθεῖς, οὐ κατάδειτε, κατὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ; Another instance of the same feeling, dictated presumably by similar considerations, is the entry in the Suda, where Lucian merits the epithet βλάσφημος ὑπὶ δύσφημος, and is condemned in the life to come to share with Satan the eternal fire. Arethas included in his commentary a more reasoned refutation of part of the argument from Juppiter Tragoedus, while less virulent, but in the historical circumstances equally damning, comment came from the patriarch Photius (d.891). Lucian's philosophy, he said, was entirely negative πλὴν εἰ τις αὖτου δοξάζειν ἐρεῖ τὸ μηδὲν δοξάζειν. Nevertheless, this period is notable for a resurgence in Hellenism as well as for its subordination to Christianity, and it is to Photius that we also owe a critical assessment of Lucian's style which shows a warm appreciation of his language, if not of his material. The reader of Lucian, his comment runs, feels that he is not reading words ἀλλὰ μέλος τι τερπνόν χωρὶς ἐμφάνους ὁδῆς τοῖς ἐσμέν ἐναποστάζειν τῶν ἀκροάτων. Liutprand of Cremona, too, can show us an acquaintance with the Gallus, which, if surprising in a westerner during the X century, surely argues

4. For Basilios see Mras p. 231, n.3; for Arethas, id. p. 232, and Rabe. Scholion on Peregrinus II, Jacobitz, IV, p.247, for Suda, see Adler, III, p. 283, s.v. Λουκιανός.

5. Arethas, Rabe pp. 644-6, Photius, Bibliotheca cod, 128, p.412 A-D.
for its currency among Greeks at this time. And as a further indication that Lucian was not wholly dismissed, though he has under suspicion, during this period, there is the Philopatris, written in 965 or 969, the first Byzantine imitation of his works.

Lucian seems to have recovered somewhat from his earlier lack of esteem during the Atticising twelfth century, when two imitations appeared. One, the Timarion, is based upon the Nطوmanteia (Menippos), while the other, Theodorus Prodromus' Βίων πεδίσις Ποιητικών και πολιτικών, uses Vitarum Auctio as its model. Moreover, Tzetzes, the most eminent scholar of the time, knew Lucian well, and refers to him without the emotion generated by his name in the IX and X centuries.

With the Renaissance of literary studies after the recapture of Constantine from the Franks in 1261, we approach the period of the Revival of Learning in the West, and Lucian again catches the attention of scholars and imitators. Thomas Magister, a leader in the educational rehabilitation, used his writings several times, and there was a general upsurge in the copying of manuscripts of his works. Imitations which may be mentioned are the dialogue Φλωρέντιος η τετεί σοφίδας by Nikephoros Gregoras, which appeared around 1330-31, and the Mazaris, an anonymous piece composed during the reign of Manuel Paleologus (1391-1425). There seemed to be no memory, amid the general literary

6. Antapodosis, I, xii; this section printed in Harrington, p. 172. See also Newlin.
7. Printed in Jacobitz, III, pp. 609-624. For an account of its date and purpose see Reinach.
resurgence, of the Church onslaught of the ninth and tenth centuries, and it was in this uncompromised position that Lucian entered Italy. It was to be over a century before conditions in some way akin to those which had prompted the words of the Suda recreated mistrust of the Syrian satirist, and drove his champions, Erasmus and More the most famous of them, into the dangerous middle ground of the Reformation. Even then, the strictures of Luther on one side and Alberto Pio on the other against the irreligion of Erasmus, an inheritance from Lucian, do not seem to have stopped the publication of translations and imitations by the Northern European humanists. The dissemination of Lucian's works continued through normal educational channels, though selection was to be controlled more carefully. Though grudgingly, even a conservative like Muretus could acknowledge some value in their study.

In the fifteenth century, the suspicions of pagan literature were

---

11 No full account of his influence in the sixteenth century exists; closest to one is Thompson's unpublished Princeton University dissertation. See Thompson, 'Lucian'. Other contributions have been made by Schultz; Caccia, 'Note'. Both Luther and Pio, engaging in criticism of Erasmus, the first for his treatise De Libero Arbitrio, the second for his Encomium Moriae and Colloquia Familiaria, mentioned in a pejorative tone his use of the works of Lucian. See Luther De Servo Arbitrio, S iiiij: Pio, Book I,0, p. Vr:III,0,p.LXXIIv:III, T, p.LXXXIr:X,0,p.CLXXIVv.

12 Sir Thomas Elyot in the Boke named the Governour, I, chapter X on "what order shulde be in learning and which auctours shulde be fyrste read" recommended that, after a few quick rules in grammar, and Aesop, "the nexte lesson wolde be some quicke and mery dialoges, elect out of Luciane, whiche be without ribawdry, or to moche skorning: for either of them is exactly to be eschewed, specially for a noble man, the one anoysing the soule, the other his estimation, concerning his gravitie". The reservations which he feels are lower down expressed thus - "it were better that a childe shulde never rede any parte of Luciane, than all Luciane". (Croft, I, pp. 57-8.) Muretus, Variae Lectiones XVIII, 16 (II, p.217) (on St. Gregory Nazianzen's use of Lucian) videlicet ut eges etiam ex amaris herbis ac floribus edcant antiqu quidem, quo ad mel conficiendum utantur: sic et talia ingenia etiam ex improbisimis scriptoribus aliquid quod prosit, excerpunt. The restrictive attitude of the Catholic Church to Lucian is seen in the presence of Peregrinus and Philpatri in the Index. (Reusch, I, p.228). But it is significant that only these works were banned.
largely forgotten in the upsurge of interest in classical antiquity, the lessons of which were becoming more and more clearly seen as allied to contemporary life and needs. As the intelligenzia which had first seized upon the new learning began to need positions and patronage, the city-states, the principates, even the Church itself provided their means of livelihood, in exchange for an efficient administration, and an educational programme which would bring the lessons of the past to bear on the problems of the present. Greek studies, though a smaller part of the movement initially than the Latin, flourished because they were related materially to this ideal, and no obstacle was put in their way. The seeds of Lucian's future discredit, therefore, lay dormant, and his reputation was good. From the very beginning of serious Greek studies in the West his works had found translators and students, and his manuscripts had been collected in increasing numbers with the spread of Greek letters to the major centres. By the end of the century fifty-four of his works had been translated into either Latin or Italian by some sixteen or more scholars, and there were available eleven Latin editions containing fourteen different pieces, and one complete Greek edition.

But apart from this statistical evidence, there are other signs to show the popularity of Lucian's works during the Quattrocento. Not the least of these is the number of people actually requesting versions of his works. It was Thomas Serezanus (the future Pope Nicholas V) to whom Poggio dedicated Juppiter Confutatus at his most urgent request. At the behest of Seraphius of Urbino, mentioned by Thomas Seneca as a literary scholar in the same breath as the doyen Niccolò Niccoli, Rimuccio retranslated Charon and Jacobus Mucius Perleo translated Piscator. Guarino sent his youthful version of Nascae Laudae to Scipio Mainente, because, as he says in the dedicatory letter, cupere te non-rumquam innuisti faceta quaedam sive ridicula hominis illius in latinam
Such enthusiasm is also reflected in the history of particular works, such as De Calumnia, which had great vogue in both art and literature during the Quattrocento, and no less by the imitations of Lucian’s dialogues from Alberti to Galeotto Del Carretto. But a period particularly noteworthy for his popularity is that of Ercole I’s rule in Ferrara (1471 - 1505). During the reign of this great patron of learning and the arts Nicolao Leoniceno, Professor of Medicine and Classics at Ferrara for sixty years from 1464, translated thirty-five works of Lucian into Italian. These, says Paolo Giovio, Herculii latinarum litterarum imperito mire placuerunt. The Duke was also the recipient of an Italian translation of De Calumnia by Bartolommeo della Fonte in 1472. But this was not all. The great Scandian poet Boiardo added to the repertory of early Italian comedy a reworking of Lucian’s Timon which was dedicated to the Duke, probably also composed at his suggestion, and performed before him as one of that famous series of classical productions which marks the birth of theatre in the Renaissance. The imitations of Lucian by Pandolfo Collenuccio, the ill-fated humanist diplomat from Pesaro, destined at last to die at the hands of Giovanni Sforza in 1504, were also addressed to Ercole. In one of them, the Specchio d’Esopo, a dialogue in which Aesop attempts to enter court to present his Apologi to the king, and gain his support, Lucian appears as one of the courtiers who already enjoy the royal patronage. Since the king is transparently a portrait of Ercole, this piece gives further evidence of his predilection for Lucian. The Duke’s tastes, finally, were known to his son-in-law Francesco Gonzaga, for it was to honour a visit by Ercole in 1492 that he commissioned a terza rima version of Dialogus Mortuorum XII

14. For De Calumnia see Chapter III p. 131, and for other works Chapter III passim. The imitations are dealt with in Chapters IV and V.
from the poet and musician Filippo Lapaccini. 15

The knowledge of and enthusiasm for Lucian which is attested by this evidence is balanced on the other side by an inability in the enthusiasts themselves to read the original Greek. Of those who asked for translations certainly Seraphius of Urbino was in this category. His request for Rimuccio to translate Charon again was based upon his reading of an older Latin version. 16 Again, although he clearly knew of the Piscator, since he asked for it to be translated, Perleò's prologue implies that his dedicatee knew nothing of its contents; cuius quidem dialogi summam quam perceperis facile mirari desines quod solebas interdum dicere. 17 Ercole of Ferrara, as we have seen, was incapable even of reading Latin. 18

If the above evidence indicates a general interest in Lucian, it also indicates the limitations imposed on an intimate knowledge of his works by the necessity of expertise. This point is further emphasised by the study of XV Century citation of Lucian. Outside the relatively small circle of his translators this is confined almost exclusively to general references, rather than actual quotation. Collemuccio, in whose Specchio d'Esopo Lucian is a character, refers to Verae Historiae and Asinus only through their main themes, while Giovanni Andrea de Buxis

15. For Leoniceno see Chapter I, p.53-4. Giovio, Elogia, p.133. For Bartolommeo della Fonte, see Chapter I, p.54-5. For Boiardo, see Chapter V. For Collemuccio see Chapter V: the identity of the King and the implications of Lucian's appearance are dealt with at pp.255-7. For his life see Saviotti. For Lapaccini, see Chapter III, pp.111-17.

16. Lockwood, p.96: latinum nescio quo interprete iam dixi factum.


alludes generally to Asinus, and vaguely to Vitarum Auctio. 19

Hieronymus Squarciaficus and Francesco Contarini are somewhat more specific in their allusions to Verae Historiae, the former mentioning the letter of Odysseus to Calypso, the latter the city on the Isles of the Blest, but neither quotes directly from the text. 20 Meanwhile, some indication of the range of these non-specialists is given by the fact that all the citations but one, that by Paolo Criniti in De Honesta Disciplina III, 2 to Hercules Gallicus, cover works well represented in the body of Latin translations. 21


20. Squarciaficus in preface to Diodorus Siculus et Cornelius Tacitus de Moribus Germanorum, Venetiis per Thomam Alexandrinum MCCCLXXXI, (Praefationes p. ccxvi) sed legant queso Lucianum in libro de veris narrationibus: scribit enim, Ulyssem suo nomine ad Calypsonem misisse. Contarini in Dialogus (Segarissi, 'Contarini', p.305): Erant et alie civitates...quippe civitatem illam auream...quam simul gravissimus et facetus philosophus Lucianus se vidisse autem...

21. Quoted in Garin, 'Pico', I, p.79: Quam vera sit atque ex re conficta a Luciano eloquentiae imago apud Celtas populos muper equidem consideravi, cum Johannes Picus Mirandula melius Laurentiumque sua orationes quocunque vellet perduceret. A second reference outside the Latin "canon" is the representation by Botticelli of 'Zeuxis' "Centaur Family" on the side-panel of the King's throne in "La Calumnia". The description of this ancient work is found in Lucian's preface Zeuxis, 4-6. It is uncertain whether or not his source could have been Lucian directly. Altrocchi's loose reference to the Venice edition of 1494 as an intermediary is, we may see, quite incorrect, and as there is to my knowledge no record of a version of Zeuxis at this period, we may conjecture that Botticelli either knew Greek, or had been recommended the subject by someone who did.† (Altrocchi, pp.472-3). Another reference outside the "canon", the narration of the outline of Menippus by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini in his letter De Miseria Curialium, addressed to Johannes Aich in 1444, is probably based on the citation of the same story by Poggio in De Infelicitate Principum (p. 417 ff.) although Piccolomini attributes the story to his father (Wolkan, pp.453-87). Lucianic (continued overleaf)

† Note: Among the works which I have consulted by art historians who mention the provenance of this motif, I have found no discussion of the means by which Botticelli came to know of the text on which he based his version.
The situation is not substantially different even among translators, although here there is evidence of a general nature that some of them were acquainted with a good many of the works. Guarino, for instance, alludes to the corpus in general when he says to Scipio Mainente: *quarum quidem rerum testimonio sunt non modo grandiora illa sed etiam tenuiora quaedam et magae ferme vulgares.*

Antonio Rossi came upon Phalaris I and II while reading some small works of Lucian in the same way as did Poggio the Asinus. Finally, Aurispa's description of his manuscript as containing *risus et seria omnia Luciani* seems to suggest that he had examined its contents.

But when one looks for more exact reference, one finds only Poggio with a wide range in his writings, and his scholarship is suspect. Not only did he say that he found *Asinus in quodam volumine operum Lucii,* but in his encomium to Scipio Mainente, he stated: *Lucianus graecus autem Hannibalem, Scipionem, et Caesarem apud inferos in certamen gloriae rerum gestarum disputantes ludens introduxit.*

In his reply in favour of Caesar, Guarino dryly corrected the error: *interim... de Luciano auctore greco diligentius et apertioribus oculis animadverte, apud quem*

---

21. (Continued from previous page) story pp. 454-5. Despite the fact that he owned a manuscript of Lucian, he shows no real trace of an acquaintance with his works at first hand. Gewerstock's contention p. 34 that this letter is based on the *De Mercede Conductis* is erroneous, both because it shows no obvious borrowings from that work, and because this particular Lucianic piece does not seem to have been translated at all in the XV Century. Thompson 'Translations' p. 20, was also under the impression that *De Mercede Conductis* was well known in the XV Century.


nullam de Ca esare mentionem factam esse cernes. Notwithstanding such inaccuracies his quotations come not only from works like Timon, Charon and De Calumnia, which were translated at an early date, but also from Menippus, Gallus, and Piscator, only the last of which is found in a Latin translation in Italy during the century. Only Guarino comes near to this, by virtue of having translated, albeit without acknowledgment, a large number of the precepts of Lucian's \textit{Cuomodo Historia Conscribenda Sit} in composing a letter to Tobia Borghi \textit{De historiae conscribendae forma}.  

But what suggests more than anything else the lack of an intimate knowledge of Lucian's works, even among enthusiasts, is the ease with which bogus works and bogus references were passed off as genuine. Deliberate frauds were worked by Aurispa, whose version of \textit{Dialogus Mortuorum XII} included additions attributed by him to Libanius, and by Alberti, whose \textit{Virtus Dea} was published as a work of Lucian translated by Carlo Marsuppini. Aurispa even used a reference to Lucian in one of his letters to Panormita which, if not a genuine mistake, may also be classed as fraudulent:–

Scribit Lucianus quendam sua aetate fuisse in caeteris omnibus rebus ingratum, astutum et callidum; nullus tamen gratus nullus iucundius, nullus voluptuosius amicis rescribere solebat quam ille et hac sola virtute inter mille vicia amabatur ille et colebatur ab amicis.  

27. Poggio: \textit{Timon} 25 in \textit{De infoelicitate principum} p.395; \textit{De Calumnia} 10, ibid.p.411; Charon 20 De Avaricia p.31; Menippus, \textit{De Infoelicitate principum} p.417-8; Gallus 24-5 ib.p.410-1; Piscator ib.p.395. Gallus was translated by Rudolphus Agricola in the summer of 1484, after he left Italy. See his letter to Adolf Rusch, ist. October 1484 from Heidelberg – \textit{addamque Myciillum Luciani, quem hac estate e greco converti}. Published in Hartfelder p.30. The translation itself was published in the XVI Century (Agricola, pp.276-289).  
29. Aurispa, see Chapter III p.106 f. Alberti, see Chapter IV p.173 f.  
The point he is making is that Panormita should answer his letters. Lucian's name has been used, if we accept that this is a fraud (and the use of Libanius' name in connection with the Dialogus Mortuorum XII gives good reason to suppose that this would not have been out of character) simply because Aurispa knew that Panormita would not have read all his works. If the case is slightly different with Maffeo Vegio's Dialogus de foelicitate et miseria, which appears in several manuscripts and editions attributed to Lucian, not through the author's intention, but by the ignorance or guile of their scribes or editors, nevertheless the essential point is the same.\(^31\) The dissemination of Lucian's works and the nurture of enthusiasm for them was entirely in the hands of a small group of experts, some of them, like Poggio, inaccurate and shaky in their knowledge, others unscrupulous in the use of theirs.

\(^{31}\) See Chapter I p. 58, and Chapter V, p. 216f.
II. Reputation in the XV Century

Nonetheless, Lucian was popular even if his works were not intimately known by many, and such popularity could only have been communicated from the prime source of knowledge, the Greek scholars, among whom there was unanimity as to the value of his writings. They spoke of him in superlatives as vir...doctissimus, vir eruditissimus et iocundissimus, disertissimus vir and indeed during the whole Quattrocento hardly an echo is recorded against him or his writings. In contrast to his reception in Byzantium and in the XVIth century after the Reformation, the Church had no word to say to his discredit. Lucian's works were translated by Petrus Balbus, bishop of Tropea, and by the Guilelmite Prior Cristoforo Persona as unflinchingly as translations were addressed to Popes, Cardinals and Archbishops by other humanists. In the face of this evidence, Goldschmidt's view that the lack of dedication, date or printer's name in the George Lauer edition of translations (Rome 1470), reflects the fact that "to the half-learned and to the severer scholars little would be known about Lucian, then as now, except that he was a naughty author"; and that the publication of the book at such a time was dangerous, seems anachronistic. Only once is there a hint of current disparagement, when Riiuccio, in the preface to his version of Vitarum Auctio notes that multitudo quae gustu caret ac primis labiis vix degustat corticem, illum ut verbis utar eorum truphatorem appellant. I have


33. See Chapter I passim.

34. pp. 17-20.

35. Lockwood, p.102
discovered, however, no reference which uses this word *truphator* to describe Lucian, and it seems possible that Rinuccio is not referring to Italians, but, since the work is a Greek derivative, to Greeks, who may have derived their hostility from those early Byzantine commentators whose Hellenism was so closely guarded by Christianity.

Lucian had already prepared the way for his immediate acceptance in the Renaissance by statements in his own works to the effect that he had gained both wealth and fame by the pursuit of rhetoric. An age which was sympathetic to the equation of fame with quality and accustomed to this type of self-praise saw nothing wrong in accepting his evidence at face value. Lapo, in his dedication of *Somnium* to Eugenius IV, clearly knew the source of the contention: *ille ait sibi ab his studiis splendorem maximum et gloriam comparasse*. Others may or may not have known. The fact remains that the statement had currency among those who translated and edited his works. Rinuccio speaks of Lucian as *Philosophus apud graecos suo tempore clarissimus*; Griffolini as *tantus vir et maximi apud graecos nominis*. Perleo and Lauer both title him *vir clarissimus*, perhaps indicating that his fame has now spread beyond the need for ancient testimony. Certainly Petrus Balbus implies that by this period Lucian's reputation was well established, when he speaks of him as one *qui quanti litterarum peritia valuerit nequaquam indigeo testibus*.

This latter statement amply demonstrates that although Lucian's reputation may initially have relied to some extent upon the acceptance

---

37. Luiso, p. 277.
40. Balbus, ms. Palermo, B. Naz., I, C, 9, f. 156r.
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40. Balbus, ms.Palermo, B.Naz., I,C,9,f.156r.
of ancient authority (in this case Lucian himself) and the general enthusiasm for things classical, by the second half of the Quattrocento many people had formed their own opinions of his worth. These opinions constitute a picture of Lucian's critical reception and more particularly of humanist attitudes to his works, and may be analysed under the following headings: style, knowledge, moralism, philosophy and humour.

Perhaps the primary quality noted in Lucian's prose by his XV century readers is his eloquence. By Aurispa, Griffolini and Rossi he was styled eloquentissimus, by Lapo and Balbus disertissimus, and by Rinuccio facundissimus Graecorum. Giovanni Andrea while conceding the point that Lucian's words flow freely, perhaps also implies by his adjective argutulus a certain garrulousness. This does not tally with Guarino's opinion. For him Lucian displays both indicendo pondus and dictionis proprietas, qualities which reflect careful and considered judgement rather than mere loquacity.

Both Rinuccio and Balbus are in agreement with Guarino on the care with which Lucian writes. Rinuccio, using Vitae Auctio as his example, stresses the elegance, brevity, precision and thoughtfulness which a careful reader will see in that piece. Balbus emphasises the keenness with which the argument in Dialogus mortuorum xvi is handled.
Together with these attributes come *iocunditas in dicendo* and *dicendi suavitas* mentioned by Balbus and Guarino respectively. These last two recall in some measure the comments of Photius mentioned earlier. But the Italians had no such reservations about Lucian's material as the Patriarch had expressed. They both felt and enjoyed the power of his language. Guarino's comment on the *Muscae Encomium* perhaps best sums up the appreciation of Lucian's rhetoric: *erit enim in re levi admirationis occasio nec tam muscae quam laudantis laudatio.*

But despite general claims for the clarity and precision of Lucian's style, translators did find problems in rendering it into Latin. According to Rimuccio, commenting upon the mess made by a previous translator of *Charon*, the fault lay completely with the latiniser: *Graece enim cum distincte atque dilucide loguatur apud nos distorte et conturbate per omnia fere procedit.* But Poggio attributed the difficulties which he himself had experienced to basic differences between the two languages. Where the *lingue latine dignitas* allowed, he translated the words. But wherever this seemed harder, he spoke in his own words *ita ut sensus integer salvaretur.* The reason for this he expressed as follows:

> *Est cum grecis vernaculus quidam scribendi usus admodum dissimilis a nostra loquendi consuetudine a quo nisi paululum recedas subasurda reddetur scribentis oratio.*

The somewhat rigid claims of *dignitas* and *dicendi copiam aut ornatum* had, Poggio claimed, presented problems to more distinguished and learned men than he faced with the more informal medium of Greek. Of course,

---

47. See above p. 65.
49. Lockwood, p.96.
50. Ms. Vat.Lat. 3082, f.98v. See Appendix for full text.
in this discussion, Poggio has Lucian in mind, and it is a fact that of all Greek prose authors, Lucian has the most varied vocabulary, drawn from sources poetic, comic, philosophical and oratorical alike.\textsuperscript{51} Such a farrago was bound to tax the Latin dignitas and copia to their limits.

Lucian was praised for his knowledge and erudition as well as for his style. For Aurispa he was \textit{vir inter grecos doctissimus}, for Poggio \textit{vir ille doctissimus}, and for Lilius Castellanus \textit{vir eruditissimus}.

Nor was his learning limited in any way. Guarino specifically praises him as \textit{rerum varietate atque cognitione mirandus}, and says that these and his other qualities are reflected not only in the larger works but also in the smaller and the \textit{nugae ferme vulgares}.

That he used the \textit{Quomodo historia conscribenda sit}, and substituted \textit{De Calumnia} for a work of his own on the subject demonstrates how seriously he took Lucian's learning.

But Lucian was not only knowledgeable. For Poggio he was \textit{vari acerrimique ingenii...vir}, while Rossius said his works reflected \textit{perspicacissimum quoddam ingenium}. From such praise of his intellect it was only a short step to the epithet \textit{sapiens} applied to him by Perleo.

Lucian, then, was a sage, endowed with a remarkable knowledge of a great variety of matters. His works were composed \textit{non sine singulari}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} Schmid, p.431 and note 22.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Aurispa, De Amicitia prologue ms.Balliol College, Oxford 315, f.30v: Poggio, ms.Vat.Lat.3082, f.96v: Lilius, prefaces to \textit{Verae Narrationes}, Arnaldus de Bruxella, Naples, 1475.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Sabbadini, 'Epistolario', II, p.406.
\item \textsuperscript{54} \textit{Quomodo etc.} used in the letter to Tobia Borghi de historiae conscribendae forma, Sabbadini, 'Epistolario', II, pp.458-465. For \textit{De Calumnia} see section III, p.88.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Poggio, prologue to \textit{Asinus}, p.138. Rossius, ms.Parma,B.Palatina, fondo Parmense, 27, f.1r.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Ms.Paris,B.Nat., Lat.8729 (8671), f.15v.
\end{itemize}
doctrina, and therefore they constituted an authority, so that Rinuccio could send to Buonaccorso a dialogue of Lucian summa cuius auctoritate tu tuis opinionibus confirmabere.  

57 Balbus mentioned veritas in concludendo as a facet of Lucian's writing in Dialogus mortuorum xvi, and asked his dedicatee to be convinced of the truth of the sentiments in DM xiii.  

58 Rinuccio was convinced that he was endowed with such weighty opinions that he was inferior to almost none of the Greeks.  

It is therefore no surprise to discover that even more than for knowledge of the sort culled by Guarino from his works, Lucian was prized as a moralistic source.

This facet of his reception is evidenced both by comments of the translators and the use to which the dialogues were put. Guarino considered Lucian in carpendis vitis vehemens et mordax.  

60 Rinuccio included Charon among those works which have a bearing upon the way in which we conduct our lives. Poggio and Aeneas Sylvius both used an outline of the story of Menippus as a moralistic anecdote, while Poggio also used an appreciable number of other passages from Lucian to illustrate or support arguments in his moral dialogues De Avaritia and De Infoelicitate Principum.  

61 Poggio and Aeneas Sylvius both used an outline of the story of Menippus as a moralistic anecdote, while Poggio also used an appreciable number of other passages from Lucian to illustrate or support arguments in his moral dialogues De Avaritia and De Infoelicitate Principum.  

62 The latter even invoked the authority of

57 Ms.cit.,f.16r (Perleo), Rinuccio, Lockwood, p.100.

58 Balbus, Ms.Palermo, B.Naz., I,C,9,f.156v: verax tamen existimes velim, ib.f.147r.

59 Lockwood, p.102. ea....gravitate sententiarum ut nemini graecorum sit fere inferior.


61 Lockwood p.97: qui ad bonos mores et ad humanae vitae instituta spectant.

Lucian as a moral mentor in branding the mendicant brethren as hypocrites on a level with ancient author’s philosophers in Contra Hypocritas. The point is further illustrated by the interpretation of unlikely works like Vitarum Auctio in this way. Rimuccio spoke of a serious message behind that dialogue, and Luca d'Antonio Bernardi saw it as a handbook of ancient philosophy.

Lucian was habitually considered a serious author then, and even came to be styled philosophus and philosophus luculentissimus. Two points may be made about this title. The first is that, like Lucian’s fame and wealth, it has its origins in his own works, most notably in Piscator, where he explains his reverence for the ancient philosophers who confront him, and in Bis Accusatus 27 and 32, where his desertion of Rhetoric for Philosophy is described. The second is that, unlike his fame, it was not accepted entirely at face value. Giovanni Andrea De' Bussi, uncertain whether to call him sophista or philosophus, nonetheless clearly maintains that he is at least a satirist, who, though writing against the philosophers lusus verius, quam calumnia, still spared none of them entirely. Boiardo too makes Lucian point out the paradox involved in being termed a philosopher, while being an ardent critic of philosophers, in the Prologo to Timone:

Per voi lassata ho la mia setta antica
Che filosofo un tempo era tenuto,
Ben che foi de' filosofi l'urtica.

63. quos, si Lucianus viveret, conjiceret inter philosophos sui temporis. Fasciculus, II, pp. 570-83. Quotation p. 578. First edition of this was by Orthuisius Gratius, Cologne, 1535.

64. See below, Chapter III, p. 150 f.

65. Titles in Bevilaqua, 1494 and Sessa, 1500.
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The paradox is, however, purely academic. The humanists felt that Lucian was truthful, endowed with keen intellect, perspicacity and wisdom, and able to communicate good mores through the medium of a clear, precise and pleasant style. That Lucian, possessed of such qualities could, despite his attacks on philosophers, still be classed as a philosopher may be seen from the description he is made to give of Aesop to Ercole in Colleuccio's Specchio d'Esopo:

Il nome di costui, o re, chiamano Esopo...et è filosofo, ma non come li altri che con syllogismi e longe narrazioni e difficili mostrano a li omni la via de la virtú, facendo oscuro quel che molto chiaro essere dovería, e non facendo però con le opere quello che con la lingua insegnano. Ma ha trovato una nova via breve et espedita, per la quale pigliando argumento di cose umili e naturali, con dolci esempi domostra quello che a li omini sia utile. E Plauto e io soi amici e compagni della medesima setta siamo.66

But Lucian, albeit he was regarded as a philosopher, a sage and a propagator of serious moral discourse, was by no means seen as a grave author. Far from it, he was to Guarino iocis ac facetiiis amoenissimus, to Balbus pater iocum (sic), to Poggio facetissimus homo.69 But there subsisted with and behind this jocularity a serious purpose. Aurispa described the works of Lucian as risus et seria, while Balbus told his dedicatee that he would see in the Dialogus mortuorum xiii simul et oratoris festivitatem et severitatem.70 Antonio Romagno described reading Timon as mixing facetiis elegantia, lepidis gravia, seria iocis.71 It was Rinuccio, however, who expressed himself most fully on the point, in dedicating his translation of the Vitarum Venditio to Seraphius Urbinas,
a notable Lucianist. Lucian was elegant and expressed serious opinions, but because he wrote in jest what others wrote seriously, many people disliked his works.

He gives as an example of this "hidden gravity" the work he is dedicating.  

This concept, it will be readily seen from Rimuccio's statement, was crucial to the acceptance of Lucian's writings in the XV century. Most people, on his evidence, turned their noses up at anything entirely facetious, but could be persuaded that a thing was worthy of perusal if it had an underlying serious purpose. So, in the main, Lucian's humour was seen as a foil to his moral philosophy, part of the general iocunditas often associated with his writings.

Nevertheless, once the concept of serio-comic writing had been enunciated, and the idea accepted, humour itself was in better odour. Writers were more able to experiment with tone and presentation in their works and it even became tolerable to write wholly in jest. Lucian's works figure largely in this change of atmosphere. The idea of literature for relaxation which he expresses in the prologue to Verae Narrationes was found acceptable by humanists, with the result that some of his works were appreciated primarily for their humour. Guarino dedicated his translation of the Parasitus to Pietro Donati with the express purpose of amusing him: Lusibus istis/tu perpetuum falle laborem/ curasque graves solare ioco.  

Lilius Castellanus said of the Verae Narrationes: habent

72. Lockwood, p.102.
73. Lilius Castellanus called him vir.in primis iocundissimus (Letter to Ludovicus, prologue to Verae Narrationes, Arnaldus de Bruxella, Naples 1475): Balbus noted his iocunditas in dicendo and quanta cum iocunditate ipse..disputat(ms.cit.f.156v.,f.150v.) Poggio (preface to Asinus,p.138) misi ad te hanc fabellam iocunditatis..plenam.
74. Sabbadini, 'Epistolario', I, p.222.
enim in se iocunditatem maximam et risum, and made no reference to any serious moral purpose. 75

The acceptance, then, of Lucian's humour as a cover for serious moral purpose, led to an appreciation of his humour in itself. But how deep was this appreciation, and what its final results were in the Quattrocento, it is the purpose of later chapters to examine. Here we may conclude by reiterating that Lucian's reputation was as a moralist, and that one necessary precondition of this reputation was the acceptance by his XV century audience of the serio-comic mode of interpretation, outlined by Rinuccio. As a summation of his attributes, as an indication of his undoubted good name, and as a further sign that the ancient comic writers were valued above all for their teachings, we may quote the description of Lucian and Plautus by Aesop in Collenuccio's Specchio d'Esopo:

Sono omni d'ogni mano, dotti, acuti, umani, faceti, pronti, eleganti, destri et esperti, che con tanta dolcezza dimostrano le condizione de la vita umana e insegnano costumi e virtù, che chi con loro practica, pare a pena che mal uomo possa essere. 76

75. Prologue to Verae Narrationes, Arnaldus de Bruxella, Naples, 1475, addressed to Marcus Pistoriensis.  
76. Collenuccio, p. 95.
III. General reasons for the scope and number of translations

The remarks of both Photius and Guarino convey a sense of clarity in Lucian's style which makes him not only a pleasant author to read but also, to some extent at least, an easy one. Certainly Erasmus, when he began to progress in his Greek studies, translated Lucian partly for this reason.77 It was the same in the XV century. Both the De Calumnia and Muscae Encomium were translated by Guarino during the period of his early studies in Greece, and of the latter he says specifically that it was done while he was beginning to practise the rudiments of Greek.78 Lapo's version of De fletu and De somnio were dedicated to Eugenius IV as meorum laborum ac vigiliarum primitias.79 For the rest Lucian's status as a Byzantine school book must have meant that many of his translators, such as Guarino, Aurispa, and Filelfo, who were teachers themselves, and had studied in the East, adopted him for their own pupils' use at an early stage.80

In addition to a comparative easiness in the language, not found, it must be added, in all cases,81 many of the works translated had the advantage of being fairly brief, opuscula rather than opera. They could, therefore, serve as either introductions to a new patron, or as stopgaps when an old one called for a work to be dedicated to him. Guarino's

78. See Chapter I, p. 18
79. Luiso, p.277.
80. Sabbadini, 'Metodo', p.23 mentions this point also:'Fra gli autori greci, quattro specialmente erano presi di mira dai traduttori che desideravano imparare la lingua greca: Luciano, Plutarco, Isocrate, Esopo.'
81. See Antonius Rossius' comment that Phalaris I and II were translated ut miorem mihi conciperem voluptatem. (Ms.Parma,B.Pal., fondo Farmense, 27,f.1r.) Also Foggio's remarks, above p. 78.
Muscae Encomium is one example of the latter phenomenon, Lapo's De Calumnia another. If the work were dedicated to a new patron, as in the case of Griffolini's De Calumnia addressed to John Tiptoft, there was often a promise that a more substantial opus would follow, if this one met with approval.

Many pieces were translated, on the other hand, because they suited the preoccupations or situation of the dedicatee or translator, because they were specifically commissioned by an enthusiast, or because they expressed something which the translator would otherwise have had to put into his own words.

Giovanni Quirini, because he had, we are told, undergone an experience similar to that of Apelles as described by Lucian, was sent a version of De Calumnia by Guarino. His honour had been saved by the severi favor principis ... criminatoris ingratitudinem exprobrans.

The De Sommio, where Lucian relates the beginnings of his literary and sophistic career, was seen by Lapo as a direct parallel to his own case. In the preface he says to Eugenius: Intuebere enim in illa non modo Luciani fortunam, sed etiam quodam modo meam. His Patriae Laudatio, on the other hand, suited his dedicatee, Gregorius Corarius, quod item tibi, quod patriae prae ceteris amantissimus fores, putavi fore gratissimum. Aurispa's augmented version of Dialogus Mortuorum XII was a fulsome, if underhand, compliment to the then Papal governor of Bologna. In the preface when he says laetor ... magnum illius romanæ

83. A liqu id for tasse dignius in tuum nomen a me traductum humanitatem tuam in britanniam usque prosequetur. ms. St. John's College, Cambridge, 61.C.11), f.105r; also Friedrich Creussnor 1475, Huremburg.
85. Luiso, p.277, and p.280.
antiquitatis exemplum tuis in factis esse, he establishes a parallel between ancient and modern, which clearly points to the analogy between Capodiferro and Scipio. His De Amicitia too suited the situation of its dedicatees, Leonello d'Este and Ludovico Gonzaga, friends and sons of friendly fathers. 86

Guarino's Muscae Encomium provides an instance also of the enthusiast's commission. In his letter to Scipio Mainente we read:

animum superioribus diebus adverti pater optime et omni reverentia dignissime, quam Luciani delecteris ingenio... Tu vero... cupere te nonnunquam inmuisti faceta quaedam give ridicula hominis illius in latinam converti linguam. 87

Seraphius Urbinas was another keen Lucianist. Rinuccio tells us that it was at his behest that he revised the earlier version of Charon. Later on he was himself the dedicatee of Vitarum Auctio. Rinuccio explains the reason in his preface:

Hunc dialogum non de nihilo ad te scripsi, nam pro diutina inter nos consuetudine percepi te maiori quodam ani ardore Luciani opera in diem magis ac magis complecti.

He too it was who persuaded Jacobus Mucius Perleo, after many requests, to translate for him Piscator, the companion piece to Vitarum Auctio. 88

Lilius Castellanus was asked by Marcus Pistoriensis

ut eos tibi libellos designarem quos vir eruditissimus et iocundissimus Lucianus greco sermone conscripsit quoque superiori tempore nostros feceram. 89

The substitution of an ancient work for one by the translator was common also, for the respect shown for ancient authors was immense.

86. For D.M.XII, see Förster, 'Libanios', p.221. For De Amicitia, Bandini, 'Codd.mss.Lat.' III, pp.270-1: appendix for full text.


88. Lockwood, p.96 and p.102. Perleo,ms.Paris,Bib.Nationale Lat.8729 (8671),f.15v: Ecce igitur Luciani...dialogum iam tandem latinum per me factum...quem totiens a me ut mitterem contendisti.

89. De veris narrationibus, Naples 1475.
Lucian was, we have seen, admired for his knowledge, his grave opinions, and the way he elegantly and urbanely expressed them. His reputation was enhanced by the fact that very often, as we shall see in detail in the next chapter, his subject-matter suited well the preoccupations of the humanists of the time. When a translator had a subject in mind, and found it preempted by an ancient writer, he thought it no hardship to give up his own project in favour of producing a version of the prior work. On the contrary, he felt that, even by this token, he would gain a little immortality. Bertholdus' dedication illustrates the point:

Hoc Luciani opus per me Bertholdum ex Greco translatum tibi de Czambeccariis mitto...ut ex correctione tua et labore meo aliqua eternitas oriatur.90

Guarino, when he saw Quirini's situation, was about to launch into an invective of his own, but while reading he came across an elegant little work of Lucian, which, he says to his dedicatee, you will think was written against your oppressor.91 Rinuccio had in mind some ideas de morte funeralique pompa contemnenda, given to him by the teaching of the dedicatee, Bonaccursius Candidus, which he says tum elegantia atque copia tum disserendi subtillitate litteris mandare decreveram, nisi facundissimi graecorum Luciani quoddam iocabundum nobis occurrit opusculum quod graece dum legerem tuarum memor disceptationum tuo in nomine latinum feci.92

Aurispa too replaced a projected work of his own on friendship with his version of De Amicitia. In the preface he tells his dedicatees that he felt equal to the task of describing the benefits of friendship,


92. Lockwood, p.100.
and would have fulfilled it, had the job not been done by many famous authors already.\textsuperscript{93}

Coupled with this respect for antiquity was a fervent belief in the efficacy of literature as a force in life and society. Bessarion, in the document willing his collection of books to San Marco in Venice, expresses it thus:

quippe pleni sunt libri sapientium vocibus, pleni antiquitatis exemplis, pleni moribus, pleni legibus, pleni religione. Vivunt, conversantur, loquenturque nobiscum...Tanta est eorum potestas, tanta dignitas, tanta maiestas, tantum denique numen ut, nisi libri forent, rudes ommes essemus atque indocti nullam fere praeteritarum rerum, nullam exemplum, nullam denique nec humanarum, nec divinarum rerum cognitionem haberemus; eadem urna quae corpora hominum contegit, etiam nomina obrueret.\textsuperscript{94}

If books confer knowledge, and morality, their effect upon human behaviour is not a matter for doubt.

Many of Lucian's works were translated with one eye on the value of example. Lapo stated the principle clearly when he sent Demonic\textemdash\textit{tis Vita} to Ludovico Scarampo:

\begin{quote}
Nec enim praesentius quicquam est aut efficacius iis qui amplissima in dignitate constituti sunt et eam cum laude tueri cupiunt, quam eiusmodi viri vitam sibi proponere, quem omnibus in rebus et privatis et publicis, in omni denique vita atque oratione effingere atque imitari contur.\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

The ubiquity of these sentiments is further demonstrated by the embarrassment felt in dedicating a piece whose moral content might be seen to have an adverse bearing upon the character of the dedicatee. In dedicating \textit{De Calumnia} to Johannes Reatinus Lapo demurs emphatically:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{93} Omont, 'Bessarion', p.138.
\textsuperscript{94} Luico, p.281.
\end{quote}
and would have fulfilled it, had the job not been done by many famous authors already.  

Coupled with this respect for antiquity was a fervent belief in the efficacy of literature as a force in life and society. Bessarion, in the document willing his collection of books to San Marco in Venice, expresses it thus:

quippe pleni sunt libri sapientium vocibus, pleni antiquitatis exemplis, pleni moribus, pleni legibus, pleni religione. Vivunt, conversantur, loquanturque nobiscum...Tanta est eorum potestas, tanta dignitas, tanta maiestas, tantum denique numen ut, nisi libri forent, rudes omnes essemus atque indociti nullam fere praeteritum rerum, nullam exemplum, nullam denique nec humanarum, nec divinarum rerum cognitionem haberemus; eadem urna quae corpora hominum contegit, etiam nomina obrueret.  

If books confer knowledge, and morality, their effect upon human behaviour is not a matter for doubt.

Many of Lucian's works were translated with one eye on the value of example. Lapo stated the principle clearly when he sent Demonactus Vita to Ludovico Scarampo:

Nec enim prae sentium aut efficacius iis qui amplissima in dignitate constituti sunt et eam cum laude tueri cupiunt, quam elusmodi viri vitam sibi proponere, quem omnibus in rebus et privatis et publicis, in omni denique vita atque oratione effingere atque imitari conentur.  

The ubiquity of these sentiments is further demonstrated by the embarrassment felt in dedicating a piece whose moral content might be seen to have an adverse bearing upon the character of the dedicatee. In dedicating De Calumnia to Johannes Reatinus Lapo demurs emphatically:

93. Amicitiam exhortanti mihi quae bona ex ea nascuntur, quae laudes habeat, in primis dicere par esse videbar, quod quidem pro ingenio fecisset, nisi eum locum multi clarique auctores fuissent exsecuti. Ms Balliol College, Oxford 315 f. 30v. Bandini publishes part of the preface in 'Codd. ms. Lat.' III, p. 270-1. See appendix for full text.


95. Luiso, p. 281.
non quod opinarer ea te disciplina magnopere indigere. Bartolommeo della Fonte in a similarly tricky situation addresses the same work to Duke Ercole I of Ferrara:

non perché io stimì haverne bisogno la tua Excellentissima Signoria (imperoché io so bene g1'optimi et admirabili co_stumi e la incredibile et divina sapientia tua optima­mente conoscerla), ma perché al tuo Felicissimo nome mandandola molti altri ne piglino qualche fructo.96

In the XV century, says Dr. Bolgar, "translations of poetical works and of authors of purely literary interest are by comparison few".97 Lucian is a writer whose combination of gravitas and iocunditas, of morality and amusement, set him outside the limits of this general dictum. It is a measure of his uniqueness that even in the XV century, he formed a class of his own.

96. Luiso, p.284. Trinkaus, p.133.
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Conclusion p. 161
The main outlines of Lucian's reputation in the Quattrocento are now clear, and it remains before passing on to the realm of imaginative imitation to examine in detail the history of the individual works during this period. They are set out as follows: first those which show Lucian used as a source of knowledge about ancient history or life; next, those fulfilling other contemporary humanist requirements; next works interpreted wholly moralistically; then those professedly serio-comic, but nonetheless interpreted moralistically; finally those prized primarily for their humour, entertainment, or literary value. These divisions, although they embody the contemporary perception of the available works, are not, of course, entirely exclusive. There are necessary relations between several of the groups, and there is therefore some overlap. Works for which there is no evidence on which to judge their reception are dealt with only briefly, after the final section.

I. Vir inter grecos doctissimus?

"We have little reason to doubt", says Dr. Bolgar, "that the interest of translators was primarily in the circumstances of Greek history and Greek life."

Lucian had plenty of information to offer in this field, a fact which, it may readily be seen from the 335 citations of his works in Erasmus' Adagia, was well understood in the later Renaissance. But in fifteenth century Italy those who translated and cited Lucian seem to have had comparatively little interest in this facet of his writings, and his reputation for learning and erudition appears to be related more to the practical utility of his

---


2. See Phillips, Appendix III, p. 399. Only 8 authors are quoted more in this compendium of knowledge and wisdom from the ancient world.
works for contemporary ends, and the wisdom of his moral teachings, than to his provision of information about the ancient world. Nevertheless some examples of this view can be given.

Antonius Rossius, not wishing to abuse the leisure afforded him by the absence of his master Rafaello Riario, Cardinal of Spoleto, employed the opportunity to return to the study of Greek, idque non invitus, he tells us also, quippe qui me his plurimum non inficier delectari. While he was reading some works of Lucian he came upon the two Phalaris orations, which he describes fairly accurately:

\textit{altera per legatos suos usum facit Phalaridem tyrannum pro dedicando tauro eneo apud sacerdotes apollinis Delphici.}\n
\textit{Altera vero est quam pro eadem re ac in eodem conventu quidam habet ex astantibus sacerdotibus.}\n
These, he remarks, showed the typical Lucianic elegance and perspicacity, and were worthy not only to be read more often by him, but also to be translated. But his real reason for attempting a version, apart from that of giving himself the greater pleasure (and, one may assume, having a gift in readiness for the Cardinal's return), was connected with the historical significance of Lucian's evidence. To do the translation, he says,

\textit{me non mediocriter movit quod cum multi phalaridem censeant hominem pernitiosissimum tantaque celebrem crudelitate extitisse ut eum non dubitent cunctis non modo aut grecis aut Latinis tyrannis sed Diomede etiam Lycurgo Polymnestore denique sevis-simis in principatu thracibus crudeliorem iudicare, ego id}\n
\footnote{See below, sections II and III}
cupiam falsa haberi huncque virum qui (ut plane constat) eloquentissimus fuit nominis usque eo cruelissimi non suo merito fuisse insimulatum. 4

Clearly Rossius did not understand Lucian’s irony, but, equally clearly, he considered the revelation of Phalaris’ innocence important enough to justify the time required to make a Latin version.

The *Asinus* was also translated in order to correct a misunderstanding, in this case acceptably to modern scholarship. Poggio tells us, in the preface of his version, addressed to Cosimo de’ Medici, that when he had read the book called *De Asino Aureo*, by Apuleius, he had been under the impression that *aut sibi ipsi quod scripserat accidisse, aut extitisse id inventum et commentum suum*, and that he was confirmed in this belief by what Augustine said in book XVIII of *De Civitate Dei*. He remained of the opinion that whether true or false, the story was to be attributed to Apuleius, until, reading a manuscript of Lucian he found *inter caetera, libellum, cuius titulus erat Lucii asinus*. Desiring to find out what the book contained, he says; *Legi quod Apuleius sibi evenisse affirmat illi contigisse, ut haud dubium sit ab Lucio aut alio ex Graecis eam fabellam adinventam*. He set about the task of translating it for the sake of the exercise, *ut ostenderem hand veterem et ab Apuleio veluti innovatum comœdiam nequaquam esse pro vero accipiendum, sed existimabam potius ab Lucio introductam studio artes eludendi magicas, prout suus mos est* (he continues paraphrasing Lactantius) *non tantum homines, sed et deos irridenti.* 5

---

4. MS. Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, fondo Parmense, 27, f. 1r.
Poggio, then, had reached two conclusions about the piece. The first was that the original of this story was that entitled *Asinus*, and found in the manuscript of Lucian which he had read. In this opinion Giovanni Andrea de Buxis concurred with him. But the most striking example of the acceptability of Poggio's view is furnished by 'Boiardo's "translation of Apuleius' work.' Influenced, presumably, by the seniority of the Greek work, he substituted in the version put out under his name the "original" ending in place of the mystic finale of Apuleius. This may, also, have had something to do with Poggio's second conclusion, that the aim of the Greek work was satirical. Certainly Collenuccio, a contemporary of Boiardo at Ferrara, agreed with this view, since he gave the work as an example of a lie being used to refute falsehoods and errors. The main point, however, is that Poggio had used his translation of *Asinus* to clarify a question of literary history, and that his conclusions gained general acceptance in the Quattrocento.

The reading of a third work of Lucian also helped solve a dilemma about the ancient world. Lapo tells Gregorius Corarius, in the letter dedicating to him *De Longaevis*, that it caused him to be *permagno levatus errore et diuturna indignatione levatus*. He used to become very indignant when he read in other ancient authors of the incredible
longevity of certain barbari, considering that men of modern times lived lives barely long enough to gain some education, and were cut off quasi flosculos quosdam as soon as they were able to put their learning to some use. But hoc lecto libello he immediately stopped being angry, for he discovered

hoc nobis non situ et natura loci caelique sed nostro vitio evenire. Nam, si quis ita se gerat ita vivat ut nihil agat unquam invita minerva ... sed in omnibus naturam optimam vite ducem sequatur ut ii fecerunt quos lucianus per multos colligit huic mea sententia minime desiderabitur vite longitudo.

Many people, he adds, do not observe these rules, and then blame nature for something which they have brought upon themselves. 10.

The piece appears to have become fairly well known. Its blend of history and moral teaching (Lapo’s remarks on diet and life-style accurately reflect the words of the text) were eminently acceptable to the spirit of the age. Alberti, in the Theogenius used two examples from the work. 11. Giannozzo Manetti, to whom Lapo also dedicated this version together with that of the Patriae Encomium, and with exactly the same dedicatory letter was perhaps influenced by the form and idea of the discourse. Among his unpublished works there exists a De Illustribus Longaevis, in six books. 12.

10. Luise, p. 279-280, gives part of the text from several mss. The part which he paraphrases, I have taken from ms. Riccardiana 149, f.19r (line 13)- f. 19v (line 10), and ms. Perugia, B. Comunale "Augusta", 520 (H.4), f.51r, line 3- f.51v, line 18. See appendix.

11. Grayson, "Opere Volgari", II, p. 86 Ieronimo istorica, scrive Luciano, visse anni quattro e cento ferme in ogni suo sentimento, ancora e persino all’ultimo dì utile a procreare figlioli (Lucian, 22); p.91 (source not indicated, but it is Lucian, 25) Filemone (espirè) pel troppo ridere.

II. Lucian in an era of patronage and ideological strife

It would be disingenuous to claim that even the three works discussed above were translated purely for the sake of eliminating erroneous views of the ancient world. With the possible exception of Poggio, who pursued a lucrative career first in the Roman Curia, and later as Chancellor of Florence, their authors were men in need of patronage and support. They would answer the technical queries about the classical world which continually presented themselves, but they were human too. Learning meant more to them than the pure satisfaction of knowledge, for it governed their lives, and therefore their careers and their fortunes, too.

Lapo is the best case in point. Around 1434, his fortunes were at a very low ebb, and he needed a patron desperately. He appealed directly to the Pope, Eugenius IV, by dedicating to him two short works by Lucian, De Luctu and De Somnio. These replaced two longer pieces, the lives of Solon and Publicola by Plutarch. One cannot help feeling, despite his extravagant claim that when he decided at last to commit something to paper, he felt it his duty to dedicate to the Pope *quasdam quasi primitias*, that the reason he gives for changing the offering is a little weak. *Quod erat res longa et perdifficilis*, he says, *meum in sanctitatem tuam studium et voluntatem nimirum remorari videbatur*. In other words, he needed to impress the Pope with his scholarship more quickly than the project in hand would allow.

13 In the dedicatory letter to Eugenius he states: *ita et nos ... gravissimis et acerbissimis nostrae civitatis casibus in has difficultates compulsi*. See Luiso, p. 277.
The works chosen suited the occasion well. First breves erant, an indispensable quality from Lapo's viewpoint, secondly they were nec mea quidem sententia iniucundi: that is the contents were aimed to please the Pope. One contained a very urbane attack upon the superstitions which men are accustomed to observe upon bereavement.

Lapo comments:

quas (i.e. superstitiones) quod scirem te pro tua summa sapientia singularique religione vehementer detestari, existimavi eorum tibi improbationem haud ingratam futuram.

The recipient could hardly be displeased with such a tailor-made gift. But the other choice was even shrewder, for in it non mediocris studia exhortatio praesertim inopibus contineri visa est. Lucian's description of the beginnings of his own studies, and his success in them constitutes in itself a sort of ready-made humanist handbook.

Lapo, not content with letting the analogy stand as a general encouragement to the Pope, takes things to particulars. First, he says,

etsi opinor te pro tuo singulari erga studiosos homines amore libenter lecturum (sc. hanc exhortationem), tamen id non tua solum causa sed etiam mea velim facias. Intuebere enim in illa non modo Luciani fortunam, sed etiam quodam modo meam.

Then he begins to draw in the distinguishing features. The grave conditions of the time, rather than ignoble parentage, as in Lucian's case, are the cause of his having started his studies a tenui inopique principio. But his situation is in this respect worse than Lucian's, that while he says that he gained great splendour and glory from his studies, mihi vero adhuc ea nihil præterquam laborem inanem et inopiam attulerunt. Nevertheless he hopes that his dedicatee's humanitatem et praecipuam in omnes bonos benificentiam will save him
from his difficulties, ut non magis me quam Lucianum horum studiorum laborisque paeniteat. Finally, in asking the Pope to accept the work, and to read it, he openly confesses it to be a personal expedient: est enim non maiestati tuae conveniens sed conditioni meae. He asks him to look upon it quasi degustationem quandam huius meae facultatis, and promises, if he likes it, to send the two lives of Plutarch mentioned earlier, and even greater works also. He closes with a fervent prayer that the Pope will take him into his service, and show him the same benevolence which he has previously shown to other lovers of the bonae disciplinae et artes. 14

It is important to note that Lapo, in his description of Lucian's works and their purpose, had not committed any errors of interpretation. Particularly in the case of De Somnio, designed, in Lucian's words ὁμοιος ὑπὲρ νέοι περὶ τὸ βελτίων τε καὶ πιθανῶν καὶ γραμμῶν, 15 his paraphrases were accurate. Nevertheless, by using this work to present his own position to the Pope more sympathetically and forcefully, he had turned Lucian from a potential witness for humanism alone into a tool of his own ambition.

There was a similar if not such a personal motive behind Guarino's use of Lucian's essay Quomodo Historia Conscribenda Sit. 16 During the Ferrarese carnival of 1446, while others passed the time in larvis ludis et cupiditatibus, he took time off to write a letter to Tobia Borghi, one of Malatesta's official historians at Rimini, de historiae conscribendae forma. 17 His remarks, aimed at helping Borghi to fulfil

---

14. All quotations from the dedicatory letter, published in Luiso, p.276-3
15. De Somnio, 18
17. Published by Sabbadini, Epistolario II, p. 458-465: all references are to this text.
from his difficulties, ut non magis me quam Lucianum horum studiorum laborisque paeniteat. Finally, in asking the Pope to accept the work, and to read it, he openly confesses it to be a personal expedient: est enim non maiestati tuae conveniens sed conditioni meae. He asks him to look upon it quasi degustationem quandam huius meae facultatis, and promises, if he likes it, to send the two lives of Plutarch mentioned earlier, and even greater works also. He closes with a fervent prayer that the Pope will take him into his service, and show him the same benevolence which he has previously shown to other lovers of the bonae disciplinae et artes.14.  

It is important to note that Lapo, in his description of Lucian's works and their purpose, had not committed any errors of interpretation. Particularly in the case of De Somnio, designed, in Lucian's words ὀνόματος ὑπό νέοι προς τὰ δεινὰ τηκτονώντας καὶ παραδέχεσθαι ἢ καθορίζειν,15. his paraphrases were accurate. Nevertheless, by using this work to present his own position to the Pope more sympathetically and forcefully, he had turned Lucian from a potential witness for humanism alone into a tool of his own ambition.

There was a similar if not such a personal motive behind Guarino's use of Lucian's essay Quomodo Historia Conscribenda Sit.16. During the Ferrarese carnival of 1446, while others passed the time in larvis ludis et cupiditatisbus, he took time off to write a letter to Tobia Borghi, one of Malatesta's official historians at Rimini, de historiae conscribendae forma.17. His remarks, aimed at helping Borghi to fulfil

14. All quotations from the dedicatory letter, published in Luiso, p.276-8
15. De Somnio, 18
17. Published by Sabbadini, 'Epistolario' II, p. 458-465: all references are to this text.
his role of historiographer with the benefit of the combined wisdom of the ages, are, he tells us, a collection of praecepta. Though he does not say so, his chief source is Lucian.

Guarino begins by saying that, although there are many things to complain of in his time, nonetheless Italy's troubles have at least seen the resurgence of the rea militaris, and were it not for the employment of this in internecine conflict, the age might be called fortunate, considering the great numbers of fine generals and leaders who have sprung up everywhere. But he finds fault with the reasoning of these soldiers, in that they expend their energy for a fame which is ephemeral. The one remedy for this, which Malatesta has been wise enough to use, is the writing of history, through which medium senescentia iuvenescunt et morientia revivescunt. By means of the docti atque eruditi homines (among whom is Borghi) cultivated and rewarded by him, Malatesta will preserve the immortality which he has gained in war. Tobia's job will be to demonstrate his gratitude by putting all his efforts in ipsum principem celebrandum extollendumque. Guarino then opens his argument with a definition of history and annals. The former, he maintains, a description of events quae nostra vidit aut videre potuit aetas, the latter an exposition of those times qui a nostra remoti sunt aetate, though here, he admits, both opinions and the evidence of usage confound exactitude.

After this rather clumsy reference to Tacitus Guarino begins to make use of Lucian. The first thing that the historian must do, he says, is to put together a sort of summation of the matters to be treated confusam veluti massam, just as they come into the head; in much the same way a painter works, sketching the outline of a horse or a bull before he puts in the details. The first precept reflects Lucian's advice at Historia 48, where he says that, once the
material is complete, an abstract should be made of it καὶ σῶμα ....

The analogy of the historian's to the painter's craft is reminiscent of a passage in Historia 51.

Once this has been done, Guarino continues, facilius animo advertes quae in eo genere sint evitanda, quae sequenda, words which reflect Lucian's approach to the subject in Historia 6. Guarino, however, does not make a formal distinction between the two categories, like Lucian, but mixes them fairly freely in his discourse. First he describes an evitandum, the fault of ignoring the events before you to make room for encomium of princes and leaders, and particularly for the type of encomium which seeks to discredit the opposition totally by the use of such invidious comparisons ut ille qui regem suum Achilli, adversarium vero Thersitae comparavit. This was certainly a mistake, for quanto praestabat Hectorem ab Achille, quam Thersiten dixisse superatum!

Historians who do such things seem to be unaware that there is very little place in this genre for personal encomium. The precepts of this paragraph, and the example used to back them up, all come from Historia. The place of the encomium in history is dealt with by Lucian in paragraph 7, in words almost identical to Guarino's. The example is from paragraph 14, and is again a direct borrowing, as may be seen by comparison of the above with what follows: Ἀχιλλεύ μὲν τὸν ἰμέτερον ἀξιόντα εἰκάζε, θερσίη δὲ τὸν τῶν Πεσῶν βασιλέα, οὐκ εἰσώς ὥστε δ' Ἀχιλλεὺς ὑμείνων ἴν αὐτῷ εἰ ἑκτὸρα μᾶλλον ἢ θερσίην καθήκει.

Next Guarino asserts that the basis of history is to tell the truth. Reinforcing this statement, which is also made in Historia 7, with a quotation from Cicero's De Oratore (II, 62) to the same effect, he continues by stressing the difference between poetry and history. The former is allowed licence to praise, exaggerate and invent at will, but history is like a virtuous matron, repudiating all lies
and false opinions as if she thought the whole world were looking at her. Once again the chief motifs here are taken from the Historia, 7, 8 and 10. But Guarino is in no way slavishly imitating the text, for where Lucian's description of poetic freedom is bound up with examples from Homer, he has substituted a quotation from Vergil, and in addition he uses the Horatian dictum _pictoribus atque poetis/ quidlibet audendi semper fuit aqua potestas_ (Ars Poetica, 9) to sum the point up. By his introduction of history as a _matrona pudica_ he has also produced an image of the genre much more succinctly than Lucian.

The one and only aim of history, continues Guarino, is _utilitas_, _scilicet quae ex ipsius veritatis professione colligitur_, whence the mind becomes more understanding through the acquaintance with the past and keener to pursue _virtue_ and _glory_. But _enjoyment_ may _praeter scribentis institutum_ have a part too, _sicuti robustissimo saepius athletae inter certandum in vultu color oriri solet ad gratiam_. Nor are personal praise and blame entirely forbidden, _modo id mediocriter fiat et in tempore_. Praise may be pleasing to the subject, but the audience often finds it trying, and even the subject if he has a manly disposition will prefer a harsh witness to an agreeable flatterer. Once again _Historia_ is the source for these precepts, but the arrangement is Guarino's. Lucian's remarks on _τὸ Χείσιμον_ as the aim of history, and _τὸ τερεσίων_ as analogous to the beauty of the athlete in _Historia_ 9, while they follow, as here, upon the discussion of the truthful nature of history and the distinction between poetry and history, are preceded in his text by the first part of the remarks on encomium which, in Guarino, follow them. Nor is Guarino content to construct his argument from one part of Lucian's work only. The idea that praise is trying to an audience, and that men of manly disposition
prefer not to be flattered comes from paragraphs 11 and 12 of Historia, while the description of the effect of history's utilitas upon the mind may owe something to paragraph 42.

The next piece of advice which Guarino gives to Borghi is that he should make efforts to find out about military matters, such as building ramparts, setting up camps and laying ambushes, from those who are experts, so as not to seem inexperienced when he has to describe them in his work. Still better, he should acquire first-hand knowledge, since seeing is better than hearing. The precept is found twice in Historia, once in the critical section, paragraph 29, and again, this time more fully enunciated, and more obviously the source of Guarino's remarks, in the advisory section, paragraph 37.

The argument now moves from practical matters, to the necessity for the historian to be free from bias. He must not be afraid, he must be uncorrupted, a stranger in his writings, nullis adscriptus civitatibus, suis vivens legibus. His only aim will be to hand to the present and to posterity a true account of events, and he knows that if he has to speak of any rash or unsuccessful action, no right-minded reader will blame him. Again Guarino has sifted Lucian before constructing his argument. The first point, the absence of bias in the historian, is illustrated in Lucian 38 by a number of concrete examples from the classical epoch. Guarino has pruned these away, leaving only general topics which the writer might touch upon in their place. The second point, a list of necessary attributes, is translated, with minor omissions, directly from Historia 41. The aim of giving a true account of events is expressed very similarly in Historia 39, though Guarino has again used his own judgement in the matter of arrangement by interpolating here the reader's indulgence of the historian's requirement to deal with uncongenial material, which may be found also at Historia 38.
The above precepts, Guarino goes on, must be thought out in advance by the historian; what follows deals with the task of writing. His first advice is on prefaces. Goodwill is not a necessary thing to bespeak; far more important than this are attention and an open mind, in addition to which must be mentioned the usefulness and relevance to the reader of the matters in hand. The length must be proportionate to the subject, and the matter separate from that of the narrative proper, like Sallust's. The kernel of this advice is again to be found in Lucian, at Historia 53, where he speaks of ἐν τούτῳ Ὀlympιάδι, and 55, where he deals with length. The necessity of the preface being separate from the material, and the example of Sallust are, however, Guarino's own additions.

Guarino now continues with the advice that the historian should at the beginning of his narrative display clearly the reasons for the events or conflicts which he is going to describe, and he gives as examples of this procedure lines from Vergil's Aeneid and Lucan's Pharsalia. Here again he is following the lead of Lucian in Historia 53-54, although his examples are from Latin literature, while Lucian's are from Greek, namely Herodotus and Thucydides. But for the rest of the paragraph he diverges from Lucian to explore a dictum from Cicero's De Oratore II, 63: etiam in rebus magnis... consilia primum deinde acta, post eventus expectantur. For each of the Ciceronian headings he gives advice, and produces an example for the procedures under discussion. To these three categories he adds a fourth, details of the lives of famous men, in the next paragraph, and again gives an example to back up the suggestion. Only when the discussion returns to general matters, like the description of natural environment, and the necessity of taking up an overall position from which to describe the fortunes of a battle, where no examples of technique are given, does he return once more to
Lucian. Description of places is mentioned twice in Historia, once in a criticism of its misuse (19), and again in a warning about its possible misuse (57). Guarino's remarks on viewpoint in battle are closer to the text of Historia, though he has once more rearranged his source, constructing his argument from sentences in paragraphs 49 and 50, and reconstituting their clauses in a new form.

In the matter of diction, which occupies part of the last paragraph, Guarino has once more followed Lucian, in saying that it should clearly state the import of the material, and avoid abstruse words, be easily understood by everybody, yet still retain elegance enough to earn the praise of the educated. This sentiment may be found in Historia 43-44. To it, Guarino added two further suggestions, that the vocabulary should be flavoured by reading approved authors, and that the historian should insert serious ideas and frequent maxims, both of which would have doubtless met with Lucian's approval, but neither of which appears in Historia. The additional remark, that the historian's style should not be tragic or rhetorical may be related to Lucian's criticisms, in Historia 16 and 23, of historians with a tragic bent, and his denial of rhetorical Sevọ́ns in Historia 43. The remainder of the argument deals with the figure of præoccupatio as a remedy for the historian who is faced with the description of incredible events. Guarino quotes an example to back up his advice, and the passage is not related to Lucian.

Guarino, we may see from the above analysis, was perfectly at home with Lucian's essay. He knew the text well enough to be able to lift what he wanted and remould it into the required form, and he clearly regarded the precepts which he thus adapted as sound. That he does not mention Lucian's name in connection with the information which he borrowed suggests either that he assumed the work to be well enough known
not to need mention, or that he regarded it as common property, or even, though this seems unlikely, that he did not want to appear too indebted to one authority. But if his reason for omitting to mention Lucian is unclear, what he wanted from his work is not. Laying aside virtually all of the humour, fantasy, joyful persiflage and critical banter of the Historia, Guarino extracted only what he thought conducive to a practical and positive approach to historical writing. While Lucian's method was to give examples only where criticism was made, Guarino's was almost the opposite. He used one brief instance to illustrate the ridiculousness of hyperbolic encomium, but gave extended examples of techniques which he thought ought to be imitated. The distinction between their approaches lies partly in the difference of their situations. Lucian was an orator, and it paid him to have more spice than gravity. Guarino, like Borghi, was in the pay of a prince, and the only safeguard for such a position was to do what the prince required. In Guarino's case this amounted to sound educational and moral doctrine, sometimes even to political wrangling in humanistic disguise. In Borghi's it meant the writing of history to glorify Malatesta. Lucian, when he wrote as a free agent, had no problem in laying down that history must tell the truth and abjure flattery. It is perhaps ironical, but typical of the age, that Guarino should without blinking have noted and offered help in his preface for the flattery necessary to the upkeep of Borghi's position, while joining Lucian in the body of the argument in debarring it from any part in the composition of history. This is not a criticism of humanism, but an indication of its limitations. It was the age which forced one of humanism's greatest practitioners to participate in the setting up of a double standard, the structure which humanism had to operate in, not humanism itself. The position of Borghi told Guarino that his job would necessitate the glor-
ification of Malatesta. Malatesta's outward display of humanism convinced him that this was deserved, and his own sense of proportion, which he attributed also to Borghi and no doubt to Malatesta, satisfied him of the consistency of his opinions here.

The history of the Dialogus Mortuorum XII, shares with the Somnium and De Luctu of Lapo an initial impetus attributable to personal ambition, and has political ramifications far more explicit than those outlined in the case of Quomodo historia conscribenda sit. The dialogue deals with a theme familiar in ancient literature from the anecdote reported in Appian, Plutarch, and Livy of the meeting of Scipio and Hannibal at Ephesus. Hannibal, asked for his choice of the best generals, lists them in the order Alexander, Pyrrhus and himself, but when asked where he would have been had he defeated Scipio replies "before Alexander, Pyrrhus and all the others." Lucian presents Hannibal and Alexander in the underworld, competing before Minos for pre-eminence. Their exchange of self-encomia is followed by the intervention of Scipio, who, while deferring to the claim of Alexander, refuses to countenance Hannibal, and asks to be given second place himself. Minos accepts his case, and gives judgement accordingly.

The work in its original form was not known generally in the Quattrocento because Giovanni Aurispa, when he "translated" it, altered the ending to include a speech by Scipio which swings the final judgement in his favour, and it was this version, one may readily see from the evidence presented in Chapter I, which gained currency.

18. Appian, XI, 10; Plutarch, Titus Flamininus XXI, 3-4; Livy, XXXV, xiv, 5-12. A slightly different version is given by Plutarch, Pyrrhus VIII, 2, where Hannibal is said to have listed them - Pyrrhus, Scipio, himself. Caccia, "Luciano", p. 13 makes nonsense of the anecdote (using Titus Flamininus, XXI, 3-4) by making Hannibal give third place to Scipio. Petrarch, Africa, VIII, 42-231, uses Livy's version.

19. See Chapter I, p. 21, and n. 73.
Undoubtedly, Aurispa's motive in making this alteration was to ingratiate himself with the military governor of Bologna, Baptista Capodiferro, to whom he dedicated the piece. This is made clear in the preface, where Capodiferro is described as a *magnum illius romanae antiquitatis exemplum*, and offered the work in order that he may rejoice in the incredible virtue of his forefathers and (as he already does) imitate them. The invocation of an existing parallel between the governor and the Roman past naturally, but tacitly, implies that he is also expected to see in the portrait of Scipio some relation to himself.\(^{20}\)

As a cover for this calculated flattery, Aurispa claimed that the additions to the text of Lucian which he had seen fit to include in his version were those of Libanius: *adiunxit quidem nonnulla huic comparationi non inepta Libanius*. Foerster has pointed out that it would be hard to find a less likely proponent of Roman greatness among Greek writers than Libanius.\(^{21}\) But Aurispa knew well that contemporary scholarship, though it might possibly be capable of exposing a fraud perpetrated under Lucian's name, would be helpless in the face of a more recondite author.

In Lucian, Scipio's role is small. He is introduced to point out Hannibal's impudence in challenging Alexander's pre-eminence, and to assert with justice his own superiority over the Carthaginian. In Aurispa, his more important part is prepared by some minor alterations to Lucian's text. The plain τίς ἀλὸς εἶ ... ἦν δὲν ἡμεῖς ἔγερες; of Minos becomes *Quis tui...es aut unde, qui hisce tam claris ducibus te conferre audes?*, suggesting an intention which is not present in the

---

\(^{20}\) The preface was published by Förster, *Libanios*, p. 221. Text in Becker, pp. 601-603.

original. In addition Minos' r:oi: o:voi o:ve:is; becomes the enthusiastic Audiendus quippe es. Scipio begins his speech by denying that he speaks because he desires the honour of pre-eminence, since reality has always meant more to him than appearance, and by rebutting the vituperative methods of his other two opponents. He explains how his life from childhood was guided by dislike of vice, and the precepts of the bonae artes and humanitas, culled from the ancient writers, which he thought it a sin not to practise resolutely. He was the hope of his fatherland, and saved it by his rout of the Carthaginians at an early age. But his success did not make him overweening, and he resisted the pressures of both good and adverse fortune throughout his career as censor, and despite his many military victories. He always valued friendship much more than gold, was beneficent, never cruel, always just, and incorruptible. All this, he concludes, was said not for hope of preference, but because it would have been a serious matter to have concealed the truth, that Romanos omni virtutum genere ceteras gentes semper superasse. As he always fought for his fatherland in life, and placed loyalty to it before himself and other things, sic apud te, o Minos, pro patria haec dicta sunt. Minos immediately gives judgement in favour of Scipio, and it is clear from his words (Itaque cum disciplina militari rebusque bellicis aut his aequalem aut praestantiorem sciamus, pietate vero ceterisque animi virtutibus maxime hos superasse) that what tipped the balance was not so much his prowess in war, as his unswerving devotion to his country.

The burden of the additions of Aurispa is quite clear. In Lucian the question was always one of the superior prowess, fame or glory of the combat ants, and the judgement was made on the basis of these qualities. In the new piece the overall picture is changed in favour of the triumph of negotium in the service of virtus over mere
military honours. The other, Lucianic, characters with their tales of victory are superseded by the scion of a new age, whose actions are governed by the demands of virtus, whose personal glory is subordinated to the reputation of his native-land, and whose life-style has from childhood been guided by the desire to know and practise the precepts of the bonae artes. Scipio patently represents the philosophy of humanism.

Aurispa’s use of the "pre-eminence of the captains" theme does not show the same type of political partisanship as does its employment by Poggio and Guarino in the Scipio-Caesar controversy. In the latter case, (where incidentally Lucian’s work was erroneously mentioned by Poggio and this error pointed out by Guarino), the evidence of antiquity was used by one side to support the priority of Florentine republican and civic humanism, and by the other to show the superiority of monarchy and humanism supported by the princes and their courts. Aurispa’s work does, however, reflect a concern, general among partisans of both sides in the above-mentioned dispute, that there should be a continuity between the values, and therefore the successes of ancient and modern Italy.

Of course, the invocation of antiquity to supply parallels for modern situations could cut many ways. Aurispa’s intention was to praise Capodiferro, and assert the pre-eminence of humanism and of the Italian nation. But in 1441 the work was employed to serve the purposes of a foreign king, invading an Italian state. René d’Anjou, during his occupation of the Castelnuovo of Naples, in a respite after the battle

22. See Baron, I p. 54-5, II p. 391-4, and notes 40-42, for an account and further references.

23. See above, Chapter II, p. 72-3 for references.
of Tufara from his efforts to claim his legacy from Louis III, was entertained with games. The record of this event, which is given in a note in Quatrebarbes' introduction to "Oeuvres complètes du Roi René", is as follows:

Anno domini 1441 die ultimo decembris, facti fuerunt ludi, coram serenissimo rege Renato, in civitate Neapolis, in Castro Novo ipsius civitatis. Inter quos ludos fuit celebratum spectaculum representans Scipionem Africanum, Alexandrem et Annibalem coram Minoe, disceptantes presidentiae etc.

There can be no doubt that it was Aurispa's version of the dialogue which was used on this occasion. The manuscript containing the above notice also records an oration given immediately after the production by the jurisconsult Cyprien de Mer, whose main theme is the comparison of the present conflict with the war conducted by Hannibal and Scipio. Alfonso is, like Hannibal, old, sly, rascally and treacherous, René, like Scipio, young, prudent, just and a friend of the truth. Even the main events and allegiances are similar. Finally, the successes of Alfonso, like those of Hannibal, have filled him with disdain, whereas René has reproduced the courage and patience of Scipio (cf. Aurispa numquam me aut in prosperis elevante fortuna aut in adversis premente) in adversity. The purpose of the presentation, Cyprien concludes, is to encourage the king by the example of these great men of old, and especially by that of Scipio, of whom René is a living likeness, and so give him new strength and determination in the just battle which he is now engaged in. 24

24. Quatrebarbes, I, p. LIX-LX. The notice is from a XVe. ms. entitled Marci Tullii Ciceronis de Officiis et Paradoxis, discovered by a certain M. Gravier in the library of Saint-Dié. It probably belonged to René's teacher, Jean Manget. Quatrebarbes quotes, in a French translation, parts of Cyprien's speech.
This piece of political allegory is interesting mainly for its perspective on the contemporary situation. For though the fact is that René, a foreigner by birth and upbringing, was claiming the sovereignty of a state situated in Italy, Cyprien's comparisons of this situation with the Punic War suggest not only that René has right on his side, but that he is a native attempting to expel a foreign invader. The justification for this view may clearly be seen in Cyprien's comparison of allegiances. Hannibal, he says, fought against the Roman imperium, while Alfonso fights against the Roman Church. Scipio, on the other hand, was defending the Republic, and René defends the Holy See. The conflict is seen as a Holy War, and René as a general of the Papal Republic. What Aurispa had invoked in a spirit of nationalism, Cyprien invoked in the name of an international federation for once described in Republican as opposed to imperial terms.

The representation itself, in terms of the history of Italian and especially Neapolitan theatre, is not particularly significant. It is an isolated example, and according to Benedetto Croce a French custom imported and produced by Cyprien. Certainly, though, there is nothing French about the version, to the popularity and general availability of which this is an eloquent testimony. The setting of the production, and especially the oration, with its moralism and allegory, suggest that the attraction of the piece lay in Aurispa's additions, and their current political implications, rather than in any intrinsic theatrical value it might have.

There is no record of whether the Naples production of the

25. Croce, p. 5. See also Ancona, II, p. 93n. De Blasis, pp. 429-430
dialogue was in verse or prose. There does exist, however, an Italian terza rima version based on Aurispa, written by the Florentine priest and musician Filippo Lapaccini; probably in 1492, for the occasion of a visit by Ercole I of Ferrara to his son-in-law Francesco Gonzaga at Mantua. It may be, Ancona suggests, the subject of a letter written by Ercole Albergati detto lo Zafarano to Gonzaga on the 5th February, 1492, which mentions Lapaccini's part in writing something for a feast:

Apreso la S.V. mi disse, in camera si potea fare qualche cosa per la cena risposi alla S.V. del caso del mio male. Non dimanco la mattina andai a trover messer Filippo Lapaccini, mi disse che in otto di se farebbe pur versi, ma se il termine fuse stato quindici e venti zorni avria fabricato una magna fantasia.

It would show something of Francesco's knowledge of his father-in-law's literary tastes, if the work of Lapaccini's were the reworking of Lucian's Dialogue. But whether or not the verses constitute a dramatic rendition is a different problem. Caccia states, a little uncertainly that the verses of Lapaccini probably represent the magna fantasia mentioned in Zafarano's letter, but that even if they do not, they at least constitute a dramatic representation, since they are contained in a manuscript which has other representations and material.


28. For Isabella d'Este's connection with Lapaccini, see Luzio & Renier, pp. 95-97. For Ercole I and Lucian, see Chapter I, p. 54, and Chapter II, p. 69-70.

29. 'Luciano', pp. 22-23.
dialogue was in verse or prose. There does exist, however, an Italian terza rima version based on Aurispa, written by the Florentine priest and musician Filippo Lapaccini, probably in 1492, for the occasion of a visit by Ercole I of Ferrara to his son-in-law Francesco Gonzaga at Mantua. 26. It may be, Ancona suggests, 27 the subject of a letter written by Ercole Albergati detto lo Zafarano to Gonzaga on the 5th February, 1492, which mentions Lapaccini's part in writing something for a feast:
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29. 'Luciano', pp. 22-23.
related to the Gonzagan court-circle. Ancona, his source, only said 'perhaps' about the fantasia and restricted himself to the observation that it certainly was intended for recitation. From the letter, it seems to me certain that Lapaccini did not have time to produce the magna fantasia, whatever that may have meant, and that, since the time limit was only eight days (note the mood and tense of fuse stato), he only produced the verses. An additional argument against the idea of a representation, perhaps, is the division of the work in the manuscript into capitula, rather than scenes. It is clear, however, that there needs to be no argument about recitation, since a court-poet would expect to write for this.

Lapaccini's version is based squarely upon Aurispa's, that is clear from the conclusion. But just how reliant upon the Latin he was may be shown by passages where he has followed a misinterpretation in the original. Caccia gives one example, Aurispa's cum subconsul essem optimus a fratre indicatus for to nevamei hipadeos on te apelphi megistov, which is turned thus by Lappaccini:

Come feci io che quando i' fu mortale
sotto consule essendo ...
fu'dal mio proprio fratre optimo scorto.

Another is atque in conviviiis amicos interemit quibus cum morerentur, auxiliari conatus est for kei emi stepheii en tois sumposiois tois phivos kei sunelamabedei eti dndagioi which becomes in Lapaccini:

E nei convivij a piu la morte porse
amici proprij a lui, che doppo il fatto
volse aiutar, ma tardi al ben si scorse.

Neither of these mistranslations is due to faulty readings in the Greek, but rather to faulty knowledge of the language by Aurispa. For in the
first case he failed to realize that *παχος* here is used adjecti-

ivaly with *τυ ρελφω* and that *τυ ρελφω* is not the agent of *ςκυσθν*, and in the second he confused the meaning of *συλλαμβανω* here "seize" or "arrest", with another sense "assist" or "help". Not only did he use Aurispa's Latin text without reference to the Greek (which was not unusual), but the text he used had variants which caused further mis-

interpretation. Aurispa translated *ευνοια της μητεος σις* correctly, as *matris insomnia narrans*. But Lapaccini's text must have had *matri* for *matris*, since his version reads:

che narrò i sogni nutricati in piumi
alla sua genitrice.

Again Aurispa's *qui mentis sententia magis quam fortuna est usus* fairly reflects the meaning of *τυ ρελφω πλεον ηπερ τυ ρελφω* 

κερεμένω, but Lapaccini's text must have had *mortis* for *mentis*. His version reads *piu sententia di morte ha sempre usato* ..... etc.\(^{30}\)

The Italian author is not without some resources of his own, for though these consist in the main of fill-up lines where the material does not quite stretch over the terza rima frame, he nearly always adds something pertinent to his source. The opening provides good examples of this type of expansion, for it is here that the Greek original and Aurispa's Latin version are least elaborate. Alexander's opening statement *Me, o Libyce, praeponi decet: melior equidem sum*, is rendered in two lines in the Italian,

Hannibal, per ch'io fui piu degno in vita

merito senza dubbio el primo grado.

But Lapaccini's design clearly called for each of the contestants to

\(^{30}\) All the exx. are from Hannibal's speech: refs. to Caccia 'Luciano', - p. 92, p. 93, p. 93, p. 94.
deliver three lines at this point, for he continues with a reason for Alexander's deserved pre-eminence which is not to be found in the other versions, che il cielo infuse in me virtù infinita. Likewise Hannibal's curt Imo vero me becomes

Anzi io, che pari a me nascon di rado
debbo esser preferito in ogni parte
a te che in vita tentasti ogni guado,
thus previewing his main moral objections to Alexander. A little further on, when Minos asks in the Latin Qui estis?, Lapaccini adds a modicum of atmospheric colouring in rendering, Chi siete voi si pien d'ira e disdegno? In his answer, Alexander, while in the Latin emphasising his provenance, ego autem Alexander, Philippi filius, stresses in the Italian his own military prowess,

i'sono
Alexandro che vinse ogni gran regno. 31.

In the speech of Alexander the poet deals even more freely with his source. The passage which recounts Alexander's exploits in Asia, paucos quosdam agens, me in Asiam traduxi et te Granicum magna pugna vici, Lydiam, Ioniam, Phrygiam capiens: et tandem, quaeunque transierim subiugans, veni ad Issum, ubi me Darius exspecta jot infinitos exercitus agens

receives seventeen lines in the Italian. Lapaccini mentions the fact that the battle of the river Granicus (mistakenly called Thegranico by the poet 32*) was fought by Duo prefecti di Dario, omits the name Lydia


32* This error stems from Aurispa also. He wrote: et te Granicum magna pugna vici for Kai épí te Γενικοῦ ξεκάτησα μεκάλα μάχη. Here Aurispa seems to have been mystified by the particle τε, though Lapaccini's text may have read Τεγρανίκω, indicating A's use of a Greek text reading Τεγρανίκω.
Ionia and Phrygia, substituting quelle parti, and changes the exact location Issus to the vague Cilicia. He also adds a description of Darius' demeanour, con modo acerbo e grave, and indicates the outcome, 

in fuga, e vinsi il regno ch'egli avea,

which the Latin does not. The recasting of this section seems to suggest some determination on Lapaccini's part to show himself not totally deficient in his knowledge of ancient history.33.

There are expansions too in the speech of Scipio, managed, if anything, with more skill than those elsewhere. From the Latin

Jam puero mihi omne vitium displicuit, et bonis artibus a primis annis deditus humanitatique inserviens, sciens solum turpe putabam, sed opere semper perficere, quidquid magnificum a maioribus natu aut literis didicissem conatus sum. Itaque adolescens vixi, ut maxima patriae spes fuerim,

Lapaccini makes twenty-one lines, dwelling fluently and elegantly upon Scipio's early years. A good example of these qualities in this section is the following stanza:

Ne l'età mia più verde ogni lavoro ogni cura, ogni studio ogni pensiero puosi in seguir virtù, fido tesoro,

which sets the right tone, without adhering closely to anything in the Latin. Just before Minos' judgement too, the poet adds two stanzas to reinforce Scipio's good intentions in presenting his case. In the main, though, here as elsewhere in the poem, Lapaccini follows his source fairly closely, and the greater fluency found in this section may be attributed to the more easily assimilable sentiments of a speech

added in the first place by a near contemporary and fellow-Italian. 34

To the same political atmosphere as the twelfth Dialogue of the Dead two other works translated in the Quattrocento perhaps also belong. The first, which reflects in its dedications only dimly the patriotic message of Aurispa, but may have provided in other hands a further text for this contemporary feeling for Italian unity, is the Patriae Laudatio. Lapo, writing to Gregorius Corarius, a Papal protonary, Venetian by birth, and to Giannozzo Manetti, a Florentine, gives as his reason for sending it quod item tibi quod patriae prae ceteris amantissimus fores, putavi fore gratissimum. 35 Antonio Pacino, dedicating the same piece at about the same period to the young Pietro de'Pazzi, gives the same reason:

Itaque cum vellem donari te iis fructibus quos peperere labores ac studia mea nesciebam que pretiosiora munera que iocundiora ad te mittere possem quam patriae laudes cum hac nihil tibi iocundius nihil amabilius esse debeat quas haud ingratas tibi futuras arbitror.

He speaks at more length than Lapo, however, and to this extent his remarks are more revealing. Taking the outstanding example of Odysseus, he tells the story of how he, after many years of wandering, though offered the chance of immortality, nevertheless amore victus patriae ad hytacam illam et parvam saxosamque redire maluit quam iocundissimarum voluptatum et divinitatis fruitionem suscipieret.

His decision, Pacino continues, emphasises the esteem in which people

35. Luiso p. 279-80.
hold their native land, since he was not born in a great and magnifi-
icent city like Mycenae or Athens, but had only a vicum fedissimum et
in iugis saxisque positum to return to. Pietro, of course, is not a
product of such a state as Ithaca, and the fact that men are affected
with the greatest pleasure when the things which they love the most are
praised to them, added to the fact that he has patriam tum splendidis-
simam tum praeclarissimam have led Pacino to translate this Lucianic
work for one whose

optima indoles nobilissimum ingenium ... incredibilis humanit-
atis ingens liberalitas animi magnitudo ac studiorum humanitatis

....immensa cupiditas

have made him a great future hope of his fatherland.36. These indic-
atations of a patriotism unrelated to Italy as a whole perhaps faintly
echo the contemporary arguments in support of republicanism to which
contributions were made by both Florentines and Venetians. The dedic-
atation of the Tyrannicida by Lapo to Leon Battista Alberti, however,
seems to fit even better into this context. The work, a suasoria in
which a tyrannicide claims the reward for disposing of the tyrant,
even though he only directly killed the tyrant's son, his father after-
wards disposing of himself with the same sword in grief at this deed,
would have appealed to Florentines like Lapo and Alberti in an era when
the tyrants of Northern Italy were being fought with every physical
and verbal weapon at the command of those states which, like Florence,
advocated and practised a system in total ideological opposition to
them.37.

37 For the dedicatory letter in full see Bandini, 'Codd. mss. Lat.',
III, pp. 362-363. For the anti-tyrant literature of the early
'400, see Baron, passim.
Lucian's works, we have seen, played a small part in the propagation of correct information about the ancient world. They were used rather to further personal ambition and the philosophy of humanism, and help to provide a general barometer of contemporary political feeling. But these facts are only symptoms of a much wider Renaissance belief in the power of literature to influence the conduct of human affairs, which, as we have outlined above in Chapter II with quotations from Bessarion and Lapo, by its very nature invited the composition of exemplary and moral literature. To a very large extent the popularity of Lucian's writings in this period must be ascribed to the Quattrocento perception in them of useful exempla and moral teachings, and to their inclusion, as Rinuccio puts it, among works qui ad bonos mores et ad humanae vitae instituta spectant. 38

The value of example is expressed at some length by Lapo, in his letter dedicating Lucian's Demonactis Vita to Ludovico Scarampo. Since he wished to send to this dedicatee something representative of his studies, he says,

nihil existimavi a me aptius effici posse nec commodius ad istum statum, in quo te non fortuna sed virtus tua collocavit, retinendum atque amplificandum, quam si clarissimi alicuius principis aut sapientissimi philosophi vitam latine interpretatus ad te transmitterem.

For, he continues, there can be no better way for one placed in a position of very great dignity to preserve it with praise than to set himself a model to try to imitate. This, he maintains, provides such great incentives for the performance of great and arduous tasks that

38. Lockwood, p. 97.
vix aliquid unquam praeclarum aut memoratu dignum sine cuiusque imitatione et similitudine gestum sit., and he goes on to give several examples. Alexander of Macedon would not have accomplished so much had he not had before his eyes the praises of his father and the glory of his deeds, nor would the Bruti have been such acres libertatis vindices had they lacked the example of Lucius Brutus. Scipio the younger must have been encouraged by the examples of his father Aemilius and the older Scipio, and Socrates became such a great philosopher with the aid of Homer's poems by imitating the deeds of his hero. The principle, he concludes, works,

e nec vero parvo est adiumento iis, qui ad virtutem et probitatem nituntur, aliorum strenua facta proposita, quasi viam qua proficiscantur, habere.

For, despite the fact that virtue itself by its very appearance and beauty should move us sufficiently, tamen nescio quo pacto si nobis auctores desint, manca quodammodo et incohata esse videatur. On the contrary, whenever we hear or read of anything justly, severely, wisely or calmly done, or even see it ourselves, maiores studio et ardore ad virtutem ipsam amplexandam incitamur atque incendimur. Consequently, Lapo says, even though his dedicatee is a man abundantly provided with both doctrine and experience, and has constantly before him the example of the Pope himself, he does not think that still one more reiteration of well-known principles will go amiss. 39

Lucian's De Amicitia was perceived as a work containing useful precepts, as can be seen from a reference made to it, among other writings on the subject, in Alberti's Della Famiglia IV by Adovardo: Ne io ti negherei, Lionardo, e' precetti antiqui assai essere utilissimi. 40 When Aurispa dedicated it to Leonello d'Este and Ludovico Gonzaga, it was with the express purpose of inciting the
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recipients to follow their fathers' example in the matter of friendship. He begins his dedication by noting that it is esteem and love which build, and hatred and discord which destroy, and goes on to mention the friendship between their fathers, and to urge them to imitate this bond with as much alacrity as they study to succeed to their fathers' kingdoms.

Quod et si vestra excellenti natura satis secuturos opinor tamen ut ad eam rem alacriores vos redderem opus luciani de amicitia .... latinum feci in quo intelligetis aut pauca aut nulla ferme esse que pro salute amicorum amplecti non debeamus.

Since the question of exactly how far one may go in aiding a friend has never been finally resolved, he tells the boys, you will not consider it wrong to follow those things done without hesitation by the Greeks and the Scythians. He concludes the letter with a brief and accurate account of the outline of the piece, mentioning the question between Mnesippus and Toxaris about the relative merits of Greek and Scythian friends, their five stories each, and the resolution of the contest in friendship.41

A further instance of the perception of Lucian's works as exemplary may perhaps given in the Luciani carmina heroica in Amorem, as the first idyll of Moschus, 'Ew5 qedr6yn5, is for some reason titled in Bevilaqua's edition of Lucian translations of 1494.42 Though there is no information about the poem as a Lucianic work, it was known in the Quattrocento in two other translations, one by Politian, and the other by Antonio Pelotti. The latter, in his dedicatory letter to Gian Galeazzo Maria Sforza, gives an assessment which may well have been that of anyone who read it as a Lucianic work:

42. The text is also printed by Becker, pp. 585-6.
Dices fortassis "Ad impuberem verbum de amore mittis". Mitto ut praeceptis Mosci institutus denique cum in annos adoleveris, ab insidiis eversoris civitatum regumque abstineas. The only addition to the principle as outlined above is that of allegory.

At times, however, the very weakness of exemplary literature in an age of patronage can be clearly seen. For although it was perfectly acceptable for Lapo and Aurispa to address to prominent persons from whom they hoped to benefit works such as Demonactis Vita and De Amicitia, in both of which the material is of a positive nature, with which the dedicatee could readily identify, the position was different with admonitory pieces, like De Calumnia. In dedicating the latter to their respective patrons both Lapo and Bartolommeo della Fonte felt obliged to counter any suggestion that work had a direct bearing on their dedicatees. Furthermore, the patronage system itself made sure that those who stood in need of example and correction were unlikely to be provided with these commodities, since a humanist in search of a benefactor would hardly be likely to risk antagonising him by pointing out his faults. Lapo's dedication of De Longaevis provides a good example of this paradox. His requirement for support in his studies led him to send this document, whose main point he saw as the advocacy of a simple and healthy diet, to one who would agree with his and Lucian's argument, rather than to one whom it would help. He emphasised the correctness of this approach, moreover, by insisting, in an argument which epitomises the restrictions of the principle in

43. Cordi, p. 432

44. See above, Chapter II, p. 89-90.
question, that although the recipient was so brought up and trained that he would believe the truth of the contention even if no one were to persuade him,

\[\text{si apud quempiam eorum, qui se ventri luxuriaeque dederint,}
\haec eadem haberetur oratio \ldots\ haud facile persuaderi fortasse hoc illis posset.}\]

 Nonetheless, despite the flaws in the practical application of the exemplary principle, there can be no doubt that the general conception of a large number of Lucian's works was moral. We have already had occasion to describe outlines of De Luctu, De Somnio, De Longaevis and De Amicitia given by their translators as accurate. But to outline a work necessarily involves selection, and the elements selected by their translators to describe these works and others reflect their concern with moral questions, rather than with other aspects of Lucian's writing.

Several other examples of this procedure may be given in illustration. Menippus, or Necyomanteia, one of Lucian's most amusing fantasy dialogues, was translated in the Quattrocento only by Leoniceno. But there are two instances of the use of an outline of it in humanist works, one by Poggio, the other by Aeneas Sylvius. Poggio, in whose De Infoelicitate Principum, written according to Walser around 1440,\[46\] the résumé is first used, was probably Aeneas Sylvius' direct source, for a comparison of the two reveals both exact reproduction of matter and a similarity in phraseology.\[47\] The material used is taken from chapters 3 to 6, and chapter 21 of Lucian's work. It begins by

\[45\text{Luiso, p. 279.}\]
\[46\text{Walser, p. 216 and n. 1.}\]
\[47\text{See above, Chapter II p.71-2, n. 21.}\]
describing the early beliefs of Menippus, as fostered by the poets, namely that bella, adulteria, furtia, rapinas, stupra, aliaque eiusmodi facinora ... licita esse atque honesta, since they were sanctioned by the authority and example of the Gods. When he became a man, the extract continues, he found out that all that sort of thing had been expressly forbidden by the lawgivers, and incertus animi, seu rectius sentirent, he went to the philosophers. But these he found disagreeing amongst themselves, nam hi voluptatem, hi vacuitatem ... vitam beatam efficere voluerunt, and, much more uncertain than before, and distrusting the wisdom of men, he decided to consult the dead. So he went to Hades, sciscitaturus a Tiresia ... sententiam quam quaerebat. After demurring at first, the prophet was finally persuaded to give an answer:

ad arem insusurrans apud privatios viros optimam vitam, hoc est felicitatem inveniri dixit. 48

In itself, the outline is accurate, but, one may readily see, it deals only with Menippus' quest for the truth about life, and makes no mention of his actual journey to Hades, or of the many paradoxical things which he saw. The reason for the selection of material is, however, quite clear. In each case the author is supporting an argument with an ancient authority. Poggio makes Niccoli tell the story in support of the thesis that men in power have an unhappy existence. Aeneas Sylvius uses it in his letter to Johannes Aich De Miseriis Curialium, and claims that his father used it to try to dissuade young men from entering court life. In both the argument, and therefore the perspective, is moral.

Another dialogue used by Poggio in this same work is Gallus, though here the selection takes the form of an extended quotation,

48. Quoted from Poggio's version, (Poggio, p. 418).
rather than an outline. The work itself, though translated twice in the second half of the century, does not seem to have been well known earlier, and Poggio's reference to it, as to the Menippus, seems to be the first. 49. Poggio's method of translation involves a good deal of paraphrase and alteration of sentences. His accuracy may be gauged from the introduction of the quotation:

Lucianus autem graecus autor in electione sua Miculum (qui et ipse aliquando rex fuisset) interrogatum a Gallo, nunquid nam felix regum vita esset, quemdmodum vita esset, quemdmodum vulgo aestimaretur, habens quod bonorum maximum homines putarent?

ita respondentem introduxit.

The passage cited, in chapters 24 to 25 of Gallus, does indeed contain a description of the evils of kingship, but it is in the mouth of the cock, not of Micyllus, the cobbler who owns him. Even if this error is attributed to a faulty reading in his manuscript, there are too many others to allow Poggio the accolade of Greek scholar, at least by modern standards. 50. Nevertheless, the quotation effectively substantiates the point at issue in the dialogue.

The speaker begins by describing his life as a ruler, with his power over many provinces tum multitudine hominum atque ubertate, tum vero amoenitate urbium (here Poggio omits Lucian’s ἐν ταῖς μᾶλιστα

49. The later versions were the Italian translation of Leoniceno, mentioned in chapter I, above p. 46, and the Latin translation of Rudolphus Agricola (see Chapter II, n. 27.)

50. Notably: the translation of (ἀκείβως ἐγρεικέναι) τὴν ἐφεστείδα, τὸ διάδημα, τοὺς προτιμεόμενους, τοὺς ἐπομένους as Veste splendebam supra eos qui ordine proibant ac sequebantur; the insertion of Menelaus for Agamennon in the Homeric quotation; the version Hic enim puer veneno perit for ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ποῦ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀπέθανεν.
his armies and his attendants, his gold, ships et his rebus omnibus (Lucian characteristically writes τεκτωνίδ) propter quas principes existimantur esse felices (presumably rendering Lucian’s plain τις δεχν, and omitting the embellishment πάσας ἐσει ἀληθὴν ἐσωμωμένη), and finally sketching the adulation with which he was always met, and the way people would run ahead of one another and climb up onto rooftops ut me inspicerent, magnificantes videre currum quo vehebar. All the while he pitied their ignorance, knowing in his own mind the troubles which afflicted him. Me vero miserabar, qui esses similis magnis illis colossis quos Phidias aut Miron (Lucian has Praxiteles also) sculptserat. For these great artefacts of gold or ivory, statues of gods with thunderbolts or tridents in their hands are inside full of props and nails and pitch, providing a playground for mice and weasels. Eiusmodi profecto regnum est. Poggio at this point omits the short speech by Micyllus, beginning chapter 25, where he asks the cock to tell him about the drawbacks of kingship, and his speaker continues with the list which is then given by the cock. Briefly, these include fears, suspicions, plots, lack of sleep, bad dreams, money worries, lawsuits, expeditions, orders, laws and the necessity for one person to look after everything. Croesus has his son’s deafness to contend with, Artaxerxes Elearchus, and Dionysius Dion (Lucian is less direct here, alluding to Croesus as τοῦ . . . Λυκόν, to Artaxerxes as τοῦ Πέρσην, and to Dionysius as Ἀλλον; Elearchus is a mistake for Κλεδεξως). But the worst thing of all, the speaker concludes (omitting Lucian’s remarks about one’s lover complying under duress, one’s concubine committing adultery, a rumoured conspiracy, and the whispers of one’s bodyguards), is having to suspect one’s friends, for both sons and lovers have been known to kill kings. 51.

One may clearly see, despite Poggio's rather lackadaisical approach to the Greek, his omissions, and his tendency to paraphrase more and translate less as the length of the quotation increases, that the extract, moralism included, is pure Lucian. That Poggio should have chosen to excerpt a moralistic passage, illustrates once more the nature of his preoccupations, but it also serves to show that one of the Quattrocento's main views of Lucian, the moral, was not necessarily the result of a misinterpretation, but could be, as we have seen in the case of Menippus, that of a selection. To add further proof of this contention, one may cite four more direct references in Poggio's work to Lucian, all of them, allowing for his normal lack of accuracy, adequately reproducing the original sentiment. The first, second and third are again to be found in De Infoelicitate Principum, supporting the arguments of Niccoli. They are as follows: A paraphrase of Timon 25, where Divitiae, asked why he does not confer himself upon the upright men, replies that it is because there is such a lack of them,

nam cum coeae vagentur, neque selectione aliqua uti possint,
usu venit ut saepius in malos (qui undique circumfluunt)
incidunt, quam in bonos;
a paraphrase of Piscator 20, where Parrhesiades (Lucian) says he is skilled in the art both of hating and of loving,

alterius iam dissuetudine oblitum in altera se admodum exercitatum
vitio hominum describit;
a translation of De Calumnia 10, where Lucian says that the courts of kings foster calumny,

in quibus invidiae et suspitiones semper vigeant, adesse quoque
adulatores gratum illis genus, ut facile detur calumniandi locus. 52.
The fourth reference, supporting the argument of Andreas Constantinopolitanus against avarice in De Avaricia, is a translation of part of Chapter 20 of

52. Poggio, p. 395 and 411.
Charon:

o stulti .. quid estis circa ista terrena solliciti? Quiescite aliquidum nam moriendum est vobis. Eorum autem quae apud vos sunt, nihil est aeternum. Nemo cum moritur auferet secum quicquam, sed nudus atque inops ad inferos transibit.53.

The acceptability of the sentiment is clear from Andreas’ answer to these words of Bartolommeo da Montepulciano: hae non unius aut alterius sunt voces, sed naturae et ipsius veritatis.53.

There is further evidence for placing this latter dialogue among those considered useful and moral by the Quattrocento. First there is Rinuccio’s description of the theme to Laurentius Columna as de variis irridendisque circa res humanas mortalium conatibus, and secondly his implication to Cardinal Le Jeune that it belongs to these works qui ad bonos mores et ad humanae vitae instituta spectant.54. But the most illuminating insight into the contemporary perception of this very popular work (it was translated three times into Latin, and appeared in two of these versions in four separate editions, as well as being found in a large number of manuscripts55) is provided by the preface to it printed by Georg Lauer in his Rome edition of dialogues c. 1470, almost certainly from ms. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Fondo Trotti 390, f. 23v.56. The text is as follows.

Bona fabula hec: que loquitur nobis tot utilia
Aurum quid sit. et quam stulte tanti reputatur.  
Auro fidens Cresus auri gracia perit

(Charon)

(Ch. 11)

(Ch. 12-13)

53. Poggio, p. 31.

54. Lockwood, pp. 96-97.

55. See Chapter I p. 14, 25, 44, 63.

56. Kristeller, I p. 350. The text is taken from a photograph of the copy in John Ryland’s Library, Manchester (no. 17383) kindly provided by the Librarian.
Aureis muneribus non delectatur deus. (Ch. 12)
Affectus animi comparantur apum examini. (Ch. 15)
Beate qui vere fuerint: aut felices. Solon. (Ch. 10)
Beatitudo in morte iudicanda Solonis. (Ch. 10)
Charon quis demon sit: et quod eius officium. (Ch. 1, 3)
Cresus quomodo cum solone disputaverit sed victus. (Ch. 10 & 12)
Charō risus occasio fuit colloquii cum Mercurio. (Ch. 1)
Cyrus quomodo post multa proelia finiendus praedicatur. (Ch. 13)
Divicie quam sunt vane: et irridende sapientibus. (Ch. 20)
Fortitudo Milonis quanta: et post mortem nulla. (Ch. 8)
Hominum et urbium idem exitus: quam peritura. (Ch. 23)
Homines mundani quare non audiunt bonas amonitiones. (Ch. 17 & 21)
Homerus quid cantavit ad inferos evectus. (Ch. 7)
Mors intercipit vota multorum insperate. (Ch. 6 & 17)
Mortis ministri febris qui vocant homines. (Ch. 17)
Nudus quisque egreditur hominum: et pauper. (Ch. 20)
Solon solus iudicatur sapiens quam sprevit aurum. (Ch. 11)
Translatio ista nova cur facta sit in prologo.
Vita humana pulcre simulatur diversis naturalibus. (Ch. 19)

The form of this piece may be poetic, though it is certainly not in quantitative metre, and there seems to be no rhythmic consistency either. The division into lines, and the stilted Latin, tailored and truncated, it seems, especially to fit them, appear anyway to argue that it is not prose. Disregarding its formal qualities, however, one may see that in substance it is a set of random references to various parts of Charon. Leaving aside lines 1 and 21, the chapters referred to in order of appearance are 11, 12-13, 12, 15, 10, 10, 1-3, 10, and 12, 1, 13, 20, 8, 23, 17 and 21, 7, 6, and 17, 17, 20, 11, 19. This analysis suggests that we have before us a series of jottings, composed by the scribe of the Ambrosian manuscript, indicating his main impressions of the work, and therefore valuable to us as a gauge
of Quattrocento interest in Lucian’s writing. The first thing to note is that the opening statement *Bona fabula hec: que loquitur nobis tot utilia* places the dialogue firmly among works which are useful. The second is that the selection itself is confined almost entirely to moralistic passages. Gold and the stupidity of revering it too much forms the subject of lines 2 to 4, true happiness that of lines 6 and 7, the vanity of wealth line 13, the necessity of death lines 14, 15, 17 and 19, and so on. Where the writer is not concerned directly with moralism, as in lines 8, 10 and 21, he is giving a factual outline of the dialogue; or information about the translation itself. The one exception to this seems to be line 16, where Homer’s crossing to Hades and the storm which his poetry caused, contained in Lucian chapter 7, are mentioned. The striking nature of the image evoked by Charon’s description of the way Homer vomited up his lines, whence he learnt what he knew of them, perhaps explains its inclusion here.

The mention of this passage, and the reference in lines 5 and 22 to other pictorial images in the *Charon* (the simile of bee-hives to describe cities from chapter 15, and, probably, that of the bubbles for man’s life in chapter 19) also, however, indicate the appreciation in the Quattrocento of another aspect of Lucian’s work. Perhaps the most apparent quality of his style is that of concreteness, the tendency to back up each idea with, or even to express it as, an illustration, either using an allegory such as we see in the *Somnium*, an anecdote as in *Toxaris* and *Demonax*, or on a narrower basis a simile or some other form of analogy, as in the examples given above from *Charon*. In a way, one may see the crossing of dialogue with comedy, which Lucian seems to have

---

57 The only rationale which I have been able to detect in the ordering of the lines is that with the exception of line 1 they are all set out alphabetically according to their first letter. This is more obvious in the original with its ornate capitals.
regarded with some pride and a little uneasiness, as a direct result of this desire to find a concrete and substantial medium for his satire, which would still retain the capacity for one-man performance.58. Even in narrative works, the complex of illustrative details is sometimes itself made more comprehensible to the educated listener by a continual reference to a familiar schema, tragedy, for instance, against which background he is invited to place the matter in hand.59. Words themselves are often chosen, from prosaic, poetic, or comic sources indiscriminately, primarily for that illustrative impact.60. In consequence, there is very little of what may be called abstract writing in Lucian. Where it exists, in the Parasitus for instance, it is usually found to express a parodic or satiric intent.

The best example of these procedures known to the Quattrocento and, as we shall see, extraordinarily popular at this period, is the De Calumnia. The theme itself is as abstract as any moralistic subject, yet the treatment is intensely concrete. Not only are examples, analogies, and similes in plentiful supply, but they are superimposed for easier assimilation upon the double background, of allegory and drama. The allegory, which is presented by the famous description of Apelles' painting, serves to introduce the abstract qualities involved, and to endow them with a visual and spatial relationship to each other.

58. See Bellinger, pp. 3-40. Bompaire, p. 239, "dialogués ou non tous les outrages de Lucien étaient destinés à la lecture publique."

59. E.g. De Calumnia 6 τείχων δ'όντων προσώπων, καθάπερ ἐν τῇς κωμωδίαις ... προτύπον μὲν δῆ μαθημάτων τῶν προστεθεισῶν ἐν τῷ διάλογῳ. Alexander, 60 τοιοῦτο τέλος τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρεος ῥητορείας καὶ αὕτη τοῦ πάντως διάλογος η κατασκευή.

60. Schmid, more than 10% of Lucian's vocabulary is poetic, as may be seen by comparing Schmid's figure for poetic words (p. 402), 1511, with his total (p. 431 n. 22), 10,400.
while the dramatic schema is used to organize the rest of the
discussion into a play, whose personae are then introduced as onto a
stage. Even the final moral is drawn with a deft illustration; the judge
must place reason as the doorkeeper to his mind to sort out what shall
enter and what shall not.

It is hardly surprising that the piece was well known in the
Quattrocento, better known in fact than most of the other works of
Lucian, since its subject is so patently in tune with the current
humanist preoccupations. Its history in the period, however, has gen-
erally to be told with reference to the single motif of the allegoric
painting of Apelles, to a brief account of which we must now turn.

Alberti's De Pictura was written in 1434 in Latin, and an Italian
version appeared a year later. In book III we find these words:

*neque parum illi quidem multarum rerum noticia copiosi literati,*
*ad historiae compositionem pulchre constituendum iuvabunt* ...

...a clear recommendation to painters to delve into literary sources for
material. It is followed by a description of the motif from Ch. 5 of
the De Calumnia, to which he appends this sentiment:

*Quae plane historia, etiam si dum recitatur animos tenet, quantum
censes eam gratiae et amoenitatis ex ipsa pictura, eximii pictoris,*
exhibuisse?

Now clearly Alberti was impressed with the visual qualities of Lucian's
description, and saw that it had possibilities of a pictorial nature,
which he then pointed out to artists in his tractate. But one wonders
if his interest would have been so great had the description not been
couched in the form of moralistic allegory which appealed so partic-
ularly to his literary sensibility, and which lies behind much of the
painting of the '400.

61. Altrocchi, p. 469.
Förster contends that his account of the motif was drawn from Guarino's translation, since this was the only one which had been done by that date. In addition, the error in acie for macie in the description of Livor relies upon a misreading of, or a mistake in the manuscript which he used. This is reasonable since, even if Alberti did know Greek, he would still have been as likely to make use of a current Latin version as to examine the text itself. The one difference between the two texts that Guarino's Calumnia holds the torch in dextra, while Alberti's holds it in sinistra, may also be explained by a corruption in the tradition, since the Italian version clearly shows that Alberti knew that Calumnia held the torch in her right hand.

The general contention among scholars is that the popularity of the motif in the art of the XV century was due mainly to this mention by Alberti. One cannot help remarking, however, that none of the three surviving Quattrocento representations of the painting can have been reliant wholly on his brief report, since they all contain certain features mentioned in Lucian but not reported in Alberti. Secondly, they are all from the second half of the century, the earliest of them datable to 1472.

Briefly, the surviving versions are these. First, the half-page miniature which precedes Bartolommeo della Fonte's translation of the piece in the Berlin-Dahlem, Kupferstichkabinett manuscript (78, c26 f II'). This is anonymous, but was clearly executed, with some deviations from the description therein, with reference to the particular version in hand, by someone known to Della Fonte. Secondly, the painting by Sandro Botticelli in the Uffizi gallery entitled 'La Calumnia di Apelle'. Again the composition suggests that Botticelli had a version of Lucian at his fingertips, though embellishments of his own are also introduced.

63. 'Verlumung', p. 34.
64. Altroochi, pp. 469-70 cites several authorities
like the crown on the 'man who sits on the right' which makes his figure a king, and the position of Truth, who looks out of the picture, rather than at the proceedings, as she does in the manuscript version and Lucian. 66. Thirdly, the pen-drawing in the British Museum, attributed to Mantegna (1431-1506), from which, probably in the XV century also, a print, of uncertain provenance, was made. In this the figures are placed the opposite way round, with the throne on the left instead of the right. 67 That this has no necessary connection with Alberti or these other two versions is shown by the figure of Envy, who has assumed a female shape to suit the name Invidia, instead of the masculine shape associated with Livor, and even with Invidia in Lapo's text.

Two other notices of the use of this motif neither of them surviving, may also be mentioned. The first is known from an entry in the inventory of the Medici collections of the XV century, which reads:

Quattro telai entrovi quattro panni dipinti alla francese, l'uno di br. 2½, circha per ogni verso colla storia della Calunia. . .

The second is the fresco of Luca Signorelli, which may be early XVI rather than XV century, painted in the Palazzo Petrucci at Siena. 68

Next, in this brief history of Apelles' picture, we must turn from art to literature, to a form nevertheless connected with representation, the Trionfo. Bernardo Rucellai, the Florentine politician and historian, wrote a poem entitled Trionfo della Calunia, probably between 1492 and 1493, of which Caccia makes mention, and Altrocchi a particular study. 69

68. Caccia, 'Luciano', p. 82 and p. 87.
69. Caccia, 'Luciano', pp. 79-80. Altrocchi, pp. 476-491; he produces from ms., a better text than Caccia's, which was taken from a XVI c. printed source.
It is, in essence, a versification of the motif, intended, no doubt, to accompany a float representing the picture, but in all probability, like Botticelli's painting, it is something more too. Altrocchi, who accepts Horne's date of 1494 for the Calunnia, connects the poem with it through the figure of Piero, son of Lorenzo il Magnifico, who succeeded to the headship when his father died in 1492. Rucellai, who was appointed a counsellor, fell foul of the young prince, and was dismissed, and withheld from taking up public office until 1493. The bitterness which he felt at this may well have moved him to make the 'man' of Lucian's description into a king, as Altrocchi thinks Botticelli did later, in explicit reference to Piero's misrule. Certainly there is a sense of finger-pointing about the two lines:

Notate il nostro canto
Tucti: ma più ciascun che impera e regge.

The other literary manifestation of an interest in this piece, and particularly the Calunnia motif, furnishes a further example. It appears in ms. F78, of the Biblioteca Comunale "Augusta", Perugia, and is dated XII June 1462. The anonymous writer addresses his preface to Helius Spineta de Campofregoso, and clearly, as in Giovanni Quirini's case, there is a very personal application in the material which it deals with. His desire to treat Calumny stems from his own experience:

havendo io molte et infinite volte provato quanta forza habiano la detractione et maligne lingue et a quanti extreminii me habiano spesse fiate voluto condure, maxime rivolendo nel animo mio la recente calamitate mi se apparregia va denanzi a tua Signoria, si la diurna gratia mediante la tua suprema prudentia non havessino al Innocentia mia dato adiuto.

A poem which appears at the end of the manuscript containing this work

---

70. For full text, see Appendix.
may also refer to his experience, and confirms the similarity of his fall from grace to Apelles' in Lucian.

The work itself is not a translation of Lucian's essay, so much as a paraphrase of certain parts of it. From Ch. 1 to Ch. 16 the text is more or less followed, though the author interpolates and omits freely all the time, sometimes adding for the sake of clarifying classical references. The section from Ch. 16 to Ch. 26 does not seem to appear at all, while the examples in Ch. 27 following have been augmented by Roman and Biblical ones. The final paragraphs of the text, 30-32, appear in paraphrase, although the last sentence is translated in part. The remainder of the work is an interpretation of the allegory of Ch. 5. Lucian's name is nowhere mentioned, and one wonders if the author took his cue from a previous Latin translation, also without attribution. But his treatment of the Apelles painting seems to indicate that he was relying on his own understanding of the Greek, since he would not have made the mistake of mistranslating, πηει ἰε αὐτὸν ἐστὰσι δῦο γυρίκες as cum la quale due altre done sono, referring to Calumnia instead of the man on the right, had he used one of the Latin versions already in circulation.

The most interesting feature of the work, which is in the main repetitive, and in no way reflects the concrete stylistic techniques of its model, partly, perhaps because of the discursive and abstract qualities of the Italian language of the day, is the author's interpretation of the allegory involved in the painting of Apelles. In a period when, as we have seen, this pictorial image was well known and understood, it is surprising to see that anyone considered that it needed any further exposition. But the reason in this case is probably the same as that which caused him to compose it in vernacular rather than in Latin:

perche vengha meglio ad essere intesa, capitolando in mano de qualunque persona men che docta.
The work was directed specifically against his accusers, and the veiled insult *men che docta* in the prologue would be doubly barbed if the clarification of the allegory were meant as more than merely a measure to ensure complete understanding of the message. But that such explicitness is typical of the author is shown by the additions to the text in Ch. 5 itself. Of the young boy, who is described as being dragged along by the hair by Calumnia in Lucian, we are told specifically: *Questo e Innocentia*, while the position of the two maids *Insidia* and *Fraude*, who in Lucian are beautifying Calumnia, is already altered by the mistranslation of *πένης δ' αὐτῶν*. *Penitentia*, meanwhile, the penultimate figure in the scene, awaits *la veritate che piu che di galoppo la segue*, who shows therefore considerably more speed than in Lucian’s plain *προσιδυσθεὶν*.

The crux of the exposition is the role of *Penitentia* and *Veritate*. In neither Lucian, the XV century representations, nor Rucellai is anything specific related about their moralistic significance. Here, however, they are seen as indications of the general outcome of a case of Calumny. *Penitentia*, says the text, is placed crying and tearing her hair and rags:

> A denotare chel Calumniatore per lauditore inteso el vero et pentendosi per vergogna de demandare al Innocente accusato perdono fra se rimordendosi et tribolandosi nesunaltro remedio al dolore suo che se stesso et panni straciare trova, ne mai resta fin che per divino ordine non corra al doloroso et miserabile fine debito premio del maldire et falsamenti accusare.

This situation is presumably the doing of *Veritate*, for as we are told just before the above passage, *molte volte la ficta Calumnia per divine virtute si scopre*. Calumny, indeed, must be regarded as an example of the exercise of divine providence, which only allows these wrongs to be
committed acio che lo veniamo a recognoscere et che se abstemiamo dal mal fare. As for the Calumniatore al fine del suo errore al quale quodammodo impossibile cosa e potere satisfare, reporta punizione de vindicta o altra pena mer-
itamenti patisse havendo senza culpa cum diabolico instincto limnente falsamenti accusato. In the final analysis, Calumny is defeated by God and Truth, and the detractor earns his just reward in the life to come.

That this optimistic Christian exposition is not untypical of the XV century approach to Lucian may be shown by reference to the poem De Morte Carmen Horrendum which appears at the end of Sessa's 1500, Venice edition of translations of Lucian. The majority of the stilted elegiacs reflect upon merely the inevitability of death, a thought not alien to Lucian's infernal satire:

Qua mors lege capi t et magnos atque pusillos
Nunc hos: nunc illos praecipitando rapit:
Pauperis et regis communis lex moriendi
Dat causam flendi si bene scripta legis.

But towards the end, the tune changes and a new ray of hope is seen:

Vado mori miserere mei rex inclyte christe
Omnia dimittens debita vado mori
Vado mori sperans vitam sine fine manentem
spernens praesentem sic bene vado mori
Annuat hoc munus qui regnat trinus et unus.

Lucian's moralism on the theme of death was acceptable and positive, precisely because it was attended in the Christian mind by the obvious corollaries of God and everlasting life. As in that case so with the De Calumnia, a potentially pessimistic message is converted by the addition of Christian eschatology into an optimistic one.

Certainly, whether this particular interpretation was the general
one or not, the work was popular at this period for its moral doctrine, and particularly for its treatment of abstract ideas. Both Guarino and Fonte remark upon the ascendancy of Invidia in their prologues, and the general tendency of the century in this direction may be further illustrated by the subjects set for the laureate competitions in Florence in 1441 and 1442, Amicitia and Invidia. Poggio and Griffolini both seize upon the remarks in Ch. 10 where the scene of Calumny is said to be more often than not the courts of princes, the former, as we have seen, to support an argument on their misfortunes and generally unhappy lot, the latter merely to adduce a good reason for the dedicatee to be pleased with the gift, and to read it diligently. Once again the value of literature is set firmly in its efficacy as a weapon of social and moral reform. This very point is made explicitly by the anonymous author, and it is worth repeating in his words:

Sogliono li mortali - per continuo studio et longa experientia de varie cose farsi docti cum argumenti de potere, de molte materie renderasone, et cum vere similitudine demonstrare lessentia del humane cose sottoposte ad infiniti pericoli le quale poi dano piu diligentia et cura al guardarsi da quelli et anche qualche volta stimolo a delinquenti de contenersi et portarsi piu humanamenti verso el prosimo suo.

By the large number of versions of De Calumnia, we may readily see that for the purposes of the XV century, it was the most immediately and obviously useful work in the whole Lucianic corpus.


IV. Risus et seria

The prevalent moral interpretation of Lucian's works was, in the evidence we have seen, based fairly upon his works, even if it was extremely selective. But another widespread view of his writings, that he was propagating serious ideas through a comic medium, had support from his own lips. In the Dionysus, a work translated by Francesco Griffolini, he uses the story of the wine-god's attack on India to typify the reactions of his audience to his works. Their preconception of him is rather like the Indians of Bacchus, namely that they expect nothing but farce from him. With this in mind they react in one of two ways: either they avoid his performances, disdaining to climb down from their elephants to pay attention to the revels of women and the skipping of satyrs, or they come, but are so surprised to find that the thyrsus hides a steel tip, that they do not dare to venture approval. 73.

From the Quattrocento we may cite an example to show that the problem which Lucian faced was well understood, for Secco Polenton had occasion to rebuke his audience for their reactions to his Catinia. Replying in a letter to Fantino Dandolo to their strictures upon his immorality, he argues that many learned men, living blameless lives, have nevertheless justified res...turpissimas artificio dicendi. But, he continues, they have done it in such a way,

quod qui aperiat oculos facile videat, ipsos eius: rei, que turpis sit, vituperatores, non laudatores esse.

This is, one need hardly say, an early example of the critical appreciation of the ironical encomium, and it is not surprising to find that Secco backs up his remarks with a reference, even if he did not realise

73. Dionysus, 5.
it was such, to Lucian's *Parsitus*. This work, an extensive parody of Platonic dialectic, wherein it is proved that the profession of the parasite is an art, was translated into Latin by Guarino, and it is to Guarino that Secco ascribes it. His argument continues

Guarino item Veronensis, quem litteris et latinis doctissimum et grecis doctorem illis ipsis, quos Grecia genuisset, fatentur omnes, de parasitica vita, que gulosa et scurrilis est, multa dixit cum iocunditate summa.74.

Secco's understanding of the principles of ironic writing was clearly dependent upon Lucian's influence, for, regardless of his ignorance of the true authorship of the *Parsitus*, the example of the procedures which he was describing came from Lucian's works, and this as early as 1419.

If Lucian was the Quattrocento's first instructor in the principles of serio-comic and ironic writing, he was also certainly their finest example. As early as 1403 Antonio Romagno was writing to Pietro Marcello, Bishop of Ceneda, about the *Timon*:

nunc denique cum Timone tuo modo paupere modo divite, facetiis elegantia, lepidis gravia, seri a iocis misceo.75.

Probably before 1423 Rinuccio described the *Dialogus Mortuorum* X as a *iocabundum...opusculum* which nonetheless put him in mind of what his tutor and dedicatee Buonaccursus used to discuss with him *graviter atque sapienter*.76. Later in the century Petrus Balbus noted the presence of both *festivitatem et severitatem* in *Dialogus Mortuorum* XIII, and attributed to Lucian in the *Dialogus Mortuorum* XVI *iocunditas in dicendo...veritas denique in concluendo*, as you would expect from the pater

---


75. Sabbadini, N.A.V., XXX, p. 228.

76. Lockwood, p. 100.
But even in these cases, where they were prepared to concede the existence of comic qualities in Lucian, their interpretation still remains strictly moral, and their interest firmly pedagogic. We have had occasion to note Poggio's quotation from Timon in the previous section, and we shall see in chapter V how even in the course of imitation its character appears fundamentally moral. The Dialogus Mortuorum X was sent to its dedicatee in order that he might be confirmed in his opinions on death by the very great authority of Lucian,

Cum apud eundem Lucianum non minus quam te ridicula monstruosaque habita sunt capita qui tanto mortis terrore afficiuntur. This moralistic emphasis was also carried into the editions of the work which appeared in Italy during the century. Echoing the words of Rinuccio it was known as Lutiani philosophi greci de funerali pompa. Petrus Balbus' interpretation of the thirteenth Dialogue of the Dead, which he sent, on request, to his friend Guillermus Manuellus or Mamullus, is of a similar kind. The enjoyment lies in its teaching;

Nam periocundum quippe videtur diogenem pauperem hominem atque deiectum summum ac gloriosissimum non intrepido modo sed alacri animo deridere.

For, he continues, Alexander, who was endowed far above other mortals with riches, power, honour and good fortune, took no more to the nether world than the humble Diogenes; nisi forsitan, he adds referring directly

78. See above p. 127, below p. 265 f.
79. Lockwood p. 100.
80. See Chapter I p. 59.
81. The ms. gives Mamullus in its rubric, Manuellus in the text.
to Lucian, ••• aut solam de amissa gloria tristitiam aut ex iniuriis in quosdam illatis quemadmodum iustum est det poenam. The work may not be magnopere ornatum, says Balbus insisting once more upon the wisdom and morality of Lucian, verax tamen existimes velim. As if to drive this point firmly home, moreover, he concludes with an affirmation of his own integrity:

nequaquam enim sum qui magis mendaciis cum apparentia quam ipsa veritate que per se clara est amicis morem gerere studeam. 82.

Balbus, by insisting that he does not traffic in prettified falsehoods, clearly sounds his approval of Lucian's ideas and his methods of presentation.

His emphasis upon Lucian's veracity is notable also in the prologue to his version of Dialogus Mortuorum XIII, which is interesting for its justification of humanistic learning from the Christian viewpoint, and for its perception of positive values in Lucian's satire of the Gods. Balbus begins with an historical assessment of the reputation of poets. Starting with ancient times, he establishes that they were well thought of in both Rome and Greece,

nam apud Romanos qui tantopere ea tempestate litteris claruerunt tantam in veneracionem hoc nomen deventum est ut et imperatores ipsi qui totum orbem terrarum suo imperio regebant hoc etiam nomine mancipari voluerunt, Greci vero....non humano dumtaxat nomine sed divino poetas esse dignos existimaverunt.

With the subsequent growth of the Christian religion and the decline of the pagan the doctors of the Church,

et si apud poetas maxime suorum deorum ministeria extabant.... non abiiciendos aut relinquendos poetas esse censuerunt.

Leaving aside the literary excellence which is manifest in the works of

82. Ms. Palermo, Bib. Nazionale, I, C, 9, f. 146r-147r. See Appendix for full text
to Lucian, aut solam de amissa gloria tristitiam aut ex iniuriis in quosdam illatis quemadmodum iustum est det poenam. The work may not be magnopere ornatum, says Balbus insisting once more upon the wisdom and morality of Lucian, verax tamen existimes velim. As if to drive this point firmly home, moreover, he concludes with an affirmation of his own integrity:

nequaquam enim sum qui magis mendaciis cum apparentia quam ipsa veritate que per se clara est amicis morem gerere studeam. Balbus, by insisting that he does not traffic in prettified falsehoods, clearly sounds his approval of Lucian's ideas and his methods of presentation.

His emphasis upon Lucian's veracity is notable also in the prologue to his version of Dialogus Mortuorum XIII, which is interesting for its justification of humanistic learning from the Christian viewpoint, and for its perception of positive values in Lucian's satire of the Gods. Balbus begins with an historical assessment of the reputation of poets. Starting with ancient times, he establishes that they were well thought of in both Rome and Greece,

nam apud Romanos qui tantopere ea tempestate litteris claruerunt tantam in venerationem hoc nomen deuentum est ut et imperatores ipsi qui totum orbem terrarum suo imperio regebant hoc etiam nomine nuncupari voluerunt, Greci vero non humano dumtaxat nomine sed divino poetas esse dignos existimaverunt.

With the subsequent growth of the Christian religion and the decline of the pagan the doctors of the Church,

et si apud poetas maxime suorum deorum ministeria extabant non abhiciendos aut relinquendos poetas esse censuerunt.

Leaving aside the literary excellence which is manifest in the works of

---
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the ancients, the argument continues, without them ita difficile est
hominem christianum nostros theologos intelligendos devenire ut fere
impossibile videatur, for who among contemporary persons can understand
Jerome, or of the Greeks Gregory Nazianzen or St. Basil, nisi hac
poetarum disciplina imbutus? Balbus is not explicit as to the contrib-
ution of the poets in general, or to the understanding of the Greek
fathers in particular. But he is, presumably, referring to their
necessity as a propaedeutic to Christian studies, since he is close to
Basil in his general argument, though he is not inclined, as was the
Greek father, to regard the usefulness of Pagan learning as its faculty
of putting in high relief by its inferiority the superiority of
Christian learning. Turning to his dedicatee, Nicolaus scholarium
preceptor, Balbus proceeds to give some advice upon the use of the poets
in education. Quoting St. Basil's dictum that there are in the poets
both thorns and flowers, and that the thorns must be bent out of the
way, so that the boys may pluck the blossoms, he informs Nicolaus that
his purpose in outlining his opinions on this question (opinions which
he is certain Nicolaus will endorse, and sent to him only because con-
firmation from friends is helpful in conducting affairs) is
ut tu in doctrina non quemadmodum quidam solum ad auditentium
voluptatem sed magno cum studio ad utilitatem doceas.
For it is his job to help pupils to distinguish between what is good
and what bad in them, in case through inexperience they accept as use-
ful, things which are in fact harmful and wicked.

Having completed his remarks on the poets and education, Balbus
turns to his offering. There are, he says, many things in the poets
adeo turpia atque deridenda ut non modo nobis christicolis verum
his qui apud suam religionem sapientissimi habeabantur ludibrio
digna magnopere visa sunt.
One of these people he has brought in to illustrate this fact, a writer
qui quanti litterarum pericia valuerit nequaquam indigeo testibus, namely Lucian.

Quid ergo de eorum hercule ipse sentiat de eo dico qui tanto in honore ac veneratione ab eis ut deus colebatur accuratissime in hoc opusculo video velim.

The qualities of the work, Balbus concludes, iocunditas in dicendo, subtilitas in disputando, veritas denique in concludendo, are such that no one can consider that it lacks strength, even if it lacks length. 83.

The importance of Balbus' prologue is twofold. First of all its presentation of the usual argument for the Christian humanist position with Lucian as a crucial witness establishes the latter's standing decisively. Secondly, the invocation of Lucian in evidence against the absurdities of his own religion provides us with valuable evidence for the Quattrocento opinion of that satire of the Gods which was to bring him into such disrepute in the next century. To Balbus the refutation of Hercules' claim to immortality by Diogenes in the Underworld testified to Lucian's wisdom in religious matters, as did the sixth Dialogue of the Dead, also translated by him. There, the harsh remarks of Pluto to Terpsion on legacy-hunting and the paradox of the young dying before the old men they have tried to buy and flatter, led Balbus to remark quanta cum iocunditate ipse de divino iudicio et de summa dei providentia disputat. 84. In this case, of course, he is not dealing with religious satire, but his words confirm the opinion, given with reference to Dialogus Mortuorum XIII, that Lucian has a serious purpose behind the amusement which his works afford, that he is positive,

83. Ms. Palermo, I, C, 9, f. 154r-156v. See Appendix for full text.
84. Ms. cit. f. 150v.
and that his conclusions are to be trusted.

Clearly the principles, outlined above with reference to De
Columnia, upon which a Christian background was automatically assumed
behind the remarks of ancient authors, obtained also in Balbus' case
with regard to the satire of the Gods, for he could not have claimed
that Lucian was a Christian. The same is probably true of other trans-
lators of works in which this theme occurred. Certainly both Lapo and
Antonio Pacini were unperturbed, when they made versions of De Sacrificiis,
about any irreligious sentiment it might contain. Pacini described it
merely as a work where Lucian deorum gentilium multam petulantiam mult-
sumque hominum stultitiam ostendit suscipisse 85, and Lapo said nothing
at all. Both, presumably, would have been in sympathy with Balbus in
accepting Lucian as a bona fide witness against paganism.

There is evidence, however, that this view of Lucian's satire of
the gods, if not actually opposed in the Quattrocento, was not absolutely
universal. First there is the argument ex silentio, that very few of
his productions in this sphere found translators in this period. Only
the De Sacrificiis and Juppiter Confutatus are found in Latin versions,
and while Leonceno added to these his Italian translations of Juppiter
Tragoedus, Deorum Concilium and Icaromenippus, not a single example from
the Dialogi Deorum or Dialogi Marini is known in either language.
Secondly, there is Poggio's preface to Juppiter Confutatus. He opens by
telling Thomas Serezamus, his dedicatee, that at his request he has tran-
slated into Latin a little dialogue of Lucian, which he goes on to
describe, assuming that the character Cyniscus speaks for the author, as
one in quo vir ille doctissimus de fato ac providentia cum ipso Iove

ludere videtur. He then makes certain remarks concerning the difficulty of translation which we have already examined in Chapter II. He concludes by asserting that he has expressed the author's meaning diligently, quicquid hoc sit, and by asking his dedicatee to read the work and judge for himself its import:

Leges igitur cum otium erit has meas ineptias quas exercitii gratia lucubravi et cum sis vir omnium nostre etatis doctissimus pro tua singulari doctrina iudicabis quantum facetissimi hominis sententiis tribuendum esse videatur.86

As in so many other cases in the history of Lucian's works in this century, the outline of the piece, though short, is accurate. But that Poggio was not at all sure of the interpretation which he should give to it may be seen quite clearly both from the words quicquid hoc sit, referring to the meaning of the work, and by the final appeal to the dedicatee. He plainly felt perplexed, and thought that the greater wisdom of the future Pope would be able to solve his dilemma. Nonetheless another point deserves attention, that he first calls Lucian vir...doctissimus, implying that he believes that there is a serious purpose to this, as to his other works, and that he ends by referring to him as facetissimus homo, implying that his methods in this instance are those of a comic writer. It seems reasonable to infer that Poggio, while he could not himself unravel the true meaning of the dialogue, was nevertheless prepared to set it in the context of serio-comic interpretation which we have been examining, no doubt because he accepted that this was one of Lucian's methods.

But the Juppiter Confutatus was not the only dialogue among the allegedly serio-comic works which caused Quattrocento interpreters trouble. The Vitarum Auctio or Venditio, the dialogue in which Zeus

86. Ms. Vat. Lat. 3032, f. 98v. See Appendix for full text.
and Hermes put up the ancient philosophers and their doctrines for sale in a piece of pure satire, brought its share of problems too. When Rinuccio dedicated his version to Seraphius Urbinas, he found, as we have seen in Chapter II, a serious purpose in it, maintaining that Lucian was a writer who put serious matters in a humorous way, and that anyone scratching the surface veneered with humour would find on a closer inspection that his point could not have been made more elegantly, or more thoughtfully: *quod in hoc opere dum philosophorum sectas aperit maxime cognoscitur*. But Rinuccio did not say exactly what the serious point of the work was, and moreover, there is evidence that he left his dedicatee in doubt on the issue.

Jacobus Mucius Perleus of Rimini, was, on the evidence of the dedicatory letter prefacing his version of the *Piscator*, companion piece to the *Vitarum Auctio*, a protégé of Seraphius Urbinas, Rinuccio's dedicatee. After much persuasion by Seraphius, he decided to drop his resolve to act on the example of Polycletus, and turn his hand to producing a piece of writing. That the work translated was Seraphius' choice, may be seen from the phrase which Perleus uses:

*dialogum...quem totiens a me ut mitterem contendisti.*

The letter continues thus:

*Cuius quidem dialogi summam quam percepereis facile mirari desines quod solebas interdum dicere quod Lucianus vir ipse omnium sapientissimus singulos philosophos preconis voce vendiderit: que tu iam ante legeras in alio eiusdem Luciani dialogo iampridem in latinam orationem converso.* *(i.e. the version of Vitarum Auctio which he had received from Rinuccio)* Nam tam etsi nec diis nec hominibus Lucianus pepercisse dicitur, scire

---

87. Lockwood, p. 102
tamen debemus singula eius verba ita ut dicta sunt non sine
singulari doctrina composita. Videbis itaque in hoc ipso dial-
ogo quemadmodum philosophi ipsi iniurias a Luciano sibi factas
egre passi ad superos venerunt, Lucianumque ad necem comprehend-
erunt, utque tandem causa constituta rationibusque utrinque
auditis, Lucianus innocentissimus repertus crimen fuerit
absolutus. Aliis enim ipse contumelias impenderat qui se alios
quam essent simulabat, non sanctissimis illis priscè discipline
philosophis.

He closes with the remark that Lucian has changed his name for the pur-
pose of the dialogue to Audentiarius, that is Parrhesiades. 88.

Two things emerge from this extract. The first is that for some
time after Rinuccio's dedication to him of the Vitarum Auctio, Seraphius
was at a loss to account for the work on the terms in which he had al-
ways been accustomed to view Lucian. Despite Rinuccio's assurances, he
could find no serious purpose in it. The second is that Perleo real-
ised the significance of the Piscator as a key to the dilemma immediately,
and related his findings, presumably unsuspected by Seraphius when he
commissioned the work, in the letter. His account of the problem and
of Lucian's own defence is accurate and needs no further comment. But
his acceptance of it at face value is both testimony to the naiveté of
Quattrocento criticism and an eloquent example of Lucian's high reputa-
tion for moral teaching.

If Rinuccio did not specify what his interpretation of Vitarum
Auctio was, nevertheless he left a clue in the word aperit in his
description of the work. If it were not for the existence of a further
piece of evidence, one might be tempted, without more ado, to take aperit
in the sense of "expose", or "show in their true light", and assume that

88. Ms. Paris, Bib. Nationale Lat. 3729 (8671), f.15r.-16r. See
Appendix for a full text.
he believed the dialogue to be an indictment of ancient philosophy. The other way to understand it, is as an unpejorative "show", in which case the piece is seen purely as an exposition of ancient doctrines, a parade of the sages.

The second of these interpretations, whether it was Rinuccio's true opinion or not, was that proposed by Luca d'Antonio Bernardi da San Gimignano in the prologue to a representation of the dialogue. Luca, the teacher of Marsilio Ficino, among others, was a master of grammar, who taught at Florence (1449, 1451, 1472, 1485-99), Colle (1458), Gimignano (1464), and Volterra. One of the characteristics of his teaching method was the recitation of ancient comedies and other works by his pupils. A number of instances are recorded in two codices of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, Plut. 90, sup. 2, and Plut. 89, sup. 27, among them a comedy of Plautus. The one which is of interest here probably belongs, according to Caccia, to the latest period of his teaching in Florence. The text is as follows.

Ab eodem Luca Antonii Geminianensi cum agi faceret Luciani dialogum de venditione et emptione philosophorum. Musa cum lyram traderet haec ait in primis ad puerum ipsam lyram accipientem.

   Mulcentem tigres adamantaque saxa trahentem
   Tu cape sacratum, numine summe, lyram
   Illa sedens in onore tuo fidissima custos
   Illa die semper nocteque leta canet
   Illa deos mulcetque irataque numina placat
   Illaque construxit menia magna trois.
   Nec mora. Carpe lyram. Fecere silentia cuncti
   et vox audiri nulla, sed illa potest.

89. My discussion here is based directly on Caccia, 'Luciano', pp. 59-70 (Chapter III), whence I have also taken the text.
Isque lyram capit ad musam refert (or inquit)

En ego thespium summo fidissima vates
Aurea dona tuo conspicienda simu.

Invocationem facit ad musas omnes

Dicite quo fontes aganippidos ypocrene
Signa medusei grata tenetis equi.

Ad populum puer cum lyra vel ad aliquem ex populo indifferenter

Si te digna manet sanctorum gloria morum
Luciani librum perlege quisquis eris.
Illic invenies quales quantique fuissent
Rebus divinis qui incumbuere viri.
Inter mille viros poteris tibi sumere vatem
Qui tibi demonstrat posse placere Jovi.
Vis tu divitas et magna palatia regni?
Dives eris. Tradent premia summa tibi.
Vis fieri sapiens? Ipsi invenere minervam;
Si sapias, aderunt in statione tua.
Diligis auctores summos? Cape philosophorum
vatem. Lucianus dat tibi quem capias.

Dummodo non summas Epicurum qui rematur:
Turpiter hic faceret per scelus omne trahi.
Hic te deciperet, nam crimen magna probaret.
Et mihi crede, animam perderet ille tueam.
Sunt et ductores virtutum mille quibus tu
herendo invenies ad Jovis ire viam.
Lucianum ergo cape et famam sine labe teneto,
Eternamque potes colligere ipse tibi.
Ore favete omnes intentique ora tenete (ad totum populum)
Venit in exemplum musa lyramque tuit.
Finis. Dehinc Luciani liber recitetur ad populum, id est dialogus supra nominatus

Post finem calliopius inquit ad populum.

Diximus, o cives, gaudete et plaudite multum,
et dignas grates disticon istud agit.

The apparatus of the setting is a mixture of classical elements, the invocation owing something to the epic, the general introduction to the prologue of Roman comedy, the metre elegiac. In addition, the stage directions are a development from the Medieval Drama. That it is only a setting, and not the introduction to a full dramatic piece is shown by the direction. Dehinc Luciani liber recitetur. Like Lapaccini's verses almost certainly, and probably like the Dialogus Mortuorum XII presentation of 1441 also, the Luca d'Antonio Bernardi setting has no such importance for the history of the true Italian theatre, as does Boiardo's Timone. Here, as in these other cases, the dramatic element is not foremost, though there at least the interpretation could not have been so firmly contrary to the intrinsic nature of the work in question although, of course, it had already been adapted to XV century requirements by Aurispa. Luca, in a period when the study of ancient philosophy was just beginning to achieve some of the importance of ancient history, saw the Vitarum Auctio as a good teaching aid. Were there not presented in it virtually all the important philosophers of antiquity, with their basic doctrines too? The listeners could choose which of them should be their intellectual and moral mentor, by whose aid they might reach the heavens and gain eternal fame. Lucian, the vates philosophorum, the preserver of the glory of mores sancti, is once again the sound and positive moralist who will show the way. Only one note of caution is sounded: Epicurus, the atheist, is a choice forbidden.

Whether this view was general, it is impossible to say. Certainly
Rinuccio may have held it, and one of the characters in Poggio's De Avaritia invokes Lucian thus in defence of the avarus:

Et doctissimus philosophorum Aristoteles, multi praeterea egregii in suis studiis viri et philosophiae dediti, ab Luciano Greco autore fuisse enumerantur, quorum tanta est autoritas, tanta dignitas, ut eorum nomen commemoratioque absque aliquo patrocinio, absque argumento possit avarorum causam satis defendere.  

If the reference were to Vitaram Auctio, which seems plausible, then the view taken would be akin to Luca's and, incidentally, much earlier than his presentation. The argument is refuted later in the work, but with no reference to Lucian, and this perhaps confirms that the interpretation itself was not disapproved of.

It is not unusual, we have seen, to find Lucian ransacked for moralistic ideas. Indeed, they are often there for the taking, witness the Necyomanteia and Poggio's abstract from it. Nor is it unusual for the comic elements to be ignored for the sake of the serious, for the part of the XV century view which we have been examining maintains the accessibility of serious matters behind the humour in his works. What is unusual in this case, is that in the absence of the kind of moral background found in the Dialogues of the Dead, for example, the satire and comedy has been ignored purely for the sake of a useful structure, where ancient philosophy may be seen in miniature.

90. Poggio, p. 11.
V. Iocunditas ac risus

The interpretation and usage of Lucian's works in the Quattrocento were governed quite clearly by the concept of utility. But this does not mean to say that the humanists were devoid of the faculty of literary appreciation. For the pleasure gained from Lucian's writings, even if it was of no account in the employment or interpretation of his works, was nevertheless plainly evidenced by his readers. In the deed requesting permission to publish printed at the end of the collection of Lucianic pieces published at Venice in 1494 by Simone Bevilaqua, the editor, Benedictus Bordo, gave equal weight to both pleasure and utility: *Intelligens maximum fructum utilitatem et voluptatem consecuturam ex eorum lectione.*

The incidence of the epithet *Iocundus* and the term *iocunditas* in descriptions of Lucian or his works is a further indication of humanist response purely on the level of enjoyment.

The most important aspect of the enjoyment of Lucian's works during this period is the appreciation of his humour for its own sake. In the two preceding sections we have seen Lucian's humour both ignored and explained away in the search for moral precepts, and have grown accustomed to the grave philosophical figure emerging from these interpretations. Some humanists, like Seraphius Urbines, certainly do appear to have derived little satisfaction from this side of Lucian. Others, like Guarino, Alberti and Lilius Castellanus, prized it highly.

Among the works whose excitement of laughter was considered a chief merit were the two paradoxical encomia *Parasitus* and *Muscae Encomium*. The first was sent by Guarino to Pietro Donati with the following introductory poem:

---

91. See Chapter I, p. 60-1.

92. See Chapter II, p. 83 and n. 73.
Vetere Draconem sive Solona
Et sanctiloquas versas leges,
Studium aut sequeris grande Minervae,
Donate, parum mihi ridenti
Ades obtutu. Lusibus istor
Tu perpetuum falle laborem
Curasque graves solare ioco. 93.

The message is clearly that Donati should use Lucian as a relaxation
from his worries, and to bring laughter to his lips. Guarino also
translated Muscae Encomium, but in this case the dedicatee, Scipio
Mainente, needed no persuasion of Lucian's humorous potential. As
Guarino tells us in the dedicatory letter, Scipio had expressed his des-
ire for the translation into Latin of faceta quaedam sive ridicula
hominis illius. 94 We do not know whether or not the offering which
Guarino dug out from his juvenilia raised a smile on Scipio's face when
he received it, or indeed whether Guarino himself found it amusing,
though his description of Lucian as iocis ac facetiis amoenissimus
and the choice of this work as suitable to Scipio's requirements (in
the same letter) suggest that he did. But we do have evidence of
Alberti's reaction when Guarino sent it to him some time later. In
the dedication of his imitation of this piece to Christoforo Landino he
tells how he had fallen into a fever, and was lying lethargically in bed,
with various friends around him, cum ad nos littere Guarini allate sunt
et cum his Musca Luciani. The reading of these, he continues, caused an
improvement in his humour: Litteris igitur et Musca perlectis facti
illariores, and as a result he felt impelled to dictate something
along the same lines at once. Someone took up a pen and Alberti says,

93. See Chapter I, p. 17.

paulo premeditatus hanc edidi muscam tanto cum cachinno, ut
ex ea hora febris tedium, levi sudore evaporato, solveretur.

His purpose in sending it to Landino is, he informs him, quo et tu
rideres. 95.

The appreciation of Lucian's humour, which is evident from this
letter of Alberti, may best be seen in the history of the Verae
Narrationes. These two books, almost alone amongst Lucian's works in
the Quattrocento, were accepted on the terms laid down by their author,
and had the desired effect upon their audience. Their impact is men-
tioned by the translator, Lilius Castellanus, in his preface to Marcus
Pistoriensis. These books, he says, habent...in se iocunditatem max-
imam ac risum. 96 An elegiac, printed at the end of J. B. Sessa's
edition of translations of Lucian (Venice, 1500), which like the lines
on Charon in Lauer's collection, sums up some of the contents, also
mentions this point: Non poterunt non blandidulos afferee cachinos.
The two aims which Lucian saw his work fulfilling, namely the intel-
lectual relaxation of educated readers, and the pleasure of spotting the
sources upon which his fictional parodies are based (for as ever, his
fantasy has a literary foundation), were not ignored in the XV century,
though neither is seriously moral. Taking the satire of ancient authors
first, Castellanus of course mentions it in his résumé of the prologue:

hec peregrina fictionis inductio ... fertur ... non sine detract-
ione contra veteres quosdam poetas scriptores hystoriarum ac
philosophos.

It is Collemuccio's Aesop, however, who expresses the general theory
behind it:

a le gran falsitadi et errori miglior rimedio non sia che porvi

95. Grayson, 'Opuscoli inediti', p. 45.
96. Naples, Arnaldus de Bruxella, 1475 prints both prefices. All refs
to them are to this volume.
al rincontro una espressa e gran bussa: come uno amico mio greco (i.e. Lucian) gia' face. 97.

Despite its humour, and its pure entertainment value, Lucian's chef d'oeuvre was to be seen as an exercise in combating pretentiousness. That it was appreciated as such is more indicative of the value set by the humanists on the mere idea of serio-comic writing, than upon their ability to understand all of the references, many of which are still obscure today. The satiric motive is only really explicit in the episode on the Isle of the Damned (II, 31), where Herodotus and Ctesias are being punished for their lies.

Whereas this satiric flavour is mentioned by Castellanus only in his résumé, the idea of intellectual relaxation, or merely entertainment is expressed in both his letters. To the Cardinal he writes:

nam cum tuo labore et cura nostrarum rerum pars maxima moderetur fiantque ee cure ut assolet sepe numero oneros: quid gratius eo offeram quam quod inter legendum te ab illo tedium ad singularem quandam leticiam iocunditatem risumque movere possit,

and likewise to Marcus animum aliis gravatum curis inter legendum exhylarent. In neither case does he use the athletic image employed by Lucian, and it seems therefore that he was familiar with, and persuaded by, this concept as a reasonable motive for literary composition. In the welter of aphoristic writing produced by the '400, it is sometimes easy to forget that the spirit of Boccaccio's Decameron had not died completely. That it had not is indicated by the existence of Poggio's Facetiae, whose preface incidentally furnishes an apt example of the motive we are concerned with here:

Honestum est enim ac ferme necessarium, certe quod sapientes laudarunt mentem nostram variis cogitationibus ac molestiis oppressam, recreari quandoque a continuis curis, et eam aliquando

97. Collemuccio, p. 93
The character of the fantasy and humour in Verae Narrationes is akin to that of Icaromenippus. Each episode arises from a parody of an ancient source, and extends itself by humorous invention upon the parody. The narrator, like Menippus, drifts along on the tide of events, sometimes protesting his veracity, always wickedly straight-faced. Lucian's linguistic style is generally concrete and allusive, playing on verbal associations, and constantly reminding the listener of its literary reference point. Here these qualities are taken to their logical limit, concreteness to a set of imaginative pictures placed before our eyes, allusiveness to an all-embracing parody.

Fifteenth century readers did not fail to take account of the ironies involved in such a web of decēt. Castellanus remarks how Lucian kept to his promise that nothing he said would be true:

> nam in ultimo versu sequentes libros pollicetur; quos nusqua m conscribit: ne forte vel circa fines ipsum in veritatem offenderet et a proposito frustraretur.

As in the Icaromenippus and other pieces, the framework itself sustains a satire of its own. Francesco Contarini, too, in his strange Dialogus, is not blind to the ironic possibilities of allusion. This time Lucian is at the centre of the pleasantry, when Sanlazarus, while describing the Isles of the Blest, remarks:

> Erant et alie civitates plurime, quas ego silentio involvo, quippe civitatem illum auream, cuius muri et smaragdo sunt, et septem porte cinnamomee monolignee, quam simul gravissimus et facetus philosophus Lucianus se vidisse autem, haud quaquam videre potuimus. Profecto nullibi gentium erat.

98. Poggio, p. 420.

The constant correction or indeed affirmation of literary sources for fantastic things, like the island of dreams (II, 32-34) or cloud-cuckoo land (I, 29), in the Verae Narrationes, may be the direct source for this.

The poem, mentioned above, in Sessa's 1500 edition of Latin translations of Lucian, brings us on to another point. Like Lauer's Charon preface, it mentions various episodes out of the whole, which seem to have particularly caught the imagination, like the Endimioneum lunae phoebique duellum and the Humanea vites squamiferumque pecus, though in this case perhaps metre was even more of a determining factor for what was mentioned than in the other. Nevertheless, it is true generally of Lucian's works in the atmosphere of the Quattrocento that certain scenes suggested procedures which were also efficacious for the designs of contemporary literature. An example from the Verae Narrationes, on a very small scale, may be found in the preface to Diodorus Siculus et Cornelius Tacitus de Moribus Germanorum, Venetiis per Thomam Alexandrinum MCCCCLXXI, addressed by Jeronymus Squarciaficus Alexandrinus to Francesco Leone. The recommendation of the volume is backed up by the appearance of Francesco Filelfo in a dream to Squarciaficus, and the text of a letter which he brings with him. The setting itself, the appearance on earth of a dead person, is itself associated with Lucian's Charon and Piscator by the words Rerum enim ille Parentem hoc mihi dedit, ut ab elisiis campis ... accederem, which are reminiscent of the excuses of the ferryman and philosophers for having left their usual haunts. But the letter itself is accompanied by a justification which alludes directly to him:

Mirabuntur fortasse quidam, Magnifice Vir, haec fieri potuisse;
sed elegant queso Lucianum in libro de veris narrationibus:

scribit enim, Ulysses suo nomine epistolam ad Calypsonem misisse.
There is a little of the irony used by Contarini here, perhaps, but it is clear that the main point of the reference is the provision of a direct literary precedent for the fantasy. The necessity for this authority is a clear indication of the novelty of these techniques even quite late in the century.

In passing, finally, it is of interest to glance at a work said by Olga Gewerstock to show signs of the influence of *Verae Historiae*. It is another of Aeneas Sylvius' letters, called *Somnium Fortunae*, addressed to Prokop von Rabstein, and dated 26th June 1444.  

Gewerstock's contention is that the description of the entry to the Isles of the Blest is taken from book two of *Verae Historiae*. An examination of the passage alongside Castellanus' translation (which would have been the source), shows no interdependence at all. The two have in common only the fact that they are both imaginative descriptions of a terrestrial heaven, and for this Aeneas Sylvius could have found many sources more to hand than Lucian.

101. pp. 30-34.  
102. Wolkan, pp. 343-353.
Conclusion

There are, of course, gaps in our knowledge of Lucian's works in the Quattrocento. There is no evidence, for instance, on which one may place in context *Dialogus Mortuorum XIV*, *Navis seu Vota*, *Harmonides*, *Herodotus*, *Scytha*, *Saturnalia*, *Dialogi Meretricii* and *Amores*, all of which were translated during the period. Only Alberti's use of comic motifs in the *Momus* stops the same being true of *Cataplus*, *Juppiter Tragoedus*, *Deorum Concilium* and *Icaromenippus*. But there seems very little reason to suppose that the lack of evidence about these works, or, for that matter, the fact that a great many other writings of Lucian were not translated in the Quattrocento, has anything to do with adverse judgement. In the light of what we have seen of humanist Lucianism so far, it would be reasonable to state categorically that if a work was translated, then it had been found useful, and on the other side, one may state that if it had not been translated, this was attributable at the worst to the translators' inability to fit it to humanist requirements (though this was not necessarily a bar: witness Poggio's uncertainty about *Juppiter Confutatus*), and most often to a shortage of time and manpower, both of which were at a premium in the recovery of the vast bulk of ancient Greek writings.

This is conjecture; the facts which we have and the story which they tell are its foundation. In general, the treatment of Lucian's works in the Quattrocento is characterised on one side by an almost complete lack of misrepresentation of content (apart from Aurispa, Luca d'Antonio Bernardi and his approach to *Vitarum Auctio* provide the only glaring example), and on the other by a rigorous selection based on humanist principles. And what the humanists wanted from Lucian was

---

103* See Chapter IV, p. 203 f.
not dictated by the tenets of literary criticism, which existed at this period only as a practical aid to writers (witness Guarino's letter to Tobia Borghi, and his use of Lucian), but by the principle of utility. The corollary is clear; all we know of Lucian in the Quattrocento is due to the pre-existent demands of humanism. Had he not fitted in with the role of moral philosopher required of him, we might have searched in vain for reference to him or his works.

It must be admitted, then, that although Lucian was regarded in the fifteenth century in much the same light as Cicero in the fourteenth, his introduction was too late to have the same kind of catalytic effect on the thought of the period as Cicero had had before him. His excellence as a magister vitae and a critic of life was not in doubt, but he only illustrates the new trend towards the pursuit of virtue with the aid of literature, he did not initiate it. Like those of other Greek authors in the Renaissance, his works provided substantiation of positions already arrived at by other means. His value to the historian of the Quattrocento, then, is as an indication of the development of humanism.

Of this development we have seen two sides, the use of literature to aid the pursuit of virtue, and its natural consequence, the achievement of greater accuracy in tackling ancient, and especially Greek, texts. A third, was the rehabilitation of the principle of voluptas as an intrinsic part of man's life. This, as Professor Whitfield tells us, was achieved by the efforts of Lorenzo Valla and Leon Battista Alberti, and its illustration from the history of Lucian's works lies in the appreciation of his humour in particular, since it was a trait related to utility

105. Chapters VI and VII of Whitfield, 'Petrarch'.
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105. Chapters VI and VII of Whitfield, 'Petrarch'.
only insofar as this concept was extended by Valla and Alberti to include man's happiness.

This vindication of pleasure and happiness signalled an opportunity for the writers of the Quattrocento to experiment more than they had done before with form and tone, so that literature could, in opposition to previous ascetic ideas, once more afford entertainment and laughter as well as instruction. Lucian's contribution to the development of this new trend will become clear as we examine in the chapters which follow those works which may be said to have imitated him in some way. But whatever this contribution is found to be (and it is not small), a conclusion which we have already drawn will still be valid. Lucian gives to the Quattrocento new examples, new modes of expression, and a new tone, but he does not bequeath new patterns of thought. What he institutes is a change of form, and not a change of heart.
CHAPTER IV
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Citation of Lucian; knowledge of Greek

Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) was no stranger to the works of Lucian. Not only did he cite them (De Calumnia in De Pictura III, Toxaris in De Familia IV, Longaevi in Theogenius II), but he was, in addition, the recipient of translations by Lapo of De Sacrificiiis and Tyrannicide, and by Guarino of Muscae Encomium. Indeed, it was this latter, we read in the letter to Christophoro Landino, which directly inspired the ex tempore composition of his own Musca. His taste for, and acquaintance with, Lucian is still further evidenced by the curious history of the Virtus Dea.

This dialogue, which is found in many manuscripts and editions attributed to Lucian, in the translation of Carolo Marsuppini, and sometimes even to Giovanni Aurispa, is the fourth piece in the first book of the Intercoenales.

It seems likely, judging from the history of the Philodoxus, which Alberti wrote under the name of Lepidus, and which fooled the scholars for ten years into believing it an ancient work, that this piece was also published under a pseudonym, "Lucian by Marsuppini", before it was eventually incorporated into the Intercoenales.


3. See Chapter I, "Editions", for printed XV century texts of this work. For its bibliographical history see further: Mancini, 'Nuovi', pp.209-210; 'Opera Inedita', p.132; Whitfield, 'Alberti', pp.16-19. Sabbadini, 'Carteggio' p.xxii, n.7 cites a ms, (Univ. di Bologna 2649, f.116b) which has the piece under the title Aurispa de Conquestu Virtutis, dated 1462, and believed it to be Aurispa's.

In addition to publishing under ancient pseudonyms, it was also Alberti's habit to refer in his writings "a sé ed ai casi della propria vita". It is not unreasonable, therefore, to see Genipatro's argument against Tichipedo, the rich man, reported by Teogenio in the dialogue which bears his name, as a reflection of Alberti's own views. In the context of his liking for Lucian, one sentence in particular provides probably the best evidence of his tastes: (quando me trovo in solitudine) Sempre meco stanno huomini periti, eloquentissimi, appresso di quali io posso tradurmi a sera e occuparmi a molta notte ragionando: ché se forse mi dilettano, e iocosi et festivi tutti e comici, Plauto, Terenzio, et gli altri ridiculi, Apulegio, Luciano, Martiale, et simili facetissimi eccitano in me quanto io voglio riso.

We have seen, however, that Lucian was already finding translators early in the Quattrocento, that Alberti certainly used Guarino's version of De Calumnia in his description of Apelles' painting in De Pictura, and was the dedicatee of three other pieces. The question of his knowledge of Greek naturally arises, since without it his acquaintance with the corpus would have been severely limited at this period.

It is the statement of one Carlo Aldobrandi, in a XVI century tract dedicated to Lorenzo De' Medici the younger, which provides the only evidence against Alberti's acquaintance with the

language. The writer, insisting upon the utility of the joint study of Latin and Greek, few having turned out eloquent with Latin alone, concludes: Nos unum audivimus inter ceteros maxime ut multi asserunt, Baptisram Albertum clarisse, quem omnino graecem nescientem summum tamen attigisse latinae elocutionis culmen nostra aetas omnis confitetur. Mancini has shown convincingly, however, that this statement has not the value of contemporaneity, and is, in fact, nothing more than an unproven conjecture, as the phrase ut multi asserunt demonstrates. 7

All the telling evidence is on the other side, and comes directly from Alberti’s own work and a contemporary source, the letter written by Lapo as a preface to his versions of De Sacrificiis and Tyrannicida. Here Lapo, speaking of the beginning of his studies, calls Alberti quem ego modo ad has liberales disciplinas et ingenuas percipiendas socium et adjutorem, verum etiam et impulsorem et hortatorem habuissem. Mancini argues that in such a context the only thing Lapo can be referring to is the study of Greek. This is confirmed by the statement graecas litteras natu jam grandiores, nec vacui omnino attigissemus, in which he and Alberti are shown to be pursuing this end in their spare time. Filelfo, who taught Lapo at Bologna in 1428, and was a friend of Alberti, who was also studying in Bologna at that time, seems to have been their common instructor.

7. 'Nuovi', pp. 210-212.
Alberti himself in the *Canis*, an encomium of his dead dog, which is in reality a flattering self-portrait, says that in three years he taught him Greek, Latin and Italian. At one time, he also mentioned his wish *provare quanto potesse imitare quel greco dolcissimo e soavissimo scrittore Senofonte*, used Archimedes directly in *Cifra*, and for *De equo animante* says he collected material from Xenophon, Absyrtus, Chiron, Hippocrates and Pelagonius. In addition, he used Greek derivatives for names of characters in the *Philodoxus* and the *Interoeiales* (e.g. Philopomus and Perifromus) and occasionally intruded a Greek work into the text (e.g. *Bios* in *Fatum et Fortuna*). 8

Finally, it seems that Molin's reason for taking Alberti with him to meet the Greek delegates to the Council of Ferrara at Venice on the 8th February 1438, was none other than that, as in the case of the Camaldulensian Ambrogio Traversari, who had served before in this capacity, his grasp of their language was needed for the task. 10

Just how deep was Alberti's acquaintance with Lucian is arguable from a closer examination of his own works, but there can be no question that in breadth it at least, equalled that of Guarino and Poggio. 11 In the *Momus* alone, reminiscences of Lucian certainly cover the following works: *Verae Historiae*, *Juppiter Tragoedus*, *Parasitus*, *Gallus*, *Deorum Concilium*, *Charon*, *Icaromenippus*, and *Cataplus*, and probably others also. 12 It is of no consequence to the argument that he used and knew Latin translations; even Nicolo Leoniceno did this


9. Since *Philodoxus* was written c.1424, when Alberti was 20, the argument from Greek derivative names is reduced in persuasiveness; that work contains many of them, e.g. *Frontisis Doxia* etc. *Fatum et Fortuna*, 'Opera Inedita', p.137: ac fluvio quidem huic ... Rios nomen est.


11. See Chapter II.

12. See below p.203 ff.
when he could. 13 The facts are that Alberti knew Greek, that Lucian was among his favourite authors, and that he knew him well enough to cite him in discursive works, and to imitate him in many of the *Intercoenales*, in the *Musca*, and in the *Momus*.

13. See Chapter I, p. 50.
II Intercoenales

According to the writer of the anonymous biography of Alberti, whom some believe to have been Alberti himself, *scripsit ... annum ante trigesimum pleraque Intercoenales, illas praesertim jocosas, Viduam, Defunctum, et ipsis simillimas, ex quibus quod non sibi satis mature editae viderentur, etsi festivissimae forent, tamen plures mandavit igni.* Mancini maintained that the composition was spread out over a number of years and that, sometime between 1439 and 1443, the pieces were collected into ten books. He based his argument upon a letter from Girolamo Massaini to Roberto Pucci, prefacing a late XV century edition of some Latin works of Alberti (excluding the Intercoenales). Here the writer mentions his own researches into these *decem Intercoenaliurn libri, quos totam non modo urbem hanc, sed omnem pene Italiam rimantes (uti sagacissimus canis investigando), maxime cum labore in unum tandem volumen redegimus.*

Massaini never printed this collection, but his notice demonstrates the scattered distribution of these pieces even in the XV century, reflected even now by the existence of *Anuli, Uxoria, and Defunctus,* not to mention the widely dispersed *Virtus Dea,* in independent codices, and the incompleteness of the Oxford manuscript which, until 1963, constituted the main, and for most of these works, the only source for the text.


15. *Anuli,* ms. Vat. Ottoboniano 1424, f.1451 Paris, Bib. Nat., 6702, f.148; *Uxoria,* Florence, Bib. Naz. II, iv, 38 (Italian); ibid., Pancitichiano 123, f.40r-50r (latin); *Defunctus,* Vienna, Bib. Palatina 3429. The Oxford ms. is Bodleian, Canoniciarius misc. 172, f. 50ff, the basis of Mancini's text in 'Opera Inedita'.
In that year the Dominican Fathers of the Convento di San Domenico in Pistoia, while reordering and cataloguing their library's incunabula, came across a copy of the 1475 Venice edition of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, which was bound with thirty manuscript pages, one blank, containing a diligently prepared copy of books I-IV and VII-XI of the *Intercoenales*. Despite the lack of books V and VI, which the collector clearly failed to find, the pieces being numbered in sequence up to the lacuna, and not after, the work, in XI not X books is probably virtually complete. The *Defunctus*, which occupied the whole of book IV in the Oxford ms., does not appear in the Pistoian collection, and may perhaps be V or VI instead, allowing for the same type of mistake as the Morenian codex of *Naufragio* made in attributing that work to book XI rather than IX. The *Anuli*, also lacking in the new ms., perhaps completes the inventory, belonging to either book V or VI, and not too short to fill a complete one judging by the example of VII and VIII. It would be attractive to see in this codex the diligent labours of Massaini, but the lack of the V and VI books, as well as the division into XI books, seems to disallow the conjecture.

The work itself consists of dialogues, both short and long, ranged along a spectrum running from realism to mythology in their setting, fables, narratives, and descriptive pieces. The tone, now bitter, now admonitory, now amused, now ironic, is scarcely less varied than the form and material. Nevertheless, the organization into books is not haphazard, and if variety is the keynote in their general composition and layout, as in their form, tone, and material, there is a

singleness of intention which unifies not only the individual books, but also the whole opus. In the prefatory letter to the first book, dedicated to Paolo Toscanelli, Alberti states his aim thus:

\[\text{ego vero his meis scriptis genus levandi morbos animi afferro, quod per risum atque hilaritatem suscipiatur, ac meis quidem omnibus Intercoenalibus id potissimum a me videri quaesitum cupio, ut qui legerit nos cum facetosuisse sentiant, cum sibi ad graves curas ani\text{m}i levandas argumenta apud nos non inepta inveniant.}\]

Fifteenth century testimony confirms the Intercoenales at least in their function as a moral work. Massaini, in his letter to Pucci, says of them quantum ad bene vivendum faciant, quantum saevientem in hominem fortunam nos ferre doceant, quantum nos re ipsa quam verbis philosophari moneant, nemo qui non legerit poterit arbitrari. Their appearance in manuscript attached to a printed copy of De Civitate Dei, as Garin says "Concorda stranamente con quell'affermazione". But for Alberti the dual purpose of instruction and amusement was clearly of great importance. As he says in the preface to book X:

\[\text{tempora cum iocosis scriptoribus non vacua, tum eadem posteri non invidieuisse plena sentiant.}\]

From the dedications of later books, especially IV, VII, and X, it becomes obvious that the Intercoenales had begun, at this stage, to assume something of a programmatic role for his critical theory.

17. 'Opera inedita', p.122.
He speaks with diffidence of *hoc nostro et inselmati dicendi generem* to Leonardo Aretino in the preface to book II, but when he addresses book IV to Poggio, turns defence into attack with a sharp rebuke to his critics in his fable of the ox and the goat. The ox disdains the goat's search for the rocky and grassless places, and warns her of the consequences of pursuing it, but the goat replies that what pleases one is not necessarily good for another: *Mihi autem non bubulus, sed capreus stomachus est.* It is the same in literature, *etque idem* (the oxen) *quod difficillimus istis et non illusmodi inventionibus delectemur, que succe vulgatorius eloquentie et bonis fortune sint refertiores, vituperant.* This neat allusion to his own departure from current literary tastes is amplified by a discussion on style in an attack on the internecine quarrels of contemporary humanists in the preface to book VII. The part which concerns us is the following:

In aliorumque scriptis pensitandis ita sumus plerique ad unum omnes fastidiosi, ut ea Ciceronis velimus eloquentie respondere, ac si superiori etate omnes qui approbati fuisse scriptores eosdem fuisse Cicerones statuunt. Inepti! Unum habuit rerum natura Ciceronem, in quo quicquid possit ad eloquentie gloriam et palmam coniecerit. Long before Erasmus' *Ciceronianus*, the faults of a theory of imitation and eloquence based purely on the works of one ancient author are neatly outlined by Alberti. *Pauci vim ingenii artisque modum et rationem in scriptore animadvertunt, he continues, but this is precisely what is required for the appreciation of works like his own. At enim varia res est eloquentia, ut ipse interdum sibi Cicero perdisimilis sit.*

22. Garin, *"Intercenali", p.140, l.13-14; 24-26.*
Two main points emerge from Alberti's own view of his \textit{Intercoenales}. The first is that, in XV century terms, they are connected in overall intention at least to the works of Lucian. We have seen how the humanists associated the coupling of humour with gravity as his trademark, often enough not to need further proof of this.\footnote{See Chapter II, and Chapter III, section IV.} The second is that in Alberti's literary theory, individuality, and presumably, the originality which it brings with it, outweighs the influences to which it has been subjected, and that each writer must therefore be judged on his own terms, and not according to an arbitrary model of eloquence such as Cicero. This does not necessarily mean, however, that it is \textit{a priori} impossible or even unlikely that Alberti could have had or could have wished to have, a single model in mind, say Lucian, when he wrote these works, only that the result would be Alberti and not Lucian, and must be judged as such. By the same token, the individual preoccupations of the author, as well as those of his own age, would affect not only his relationship to his model, but also the contemporary perception of this relationship.

This last point is well illustrated by the \textit{Virtus Dea}, which circulated, we have seen, as a work of Lucian, in the translation of Carolo Marsuppini. Presuming that Alberti was responsible for the pseudonym, this tells us something of his perception of Lucian. The fact that it was accepted by many as a genuine work of Lucian in the XV century, tells us, again, something of the view that such people held of Lucian's works. But it does not tell us how deeply Alberti knew his Greek model, unless, of course, we ourselves agree with the XV century judgement of the Albertian dialogue in relation to the
genuine works. Nonetheless, the true implication of Mancini's remark ("Senza aver letti e assaporati i dialoghi ed i sali lucianeschi, poteva mai scrivere in guisa da trarre in inganno gli eruditi?"), is that it was the identity between the views of Alberti and his educated public with respect to Lucian which conditioned both Alberti's approach to imitation, and the public acceptance of the imitation as genuine. This small piece, then, is not only the obvious place at which to start a discussion of Alberti's relationship to Lucian, but precisely because of these observations, it is also the best.

Alberti's imitation, in practice, as well as in theory, is never slavish. Professor Whitfield ('Momus', p.178) has neatly made the point that Virtus Dea could not have been taken for an original piece of Lucian had it been modelled directly on one of the dialogues. Equally, it could not have been taken for such had it not embodied qualities which were, to Quattrocento perception, essentially Lucianic. Our first task, then, is to relate the procedures illustrated by the dialogue to what we know of Quattrocento views of Lucian.

The prevalent moral assessment of Lucian indicates in this case only the general area in which this relationship is to be discovered. The tone and form of the Virtus Dea and the overall intentions of Alberti in the Intercolumnales direct us more precisely to the concept of serio-comic writing with which Lucian was also connected at this period. But when we look back at the information which we have on this aspect of his works, what exactly do we know? That Lucian was thought of as writing in this manner, that several works were said to yield up their secrets when interpreted with due deference to this

25. 'Vita', p.45.
criterion, that Poggio placed *Juppiter Confutatus* in this sphere, but was unsure of its meaning, and that Luca D'Antonio Bernardi ignored the comedy and satire of *Vitarum Auctio* in interpreting it as a catalogue of ancient philosophy. These are all valuable hints, but they do not of themselves furnish us with the details of the methodology by means of which Quattrocento readers fathomed the intentions of those works which they could not construe at face value, and knowledge of which will allow us to read once again the relation between Lucian and the imitations perceived by the Quattrocento. These must be inferred with the help of the *Virtus Dea*.

The dialogue begins with Mercurius explaining his appointment with Virtus, made by letter, and implying his haste to get back to Jupiter. Virtus arrives, and, given hope by his presence, thanks him profusely for ensuring that she has not remained completely disregarded by all the gods. Here Mercurius cuts her short, and reiterates his haste to get back to Jupiter. Virtus, upset by this peremptory attitude produces a complaint, asking where she is to seek help if not from Jupiter and Mercury, but at the end, Mercury only stresses his impatience even more, and Virtus finally begins her story. She first makes reference to her nakedness and dirtiness, and says that both were the fault of Fortuna, who insulted her with the appellation *plebeja* and demanded that she give way to greater gods, while she was involved in a discussion with some of her old associates, such as Plato, Socrates, Demosthenes, Cicero etc., in the Elysian fields. Upon Virtus' answer, repudiating the insults of Fortuna, this great goddess flew into a rage, and said a lot more in the same vein, and soon brought her own retainers into the fray to silence the disputations of Plato and Cicero. Virtus, deserted by her fellows, who were no match for this violent crew, and by all the gods who were there, was
battered, kicked, stripped and thrown into the mud. In this sorry state she went as soon as she could to see Jupiter, but waited a month without success, all the time hearing excuses from the other gods that they were busy seeing that the pumpkins bloomed in time and that the butterflies had beatifully painted wings. What then, Virtus continues, will they always have something else to do so that I can be kept out and disregarded? The pumpkins have bloomed, and the butterflies are flying around in a lovely condition, but I am not valued by gods or men. Her conclusion is a plea to Mercury to take up her cause, and to make sure that while she is shut out by the gods, she does not become also a laughing stock to men, which would in itself bring disgrace on the immortals. Mercury’s answer is complacent. He is sorry, but for their old friendship’s sake he ought to warn her that she has made a very powerful enemy in Fortuna, for to say nothing of the other gods, Jupiter himself knowing that he owes her a great debt on account of past good turns, is afraid of her. Fortuna made it possible for the gods to be where they are, and she can take away what she has once bestowed. So his final advice is for Virtus to lie low until Fortuna’s hatred has abated. Virtus ends the piece with the remark that this must be forever; she is shut out, naked and despised.

That the interlocutors in the dialogue are both gods points us immediately in the direction of Lucian’s comic universe for the basis of Alberti’s imitation here. But the significant fact is that of the two characters portrayed only Mercury is a fully fledged personage in Lucian, appearing in important roles in Charon, Cataplus, Vitarum Auctio and Timon to name only the works most accessible in the Quattrocento. Virtus, on the other hand, makes her only appearance as one of the followers of Philosophia in Piscator 16, and does not herself utter a single word. Two observations may be made here. The first is that
Alberti must be regarded as both shrewd and original in picking up this casual reference, and developing it into a new member of the immortal tribe. Shrewd, because the character was provided for in Lucian, original because the portrait was his own, and as such reflects in substance his own thoughts and convictions. The second is that moral personification was perceived by both Alberti and his audience as a major element in Lucian's writings. That this evaluation was not unfair from the Quattrocento viewpoint may be seen by the popularity of the Calumnia motif in De Calumnia 5, as well as in the appearance in the Timon of Plutus and Penia. Further indication of the use of personification by Lucian may be seen in the figures of Sculpture and Education (De Somnio), the lamp and bed testifying against the tyrant (Cataplus) and Philosophy, Truth, Justice, Virtue, Temperance and Culture (Piscator).

A second element in the composition of the Virtus Dea which owes its inspiration to Lucian is the role of Fortuna. Alberti has made her omnipotent, not only in the affairs of men, but also in those of the gods. This is revealed quite clearly by Mercury's unequivocal statement of Jupiter's fear of her power: Fortuna enim ad coelos diis ascensum praestitit, atque ubi velit, valens sua armatorum manu eosdem ipsos deos ejicet.26 Now in Lucian it is not Fortuna who holds this sway over the gods, but Fate. Allowing however for this adaptation to modern interests, the situation is clearly that which emerges after Jupiter's disputation with Cynicus in Juppiter Confutatus, and which is reiterated by him in Juppiter Tragoedus in answer to Poseidon's suggestion that Damis be removed by a thunderbolt, and Hercules' that

26. 'Opera Inedita', p.135.
the Stoa be brought down on his head (25 and 32). The gods are only underlings, and cannot interfere in the order of things.

Now, it is precisely this topsy-turveness which is at the heart of our attempts to read Lucian back into Virtus Dea. For in the dialogues cited the Greek author is at his most comic, and least moral, and any search for a true meaning is thwarted by the consistent irony of the whole facade. In Alberti the picture is quite different, for although he too portrays a topsy-turvy universe, it nevertheless invites interpretation. Virtus is valued least where she should be valued most; Fortuna has power even where her power should be limited; Mercury is peremptory where he should be helpful; Jupiter is no true god if he is fearful of Fortuna. The universe, that is, is presented satirically as it actually is, with all its flaws of judgement and wrong values.

The errors of the system are therefore clearly outlined, and the positive message is to discovered by a process of reversal. The implication, mutatis mutandis, is clear. Lucian's array of comic figures, gods, personifications, pseudo-philosophers etc, was also perceived as belonging to a universe which was at once a satirical mirror of reality, and by reversal a guide to the truth. It is easy to see how closely Alberti would seem to have come to reproducing the real spirit of Lucian to a Quattrocento reader armed with this method of interpretation.

But there are two further implications for Alberti's imitation of Lucian stemming from this approach. First, the consequence of presenting a satiric picture of the universe involving the gods and other well known figures is that there will be a continual conflict between what is expected and what is actually found. This type of irony is constant in Lucian because his characters are always being placed in situations which compromise some essential aspect of their nature.
The onus of spotting the irony is placed on the audience. Examples are the behaviour of the philosophers maligned in *Vitarum Auctio* when they get hold of Lucian in the *Piscator*, and the peril in which the gods are placed in *Juppiter Tragoedus* merely by the arguments of the Epicurean Damis. Since the mode of interpretation adopted by Alberti does not expunge the anarchy of Lucian, but merely perceives some intended order in it, this irony too passes naturally into his works with the acceptance of the Lucianic universe. So the fact that Virtus is found among the dead when Fortuna confronts her appears ironical to the reader who spots this as an allusion to her absence from the realm of men. Likewise Mercury's bland admission of Jupiter's subservience to Fortuna appears ironical to the reader who sees its implications for the power of the gods. There is only one change in the texture of the irony, namely the background of expectation against which it resounds. This is designed to accord with the culture of the contemporary audience. Lucian demanded of his audience for the understanding of his irony a substantial literary culture. Alberti demands the ability to supply moral paradigms and make moral inferences. This distinction, would not, of course, have been understood by the Lucianists of the Quattrocento, since they view his irony as morally based anyway. In this respect also, therefore, Alberti's *Virtus Dea* would have faithfully reproduced its model.

The second implication is that the formal characteristics of the Lucianic model will remain unaltered. One of the most important facets of the dialogues of Lucian is their dramatic self-sufficiency. Stage-directions, like changes of speaker, the entry of new characters, the description of the setting or other *personae*, are all embodied in the dialogue itself.27 This was not so in the Ciceronian dialogue, or

---

27. See Bellinger, pp. 3-40.
itsimitations. One example from Virtus Dea will serve to demonstrate Alberti's adherence to his Lucianic model:

Mercurius: Virtus dea per epistolas oravit modo ad se huc ut exirem.

Accedo ut perconter quidnam a me velit: illico ad Jovem redibo. 28

Virtus: Salve, Mercuri.

Mercury outlines his own movements, states his business, and gives us a preliminary idea of his peremptory attitude. Virtus' arrival is signalled by the greeting to Mercury, which incidentally, tells us who the first speaker was. This direct dramatic approach to dialogue, is typical of Lucian. An useful comparison for this passage is the beginning of Charon:

Hermes: τί γελάσας, ὡς Χάρων; ἢ τί ὁ πορεύμενον ἡπολιτῶν δεῦρο ἀνελήμφθας ἐσ τὴν ἡμετέραν ὡς πάνω εἰσελθὼς ἐπὶχωρίσθην τοῖς ἕνω περήμοσιν;

Charon: Ἐπεθύμησα, ἢ 'Ερμη .... 29

One final point of contact between the Virtus Dea and Lucian must briefly be mentioned. We have seen in our discussion of certain facets of Lucian's style (above, Chapter III, section III) his great penchant for the visual image. This emerges, as we have just noted, in the purely mechanical aspects of the dialogue. But is is also evident in the general concreteness of his writing. Lucian does not, as a rule, employ complex reasoning, he prefers the tangible, and this means that abstract ideas such as death, fate, riches and slander are always expressed with reference to some solid framework. Death, for instance, involves the very substantial trip on Charon's ferry, and riches are among those extremely tangible accoutrements which must be physically shed at the shores of the Styx. Whatever is being dealt with, there is always a

28. 'Opera Inedita', p.132.

29. Quotations are from Jacobitz's edition.

30. See Charon passim, and Dialogus Mortuorum X.
train of events to which it can be referred, whether it be set in a real-life context, as in De Calumnia, or in fantasy, as in Charon.

Indeed, it is in the construction of tangible sequences from moralistic and literary sources alike that the basis of his fantasy is to be found. In imitating Lucian, Alberti clearly recognised the concreteness of his structures, but, because of the mode of interpretation which he adopted, related them constantly to moral aims, and so did not indulge in the pure comic fantasy which characterises many of Lucian's works.

Thus in the Virtus Dea the concrete sequence of events which leads to the disparagement of Virtus is directly related not only to Lucian's own style, but also, in Alberti's mind, to his intentions. For Alberti regarded Lucian's comic universe as a sort of moral mythology, which he himself developed as he wished, but most certainly did not invent.

The Virtus Dea is a touchstone not only for the serio-comic interpretation of Lucian by Alberti and the Quattrocento generally, but also for the imitation of the Greek author in the rest of the Intercoenales. For it teaches us what to expect and what not to expect in the relation between the two authors. Primarily, then, we should be prepared to encounter Lucanian schemata (usually in dialogue form), concreteness of style (often expressed by personification), and irony of expectation against what is actually stated. What we shall not meet is direct and obvious plagiarism. This means, of course, that wherever ideas or schemata are picked up from Lucian, they are always developed so imaginatively that the original source is often obscured, and often seems a weak parallel when offered. In what follows, therefore, it has seemed best rather than give an extensive résumé of every passage connected to Lucian in the Intercoenales to expound the main points with the help of a few specific illustrations.
The procedures of the Virtus Dea are reproduced almost exactly in three other dialogues of the Gods. The Patientia (book I), Discordia and Suspitio (book III) all present incidents among the gods of the absurd universe directly comparable with those outlined by Virtus. In Patientia the characters are both personifications (Patientia and her mother Necessitas), and through their discussion we learn that Patientia has almost as few adherents as Virtus, and why industry and hard work are often replaced by flattery and hope. As in Virtus Dea, so here the events provide a keen irony for anyone who can read in the moral background. In the following example, for instance, the audience is required to know the reputation of princes.

Patientia: At quos me ais expectare principes, mater?
Necessitas: Te quidem hi principes praestolantur, filia, qui in lubrico constituti contra perflantem austrum audaces repetant: nam impetu et appulsu turbinis prostrati obdurescerent.

Patientia: Eos ego, mater non satis novi, quonam terrarum loco sedeant.
Necessitas: De istoc in tempore consulemus; sed reges fortassis decet pretiosius curari. Itaque potius emplastro spei eos pulchre illinefus ...'

The formal qualities which along with irony and concreteness of structure we attributed to the imitation of Lucian in Virtus Dea are also in evidence here. After Patientia's soliloquy upon the cares of men, her mother is introduced onto the scene with the words which describe both her location and her intentions: 'Quod ni meam istic inter has ipsas abruptas rupes, ubi meridiare solita est, natam reperierim ...' The absence of names which indicate within the dialogue itself who the

31. 'Opera inedita', p.146-7.
32. ibid. p.144.
interlocutors are from the outset is a divergence from Lucian and

**Virtus Dea** found also in *Suspetio* (though not in *Discordia*) which may be attributable to less close observance of known Lucianic procedures in works no longer overtly claiming to originals. In all other respects, however, the **Patientia** and the other two **Dialogi Deorum** of the **Intercoenales** fit precisely into the pattern of imitation of the **Virtus Dea**.

In several other dialogues, the Gods appear in conjunction with men, or rather with satirical character-types on the model of **Dialogus Mortuorum X** or **Timon**. This basic scheme, which is used in **Oraculum** (book II), **Corolle** and **Cynicus** (book IV), is broadly reminiscent of **Vitarum Auctio** and **Piscator**. As usual, however, there is no obvious single model to be found, and the similarities between the two authors are in the realm of technique. In **Corolle** various thematic figures, **Rhetor**, **Poeta**, **Dives**, are all shown in the presence of **Laus**, competing for her favours, which are denied them by the constant intervention of **Invidia**. The only one to succeed in obtaining a crown even though of nettles and briars, is the **Obtrectator**. This figure, who pours scorn on the shortcomings of others, is close in type to **Lucian's cynics**, **Menippus** and **Diogenes**. But the manner of his own exposure at the hands of **Invidia** is specifically reminiscent of the Lucianic technique of putting into the mouths of the actors brazen and straight-faced confessions of what others will consider deplorable, but seems commonplace and acceptable to the speaker. Thus when **Invidia** says of **Obtrectator**:

> Mihin isthmuc parum cognitum reris, qui quidem ex me genius sit et apud me educatus, ut omnes quas ipsa novi artes egregie didicerit atque ad unguem tenet: detrahere omnibus, facta dictaque improbare omnium, inque trivis bonis atque pravis, doctis atque indoctis, succenseri, vera falsaque promiscue ad ignominiam.
decantare; hec enim omnia egregie et perquam belle novit, me magistra et instructrice. 33

she is, in effect, setting herself in a position which will be ironic to the reader who is aware of the requirement to see her as a morally reprehensible character. The use of this unwitting self-irony may be exemplified from Lucian by the passage in Vitarum Auctio 10 where Diogenes, diligently explaining his art, and quite unconcerned by the fact that his audience will see in his words the opposite to the accepted moral norm, says: Ἰταμὼν χεὶ ἕινι καὶ ΘρΣεὶ τι καὶ λοιδορείσθαι πάσιν ἐς ὑσς ... αἴδως δέ καὶ ἐπιείκειά καὶ μετριότης ἀπεστώ, καὶ τὸ ἐφεδρίαν ἀποξεσον τοῦ προσώπου παντέλως.

This type of self-exposure may be seen in Corolle also in the attempts of Poeta and Rhetor to gain a crown. The poet produces an unmetrical Vergilian cento, while the orator leaves the company (and himself) breathless in one indescribably long sentence in which he employs all the clichés in his rhetorical stock. Parallels in Lucian for the use of poetic or rhetorical inability to satirise characters, which may have furnished Alberti with material on which to work, are to be found at Juppiter Tragedeus 6 and 15. In the first, Hermes calls together the gods with Homeric verses, which he cannot quite manage. In the second, Zeus, worried by the prospect of facing the gods in council, forgets his own prologue, and has to borrow one from Demosthenes.

Another satiric technique employed by Lucian is that of seeing society completely in pejorative terms. This may be illustrated by the answer of Philonides to Menippus' request for an account of what has been happening on earth during his absence (Necyomanteia 7): Καίνων οἴδεν, οἶδ καὶ πρό τοῦ ἄρπαζοςιν, ἐπισκοπεῖ, τοκούλυφοςιν, ὀβολοστατοῦσιν.

All human activity is characterised in terms of greed and deceit, and this is precisely Invidia’s way in Corolle. At the end of the dialogue she quickly disabuses Laus of her positive attitude:

Invidia: Abeamus virgo, nam hoc toto in foro reperies neminem corona dignum.

Laus: Eccum iurisconsultos et physicos et sacrarum litterarum studiosos.

Invidia: Nihil est quod illi minus quam tuas coronas pensint. Aurum est, o virgo, atque ambitio, quod appetant. 34

Even those who might be thought least susceptible to the temptations of worldly goods, then, are tarred with the brush of avarice.

In Cynicus the third piece in the book, such techniques may be seen in use once more. Here Mercury brings to Phoebus all the recently deceased souls who are to be returned to the world in new, and more appropriate forms. They include Sacerdotes, Philosophi, Poete, Rhetores, Sophiste and Mercatores. The choice of forms is effected with the help of Cynicus, who freely offers his abrasive tongue to expose these various sects. The main character, Cynicus, is a cynic figure who uses exclusive condemnation of the kind discussed above. One example may be given to continue the illustration. Here Cynicus refutes the claim of the Sacerdotes to have been pious and holy:

nam improntissimi cum sint, et omni turpitudinis nota sedissimi, id simulando agunt, ut viri esse boni videantur. 35

One may compare Lucian’s concern with the similar behaviour of the false philosophers at Piscator 31: ὅπωςα γαντι μημείδαι δέβιον εὖ μάλα εἰκότας ἁγιὰς ἁνδράς ... ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῶν πεθαμάτων ἄντι- φθειγγομένους τῷ σχήματι.

34. Garin 'Intercenali', p.150, l.192-196.
Incidentally, the model for Cynicus' freely offered service is perhaps to be found in Catapclus 4 and 25, where Cynicus first helps catch the runaway tyrant Megapenthes, and then offers himself first for examination in Rhadamantus' court in order to accuse him with more credibility.

A further relation to Lucian may be seen in the appearance of the author himself in several dialogues, under an assumed name. As in the Greek author, the name changes to suit the occasion, and as Lucian was merely the Syrian in Bis Accusatus, but Parrhesiades in Piscator, so Alberti interchanges between Lepidus (his pseudonym for the composition of the Philodoxus), and Philoponus. The contemporary justification for the view that Lucian appeared in different guises in his own works may be given in references to Poggio and Perleus. The first said of Juppiter Confutatus that vir ille doctissimus.....cum ipso Iove ludere videtur, implying that Cyniscus was merely a cover for the author, and the latter warned Seraphius Urbinas that in the Piscator pro luciano eundem iurii nomen sibi commutasse. As Lepidus in the pieces Scriptor and Religio, (book I) Alberti is the butt of his own satire. But in Corolle and Anuli (in the first as Lepidus, and in the second as Philoponus) the picture is more gloomy. Lucian is always playful when he appears in his own writings, but Alberti cannot help allowing some of his personal pessimism to creep in when he talks of his own life and circumstances.

In the Lepidus/Libripeta dialogues of book IV, the role of Lepidus becomes akin to that of the interlocutor of the Menippus dialogues. And indeed in this human realm there is more specific indication of a debt

to just this source. In the Somnium Lepidus meets Libripeta, covered with filth, having just emerged via a sewer from a visit to the land of dreams, and questions him about the journey, and his reasons for going. Libripeta, amid scornful interjections from Lepidus, describes the things he saw, interesting allegories of power and love, and the way he sailed out again on a novel kind of boat, spent some time in a field of hair, and was driven to exit through the sewer by a horde of fleas. The main outline is reminiscent of the Necyomanteia, where Menippus goes to Hades to ask Teiresias which is the best life, after failing to get a satisfactory answer from the philosophers. He employs a μδαγος to show him the way, and after a great deal of ceremonial and magical purification, he eventually arrives. A glance at the corresponding part of Alberti will serve to demonstrate both the similarities and divergences between the two. Libripeta speaks:

Mihi quidem intuenti hoc diluvium stultorum hominum, quo hec etas exuberat, admodum stomachato incidit in mentem moribus meis ad vitam degendam sum esse aptissimum locum, ubi se ne sonniunt recipiunt. Nam illic tuto, ut inter somniandum vides, licet pro arbitrio delirare. Eam ob rem conveni sacerdotem quendam, magicis artibus plane eruditum, a quo summis precibus tandem brevissimum illud iter didici, ad eas ipsas provincias proficiscendi, ad quas pervolant somniantes. Illico me illuc properans contuli.  

It will be recognised that Alberti is more concise than Lucian. The description of the reasons for the journey and the preparations for it here occupy only a few lines, whereas in Lucian they take up some ten chapters. But the main motif of someone despising the world and leaving for a fantasy destination is clearly related to Lucian's dialogue.

It is worth adding that besides this general schematic convergence, there is a particular one in the difficulty of persuading the magician to yield his secrets. Compare Lucian, 6, δενθεὶς δὲ καὶ καθικετεύσας, μόνις ἐπέτυχον παρ' αὐτοῦ... καθηγήσασθαι μοι τῆς ὀδοῦ.

There are two further similarities in the composition of the two works. The first is the degrading and uncomfortable exit from their journey of both Menippus and Libripeta. Menippus has to climb into the temple of Trophonius while for Libripeta fata hanc nobis clocam prehœre.

The second concerns the satirical manner in which the fantasy traveller is presented. Menippus is seen quoting tragedy and dressed in the trappings of Odysseus, Orpheus, and Hercules, while Libripeta is filthy and covered with mud. The tone of Lepidus' interjections, however, is closer to that of the interlocutor in Icaromenippus, or to that of the Lycinus of Nevis seu Vota, than to the Philonides of Necyomanteia. But it does lend an irony to the character of Libripeta, which is very similar to that which surrounds Menippus.

Two other Lucianic passages may be cited as parallels for Somnium, both from Veræ Historiae. The first is a general source possibility, the visit to the kingdom of sleep in II, 33-34. The second, more specific, concerns the method of Libripeta's crossing of the river,

Namque adsunt ad transportandos homines damnate quedam vetule. Ridebis, si tranandi modum dixero ... Stant quidem illuc ad litus vetule ille resupinae nude. Tu genua in ipsis convallibus hilium inligis, manibus vero earum aures adprehendis, atque quo velis traicere substrate vetule caput pro clavo dirigis.39

The Lucianic passage, *Verae Historiae II*, 45, is similar enough to have suggested the idea, and divergent enough to demonstrate clearly the imaginative originality of Alberti.

The text is quoted for comparisons: μετ’ ὀλίγον δὲ καὶ ἄνδρας εἰδομεν καὶ νυτίλις Χεωμένους ἀντί ήμεν καὶ ναόται καὶ νησίς ἡμῶν λέον δὲ τοῦ πλοῦ τοῦ τρόπου. ἡπτιοί κείμενοι ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑβάτου ὁρθώντες τὰ κηδοί - μεγάλα δὲ Φέρουσιν - ἐξ ἄγων ὕδωντο πετάσκοτες καὶ τᾶς Χερσί τοῦς ποδεῶν κατέκουτες ἐμπίπτουσι τοῦ ἱνέμου ἐπλεον.

The longest dialogue of the *Intercensales* makes use of another Lucianic schema. *Defunctus*, which perhaps comprised book VI, is a Dialogue of the Dead. In general outline it is an account by the newly-dead Neophronus to his old friend Polytropus, when he meets on his entrance to Erebus, of the revelations brought him by the observation of his wife and children, and other of his worldly acquaintance on the day after he died. The hypocrisy of his wife, weeping in public, making love with the bailiff in private, the curses of his eldest son, the greed of his relatives and their destruction of his annales, and the quirk of fortune which led his worst enemy to his secret hoard, all bring Neophronus to revile life and its follies, though Polytropus' opinion is that man's own stupidity lets him in for all of this, and that if people took note of their own capacity for virtue they could avoid the ills of the flesh, tempering fortune with prudence. The scene closes with the pair going off to see the punishments meted out to the principes.

The individual passages are not nearly as grave as this sketch suggests. As in Lucian's underworld pieces, laughter is a modifier which, whether in Polytropus' or Neophronus' mouth, takes attention away from the potential gloominess of the setting and the anecdotes related to it. Neophronus, for example, seeing his wife's secret intercourse with the bailiff, and her feigned tears afterwards among
the other women etsi exam ob villicum nonnihil admodum indignatus, nequivi tamen risum continere, and this ability to make merry with disaster is easily paralleled by a passage from Charon, where Hermes has just described to the ferryman the mechanics of fate and her threads, whereupon Charon interjects, 16, παρθέλων ταῦτα, ἢ Ἐρμή, and Hermes agrees, 17, καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐπείν ἔχοις ὡς κατὰ τὴν ὑβίαν, ὡς ἑστὶ καταφελάσσα, ὃ Χάλεων.

There is a similarity, too, between much of the satire. The behaviour of Neophronus' wife is reminiscent of that of Megapenthes' concubine in Cataplus 12, who is however somewhat more vicious in her choice of place. She uses the room where the tyrant is laid out, and thus pays him back for his own vileness. She is closer, perhaps, in her reaction to the presence of others, for, ἐπεὶ Ψόφου προσιόντων τινών ἡσέτο, σιέλω Χείσασα τοὺς οὐραλμοὺς ὡς δακέουσαι ἐπ' ἐμοι, κυκύουσα καὶ τοῦνομα ἐπικελομενὴ ἀμηλάττετο.

The speech made by Neophronus' son, on the other hand, brings to mind the fond father of De Luctu, paradoxically, for there the extravagance of speech is one of sorrow in death, and here joy. Nevertheless, the parallel is striking: Lucian's father: τέκνον ἡδίστον, δίκη μοι καὶ τέφυκας καὶ πρὸ ἔρεις ἀνηρεπάσθης μίνον ἐμὲ τῶν ἐθλίων καταλιπών... οὐ κυκάς πάλιν οὔδε έρεσθήσῃ, τέκνον, οὔδε ἐν συμποσίοισ μετὰ τῶν ἡλικιώτων μεθυσθήσῃ.

Neophronus' son: Abiisti jam neque amplius aderis, severe; jam aberis, indignissime decrepito; jam quidem meis voluptatibus non adversaberis, maligne, qui neque apud socios coenare, neque dormire apud amicos, neque amare aut potare, neque ullam pro mea libidine rem agere patiebaris. 41

40. 'Opera Inedita', p.186.
41. 'Opera inedita', p.190.
The Albertian passage looks almost like an answer to Lucian.

More generally, the idea of this observer, of life, invisible to the people acting out their foolish and despicable scenes, could easily have been suggested to an original and creative intellect like Alberti's from a number of passages and even whole dialogues of Lucian. The end of the *Gallus* is one possibility, where Micyllus is led magically into the houses of the rich, to see their misfortunes at close quarters, and the quoted passage from *Cataplus* another. Even *Charon*, although itself a dialogue of the gods, might have inspired this idea.

Nevertheless, despite its use of Lucian's structure, the proximity of the satire, irony and humour to his, and the similarity in the tangibility of presentation, the *Defunctus* stands apart from the source of its inspiration as do all the *Intercoenaes*. For Alberti's imagination and the vision he has of his mad universe transcend the bounds of mere imitation, and even given that his view of Lucian's moral purposes must be for us a constant background in our view of Alberti's relation to the Greek author, we must admit that his scope is enormously greater. The *Defunctus* gives us a glimpse of what we shall see in the case of *Momus* amplified tenfold. The adoption of Lucian's techniques and forms combined with the vast broadening of scope which we see in the two aforementioned works entitles us to speak rather of recreation than of imitation.

The first *Intercoenaes* of book III allows us a final glimpse of Alberti using Lucianic methods to paint in further additions to the moral mythology which he felt he had inherited from the Syrian. *Picture*, is a description of pictures in a temple of the gymnosophists, which has two walls with ten women portrayed on each. On the left are *Invidia mater*, with her child *Calumnia*, then in turn *Calumnia's child Indigmatio*,
Indignatio's Inimicitia, and Inimicitia's Miseria, and Ambitio mater, with Contentio, Iniuria, Vindicta, and Calamitas, in similar sequence. On the right are Modestia, mater, Securitas animi, Cura virtutis, Leus, and Immortalitas, and Humanitas mater, Beneficentia, Benivolentia, Pax, and Felicitas.

There is an obvious connection between the conception of this work and Lucian's De Calumnia 5, yet Alberti has followed his own requirements in portraying the figures of Invidia, Calumnia, and Miseria which appear there. Compare Lucian's Calumnia, for example: ίναντον ἐς ὀπτομον ὑπὸ θεομον ἐκ και πιεδεκινημόνυν, ὅτι τὴν λύταν καὶ τὴν άριην δεικνύουσα, τῇ μὲν ἤρετεξ δεδε καιμώνῃ ἔκων with the shrivelled specimen of Alberti facie vehementer macra, aspectu vafra, et quemadmodum versutiloqua videatur, rete contecta. Ea quidem flat ore flammas, manu altera flores ostentans, altera tribulos disseminans.42

If the pictorial allegory connects this piece with De Calumnia, the actual idea of the series of paintings in a temple perhaps stems from De Domo, 22-32, where Lucian interrupts himself while talking of the magnificent hall in which he is speaking to introduce another λόγος, who proceeds to complete the encomium by describing the pictures which adorn its walls. But the important thing to notice about this passage in comparison with the De Calumnia is the lack of allegory. The works of art are described purely as paintings. If Alberti had both passages in mind while he was writing this Intercoenalis, however, it is probable that his moral perception of Lucian led him to see in the pictures of De Domo a similar format to that of De Calumnia. One thing anyway is clear, that the ecphrasis of Picture, if its visual impact is

42. Garin 'Intercoenali', p.129-130, 1.35-37.
important, is nevertheless tied firmly to the model of De Calumnia. The allegory and its meaning take first place, since the work is fundamentally one more contribution to that understanding of the moral predicament of man and its causation which the opus as a whole fosters.

There are many more points in the Intercoenales where Lucian comes to mind. But it is almost always in a general way. One asks oneself the question, "Who else writes like this?", rather than thinking categorically, "The source for this is Lucian". And indeed Lucian is not the only author who comes to mind when one reads the opus. Aesop and, of course, Cicero, to mention but two, have had a clear effect on the composition of several works. Just as in the works of Lucian, there is cross-fertilisation of techniques, and there are a number of dialogues which combine Ciceronian arguments with the presentational methods of Lucian, as there are Aesopian Apolocy which reflect Lucianic satire and humour. But overall one may say, it is Lucian who has, via the Quattrocento interpretation of his comic universe as a moral entity, informed and inspired, in form and in tone, the composition of the Intercoenales. Looking back to the example of Virtus Dea we may see that the result of a comparison between the ancient and the modern author is a set of similarities and distinctions which serve to commend Alberti's skill as an imaginative and creative author, and to verify, even in the context of what he probably saw as a profound debt to Lucian, his great originality.

43. See for instance Erumna in book IV, for the first, Numma in book II for the second.
III Musca

The exact date of the Musca is not known, but Cecil Grayson, editor of the most recent text, puts it between the end of 1441 or beginning of 1442 and March 1443, at Florence. His criteria for the terminus post quem are these. First, the letter of Guarino dedicating his translation of Muscae Laudes to Scipio Mainente, ascribed rather uncertainly by Sabbadini to October 1440, which gives, however, no indication of any kind to fix it in relation to the dedication to Alberti. Second, the fact that Alberti only met Christophoro Landino, who mentions this work, along with Canis and Passer, in his poem Xandra, and who was its dedicatee, at the Certame Coronario of 1441. Third, echoes of the work Tranquillità dell'Animo, composed about this time, in Musca, and a partial correspondence between the classical references in the two works, as well as in three other works, Canis, Teogenio, and the fourth book, Della Famiglia, from about the same time. Of the criteria for a terminus ante quem, one, at least, is secure, the mention in Landino's Xandra, which is dated by A. Perosa to March, 1444. Grayson adds that the mention of Marco Parenti in Alberti's prefatory letter may indicate that he was still in Florence when he composed it. This would bring the date back to before 7th March, 1443.

It is unfortunate, that Guarino's letter accompanying his translation of Lucian's Muscae Laudes has not survived. Had it done so, it might have given even more positive evidence than we have already of Alberti's delectation for the Greek satirist's works. As it is, we have only the bare indication that

ad nos littere Guarini allate sunt et cum his Musca Luciani, quam meo nomini latinam effecerat,

44. Grayson, 'Opuscoli in editi' pp. 18-21.

45. Perosa, p.15. Book I, xiii, verse 34.
and the story of how his extempore composition helped rid him of a fever. But this is enough to show two things. First, that Alberti's *Musca* was inspired by the reading of Lucian's. Secondly, that the title in Guarino's letter was not *Muscae Laudes*, as in that to Mainente, but *Musca*. As Alberti meant the two works to stand side by side, and his to be "a rival, not a copy", he assumed the identical title. Nevertheless, there is a difference in Alberti's own perception between the relation of *Musca* to Lucian, and that of *Virtus Dea*. The preface of *Musca* invites comparison, the publication of *Virtus Dea* (as seems likely) by Alberti under the pseudonym Lucian, identification, with the ancient writer.

Alberti, as might be expected in such a restricted subject, uses much of Lucian's basic material, and with it some of his stylistic techniques. The fly is allowed no failings: even his most annoying features are turned into praiseworthy qualities. For example, in Lucian her buzz is as superior to that of wasps and bees ὁσον σάλπιγγος καὶ κυμβαλλων ἱλιοὶ μελιχρότεοι (2), and Alberti goes so far as to assert (p.56) that the Pythagorici a musca musicam munuspaevere, taking the different notes of the scale from the sounds made in different circumstances. Her constant attendance at any table where food is laid out makes her for Lucian (4) σύντεροφος ... ἄνθρωποι .... καὶ δρομίδατος καὶ ὁμοτεδερεύως, while Alberti protests that it is a sign of her godliness (p.53): an uspiam fuere dapes diis exposite, an factum unquam sacrificium, cui non quod licuerit musca interfuerit? In Lucian even the great bard testifies to her Ἄρεστος and ἄνδρεια, while for Alberti none of the ancient reports of prowess, ingenuity, or virtue

46. Grayson, 'Opuscoli inediti', p.45. All page refs. are to his text.
can be found which is not overshadowed by, or which does not stem from the example of, the fly.

But here, we have come to a basic divergence between the status enjoyed by the insect in each work. In Lucian the fly is presented, according to the rules of a genre whose object is to praise things unworthy of or too insignificant for praise, and so to provoke laughter. Apart from the final comment, the author allows the ambivalence of the material to speak for itself. There is no satire of "le ciarle dei retori e i magnificatori delle inezie", for the composition is itself a rhetorical tour de force, whose ironies are directed inwards upon itself, rather than outwards upon the system. In Alberti, it is entirely the opposite. Like the spider in his Aranea (Intercoenales X) the fly is a paragon of virtue. Instead of approximating to human qualities, she exceeds them, far enough, in fact, for the author to say (p. 52) mitem, pacatam, equabilemque vitam ipsi homines ut ducerent persimilem muscis! The whole scheme of the work is tied up inextricably from the start, as one would expect from the author of the Intercoenales, with a moral intention. Witness Alberti's words (46-47) in the introduction: Ac meo quidem iudicio, erimus apud cupidos litterarum non omnino aspernandi, quandoquidem nos qui leguerint saepe intelligent esse compertum natura, ut voluerit bonas vivendi artes passim a quovis infimo animante medium inter hominum usum exstare.

Nevertheless, this moral structure does not prevent the intrusion of humour. Examples are the tongue-in-cheek ending: Uterer epilogo et

48. Mancini, 'Vita', p. 258. Bompaire, p. 283 "Dans un paradoxe ... Lucien ne cherche pas à faire rire aux dépens d'un auteur ou d'un genre; il accepte pleinement ce genre dont l'objet même est de faire sourire ... Par conséquent il n'y a aucune intention polémique dans l'Eloge de la mouche."
in eo presertim grandi vaguer commiseratione, nam amplificazionee pro rerum magnitudine non liceret, sed ingens muscarum copia suorum meritorum conscriptori congratulatum confluens id ne exequar crebris osculis interpellant, and the equally sly remark on the religiosity of the fly quoted above.

Alberti, we see from these illustrations, directs and fashions his material but, unlike Lucian, he is seen to do so, and this constitutes the vital, but surprising difference between the two works. Vital because, we have seen, Lucian seeks no effects beyond the bounds of his genre, while Alberti exploits every last opportunity, both for moral instruction, for amusement, and for irony, which the ambivalence of his subject presents. Surprising, because it is unusual for Lucian not to write this style of authorial insinuation in his narrative work, not to exploit at least the humorous and ironic side of his material to the full, by the constant intrusion of the modifications and evaluations which are patently lacking in his Musca, but are so clearly present in Alberti's.

Alberti, then, we may conclude, took the unstructured and undirected description of the fly which constitutes Lucian's work, remodelled it to conform to his own moral intentions, and managed nevertheless, in addition, by the skilful use of a visible authorial control close to that of Lucian in works like De Sacrificiis, to exploit to the full the comic contrast between the material as employed by him, and the reality from which it was borrowed. His ingenuity here, as in the Intercœnales, is in the adaptation of the methods and materials of others to serve a literary end which is totally original, and wholly his own. It is clearly something more than either "una parafrasi" or "un' esornazione", looking back, as it does, to the Intercœnales for its irony, humour and fantasy, for its moral content, and its effective balance between these ingredients.

49. Mancini, 'Vita', p.258.
IV Momus

There is very little evidence from which to date the Momus, though it clearly belongs in the development of his Latin works after the Intercoenales, and probably after the Musca too. Mancini thought that it was composed some time after 1447, the date of Eugenius IV's death. But this merely suited his own interpretation of the work as an historical allegory whose central figure, Jupiter, was meant to represent Eugenius, and need not be taken as fact. Professor Whitfield mentions a date somewhere in the 1440's, though he does not specify exactly when. The text exists in one manuscript, and in two separate editions from the year 1520, both fraught with inaccuracies.

The work itself takes the narrative form, and consists of four fairly long books, plus a general prologue to the whole. It tells the story of how Momus, the most perverse and singular of all the immortals, brought the whole universe and the gods into extreme peril by his unique mixture of cunning, hatred, and irresponsibility; how his actions were aided and abetted by the complete ineptitude of the princeps, Jupiter, and of the eventual solution of all the problems by his acceptance of the judicious opinions collected during his earthly experience by the arch-conspirator himself.

The setting, it is clear from this brief outline, is that of the pagan universe, governed by the Olympian gods, including a number of Alberti's own invention from the Intercoenales, and peopled otherwise by a motley collection of philosophers, actors, and figures from

50. Mancini 'Vita', p.260.

51. Whitfield, 'Momus', p.178. Modern edition, which gives information on ms. and texts (Mazzochi, and Guilleret edd.); Martini. Page refs. are to this text.
ancient history and literature presented together with no regard to normal rules of place or chronology. It is, in short, a vast and intricate fantasy engineered by Alberti through the combination of invention with imitation, with the express purpose of amusing, and at the same time, instructing the reader.

This aim is clearly set out in the prologue, pp. 3-7, whose argument may be summarized as follows. "It was my intention to write something original, for I had observed that in nature, those things were closest to divinity which were unique. But as the saying goes (p.4) nil dictum quin prius dictum, and since one cannot hope to be entirely novel in what one says, one must endeavour to find new ways of saying the old things. Itaque sic deputo, nam si dabitur quispiam olim, qui cum legentes ad frugem vitae melioris instruct atque institut dictorum gravitate rerumque dignitate varia et elegantia, idemque una risu illectet, iocis delectet, voluptate detineat, quod apud Latinos qui adhuc fecerint, nondum satis extiterea hunc profecto inter plebeios minime censendum esse. (p.5)

But in the pursuit of this style there are many more difficulties than imagined by the inexperti. For there are those who, while they attempt to be original, propagate commonplaces, but do so after adopting a mask of severity, so that they are judged extremely praiseworthy. Nos contra elaboravimus ut qui nos legant, rideant, aliaque ex parte sentiant se versari in rerum pervestigatione atque explicatione utili et minime aspernanda. (p.5)

Some excuse, meanwhile, is called for in relation to the introduction of the gods into my history. Nam veteres quidem scriptores ita philosophari solitos animadverti, ut deorum nominibus eas animi vires intelligi voluerunt, quibus in hanc,
When I began, therefore, to write about the princeps qui veluti mens et animus universum reipublicae corpus moderatur I took up the gods, quibus et cupidos et iracundos et voluptuosos, leves suspitososque, contra item graves, maturos, constantes, agentes, solertes, studiosos ac frugi notarem, quasi per ironiam.

There is much to help disclose the mores of the courtier here, though I have omitted to compromise myself by presenting the figure of the flatterer, as I omit flattery of my dedicatee, whose virtues are well enough known. I hope you will find it fulfils its purpose, and that you laugh at it as often as you laugh at other stuff of its kind.

The first point to notice here is the continuity of purpose between the Momus, and the Intercoenales and Musca. The second is the virtual announcement of his model as a non-Latin writer who was famed for his combination of gravity, dignity, variety and elegance with laughter, joking and pleasure. The description is a good deal more detailed and more deliberate than that of those of the Intercoenales' prefaces which seem to indicate the existence of a model, and no one who is familiar with the material outlined above in Chapter II and III will fail for a moment to recognize it as a typical XV century interpretation of Lucian. Alberti implies, it seems, that the final solution to the difficulty he had clearly encountered in finding a way successfully to combine humour with moral instruction, had lain in a close imitation of the Greek author.

This solution had, of course, already been arrived at in the Intercoenales. But there Alberti left his reader to infer the model to whom he refers almost openly here. In addition, he had declined to
reveal the method by which he had achieved his goal, whereas here he gives some valuable indications. He had, he informs us, noted the manner in which the ancient poets used the names of the gods to indicate the passions which drive the human mind. It was in imitation of them that when he turned to write of the prince, he used the gods, quasi per ironiam, to indicate virtue and vice.

It will immediately be clear, first of all, that the ironia which Alberti specifies as a mode of interpretation is the same in essence as that reversal which we have inferred was required for the understanding of those of the Intercoenales which employed the absurd universe of Lucian. In fact this ironia conforms with the definition given by Quintilian for the schema: 52 "an entire speech or case presented in language and a tone of voice which conflict with the true situation". It is, as some of the ancient rhetoricians themselves noted, a type of allegoria, yet it is much more flexible than true allegory, because it requires the reader himself to make the hidden meaning plain, and leaves the writer free, within the limits of the context which he has established, to concentrate on other objectives without continual reference to his true intention. Just how flexible Alberti saw this ironia to be is demonstrable from the only use of the word in the body of the work itself, in a passage which may well have been inserted for just such a purpose. In book II, Momus, returned from exile, and in high favour with Jupiter, for his amusing accounts of his life on earth, is invited to Hercules' inaugural feast to liven things up but, to everyone's surprise, when asked to retell the episode of his chewed-off beard, he gives a version which is both solemn, and adverse to the philosophers with whom he was in altercation, who are accused of atheism and despite of the gods. All this is plain enough,

52. Instit. Orat, IX, ii, 44-53. See Knox, p.5.
it seems, but Hercules thinks otherwise, and enquires of Momus what his real purpose was (p.91) utrum philosophos atque eruditos ad invidiam trahere, an deos lacessere dictis et ironia? Refusing to accept that he could really be trying to displace the gods' one true prop, he eventually discloses Momus' part in his deification, and concludes that his real end was to draw the gods towards a feeling of benevolence, not anger, towards men. Of course, this was not Momus' purpose at all, and yet, even if there is, in this confusion of aims, more than a modicum of another type of irony, the idea behind ironia is illustrated well enough. The face-value of the statement is denied, and its real meaning is discovered by a process of reversal.

Our study of the Intercoenales allows us to make a further observation with regard to ironia. The composition of Virtus Dea as a Lucianic work led to the inference that the reversal by which the true meaning of the piece was to be discovered was directly imitated from Lucian. The fact that in explaining ironia and excusing his procedures in the Momus he refers specifically to the gods as figures representative, by reversal, of the vices and virtues, together with the virtual avowal of his source of inspiration seems to lead fairly clearly to the conclusion that our earlier diagnosis was correct, and that Alberti viewed the god-satire of Lucian as positive moralism, subject to the mode of interpretation outlined here. Alberti, in other words, has incidentally given us, while explaining his own aims and excusing his own methods, an account of what he saw as those of Lucian in the same context. This could mean,

conceivably, that he saw the *Juppiter Tragoedus*, one of his chief sources of inspiration, *quasi per ironiam*, as itself a satire of the princeps, and that it was, therefore, the source not only for the characters of Jupiter and Momus, but for the conception of the work as a whole.

To pursue such conjecture is, however, unnecessary, for the reader has not far to go before obtaining the first positive sign of the employment of Lucian. In the very first line of book I Alberti says (p.11):

*Mirabar si quando apud nos humiles mortales in vita degenda pugnantem aliquam et inconstantem rationum judiciorumque vigere opinionem intelligebam ••• sed cum superos ipsos maximos ••• caepi animo accuratius repetere, destiti hominum ineptias admirari •••*

Right from the beginning we are introduced into an absurd universe, which the statement of those two major satiric themes from *Icaromenippus* tells us, is going to be modelled, in its comic standpoint at least, on that of Lucian, in whose treatment of the gods particularly the ironies of self-contradiction and inconsistency are always fully exploited. The introduction of the two major figures, Momus and Jupiter, in a scene which represents a development from one of Lucian's favourite mythological references, Momus' criticism of the creations of other gods, adds the substance to this framework of imitation. Momus, even if his role is altered, and the sympathy afforded him for his satire in *Deorum Concilium* and *Juppiter Tragoedus* is discarded, is nevertheless recognizably descended from Lucian's outspoken figure,54 and Jupiter, that arch-lover whose petulance and inconsistency well suits the universe he governs, is

54. The direct suggestion for Momus' rather unlikeable disposition may have come from Zeus' words at *Icaromenippus* 31 Καὶ ἔστερ ὁ Μῶμος ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀφνομένῳ δυσκόφαντώ.
perhaps in his μεμψιμομεθα to even closer to his model.

Once the initial acknowledgement of Alberti's debt to the ancient author is recognized for what it is, the reader who keeps it in mind will notice continually the overall resemblance in the style of composition and satire. The particular themes which have been borrowed and adapted to suit the new context will furthermore furnish constant evidence of the material nature of Lucian's influence here. It is informative to look at some of these in more detail.

Soon after the creation of the world, which is accompanied by the ridicule of Momus already noted, Jupiter is forced to inflict disease and other misfortunes upon the human race in order to pacify the gods. At the same time, he gives houses and gifts to the immortals, and, expressing a desire (p.16) ut possit vitam degere curis vacuam atque liberam, he hands over to Fate the volvendorum orbium curam. This idea, which forms part of the sequence of events, and serves to highlight Jupiter's weakness of character, originates in general form from Cynicus's contentions in Juppiter Confutatus, though its specific source is probably the passage Jupiter Tragoedus, 25, where Zeus himself tells Poseidon that the power to do certain things is with the Moirai, not with the gods.

The same passage, in explaining the "power of the fires" also given to Fate, which enables gods to change shape, adopts almost verbatim, and with mute irony, a favourite Lucianic jab, usually aimed at Jupiter's amorous adventures. Most gods have at one time or another used the power, says Alberti (p.16) alii in aureum imbrem cygnnumve ... (se) convertentes. If the words recall Prometheus 17 οὐτὶ μὲν τὰύτοι οὐτὶ δὲ σάτυροι καὶ Κύκνοι γίνομενοι rather than the other passages which come to mind, it is because Prometheus is in the next sentence mentioned, with regard to the theft of this fire. This is one instance where Alberti may be said
to be making the same sort of demands upon the audience's prior knowledge of mythology for a humorous effect as Lucian does.

Passing over the resemblances between the gods' reaction at Momus' seeming covetousness of the principate and their words against the philosophers in Icaromenippus 33, we reach the period of Momus' exile among men, during which he first becomes a poet, and puts out all those scurrilous stories about the gods, and then a philosopher, dissuading men from reverence or belief in them, and succeeding in so moving the majority with his reasons (pp.21-22)

\[ ut \text{iam intermitti sacrificia, et solemnes antiquari cerimoniae deorumque cultus passim apud mortales deseri occiperent. } \]

The philosophers came in droves to argue with him, each with their own opinion, until (p.23):

\[ \text{Disceptantium philosophorum tumultu perciti superi, unde a caelo exaudiri voces possent, ad rem spectandam accursitarant suspensisque animis disputationis eventum expectabant, nunc Momi responsionibus tristes, nunc philosophorum vocibus laeti. } \]

Three Lucianic themes, the scurrility of the poets (e.g. Nectyomanteia 3), the atheism of the philosophers (e.g. Icaromenippus, 8-10, 30), and the cessation of sacrifices (e.g. Timon 4), which enjoy a certain ubiquity in Lucian himself, here have been evolved into a chronological sequence, attributed to the activities of a single figure, Momus, and set off by a reworking of the main scene of Jupiter Tragoedus (34ff), in which the gods look on powerless while Damis the atheist tramples on the feeble arguments of their champion Timocles. As in the model, so in Alberti, the scene finishes with an absurd touch, in Lucian an ironic surrender by Damis and a physical assault by Timocles, in Momus with the biting off of his beard by pusillus quidam cynicus, dismissed with a remark which brings us
back to the *Icaromenippus* (30ff) in its description of the nature of the philosophers (p.23): *natura ambitiosi, mente arrogantes, usu vehementes, uti erant altercatores.*

By the beginning of book II, which marks the end of Momus' first exile, his latest invention, prayer, has already begun to bring grave inconvenience to the gods. Since the prayers are conceived as having substance, the heavens are full of them, but, Mercury explains (p.67): *illud ... inprimis superri abhorreabant atque exerabantur quod inter vota comperiebantur quae parentum, quae fratrum, quae liberorum virique imprimis necem atque interitum exposcebant.*

Now this last is provided for by the scene in Ch.25 of *Icaromenippus* where we hear among the prayers coming through the little door *ὁ θεός, τὸν πατέρα μοι τὰ χέρια ὑπάνασιν.* But it is not inconceivable that the hint for the law passed to exclude these same wicked prayers and only admit the good, and also for the idea of their material nature, which allows for Phoebus' hold-up and Juno's triumphal arch, was given by this excerpt from the same place *τὰς μὲν γὰρ δικαιὰς τῶν ἐκχών προσεῖτο ἵνα διὰ τοῦ στόμιου καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ δεξιᾷ κατετίθεις φέρων, τὰς δὲ ἀνόσιας ἀπεικότως ὁ δὲ ἀνόσιας ἀπέπεμπεν ἐπομφώσων κάτω ἵνα μηδὲ πλησίου κένοιτο τοῦ οὖρανος.*

But certainly the most striking Lucanian parallel in the book, and perhaps in the whole work, is the speech of Momus at Jupiter's dinner, in which he describes his search during exile on earth for the best life among those available to mortals, and concludes that (pp.71-2): *nullum genus vitae se ... comperisse, quod quidem omni ex parte eligibilibus appetibilibusque sit, quam eorum qui quidem vulgo mendicant, quos erronee muncupant. Hanc esse quidem omnium unam facilem artem, in promptu utilem, vacam incomodis, plenam libertatis ac voluptatis multa cum festivitate Momus cum plerisque aliis argumentis ... demonstrabat.*
The arguments with which he proves his proposition, and the nature of the proposition itself take their lead from Lucian's paradoxical *Parasitus*, in which it is proved in a philosophical dialogue between Tichiades and Simon, that the profession of the parasite is an art and that of all the arts it is the easiest to master, needs no instruction, gives results immediately, and requires no sweat from oneself. Nevertheless, the strength of Alberti's originality in imitation will be seen here from the adaptation of the schema to suit both a quite different subject and a quite different literary form.

The other speech made by Momus in this book, this time at Hercules' dinner, in which the facts of his confrontation with the philosophers in book I are retold to bring some credit for defending the gods upon himself, shows more general employment of Lucianic themes. It makes use of the hypocritical philosopher from *Piscator*, whose demeanour is belied by his life-style, of the different opinions of the gods from *Icaromenippus*; and presents verbatim an oration which is broadly reminiscent of much of the criticism of the gods voiced in Lucian's pages.

Perhaps more specifically related to his text is the anger of Jupiter at the end of book II, directed against the greed and folly of mankind, which leads to the declaration of his intention to build a new world. His words are (p.99); *hinc altercantium inter se expostulationibus obtundimur, hinc votis, aut potius execrationibus obruimur*. The situation is similar to that related by Zeus in *Timon*; *μακραμένων γὰς πρὸς ἄλληλοις καὶ κεκρατότων οὐδὲ ἔπακολος ἐστὶ τῶν θεῶν. ὡστε ἦ ἐπιβοσάμενον θέη τὰ ὅτα καθ' ἑσθαι ἥ ἐπιτείχημαι πρὸς ὀμότων*....

though the action which he contemplates is scarcely comparable to that of his counterpart in Momus.55

55. See also Zeus' speech at *Bis Accusatus* 1-3, where he complains of the bad deal which the gods get.
In book III the action is dominated by this resolve of Jupiter to build a new world, which he is unable, however, to effect without advice from the philosophers, satire of whom, even if Jupiter has a very high opinion of them, is no less ripe than in the Piscator, Vitellum Auctio, Necyomanteia, and Icaromenippus. In this regard Alberti has once more made specific, as well as more general use of Lucian. Jupiter's personal visit to the gymnasium to consult the philosophers finds a parallel in Juppiter Tragoedus 15-16, where Zeus reports to the gods his chance encounter with Timocles and Damis, in dispute over matters of the utmost importance to the immortals. Their appearance, however, (p.116): nitenti barba et lauto apparatu, fluenti ab humeris purpura, leni incessu, commoderatis oculis, seems to impress Jupiter much more than it did his counterpart in Lucian.

When Mercury arrives on earth to be greeted by a Socrates not uninterested in his physical make-up, it is reminiscent of Lucian's satiric portrait from Vitarum Auctio 15, with the philosopher replying, when asked what he knows μαθηματικός είμι καί σοφός τι δέχομαι. Apollo, too, when his oracular powers bring an absurd answer to Jupiter's question about Democritus' wisdom, and when he confesses himself unable to interpret the opinions of the philosophers (p.131 adeo sunt obscura, adeo ambigua, ut nihil supra) brings to mind his woeful inadequacy in the face of the task of having to predict the outcome of the contest of Timocles and Damis at Juppiter Tragoedus 30-31. His complaints of the uncertain and contradictory nature of their assumptions recall the words of Menippus at Necyomanteia 4, and Icaromenippus 5.

Finally, the appearance of specific philosophical figures in his account has at some points a connection with Lucian. The scene with Democritus, where Apollo imitates his investigations of the crab by the use of an onion, thereby making himself cry, looks like an extremely
inventive development from the Heraclitus and Democritus sequence in *Vitarum Auctio* 13-14. Jupiter’s request for information about Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoras is in outline based on the passage in *Verae Historiae II*, 17-18 where Lucian explains the absence from the Isles of the Blest of certain philosophers, and indeed the explanation of Plato’s whereabouts is, as we can see from the following comparison, borrowed directly from there.

Πλάτων δὲ μόνος οὐ παρεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἔλεγεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἁναπλαθείσῃ ὑπ’ αὐτῷ πόλει οἶκεῖν Χρόμενος τῇ Πολιτείᾳ καὶ τοῖς νόμοις οἷς συνέχεσθεν. (p.137)

*Platonem erant qui dicerent abesse longe, apud suam illam invisam, quam coedificasset, politiam.* The whereabouts of Pythagoras, too, are fixed with reference to Lucian, this time to *Gallus* (p.137):

Pythagoram audiebam paucis superioribus diebus in gallo quodam fuisse cognitum, eundemque fortassis nunc invenire posse in pica aut loquaci aliquo in psitaco.

The philosophers are not, however, the only Lucianic feature in this book. The council, headed by Momus, and exasperated to the point of violence by his perverse nature, is related in theme to those of the *Deorum Concilium* and *Jupiter Tragoedus*, and in treatment particularly to the latter, which also presents a paradoxical issue, in the face of which many of the gods manage to demonstrate publicly their own ridiculousness. At the end of the book, too, Momus is formally re-exiled by a complex decree which is reminiscent of those of *Deorum Concilium* 14-16 and *Necyomanteia* 20.

Book IV sees the final débacle, with the gods forced by Momus to go to earth to witness the games organized for them by the worried human race, and falling into extreme danger by laughing out loud at Charon and Gelastus’ discomfort, while masquerading as their own statues. This last
idea, which lies behind one of the two themes most vital to the action of the last book, may well have been suggested by the appearance of statues as gods in the council of Juppiter Tragoedus, 7-11. Paragraph 33 of the same work contains a similar conception, showing the statue of Hermes in the Stoa running to heaven to tell Zeus of the events there. Indeed, Lucian often invokes a confusion between the god and his image (as in Timon 4 where Zeus the \textit{τηγαντολέτω καὶ Τιτανοκατώτως} sat and let his locks be cut off although \textit{δεχάττεκαν κεκουμνήν ἕκων ἐν τῇ δεξίᾳ} in order to produce a comic effect.

The second vital theme is that of Charon's visit to earth, which initiates indirectly both the ultimate degradation of the gods in the theatre, and, through the encounter with Momus, the final resolution of the whole situation. The source for Alberti's inspiration here is indubitably to be found in Lucian's \textit{Charon}, where the ferryman, driven by the same sense of curiosity as the Chiron in Momus, though not by the same sense of urgency, comes to earth, and is shown around by his colleague Hermes. In \textit{Momus}, of course, the dramatic requirements are different, and the circumstances of the plot demand that Charon choose for his guide the philisopher Gelastus, not unconnected himself, however, with the cync characters of Lucian's underworld satires, Diogenes and Menippus.

Within the outline of this adaptation several more specific details recall passages of Lucian. Charon's excuse, for instance, for not taking Gelastus across the Styx unless he performed the duty of guide is that (p.158) \textit{non attulerat quo portorium solveret}. In \textit{Cataplus} 19 and 21 Cyniscus and Micyllus got away more lightly when they did the same thing. Charon's rebuke to Gelastus for his ability, as a philosopher, only to confuse people when talking of familiar things is followed by this question (p.163):
vel quid ego tibi credam temere, quando tu quidem, qui primis rerum conditor quid animo habuerit te non ignorare affirmas, profecto, quod pueris evenit, domum redeundi viam oblitus es?

Although Alberti has made the joke specific to the situation (Charon thinks they have returned to Hades), nevertheless the parallel with Icaromenipras 6 is obvious. Πρώτα μὲν ἐπὶ γῆς βεβηκότες καὶ μηδὲν τῶν Χάμηι ἔχομενων ήμῶν ὑπερέχοντες... ὥμως ὅρθον τε πέρατα διορθῇ ἐφικτοῦ καὶ τῶν ήλιον περιεμέτερων... καὶ πολλάκις, εἰ τὰ ἄρα, μηδὲ ὅποσοι στάδιοι Μεγάλοθεν Αθήνας εἰσὶν ἀκείβος ἐπισταμένοι.

Another pleasantry employed by both writers is the irony of the dead or those who are exempt from death fearing it nevertheless. Gelastus rebukes Charon with it (p.171-2): quos quid est cur metuas, cui ne vitam quidem possint auferre?; and in Lucian we may compare Necyomanteia 10, τὸν μὲν Ῥαδάμανθον εύρομεν τεθνεώτα μικροῦ δεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν δίους
and Cataplus 18, where Micyllus decides to swim the Styx, arguing οὐ γαίε δεξιά μὴ ἕπαθος ἐν τοῖς τροχώμοις τῆς τεθνεώς.

Charon's fable concerning the masks, with its conclusion (p.165): quo fit ut alteram nemo ad ripam non nudatus amissa persona pervenerit, may well have been suggested by the events of Dialogus Mortuorum X, but there is more certainty about the origin of the discussion between Peniplusius and Megalophos on the boat across to Hades, about the merits of a poor man's life. In Gallus the cock explains to Micyllus the cobbler in much the same terms, why his poverty in life gives him more happiness than that enjoyed by the rich and powerful. The idea is not uncommon in Lucian, and appears also in the Epistulæ Saturnales, and Cataplus.

Throughout the work both major and minor elements of the plot are informed by the influence of Lucian. In humour and imagination too
there are constant parallels to be drawn. Yet Alberti's imitation in all these spheres is never in any way slavish. Even when he is very close to the text of his model, it is his own context, and his own conception which dominates. The sequence of events, although often we have seen, rationalizing Lucianic themes into a chronological order, nevertheless turns by its own motion, with its own causation and motivation, from first to last. In the final analysis, indeed, the *Momus* is in scope, even if Alberti would have demurred here, and certainly in scale, quite outside the range of any single work written by its Greek model. Even so, this culmination of Alberti's serio-comic literary aspirations is the zenith of XV century Lucianism.

56. Whitfield, 'Momus', p.180, "all the wheels turn, from beginning to end, by their own motion."
Conclusion

It is clear enough from internal evidence as well as external observation that the development of the comic-moral style of writing practised by Alberti in the works which we have been examining was effected very largely by a fundamental awareness of the techniques of Lucian. In each of the sections above, we have noted both specific allusions to the works of the Greek author and imaginative creations based on the understanding of his satire, fantasy, and irony, and the use of his schemata. All this has proven conclusively Alberti's debt, and his ability to transcend it.

In the realm of interpretation, the examination of Virtus Dea and Momus has led to very important conclusions about the nature of the Quattrocento view of Lucian. With the concept of ironia to guide us, we are able to see how the serio-comic mode of writing was seen to work. Once the question of meaning was settled, and the writer was certain that his audience would not misapprehend his intentions, comedy could be presented without adulteration. Lucian's dialogues of the gods, and satire of philosophers were accepted precisely because the exploitation of the inconsistencies and absurdities of their characters could be put down to the natural reversal to be expected between the ridiculous and the real universe where ironia was in force.

But the supreme importance of Alberti for any study of Lucian's influence in the Italian Quattrocento does not lie merely in our recovery from him of a contemporary interpretation of the Greek author. Nor does it depend upon our ability to pick nuggets of pure Lucian from his writings in the manner of a Quellenforscher, since this would merely show knowledge of his writings, and would not allow an assessment of influence in depth. The crux of the matter is that Alberti was able to recreate the techniques of
Lucian in a living fabric which was contemporary in both intention and language. In so doing he naturalised the comic dialogue, the ironical encomium, the fantastic narrative, and irony itself, and thus, potentially, made available to lesser talents than his own the most productive items in the legacy of the ancient writer. Only potentially, however, because of the circumstances outlined below.

It has been rightly claimed that Momus represents "the most sustained, the most inventive offshoot from Lucian before Gulliver's Travels". The great misfortune for the development of Lucianic writing in the Quattrocento was that Momus had no dissemination to speak of, and therefore no real impact. Even the Intercoenales were only distributed randomly, as we have seen, and were, except for the Virtus Dea, a comparative rarity in their own period. The influence of Lucian via Alberti was limited, we shall see in the final chapter, to the model of Virtus Dea in almost every case where it was not exercised at first hand. Since there is but one Alberti in a generation, we may readily appreciate that such a great contribution as he had made to the transference of Lucianic techniques was not to be expected again.

One final point may be made. Although the naturalisation of Lucianic techniques by Alberti had little impact, except in a very small way, these observations allow us to correct one date in the history of European literature. It is often said that it was under the influence of Lucian that irony reentered Western literary tradition. But this re-emergence has in the past been linked with the names of those later Lucianists, Erasmus and More. We are now, as Professor Whitfield has noted, in a position to date this important departure some seventy years earlier, to the Lucianist who composed the Intercoenales, Musca and Momus.

58. Thomson, "Erasmus" p.67, for example. Also id. 'Irony', pp.233-235.
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Conclusion
Preface

Alberti was perhaps the most important imitator of Lucian in the Quattrocento, but he was by no means the only one to fall under the spell of the Syrian satirist. A number of other writers produced during the course of the century a variety of pieces related in one way or another to this same model. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine these works. The scheme adopted is, in the main, chronological, though Vegio has, for reasons of emphasis, been placed before Lauro Quirino, whose *Dialogus in gymnasiis florentiniae* would naturally follow next after Alberti's works. The imitation of Timon by Boiardo has also been misplaced historically, and is dealt with after the works of Collemuccio, in order that the later adaptation of Galeotto Del Carretto may be treated alongside it.
Maffeo Vegio da Lodi is perhaps best known to posterity for his audacity in adding a thirteenth book to Vergil’s Aeneid, though he also receives an occasional mention in the histories of education for his treatise De educatione liberorum. In his own time he was regarded as an elegant writer in both prose and verse, and gained fame through his integrity of life as a devout and religious man. Vespasiano da Bisticci, not wishing che appresso de' vulgari perisca la fama di si degno uomo, wrote a short account of his life, and appended to it, as was his wont, all the works which he knew of.1. Among them only one of his major works is mentioned, but missing also are the three so called "dialoghi lucianeschi,"2, which had perhaps greater popularity and wider dissemination in the Quattro- and Cinquecento, than any other of his writings, and which we will be concerned with here.3.

There is no truly objective evidence to show that Vegio was acquainted with Lucian’s works. A swift perusal of all the works available in print reveals no citation of the Greek author. On the other hand he was, so Vespasiano tells us, dottissimo in greco e in latino.4. But again, this is not a solid basis for conjecture. As for the three works in question, Dialogus Veritatis et Philalithis, De felicitate et miseria, and Disceptatio inter terram, solem et aurum, any postulation of a connection between them and Lucian comes not from Vegio himself, but his audience, both contemporary and modern. Vegio was no Alberti; he published his works under his own name, as may be shown by the fact that even the De felicitate et miseria appears

2. Rossi, V., p. 283.
3. For the mss. and editions see notes 5, 6, 7, 8, below.
correctly attributed in both manuscript and print during the Quattrocento. It seems likely that the error which gave many Quattrocento readers an extra work of Lucian stems from Georg Lauer, or the manuscript which he used for his Rome 1470 edition, since there he misplaced the letter to Laurentius Columna which belonged properly to Rinuccio's translation of Charon, putting it instead before the work by Vegio. The tradition of printing the Palinurus (its other name) as a Lucianic work, thus established, continued unchecked into the sixteenth century.

Despite the lack of objective evidence, however, it seems probable from a comparative study of Philalethes, Palinurus, Disceptatio and the Lucianic corpus that Vegio was acquainted at least, with a few of Lucian's works.

**Dialogue Veritatis et Philalethis**

This dialogue which is found in a large number of codices and was printed in at least seven separate incunabula, always with correct

---


6. See Chapter I, p. 58. In support of this conjecture, ms. Florence, Bib. Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi G. 5, 865, may be cited, since it has, f. 31v-40v, Palinurus attributed to Lucian in Rinuccio's version. Comparatively few mss. are found with attribution to Lucian. See Ch. I, p. 58 for these.

7. For incunabula printing this as a Lucianic work see Ch. I pp. 57-63. Add N. Lepe, Avignon, 1497. By the time of the Basel 1563 edition, this piece and Virtus Dea were being printed with a note refuting their authenticity. The work is correctly attributed only in Cratander and Croftanus, Basel, 1518 and Rembolt, Paris, 1511.
attribution, is conjectured by Raffaele to have been published at Florence in 1444. In the prefatory letter, dedicating the piece to his brother Eustathius, Vegio notes that this is his first excursion into prose—(p. 754F) liberum numc primum, solutamque dictionem complector. He mentions, too, that the actual literary form which he is using is new (p. 754F)—agressus sum novam brevemque et (ut puto) non inuicundam ingenii lucubrationem. It is a serio-comic dialogue, basically a satire on the corruption of the human race, which will probably be offensive to many people—(p. 754F) videbitur oratio nostra mordacior quam vel ego soleam, vel delicata multorum ingenia patientur.

The dialogue begins with Philalethes asking Alithia who she is, and incidentally establishing for the reader the setting—(p. 755A) per vasta haec montium inaccessaque aliis locis. After some further exchanges, it is established that he is speaking to Alithia, and he reveals his own identity to her. They are both delighted, since they have each been seeking the other without success for a long time.


10. Page references are to the text in La Bigne, 1677, pp. 754-759.
Philalethes asks the reason for Alithia's wounded and dirty appearance. She tells him that it was the human race which caused it, whereupon Philalethes himself admits that this same thing has driven him to live in the wild in the unkempt and squalid manner which she sees. Upon his request, Alithia recounts from the beginning the causes of her misfortunes. After Concordia, Pax, Iustitia and Pudicitia had been sent down to earth, and been put to flight by the wickedness of mankind, Jupiter decided to try Veritas as a last effort, thinking that she would naturally gain great honour among men. But on the contrary she met with nothing but violence from them. At this point Philalethes interjects that he can easily guess by whom she was most offended, and lists the charlatans, the actors, the alchemists, the diviners, the astrologers, the philosophers and the poets. But Alithia dismisses each of these in turn, paying particular attention to the poets, whom she defends against the charge of enmity towards her by arguing that the poet's inspiration is, unlike that of the historian, free from the constraints of grammatical and historical necessity. She then proceeds with her narrative, explaining how first she visited Hades, and was received with great honour by Charon and Pluto. On her arrival on earth, however, she received no such respect. She was shocked by the violence of the soldiery, but only suffered violence herself when she encountered seafarers. Driven off by them, she made her way to the land, hoping for better treatment from the farmers, but in vain. Everywhere she went, to the priests, the merchants, the women, the children, the bakers, the painters, the advocates, and the princes, the story was exactly the same. Eventually, when her tormentors thought that she had breathed her last, she was thrown down outside the town to be eaten by the wild animals. But they, paradoxically, were far kinder to her than men had been. Philalethes, hearing all this,
curses the atrocity of mankind, and calls down the thunderbolts of Jove upon this wickedness. Alithia promises that all will be avenged, and urges him to put an end to grief, whereupon he invites her, before her departure, to share for a while his frugal hospitality, and she accepts.

It seems most likely that Vegio's chief inspiration here was the Virtus Dea of Alberti. The two works are alike not only in form, but also in their presentation of allegorical personae. Furthermore, the figure of Virtus in Alberti's dialogue provides for several aspects of Veritas (or Alithia) and her situation. First, for her appearance; Virtus was mistreated by Fortuna's strong-arm men, while Veritas suffered at the hands of many people on earth, and so both appear dirty (foeda, Alberti: foedata, Vegio). There is even some verbal correlation between their experiences (Alberti, pugnis et calcibus totam confregere, vestesque meas dirupere, in lutum prostratam relique: Vegio (p. 758F), pugnis, calcibus, saxisgue me contundere).

Also, both are naked (Virtus by mistreatment, Veritas by nature). Secondly, for her mistreatment by men; for although Virtus has not actually been attacked by living men, nevertheless her statement to Mercury that she is neque die, neque hominibus commendatae gives the hint for Veritas. Thirdly, for the irony of her situation; Virtus was found in Elysium, catering not for the living, but for those who were long dead, and Veritas is found hiding away from men also. Further, her sole admirer, Philalethes has never until this minute seen her, nor she him.

With this probable relationship between the two dialogues, the question naturally arises whether Vegio was aware of the authorship of Virtus Dea. It would certainly not be out of the question for him to have read works by Alberti. In fact Mancini has asserted that the De educatione liberorum is basically a version of Della famiglia, with
the addition of various observations stemming from his own experience, and from the study of the Roman jurisconsults and Church Fathers, done into Latin "affinchè ne tenessero conto gli eruditi." But if he were following a contemporary knowingly, it is unlikely that he would have described his work as novam lucubrationem. It is also improbable that he would have embarked upon a new literary genre without some model, or rather, some classical model (since he was using the classical language). The truth perhaps is that Vegio used Virtus Dea, believing it to be a genuine work of Lucian, and called his work "new", in the sense that no modern had yet written in this style or form.

But if we assume that Vegio was wittingly following Lucian, then we are entitled to look also for traces of his use of the genuine works. The most tangible of these are reminiscences of Piscator. In the first place the two characters could derive from chapters 16 and 20 of that dialogue. In 16 Philosophia says: ἡ ὑμιδεὶς δὲ καὶ ἀδεφῆς τὸ Χεῶμα ἢ Ἀληθεία ἐστίν , to which Parrhesiades replies that he cannot see her, and Philosophia adds: τὴν ἀκαλλιώπιστον ἐκεῖνην οὐκ ἰδεῖς, τὴν χυμήν, τὴν ὑποφεύγουσαν ἀνεί καὶ διολισθᾶνουσαν ; In 20, Parrhesiades adds to the attributes of a hater those of the lover, among them being φιλαλήθης . Secondly the difficulty of finding Veritas encountered by Philalethes has its parallel in Parrhesiades' search for Philosophy. One may compare the passage in chapter 11: ποῦ δὲ τὴν Φιλοσοφίαν ἐφοί τις ἦν; οὐ γὰρ ὁδὸν ἔνθα σιγῆ. καίτοι πάνω πολύν ἐπιλαύνην Χρόνον ἀναζητῶν τὴν σικίδαν, ὡς δύνασθαι αὐτῆ , with Philalethes' cry (p. 755, C)

ο faustum hunc mihi diem quo tandem videre te mihi contigit,
cuius videndi incredibili iam diu desiderio flagrabant, propeque
tabescebam.

Thirdly Alithia's defence of the actors, and her criticism of the
collision between outward appearances and inner reality both have their
parallel in Philosophia's attitude to the Dionysia in Piscator 14, and
the invective of Parrhesiades against the false philosophers in chapter
31. Finally, the defence of poetry, which must be considered to
represent Vegio's own views on the subject, brings to mind the reply
Lucian makes to criticisms of his new literary synthesis in chapters
29-37 of Piscator.

In composing his novam...lucubrationem, then Vegio may well have
had two works of Lucian in mind. From one, the Albertian Virtus Dea,
he took the form, suggestions for the action, and for the appearance
of Alithia, and the irony. From the other he took, perhaps, the names
of the two characters, some thematic suggestions, and the idea of a
literary self-justification. What he created was more virulent than
the first, and less comic than the second.

Dialogus de foelicitate et miseris.

The Palinurus (as it is known, from one of the interlocutors) is
conjectured by Raffaele to have been published at Florence in 1445. 12
It was addressed by Vegio to Cardinal Gerardo Landrini, the man who,
when bishop of Lodi, had discovered the manuscript of Cicero's rhetorical works. 13 The dialogue was to have, like its predecessor the
Philalethes, wide dissemination in manuscript and in print, though, as
we have already seen, 14 it was very often accepted by editors of
selections from Lucian as one of the Greek satirist's works.

The work begins with Palinurus' request that Charon ferry him
across the Styx. Charon, having ascertained his identity, complies,
and, after they have exchanged courtesies, Palinurus remarks upon the

13. See Brinton, p. 17.
grave burdens of the steersman's life. Charon assures him that he is content with such a life, and remarks that Palinurus' discontent is a symptom of the normal human feeling that what other people are doing is much better than what you are doing yourself. Palinurus is unconvinced, and, at Charon's invitation, he embarks upon a description of the life of the steersman, with all its attendant perils and fatigues. Charon admits the truth of all this, but still insists that others are worse off, and goes on to make a detailed examination of various social conditions. He touches on the citizen, the jurisconsult, the soldier, the rich man, the husband, and finally the prince or tyrant, whose ills he dwells on with particular emphasis. He even gives an account of the worries which beset the gods. Finally, when they have discussed the punishments which are administered in Hades, Palinurus asks if there are any mortals who can be called happy. Charon replies (p. 63):

Qui amore virtutis et literarum contemptserunt caetera mundi bona, qui se innocuos, pueros, castos, integros, incorruptosque conservantes, extulerunt animam altius, ad gustandam divinam excellentiam, humana quasi sordida et abieda relinquentes. 15.

The dialogue is, in conception, clearly Lucianic. Its setting and the use of characters from mythology and literature, especially that of Charon, mark its genre as the Dialogi Mortuorum. Furthermore, its partial dissemination in the XV and XVI centuries as a genuine work of Lucian, even if due initially to a scribal error, testifies to its possession of qualities which were to the readers of those times Lucianic. Proof of this last contention may be given from a letter included in Guillermus Signerre's Milan 1497 edition of some of Vegio's works. Franchinus Gaforus, presumably the editor of the selection,

15 Page references are to the edition of the text by Croftanus and Cratander, Basel, 1518, pp. 40-64.
writes to Iacobs Antiquarius:

Delectabit non vulgariter eius de foelicitate et miseria
Dialogus eo magis quod cum Luciani charunt grecum proximo
imitari pluribus videatur longe tamen vestigia secutum fatearis
oportebit.

Andreas Cratander also, at the end of his Basel 1518 edition of Disceptatio, Palimurus and Lucian's Dialogus Mortuorum X, indicates a community of theme and purpose between the ancient and the modern author, if less specifically than Gaforus:

Habes, candide lector, duos nunc dialogos variam mortalium conditionem perpulchre dissipentes. Horum prior Mapheo, alter, per Alamannum Rhinuccimum Florentinum denuo latinitate donatus, Luciano adscribitur. Quos si aliquando, animi refocillandi gratia, attente legeris, magnum ex iis nundum iucunditatem, verum et utilitatem percipies.

Cratander's remarks indicate the continuance into the XVI century of the view of Lucian as a moral, yet amusing author. Vegius' dialogue is perceived by him in those terms. Gaforus, probably, would have agreed with so general a relationship to the model. His immediate purpose was, however, to refute the contention that Vegius' direct model was the Charon. Clearly he had more knowledge of Lucian's works than those who said this, since the setting there is above, not below, the earth, and the chief theme is death. But this widespread ignorance of the details of one of the most popular of Lucian's dialogues serves to emphasise at least that for most readers of the period the boundaries of Lucianism were marked by very general criteria.

Gaforus is certainly correct about Vegio's use of Charon. If that was a source of inspiration, then he did not follow it closely, but took only the character of Charon, and a few details. These last
include; the tyrant's imperia - quam tenuissimo quasi quodam filo pendant, (p. 52) which is perhaps derived from Charon 16 δεύς δεύ
υπ' λαβτοῦ κεκαλιμένως ἀπωντάς ; the theme of maior...exaltatio.... major...casus et ruina, (p.59) which is also found at Charon 14:
the desire of Palinurus to shout aloud a warning to all mankind, which is paralleled by that of Charon in chapter 20. Perhaps the closest Lucianic parallel for the mechanics of Vegio's dialogue may be found in the Cataplus, where the action takes place in the underworld, mainly in and around Charon's ferry. This source may also have provided the inspiration for the inclusion of one of the most important themes, that of the tyrant, and his unhappiness. On the other hand, this may have come from another dialogue, which perhaps afforded Vegio the overall scheme for the conversation, the Callus. There Micyllus the cobbler and his cock discuss the comparative merits of different types of human and animal existence. The cock, like Charon in the Palinurus, maintains that Micyllus' life is by far the happiest. Like Charon, too, the cock dwells particularly (chapters 24-26) upon the unhappiness of the life of a tyrant. The hint (p.50) in Palinurus that multo optabilior...privatorum conditio, perhaps bears some relation to the remarks of Teiresias to Menippus at the end of the Necyomanteia (chapter 21: see also chapter 5), while Charon's remark (p.48) nuda...hic omnia atque aperta sunt is reminiscent of Dialogus Mortuorum X. Two further dialogues may have provided Vegio with material. For the passage (p. 56 ff.) where Charon describes the troublesome life of the gods, Zeus' complaint at Bis Accusatus 1ff. comes to mind. For Charon's statement that during the Trojan war there were so many corpses and he was so worn out ut prae multitudine omnibus transvehendis minime hec cymba sufficeret, there is Alexander's remark in Dialogus Mortuorum XII, 5 Φησὶ γὰρ ὁ περάμεν ἐς διλογέσας αὐτοὺς τὸ το σκόφος.

But if Vegio used Lucian fairly extensively, he was also indebted
to Latin literature, from which he derived not only the figure of Palinurus, and the background for his character, but also several themes, such as the dissatisfaction of men with their own lot (p.41), and the inability of the rich man to be satisfied, however much he has (p.55), both from Horace's Satires. His Dialogus de foelicitate et miseria, then, may be regarded as a cross-fertilisation between the Roman and Greek traditions. Even so, his debt to Lucian, acknowledged by his contemporaries, if not by himself, stands out as the feature which has endowed it with its most striking literary characteristics.

Disputatio inter Terram, Solem, et Aurum.

The Disputatio (or Disceptatio) inter Terram, Solem et Aurum is said by Rafaellé to have been published in Rome, 13th January 1452. It did not have the same fortune as Philalethes and Palinurus, being disseminated in few manuscripts, and appearing in only two editions in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Nonetheless, it is an important work, since it shows a different facet of Lucian's influence upon Vegio's writing from that seen in the context of the two dialogues.

The Disputatio is not a dialogue. It takes the form of a contest between the Earth, Sun and Gold as to which of them has the greatest beauty and power. The dispute is referred to the summus omnium rerum autum (p.3) who sits in judgement, assisted by him for whose sake he created everything, man. The first to speak is Terra, who while admitting that the glory for her creation accrues to her maker, vaunts the beauty and excellence of her gifts, beginning with fields, mountains,

16. Rafaellé, p. 83. The evidence given is the date at the end of the ms. Ottobon. lat. 1253, which is repeated in the ed. of Signerere, 1497.


18. All page references are to the text by Cratander and Croftanus, Basel, 1518, pp3-39.
hills and mineral wealth, and culminating, after a passage on animals which lays particular emphasis upon the bee, with man himself. When she has finished speaking, all applaud vigorously, and it seems that her cause is won, when the Sun begins. His speech concentrates upon showing that all the gifts which the Earth has outlined as demonstrating her overwhelming power and beauty are in fact subject entirely to his light and radiance. Without this, none of the flowers or the creatures so proudly presented by the Earth could exist. At the end of his speech, the Sun, it seems to everyone, has carried the day, and the Earth, with eyes downcast, looks as though she admits defeat. But forward comes Aurum, and, amid cries of disdain and disgust from all quarters, demands to be heard. The summus auctor, dismissing the objections with an assertion of the right of free speech, asks Gold to proceed. Beginning by a claim to have the power of a god, cum nihil sit sub orbe, quod non vigorem meum sentiat (p. 17) he describes his effect upon the mechanics of human society with such persuasiveness, that the arguments even of the Sun pale into insignificance, and everyone hails him as indeed the most powerful.

The piece has a rhetorical structure and thematic basis reminiscent of Lucian's Dialogus Mortuorum XII, where each of the three contestants justifies before Aeacus his claim to preeminence. But the tone of the work brings to mind rather those paradoxical encomia Muscae Laudes, Phalaris I and II and Parasitus. For in effect Vegio's work is a nicely turned piece of satire, depending for its impact upon the ironic implications of the speech of Aurum, by whose assertions of supreme power in the affairs of all men the cupidity of all men is outlined, and by whose victory the satire is struck home. Lucian's method of blame by praise, employed to such effect in the Phalaris orations, where the reader's foreknowledge of the normal angle
on the conduct of the well-known tyrant provides the background for the irony, is here skilfully used by Vegio. Gold, the root of all evil, as everyone knows, has, like Phalaris, the audacity to challenge accepted views of himself. The irony here is that his audience knows too well the truth of his claims to be able to deny them, and is thus, along with the summus autor, drawn into the general satire aimed at those who succumb to the power of gold. But there is in Aurum's character and in the overall logic of his speech some confusion present, and out of it may arise the question whether Vegio truly intended to satirise God. The answer may be found in the fact that this question was asked also of Lucian, and Erasmus in his "Praise of Folly". The fact is that there is of necessity a danger in the use of irony, especially when it is associated with a fundamentally religious scheme. Lucian's Timon by its use of fantasy to present certain moral precepts about wealth puts the gods in an ironical light. Vegio's presentation of Aurum in a divine context does the same thing. That no-one paid attention to this side of the ambiguity at this period shows that ironical writing was already finding acceptance.

Vegio's dependence upon Lucian in this piece was not noted by any Quattrocento readers, but Andreas Cratander mentions it in the introduction which precedes his 1518 edition of Disputatio, Palinurus and Lucian's Dialogus Mortuorum X. He writes:

Ad lectorem: Si hunc Maphei Vegii Laudensis oratoris clarissimi libellum obviis (quod dicitur) manibus, candide lector, exceperis, identidemque pensiculatius lectitare non fueris designatus, haud modicum sane profectus et utilitatis te inde consecuturum putamus. Quippe qui in hoc scribendi genere illum Samosatensem

19. The wording of the introduction (hunc...libellum), together with the fact that Palinurus and Dialogus Mort. X are dealt with in a separate postscript at the end of the volume, makes it clear that this prefacing refers only to the Disputatio, which immediately follows it.
rhetorem non a longe secutus, tam copiosus, tam varius tamque
ornatus reperitur, ut non iniuria de hoc autore (modo plura id
genus opuscula maluisset conscribere) dici posse videatur,
Metheum vel solum et unicum, si omnes libri latini (quod abominor)
perissent, satis superque esse sua copia, varietate, et elegantia
(sicuti tota constanter Graecia de suo Luciano praedicat) ad
linguam latinam excitandum instaurandum, atque consummandum.

Cratander’s words indicate a relation between Vegio and Lucian both
in style, tone and genre. In style Vegio presents the desirable qual-
ities of the rhetor found in Lucian, copia, varietas and ornatus. In
genre, Vegio has followed Lucian’s lead in the paradoxical encomium.
In tone, he has adopted the serio-comic technique, which yields both
profectus and utilitas. This last may be inferred from the exhort-
ation to the reader to read pensiculatius a work which at first sight
he may be inclined to disdain. One recalls Rinuccio’s words on Lucian’s
Vitarum Auctio, which have the same import.

If these are general similarities, there are also several more
specific points of contact with Lucian, especially in the speech of
Aurum. First, however, one must mention the ‘Praise of the Bee’ which
is part of Terra’s oration (p. 6-9). Although it is not a paradoxical
encomium in the manner of Lucian’s Muscae Laudatio, the choice of
subject must naturally raise the question of dependence. But even
here, the only real connection is the idea of praising an insect, and
all other similarities are removed by the fact that there is no ambi-
valence in the role of the bee, as there is in that of the fly.

In conception the character of Aurum owes something to the figure
of Plutus in Lucian’s Timon, though the happy addition whereby gold
becomes the elemental force behind all human life must be attributed
to Vegio’s invention. Certain details of his speech may also have
their origin in various of Lucian’s works. For example, Aurum’s state-
-ment of the difficulty of finding good and honest men (p. 33):
Quamquam illud non debere tacere, paucissimum me illorum numerum
comperisse, quos bonos et rectos vere possim appelare) is parallel
to that of Plutus at Timon 25, quoted by Poggio in De Avaritia. 20
The claim that his presence can make the meanest man the subject of
universal reverence and acclaim (p. 34-5):
Cogitate per animos vestros vilissimum quempism....quam primum
me contubernioni illius coniumxero...tanta eum impleo gratia,
ut quocunque incedat, passim illum quisque salvum dicat, vener-
etur, bland excipiat...etc.

perhaps stems from Gallus 13 where Micyllus says οός τί ἐν σοι ἰο
τούτων ἔτι λέγομεν, δόσας μὲν χρείας παρέκκειται δ χειροσὶς, ὡς ἰδίδ
μν πάντα, καλοὺς τε, καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ λόγιους ὑπερεξάκειται τιμή
και δόξαι πεσαπτικαν και εξ υφανών και ἀξίων ἐνίοτε πεπλέπτως
και κοινιμοὺς ἐν βρασκεὶ τ’θεσι;
The assertion that even the most unattractive person can be made
desirable by Gold (p. 36-7):

Afferatis mihi hominem quam longo vultis senio gravatum.....
Ast ego admirabili et praepotenti vi mea tantum operabor, ut
adolescentulae alicuius et quidem nobilissime ac formossimse
coniugio potiatur

has its counterpart in Gallus 14, where Micyllus describes the changed
status accorded to his neighbour Simon by the accession of wealth: τὸ δὲ
μέγιστον ἥσθαι καὶ ἐρωτάσις αὐτῶν ἀπ’ γυναικές, ὥς ἦν ὑπερεχται πεῖς κράτος
και ὑπεξαγαγε καὶ ταῖς μὲν πρεσβίες καὶ ὑπεξαγαγε ἐν ἡμέρι, ὥστιν, ὅ ἦν ὑπελαύσιν
ἀναφερθείν ἐκ τῶν ἐμελούμενας.

Other themes, such as the miser’s lack of enjoyment of his wealth
(p. 19), the role of luck in a good man’s receipt of riches (p. 31),
and the locking of Gold in dark places (p. 32-3) may relate to passages
in Timon 15, 24, and 15-16 respectively. The reference to the avarice

20. See above Chapter II, p. 73, & n. 27.
of philosophers in particular (p.21) could reflect a number of passages in Lucian, notably those at the end of Timon and Piscator.

The Disputatio is a new departure in Vegio's Lucianism. By abandoning the dialogue, but not its fantasy, and turning to the rhetorical encomium to embody the type of satire produced by Veritas in Philalethes, the author has begun the journey which will end with the 'Praise of Folly'. Irony found in this work one more stepping stone to its general rehabilitation in the literature of Europe.

Despite the lack of objective evidence, the case for Vegio's knowledge and use of Lucian seems clearly proven. Though no Alberti, for these small works in no way reflect the scope and depth of that writer's imagination, nevertheless Vegio was in a less spectacular way rediscovering through the works of the Greek satirist certain elements hitherto neglected in modern European literature. In terms of form he, like his contemporary Alberti, was experimenting with the fantasy dialogue, wherein characters from myth, history, or the realm of personification could be brought together to express general truths about life. He was working, too, with a more rhetorical scheme, the paradoxical encomium. In tone, he was rediscovering the usefulness of irony in satirical writing, an advance we have already seen in the works of Alberti. Meanwhile, he was complementing these new technical advances with thematic material drawn from a number of Lucian's works. And, while he made no mention himself of the source from which these novelties came, his contemporaries and near contemporaries had the insight to name it. These small pieces, then in conclusion, provide us with one more notice of the Quattrocento penchant for Lucian and Lucianic writing.
II Lauro Quirino

In 1442 Leon Battista Alberti planned for a second Certame CoroARIO in Florence, following upon the debacle of the previous year. The subject set was Invidia. The contest never took place, but it is the reference to it in Quirino's Lucianic imitation *Dialogus in gymnasiiis Florentinis* which allows this piece to be dated with precision to that year.²¹ Quirino, a Venetian humanist educated at Padua, was self-assertive and arrogant in his writings and dealings with other scholars. It is no surprise after reading some of the insults which he aimed at Leonardo Bruni and Lorenzo Valla, and the high opinions of himself which he puts into the mouths of others (Aristotle in an earlier dialogue, Mercury in this) to hear Poggio saying of him:

Stomachum mihi fecerunt littere Quirini...qui immemor facultatis sue more levissimi hominis se nimium effert laudibus et ultra quam vires sue patientur...solum se oratorem et philosophum putat, oteros despicit et contemnit.²²

But despite the unpleasantness of his character, and the self-laudatory purpose of the work, the *Dialogus* is at least an enterprising piece of writing, and its dissemination in some ten manuscripts argues a limited popularity.²³ The outline of the dialogue is as follows.

Mercury, seeing Charon, absent from his infernal post visiting the upper air enquires why he has come there. Charon replies that he has been drawn by the wish to see what are those great benefits of life which everyone weeps to leave behind. But he himself is not

²¹ The date is confirmed by the subscript of ms. Brit. Mus., Arundel 138, which states that the work was copied by H. Stregkebeyn, 24 Sept., 1442, in Padua. This information from Wilmanns & Bertalot, p. 478. They also publish the text, pp. 483-493. Page references are to this.

²² Wilmanns & Bertalot, p. 503. For the letter to Valla see Sabbadini, 'Briciole', pp. 248-250.

²³ For ms. information see Wilmanns & Bertalot, pp. 478-483.
capable of investigating on his own, and therefore asks Mercury to show him round. Mercury agrees, but, since he cannot show Charon everything, devises a vantage point by piling several mountains one upon the other. Seated upon the summit, Charon at once exclaims how dolorous are men's affairs, so tied to the pursuit of vanities, and how few are those who resist these temptations to live virtuously. His gaze then turns to more specific locations, first to Troy, where he observes the siege, whose cause, says Mercury to his disgust, was the theft of one woman, and then to the East, where Alexander the Great is conversing with the gymnosophists. Here Charon requests that they listen to the conversation, and the focus of the dialogue duly changes to show how each of the gymnosophists replied to the questions of Alexander. After praising their wisdom, Charon once again looks around, this time alighting upon Rome, where first the Punic then the Civil Wars pass before his eyes. This leads him to apostrophise the life of men in the simile of the wheel, and once more to despair of their vain exploits. His eye is now caught by the contentious strivings of certain men, in a great city. This, Mercury informs him, is Athens, and the men are philosophers. Charon is surprised that they seek the truth from so many different angles, but Mercury explains that this is because truth hides in such a narrow and inaccessible corner, and Charon then expresses a wish to listen. They hear first Plato, discoursing with Antisthenes about the ideas, then Aristotle reasoning about the heavens, and finally Chrysippus, tying Hermagoras in knots with his syllogisms about the horns. Charon's gaze now switches, for the last time, to Florence, where Alberti is making preparations for the Certame Coronario. He catches sight of an orator, who is the centre of an admiring crowd, and having ascertained from Mercury that this is Laurus Quirinus, a promising rhetorician, who is delivering a speech
against Invidia, they both listen. After the oration, Mercury makes a fulsome tribute to the brilliance of Quirino's rhetoric, and then Charon and he go off to their respective duties.

The dialogue is quite transparently based upon the Charon of Lucian, which would have been available to Quirino at this time either in the Greek text or the translation by the anonymous author contained in ms. S. Croce XXV, IX. The characters are the same, Charon's reason for visiting the earth is similar, and the mode of obtaining a vantage-point is identical. Furthermore, though the individual observations which Charon makes of mankind's activities are different in the two dialogues, their style is similar. For example, in Charon 8 the ferryman asks, in Homeric centos, who a certain strong man is, and, upon hearing Mercury's reply, makes a suitable comment on his activity. Similarly, in Quirino (pp. 484-5) Charon asks what city he sees before him, and upon hearing Mercury's answer, comments upon the sight. The technique of focusing in upon conversations is derived directly from Charon 10 and 12, though once again the actual material is taken from elsewhere, except for the comments of Antisthenes (p. 488) upon Plato's ideas, which derives (but for the addition of the name Antisthenes) from Vitae Auctorum 18. Moreover, Quirino's use of the scheme is more frequent than Lucian's, occurring as it does four times, and covering what is the main focus of the piece, namely the oration of Quirino himself. From Charon too is taken the method of dispensing with normal historical chronology which is so marked here. Like Lucian, Quirino feels free to dart from antiquity to the present without a blink. Finally, one may mention the simile used by Charon to

24. See Chapter I, p. 14 ff. If one accepts Lockwood's dates for Rinuccio's translation, i.e. 1440-43, then this may also be admitted as a possible medium for Quirino's knowledge of Charon. But Wilmans and Bertalot assign it to 1449 or after, p. 496. It is impossible to discern which was Quirino's direct source.
express his feelings about man, which has its counterpart in Charon
19, though there is no material relation between the two. Moving
away from Charon, it is possible that the idea of presenting himself
in the fabric of the dialogue was suggested to Quirino by the Piscator
or Bis Accusatus, works in which Lucian, albeit under a pseudonym,
appears.

Almost more important than the similarities are the things
which Quirino chose to omit in his adaptation. Charon is not laugh­
ing when Mercury accosts him, and although laughter is one of his
chief reactions to the folly of mankind in Lucian (e.g. 8,13,14,16 etc.),
in Quirino he is consistently shocked by what he sees (e.g. p.484:
O stulta hominum mens, que in talibus oblectatur bonis.). Other
humorous appendages have been avoided by Quirino also. In the intro­
duction in Lucian, there is much made of Mercury’s haste to complete
his task for Zeus, and of Charon’s insistence that Mercury conduct
him around, in return for the favours he has always granted him in
terms of the work he has to do in ferrying the dead. This is all very
amusing, as is the Homeric element in the piling up of the mountains,
and the sharpening of Charon’s sight (Charon 3-7). All this has been
cut down by Quirino to the bare bones of the action, which, though
amusing in itself, is not here given any additional boost, such as is
evident in Lucian. Noticeable too is the absence of Charon’s peculiar
perspective, which throughout the Greek dialogue is brought to bear
upon every facet of human life which is there presented. In Lucian
Charon’s role as ferryman of the dead and the backcloth of death are
ever before our eyes, giving constant meaning to the acts which are
being observed. Quirino has stripped Charon of this particularly apt
viewpoint completely, substituting instead a purely moral perspective,
which opposes to the vanity of human pursuits not the finality of
death, but the preferability of virtue. Thus in Lucian Charon, after
seeing the way in which men conduct themselves, shouts out to them that they are fools, since what they so eagerly accumulate will all be taken away by death. (20) But in Quirino the first thing that Charon says upon seeing the view from the mountain is (p.484):

O stulta hominum mens, que in talibus oblectatur bonis, frustra vigilat, frustra sudat in vanis floccis pendendis aspermandisque rebus. Peucoes admodum cerno, qui cum virtute d cogn,

Thus he indicates his interest in life itself, and the precepts by which it should be run. This impression of his attitude is further strengthened by his reaction to the answers of the gymnosophists (p.486):

nam et ea responderunt, que in admiracionem quemvis movere possent.

It is set in its proper place, however, only by the speech against Invidia, for this is at once meant to underpin Charon's attitude, and also to provide the cause of all the evils which he has seen. For the nihilistic view of Lucian, Quirino has substituted a perspective whose emphasis is upon life, and the battle between vice, in the form of Invidia, and virtue.

Great originality cannot be claimed for the Dialogus. Its main strength lies in the structure borrowed from Lucian, which has been weakened by the removal of the chief prop to Charon's character and by the limitation of its imaginative scope. Humour, the mainstay of Lucian's art, has almost wholly been banished. But despite its literary shortcomings it does have for us a great value as evidence of Quattrocento reading of Lucian, and as such it confirms the conclusions already made above. Quirino, like many more of his contemporaries saw in Lucian material useful to the propagation of moral truths. Whether or not he realised the existence of the qualities which he ignored, the humour and the irony for instance, it is impossible to say. His adaptation clearly shows, however, that they cannot have been uppermost in his consciousness. Of the advances made by Alberti and Vegio in relation to Lucian, Quirino shares only in that of form.
Contarini, another Venetian, was born around 1422 and died some time after 1460. Like Quirino he received his education at the Studio in Padua, graduating first in arts, then in law. He was not, however, as arrogant and unpopular as his compatriot, though the laudatory speeches made by Niccolo Barbo and an anonymous author are balanced on the other side by the invectives which he aimed at Daniele Porciglione and, in the work which concerns us here, Giovanni da Prato. The University of Padua employed him as lecturer in Philosophy, but he did not restrict his talents purely to education, going as orator for the Republic on embassies to Bologna, Pope Pius II, and Siena. Of the last his own account, under the title of Commentarii, has survived. His other literary endeavours, apart from letters and speeches, were a Novella in Italian, entitled Novella di Tedaldino e monna Rose, and the Dialogus which is of interest to us here.

The interlocutors are Guidantonius, who has not been identified, Ianocius, who may be either Gianozzo Manetti or Gianozzo Alberti, and Sanlazarus, the jurist Giovanni da San Lazzaro, professor at Padua from 1440 to 1448. Guidantonius brings Sanlazarus to Ianocius in order to join the two in bonds of friendship. Ianocius rejoices to receive a new friend, but is puzzled since he has heard that

25. This and the following information about Contarini from Sgarizzi, 'Contarini', pp. 277-306.

26. Sgarizzi, 'Contarini' publishes the text of the Dialogus, pp. 293-306, but with many errors, which are pointed out by Wilmams & Bertalot, p. 504, n. 4. Page references are to Sgarizzi's text.

27. Sgarizzi, 'Contarini' p. 281. Manetti is the conjecture of Zeno, but Sgarizzi prefers Alberti, an interlocutor in the Famiglia of L.B. Alberti.

Sanlazarus was dead. This Sanlazarus dismisses with an adage, and is backed up by Guidantonius' claim that no-one dies who has lived *in virtutibus*, and who has devoted himself to the pursuit of knowledge, for he is kept alive by his fame. This reminds Sanlazarus of his recent calamities, and of his voyage to the world beyond in Charon's boat, though at this stage he only recounts a part which is of consequence to the present discussion, namely an inscription on the walls of Sinope averring the immortality of Diogenes. This sentiment Ianocius supports with a long list of ancient examples, returning at last, with Guidantonius' concurrence, to urge Sanlazarus to tell them the whole tale. This Sanlazarus does, recounting the long and terrifying journey in Charon's ferry past the sirens, Scylla and Charybdis, Libya, where he espies one Antonius Gunisius, an exile from Lucca, and on to the Strophades islands, where the entrance to Hades lies, passing on the way another contemporary, Giriaco d'Ancona, intent upon discovering an inscription. Once in Hades, he is chained and led to the court, where, after cases concerning Brutus and Cassius, Proserpine, Ganymede, Trajan and Petrarch, he is tried and acquitted. On his way to purgatory he passes by those who are being punished, and stops to converse with Giovanni da Prato, a jurisconsult contemporary with Contarini, who is undergoing vicious tortures at the hands of Tisiphone and Megeira. He is about to pass over the details of his life and crimes, but is encouraged to report them by Ianocius, who expresses a very low opinion of him. Sanlazarus then launches into a long invective, in which Giovanni is accused of prostitution and fraud, and arraigned in the most violent language. Passing on, Sanlazarus describes the journey to the isle of Purgatory, on the way to which he saw three poets being tossed upon the ocean in a boat with no pilot. They informed him that this was a punishment for the wanderings of their literary efforts while alive, and he jibed at them as he was
whisked by. Arrived on Purgatory, he wondered at the marvellous baths and fountains designed for washing away sins, until messengers from Jupiter came to inform him that a ship was being sent to carry him, and those who were with him, to the Elysian Fields. Sanlazarus describes the wonderful vessel which transported them, the beauties which greeted them on their arrival, and finally the games and disputes about precedence which they had been invited to attend. Finally he tells how he has returned for a short while by joining Jupiter's ambassadors, in order to repay the love which some have shown him, and to surprise the rest of his friends by this unexpected arrival. Promising he will give good report of Ianocius when he returns to the Elysian Fields, he begs leave to depart.

That Contarini knew the works of Lucian, or at least the Veræ Historiae, is clear from his citation (p. 305) of the passage (II, 11) where the City of the Blest is described. But although this is the only precise allusion to the Greek author in the Dialogus, there are other passages reminiscent of his own fantastic journey in the Veræ Historiae. For example, the trials witnessed by Sanlazarus (p. 293-5) have their counterpart in Veræ Historiae, II, 7, where similarly ancient disputes are settled, while the arguments about precedence (p. 306) mirror that described in Veræ Historiae, II, 9. Less generally, the description of the awareness that the islands of the shades were at hand (p. 301):

sex insule sese offerunt, e quibus varios penantium ululatus, flagellorum sonitus, hominum fletus audiebamus. Cernere erat per crassam caliginem insulas flamas ventos fumum instar bituminis sulphuris et picis ardentis evomentes

29. Already quoted and discussed in Chapter III, p. 158.
has some verbal relation to *Veriae Historiae*, II, 29 Ø̂vίκα ὅμας ὀμη τε δεινῇ διεδέχετο οἶον ὕσφαλτου καὶ θέλου καὶ πίτης ἦμα καιομένων, καὶ κυνὰ δὲ πουρρά καὶ ἀφέβητος ὕσπες ἢπ', ἀνθρώπων ὑπωμένων, καὶ δ ὧ νε ξοφερός καὶ δμιχλάδος και κατέστατεν ἕξ αὐτοῦ δρόσος πιτίνη, ἴκνομοιν δὲ καὶ μαστίγων ψόφων καὶ οίμωσην ἀνθρώπων πολλῶν.

Other correspondences may be seen between the miraculous fountains mentioned by Sanlazarus (p. 302 and 304) and those in Lucian's paradise (*Veriae Historiae*, II, 16), the river of nectar (p. 304) and Lucian's river of wine (*Veriae Historiae*, I, 7), and the circenses ludi (p. 305) and Lucian's "Games of the Dead" (*Veriae Historiae*, II, 22).

Parallels could be multiplied quite easily by looking at other works besides the *Veriae Historiae*, but the results would be as inconclusive in determining the degree of dependence upon Lucian, as are those already quoted, since imitation is not purely and not even necessarily a process of copying bits and pieces extracted from other writers. Yet it was on the basis of the lack of really detailed correspondence that Segarizzi denied that this was an imitation of the Lucianic dialogues, "ai quali si potrebbe avvicinare per il giudizio infernale e per le dispute finali, senza però poter affermare che il Contarini si sia ispirato a Luciano nemmeno in codesti episodi, gli uni communi ad altri autori, gli altri a dirittura tolli dalla realtà." 30.

Now it is true that voyages beyond the tomb, whether or not they take in a visit to the tribunal of the dead, are not uncommon in literature, appearing as they do in Homer, Vergil and Dante, not to mention the medieval 'Voyage of St. Brendan'. Nor is the dialogue form a literary rarity, used as it was by Plato, Cicero, Tacitus, Petrarch and a good many more authors of the Tre-and Quattro-cento. What is uncommon is a combination of the two, such as we find in Contarini,

and in no other author ancient or modern but Lucian, whose fantasy voyages in *Menippus* and *Icaromenippus* are encased in an introductory dialogue, such as we find here.

More important than this, however, is the tone of the fantasy voyage, and its overall intention. In Homer, Vergil, Dante, and St. Brendan the tone is straightforward, the intention serious. In Contarini, the tone is constantly modified by irony, and the intention is satirical. These observations may be illustrated by several passages. Irony is present in the correction of several poetic errors, notably in the description of the sirens: (p. 291)

*Verum, cum propius accessisset, magna de spe decidi et e vestigio errorem gravissimorum poetarum plane percipi. Pro sirenis siquidem meretrices tres conspicio...*

but particularly in the reference to Lucian (p. 305). It is also obvious in Sanlazarus' explanation of why he has returned, (p. 306)

*ut hominibus de me benemeritis aliqua ex parte in amore responderem,*

a covert reference to such as Giovanni da Prato, whose enemies he has pleased by satirising, as well as openly referring to those well received by Contarini. The satirical intention is displayed by this letter, together with the many contemporary references, to Ciriaco d'Ancona, who is laughed at as he tries to bolster his fame by collecting an inscription in which his own fanaticism is ironically portrayed, to the three poets, Giacomo Langasco, Matteo Ronto and Antonio Baratella who are adrift in a pilotless boat, because their poetry was such, and not least to Giovanni da Prato, the invective against whom is the central feature.

It is precisely in this modification of the fantastic voyage by irony and satire that Lucian's influence is obvious. But, given the initial impetus by a reading of *Verse Historiae*, and perhaps *Menippus*...
and *Icaromenippus* also, Contarini had enough imagination to do the rest himself. The result leaves, however, an uneven tone such as is not found in Lucian. Contarini's irony is only intermittent, while his satire, concentrating on the contemporary as Lucian's rare does, has lost much of its bite. The reader is left, therefore, in several minds, but finally realises that each section must be taken as it is presented, ironically or seriously, whatever the implications for the overall view of the work. Nonetheless, there is much merit in the dialogue, whose language is, like Lucian's, richly studded with tags and quotations from the ancient authors, and whose debt to the Greek satirist may be obliquely admitted by the adoption of a schema (ironical confirmation or denial of the paradoxical evidence of another author) inherited from Lucian himself (perhaps from the references to Aristophanes at *Verae Historiae*, I, 29 and Homer *Ibid.* II, 33), and involving its original creator, but is at the same time set in its true perspective by Contarini's covert claim that his own imagination in the matter of describing the wonders of the Elysian fields has surpassed that of his master. Contarini: indeed learned irony from Lucian, but did not need to pick his bones for material, and indeed took formal ideas and the germs of structure from the same source, but could clothe them himself.
Valagussa, a native of Brescia, was born in 1428, and died in 1464. His life was devoted to the study and teaching of the studia humanitatis, a love for which, fostered in the school of Nicola Botano at Brescia, was brought to maturity during his long sojourn in Ferrara, at the school of Guarino. He moved into the employ of Francesco Sforza in Milan in 1455, where he remained, despite hopes of papal preferment, until his death. The work which concerns us here, the Deorum Dialogus, represents the effort which he made to ingratiate himself with Pius II, in the hope of a Papal recommendation to Sforza, which, when granted, was to prove of no consequence for his future plans. It was written during the two months following the election of Aeneas Silvius, 19th August 1458, and probably was already finished and dispatched to Pius by October of the same year.31.

The dialogue is set in the pagan Olympus, where Mercury craves the attention of Jupiter for an important piece of business. His plea is backed up by Minerva, and Jupiter consents to listen, while Mars and Phoebus indicate their interest also. His speech concerns the predicament of the orators and poets now that their chief supports have been removed, Nicholas V having died in 1455, Alfonso of Aragon in June 1458, leaving only Francesco Sforza to carry the responsibility. The time is ripe for a new protector to be installed, Callixtus III having died on the sixth of August, and the Cardinals being already in conclave to elect the next Pope. At the end of this exhortation, Mars too begs and obtains leave to speak, and begins a tirade against Jupiter for so long allowing the Turks to belittle and over-throw Christianity in the East. The new Pope must be a warrior, to lead the

31. This information and the text from Resta.
march against the infidel. Jupiter, admitting the justness of their pleas, assures them that he has chosen a man who will suit both conditions, and goes on to name Aeneas Silvius as Callixtus' successor, and to praise him in a long oration, covering the main events of his life and career. This done Mars and Minerva prepare to hurry to Rome, to undertake tutelage of Pius II, while Mercury first must convey the glad news to the Muses. Jupiter bids heaven celebrate the day with rejoicing.

There are two pointers towards Lucian's influence here, the form and the title. Clearly enough there are precedents in the Greek author for an assembly of the Gods (Juppiter Tragoedus and Deorum Concilium) where matters of importance are treated, albeit satirically. But equally there are many other dialogues in the corpus which involve the gods as interlocutors. Valagussa's title may suggest a general debt to the ancient author for the overall scheme rather than an unsmiling adaptation of one or the other of these two councils. It does not, however, necessarily indicate a knowledge of Lucian's Deorum Dialogi, which were neither cited nor translated in this period.

That we should think of Lucian as the source for Valagussa's dialogue, and not one of the modern authors already discussed, is shown by the letter which addresses the piece to Pope Pius. It begins:

(p.99)

Admiraberis fortasse, beatissime pater, novum scribendi genus
in laudas tuas cunctis mortalibus admirandas a me muper
excogitatum. 32.

We have already argued above (p.221) in the case of Vegio, that the claim to have thought up a novum scribendi genus indicates the use of a classical rather than a modern exemplar. Lucian would have been available to him not only in Latin translations, but in the original

32. Page references are to Resta's text.
Greek also, for he was pursuing studies of this language while at Ferrara, and could easily have used Guarino's copy of the works for reading practice at some stage. He may even have been encouraged so to do by a teacher who had discoursed upon the merits of the satirist's writings. These observations may be given added support by the parallel between Jupiter's statement (p. 109) sed soleo saepenumero pessimos viros... in altum extollere, ut cadendo maiorem ruinam patientur and that of Charon at Charon 14 ἐν τοσούτῳ δὲ ἐπαιρεόμενώ ὡς ὁ ἄφισσι ψυλλέον ἱλαρότερον καταπιεσόμενοι and that between the speech of Mars (p. 106 ff.), who vigorously attacks the father of the gods for his unconcern, and the opening chapters of Timon. A specific point in this latter is the accusation that Jupiter is sleeping, which is found in Mars' mouth (p. 107) and Mercury's (p. 100), and in Timon 2. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that Mars' reference to Jupiter's constant state of business (p. 105: te semper ob immemorabilis necogia tua impeditum offenderim) is reminiscent of the complaint of Virtus in Virtus Dea (Quid igitur: nase vero alius semper habebunt negotii quo nos exclusas teneant ac floccipendam?). This may well point to Alberti as the chief source, from whom the type of internal scene-setting which is a mark of Valagussa's dialogue could have been learnt as well as from Lucian, though, as in the case of Vegio, one must assume that he would have considered the author of Virtus Dea to have been Lucian.

Whatever the truth of the relationship, the marks of Lucian's influence upon Valagussa are not strong. If he used the Greek author directly, he discarded his humour and satire, though whether by choice,

---

33. For his Greek studies see Resta, p. 12, 13, 14, 16 n. 1. For Guarino's copy of Lucian, see above, Chapter I, p. 1-2 & n. 6.

34. See Chapter II, p. 77-9.

35. Opera inédita p. 134.
or purely through the influence of the current moralistic interpretation of his works it is impossible to say. Even assuming that he used Virtus Dea as his inspiration the same thing applies, for Valagussa's gods are portrayed without the slightest hint of irony, and his purpose has encomium as its basis, not satire. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this wedding between ancient form and modern matter, is precisely this role of the pagan gods, and the serious way in which they deal with the election of Christianity's highest officer. Valagussa seems to sense no conflict in their juxtaposition, allowing Jupiter the exclamation bone Iesu as if to emphasise the amalgamation. The message, at least for the reception of Lucian in the Quattrocento, is clear: the satirist's deities provide a useful moral framework, and are in no way contradictory in their employment to the spirit of Christianity. This naïveté was helpful in propagating Lucianic schemata during the Quattrocento, but was due to reap its full reward in the face of the severely dogmatic sixteenth century Reformers.
V. Giovanni Pontano (1426-1503)

Pontano, secretary to the kings of Naples and leader of the Neapolitan Academy, besides being a poet and writer of prose treatises, was also the author of five dialogues, one of which, Charon, is of interest with respect to the influence of Lucian. Written around the year 1467, it is set in the pagan underworld, and deals with the foolishness of men, and the true values according to which life should be lived. Though surviving in only two manuscripts, the dialogue nevertheless seems to have achieved a certain popularity through the medium of print, for it appeared in one XV century and six XVI century editions.36.

In the first of a number of separate scenes, we are introduced to Minos and Aeacus, who converse about the value of negotium in the pursuit of virtus, and the goodness of God, so loving of mankind that he sends omens and portents before he punishes them for their sins. The two judges are taking advantage of a holiday for their discussion, and soon they are joined by Charon, who, because himself a philosopher, takes equal part in lamenting the vices of man, especially ingratitude, which has been responsible for such enormities as the murders of Socrates and Christ. The arrival of Mercury on the other bank of the Styx puts an end to Charon's participation, and we are left to listen to the two judges as they consider the conversion of the ferryman to philosophy. Further away Mercury and his assistant Pyrichalcus are

References in the work to the incursions of the Turks into Libernia give a rough date between 1458 and 1468. Rossi V., p.518 (note 37 ) dates it more precisely by the references to Ludovico Scarraemo (d. 1465), G. D. Nella (d. Oct. 1467) and the earthquakes in the kingdom of Naples in Jan. 1466. The text is published by Tallarigo pp. 639-744. Also, more recently, and more critically, by Previtera, pp. 3-45. This is the text referred to by page. For the mss. and editions see Previtera, pp. XVI-XXI.
dividing up the dead, and branding them so that they will easily be recognised by the judges. Among them are two cardinals, who try to hide under their red caps. Charon arrives, and his greeting to Mercury begins a bantering conversation in which pungent satire is aimed at the gods. They embark, and the satire continues as they sail, turning now upon the interpreters of Aristotle, now upon priests, doctors and lawyers. Upon the other bank, Charon leaves the boat with Mercury, and they travel through fields of flowers to meet the two judges, who are anxious to know what is happening on earth. Mercury informs them of the earthquakes and the comet which have appeared in Italy, and the way in which men stupidly blame this very rare anger of nature, when they seek war of their own accord the rest of the time. Attention is given to the subject of free will and predestination, and to superstition, some of the most foolish examples of which, such as Martinmas and the Neapolitan pig-hanging ceremony, are given as illustrations. Charon now departs, and we follow him, as he converses on his way with Diogenes and Crates. Meanwhile Minos and Aeacus ask Mercury the meaning of the portents, and he tells them that they foretell war, conducted by priests for the increase of their kingdom. Minos and Aeacus are horrified, but Mercury recalls that all things fail in time, even the glory of Greece, which is now subjected to the Turks. The two judges, perturbed by the imminence of a great influx of souls, return to their colleague. Mercury now awaits Charon's boat at the bank, and is immediately faced with three grammarians, whose quibbles he hears and satirises. The scene switches to Charon, who is embarking several shades on the other bank. These he questions, the prostitute, the friar, the bishop, the girl deceived of her virginity by a priest, and listens to their sad, ridiculous, or poignant stories. The dialogue closes with his conversation with two more shades, the first of whom jokes with him, and tells of his formula for
a happy life, the second of whom discourses on virtus. The work is completed by the addition of two poems, the one spoken by the guilty shades, the other by the innocent.

As with Giorgio Valagussa, there is no objective evidence to substantiate Pontano's reading of Lucian. He does not refer to him by name in any of his writings, and so far as I have been able to discover, there is not even the voice of a contemporary to link his and Lucian's works, as there is in Vegio's case. Nonetheless, the affinity between this dialogue and those of Lucian in form, tone, technique and even theme, is quite marked, and it is unthinkable that Pontano did not know several of the Greek author's works fairly well. This would have been possible in Naples where the Dialogus Mortuorum xii had arrived by 1441, and where Lilius Tifernas, translator of the Verae Narrationes, also resided.37

In form the work is a Dialogue of the Dead. But in its episodic structure, as well as in the use of that part of Hades and those characters associated with the journey over the Styx and the judgement of mortals, it is particularly akin to the Cataplas. The technique whereby one episode is linked to the next, and the introduction of characters and the description of location and scenery is embedded in the speech of the interlocutors is also borrowed from Lucian. In addition, Pontano has learned much about tone from his source, for although the dialogue has a fundamentally serious purpose, there are whole passages where satire, irony, humour and verbal play are foremost, and which give relief to the moralising sections. Doubtless in the insertion of such material Pontano was following the general view of Lucian as a serio-comic author, and was, like Contarini and Vegio, making an attempt to imitate his method.

37 See above Chapter III, p.109, and Chapter I p. 32.
Particularly interesting as a combination of humorous techniques inherited from Lucian is the passage in which Charon and Mercury first greet one another. Charon opens with a natural salutation (p. 12, line 9): *Salvum te ac sospitem venisse, Mercuri, gaudeo.* But Mercury is not in the mood to accept such loose use of language, and replies (p. 12, lines 10-11):

> Ubi nam est, Charon, philosophia quam profiteris? Deum sospitem venisse gaudes ac si nocere quipiam possit Deo.

To this quibble Charon opposes an ironical account of the troubles of the gods, reminiscent of the words of Momus in *Deorum Concilium*, or of Damis in *Jupiter Tragedus* or of Lucian himself in *De Sacrificiis* (p. 12, lines 12-14):

> Et Deus male habitus ab hominibus fuit, dum inter eos ageret, et coelum vereor ut securum sit, tot inter se dissentientibus diis...

But Mercury, ignoring the destructive tone, and implicitly admitting the truth of the accusations, says that there is no need to fear now, since the gods have given up their attentions to mortal women.

Charon, remaining ironical asks: (p. 12, lines 27-3) *Consenuerunt ne coelestes, an spadones lex aliqua fieri eos iussit?* Mercury, still very straight-faced, puts the affair in its historical perspective, and in a piece of consummated fantasy tells of Jupiter's last conquest, the resulting loss of a tooth, and its replacement by a false one made of ivory. This is capped by the bland statement that the gods' ministers have since been permitted to take their place, a satiric dart against the corruption of religion which is by no means alone in the dialogue.

This is not an imitation of any specific passage in Lucian. There are many places in his works where the gods are treated ironi-

ally because of the inconsistency of the stories about them but the matter-of-fact tone of Mercury in the presentation of paradoxical
material is reminiscent of Menippus in the *Necyomanteia* and *Icaromenippus*. The final barb recalls the irony of the tyrant's admission of guilt for murders, but not for sexual crimes in *Cataplus* 27. Further, the intimate concern for words which is the starting-point for this episode, and which may be illustrated from elsewhere in the dialogue (e.g. the word play on *campani* and *campanae*, p. 26, lines 24-25; *canem* and *piscinanem*, p. 28, lines 31-32: *Istrio* and *Istria*, p. 39, lines 35-6), may be paralleled in the *Verae Historiae*, where much of the humour is related to the inventive use of language.

Pontano is hard to pin down in specific borrowings, precisely because his imitation, like Alberti's, is dynamic, and in no way superficial. But it seems likely that several passages in the Greek author helped him in invention, as we have seen that he was helped in form, technique and tone. The suggestion for the philosophic interests of Charon surely stems from his role in Lucian's *Charon*, where he makes serious, as well as humorous, observations upon 'la condition humaine'. His humour too, reflects the character of the ferryman in *Charon* and *Cataplus*. Particularly significant are the attitudes of Mercury and Charon to certain human foibles in the continuation of the passage already cited. As in Lucian's *Charon* their reaction is laughter (p. 15, line 13, *Vix risum tenes*, Charon; p. 16, line 10, Ch.: *Eum ego... in aliis multis ridebam...*). Charon's wish for men to know of the pains of Hades, that they might become better (p. 7, lines 6-8), and Minos' unhopeful reply were perhaps suggested by *Charon* 20, where the ferryman wishes to shout out to mankind, but is prevented by Mercury, whose opinion is that it would do no good. This passage may also be the inspiration for Mercury's statement (p. 31, lines 11-13) that men quod praesentibus solum voluptatibus intenti sunt, nihil sunt de futuro solliciti, nec vident haud multo post seque, suasque
The suggestion for the idleness of Charon, and specifically for the statement (p. 5, lines 1-3):

\[ \text{etque adeo indignabar...ut in Plutonis aerarium ne collybum} \]

may be taken from [Cataplus 1] kai σχεδον ὁμφὶ βουλυτὸν ἔστιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδέποτε οὐδὲ ὁβολὸν ἐμπεπολῆκαμεν. εἰτα δὲ Πλούτων ἐσὶ οἶς ὅτι ἐμὲ ἐφθυμεῖν ἐν τούτοις ὑπολήψεται.

The branding of the shades before embarkation (pp. 11, line 117–p. 12, line 7) is perhaps an extension of the idea in [Cataplus 24] whereby all shades must display to Rhadamanthus the scars left on them by their wickedness during life.

Furthermore, the categorisation which they undergo before the crossing in Pontano is paralleled by their division into groups in [Cataplus 3] 5-7. Two other suggestions may have come from this last piece. First, the pointing out of offenders (p. 43, line 12ff.) is related to the indictment by Cyniscus of the tyrant (Cataplus 24ff.), although the role of Menippus in Dialogus Mortuorum X could also have provided the inspiration. Secondly, the characters of the two shades whom Charon deals with last, one laughing and cynical, the other serious and philosophic was perhaps suggested by the characters of Micyllus and Cyniscus in Cataplus. On the other hand, they may be an extension from the passage at Cataplus 3 where Clotho describes the arrival of Hermes:

καὶ ἄλλου ἀνεύματα ὅρω, ἐναὶ δὲ τινὰ καὶ πήγεν ἐξημμένων καὶ σώλων ἐν τῇ χεῖρι ἔχοντα, δειμην ἐνορωντα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπιστούδοντα.

Finally, the idea of a message being carried from Hades to the upper world to give information to the living, which Pontano uses (p. 36, line 13ff.) to satirise the grammarians, is perhaps derived from Dialogus Mortuorum I, where Diogenes asks Hermes to deliver a message to Menippus.
Despite its classical basis, Pontano's dialogue is a work thoroughly in tune with the ideas of its time. Borrowings aside, it deals with problems of a philosophical nature, as well as satirising the excesses of the religious and the quibblings of the grammarians, preoccupations not of his source, but of his age, in a way which transcends pure imitation. Yet his observation of Lucian's techniques was the clue to his measure of success in this new form, and he can only have gained his mastery of them from first hand experience. More, perhaps, than any dialogue outside of those of Alberti, Pontano's Charon represents the potency of Lucianic imitation.
VI. Pandolfo Collemuccio

Collemuccio, a native of Pesaro, born in 1444 and executed by Sforza in 1504, was, during the 1490's, associated with the court of Ferrara. He was a learned man, a student of all matters concerned with the ancient world, and proficient in both Greek and Latin. During his stay at Ercole's court, he produced three dialoghi lucanei, Specchio d'Esopo, Filotimo and Apologi Quattuor, which claim our attention here. First, however, we must examine his acquaintance with the works of Lucian and some associated problems.

It is clear from the Specchio d'Esopo that Collemuccio knew Lucian, since he appears as a character in the dialogue. He and Plautus are introduced as cortesani of the king to whose court Aesop has once tried and failed to gain admission with his gift of Apologi, and to which he returns in the company of Hercules. Lucian is described by the doorkeeper Blacico as da Patrasso, a reference to the Asinus, where Lucius of Patras describes his adventures in the form of an ass, and which is probably not a genuine work. This piece is referred to again, along with Verae Historiae, a little earlier (p.93), when Aesop says, describing his use of the method of confuting great falsehoods by the addition of an even greater one:

come un amico mio greco già fece, che disse esser già diventato asino e altre volte con le navi esser stato, e aver visso bon tempo asino quindici giorni nel corpo di un grandissimo pesce.

38. For his life see Saviotti.
40. Croiset, p. 43. One the other side see Perry.
41.
The inaccuracy of the reference to *Verse Historiae* and the use of the nomenclature *da Petrasso* seem to indicate that Collemuccio had no great interest in the detailed study of the satirist. Nonetheless, he knew several other of his works, as may be seen from the passage (p.98) where Lucian confesses himself unable to interpret Aesop's reference to the mirror, later explained by the king:

Io, o re, con molti savi ho praticato, in tanto che una volta io ne vendetti una mandria per pochi denari, e ho veduto assai del mondo e insino con Caronte, infernal dio, ho già avuto commercio, e s'io dicesi con Giove ancora, non mentiria; et èmmi bastato l'animo (come tu sai) fare de la mosca un elefante.

The first work is clearly *Vitae Auctior*, the second perhaps *Charon*, but possibly *Cataplus*, the third *Jupiter Confutatus* (Collemuccio assuming with Poggio that the interlocutors are the author himself and *Jupiter*\(^{42}\)) and the last *Museae Laudes*. He may also have known *Icaromenippus*, *Nigrinus* or *Callus* since he puts into Aesop's mouth (p. 93) a simile akin to those concerned with the tragic actor and his pretence in chapters 29, 11 and 26 of those dialogues respectively:

l'assomigliai a quelli istrioni che rappresentano Ercole ne le tragedie, che pareno terribili e robusti con quelle grandi e grosse mazze in mano, e infine sono pieni di stoppa li lor abiti, e le lor mazze di carta e sono vòte dentro.

Not a direct copy of any passage, it is perhaps closer to that of *Callus*, than that of *Icaromenippus*, *Nigrinus* perhaps having furnished the name of Hercules.

Collemuccio's knowledge of Lucian and his works is clearly established by these references. But if we wish to know more of his importance to Collemuccio, we must examine the role of Lucian in the

---

\(^{42}\) See above Chapter III, p. 146.
dialogue itself. He is presented, we have seen already in Chapter
II as a philosopher whose experience of life is great and whose
method of relating the truth is not concerned with syllogisms and
long arguments, but is simple and direct. This information does not,
however, refer to Lucian alone. Part of it is from Aesop's descrip-
tion of Plautus and Lucian, and part is deduced from Lucian's des-
cription of Aesop and his methods (for he states that he and Plautus
are Aesop's followers). Furthermore, when Aesop has gained admittance
to the king, and he is being questioned about the use of the Apologi,
neither Lucian nor Plautus, the king's favourites already, can under-
stand his answer, though the king can. The implication is clearly
that Aesop has gained admission to and favour with the king for two
reasons. First because the king does associate with learned, witty and
philosophical authors (Plautus and Lucian are examples of his taste),
secondly because he is, if anything, wiser than those with whom the
king now consorts, although admittedly these are wise too. But if,
as this analysis suggests, Lucian's role in the dialogue is secondary,
and the important literary figure is Aesop, why is he there in the
first place? Perhaps his presence and that of Plautus indicate the
ture tastes of the king there portrayed, to whom the dialogue and the
Apologi brought by Aesop are therefore dedicated, and who is thus doubly
flattered, both by the praise for his education and literary taste and
by the gift. External evidence will confirm this view of Lucian's
presence in the work, if we try to establish the identity of the king
in question. Saviotti considered that the Specchio might have been
composed to preface a collection of the Apologi Quattuor dedicated to
the King of Naples, and that the work was completed some time after
the latter.43. But the Apologi were originally dedicated to Ercole of
Ferrara, and Saviotti gives no evidence which might substantiate his

43. Collenuccio, p. 358. But in his earlier work (Saviotti, p. 218) he had
stated that the Specchio was clearly a preface to the Apologi which
Collenuccio dedicated to Ercole.
conjecture that it was rededicated elsewhere. Indeed the only stumbling block to this assumption is the use of the term "re", which is above the Duke's station.\textsuperscript{44} That this may be set aside as a piece of flattery quite in keeping with the tone of the piece is clear when we examine two good reasons for the identification. The first is that while we have no evidence of the taste of the King of Naples for Lucian and Plautus, we do know that Ercole of Ferrara read and enjoyed Lucian, and had the plays of Plautus performed in his palace.\textsuperscript{45} Secondly, one of the main figures in Specchio and occupying an important place in each of the Apologi and in Filotimo, which was also dedicated to Ercole, is Hercules. Had the piece in fact been designed for the King of Naples, these allusions would have had no meaning, whereas their continuity in the three works, and especially Specchio and Apologi, is immediately relevant in the context of their dedication to Hercules' earthly namesake. One consequence of this argument is that the date of the Specchio should be the same as that of the Apologi, 1497, rather than later.

Collemuccio's Lucian, then, was a figure of convenience, placed in the dialogue to facilitate the introduction of a new favourite. The author, judging both by the importance attached to Aesop in this work, and by the choice of the term apologus (particularly associated with the manner of Aesop) to describe the genre of all three, clearly felt that the chief influence upon him was the work of Aesop. Be that as it may, the impression which the three pieces leave is certainly not that they are simple fables. Even where the narrative style is retained, for instance in Agenoria, the allegory and the

\textsuperscript{44} Saviotti does not account for the dedication to Ercole found on the ms, Vat. Urb. 1228, which he describes, Collenuccio p. 358.

\textsuperscript{45} See above Chapter II for Ercole and Lucian, Rossi, V., pp. 380-381 for Plautus. The very interesting question of why Ferrara was particularly favourable to Lucian demands separate treatment, and is unfortunately beyond the scope of the present discussion.
language are both un-Aesopian in their complexity, while the insistent
enigmatism is also something new. But the use of dialogue (Specchio
d'Esopo, Misopenes, Filotimo) and the concern with social satire
indubitably argue influences beyond the Phrygian fabulist. Whether
these can be said to have included Lucian, and if so, how important
an impact his was, are the questions to which we must now turn.

The Specchio d'Esopo, despite its exaltation of Aesop, is in
form a Lucianic dialogue, whose characters, except the king, are figures
from myth or literature, placed together with no concern for the laws
of time or space. Furthermore, the action of the piece, such as it
is, is indicated, as in Lucian, by the words of the characters
themselves. An instance is the opening (p.87), where the speakers'
identities are immediately made known through the dialogue: Che hai
tu, Esopo....? and the reply: O Ercule, io non m'era di te accorto.
This method may be seen in Lucian for example at the beginning of
Charon. In addition the character of Aesop, with his ability to
excite laughter while instructing (note Hercules' reactions: p. 88:
Tu mi fai ridere, Esopo. p. 90: Tu mi fai..troppe ridere, Esopo.
p. 94: Ah, ah, ah, tu mi fai schioppar la risa!), is in keeping with
the Quattrocento view of Lucian. This is no surprise, since in a
sense the point is made by Lucian himself in the dialogue. But the
fact that he shares an image which had belonged to the satirist
throughout the century, and his employment of Lucianic method and
motif (see above p.254-5 the lie to confute a lie, the simile of the
actor), tend to the conclusion that his character owes much to
Collemaggio's knowledge and reading of Lucian. Here the author's
intention was perhaps belied by a deeper influence.

In Misopenes too, the title of Apologus and the implied relation
to Aesop are misleading. The work, except for a short preface and
epilogue, is in dialogue form, and presents a conversation between
the philosopher Misopenes and two slaves whom he is thinking of buying, namely Chrysius and Sophia, who are being put up for sale at the auction. They are, of course, personifications of gold and wisdom, and the discussion, in which it is discovered that there is a congenital hatred between the two slaves which makes it impossible for the buyer to possess both, turns upon their power. The final choice made by Misopenes is Chrysius, and the god Hercules helps him to obtain his services, which are denied him by Fortuna. The moral, expressed in the Argumentum at the beginning of the piece, and referring to the epilogue rather than to the body of the work, is that the powerful should give aid to virtue when it is deserted by Fortune.

Without doubt, the source for the general idea of the dialogue was Lucian's Vitaeum Auctio, where Jupiter and Mercury put up for sale as slaves the philosophers of the ancient world. That Collenuccio knew this work is clear from Lucian's reference to it in Specchio d'Esopo. His use of it, the reader will notice, is in line with the interpretation of Luca D'Antonio Bernardi. For this latter, the dialogue was not so much a satirical jeu d'esprit as a document of help to the student in discerning the various philosophical sects. Collenuccio seems to have concurred in the allegorical analysis of the dialogue (the servant you choose is the master of your life), and has merely substituted different characters and therefore a different set of moral implications. The new area which he has chosen necessarily involves social comment, and much of this is satirical.

Here too Lucian seems to have given the author some suggestions, which it is of interest to enumerate. The appearance of Chrysius may have been suggested by that of Plutus in Timon, and there are other hints of reference to this dialogue. Chrysius' description of a hypocritical philosopher (p.24):
nam et ille, quem truci adeo aspectu ac fulminantibus oculis
quasi tonantem minasque de inferorum suppliciis ingerentem iis
qui mihi insidiatur, conspicis, is ipse primus est qui me in-
nassare, quasi piscem, cupid, ac tum laqueos mihi intendit
maxime, cum blaterat maxime

is reminiscent of Thrasycles, who appears at Timon 54-7. The refer-
ence made by Chrysius (p.25) to Danae reflects that of Timon in
chapter 41. His remark (p.28) on the consequences of keeping him
locked up in a chest takes up the strain heard at Timon 13-14, and
the idea of such people being punished by the Harpies (qui te tandem
Puriis Harpyisque spoliandum lacerandumque

relinquam) perhaps echoes Zeus’ remark at Chapter 18 διὸδει γιδὲ....
καλὴν τὴν δίκην.... καθάπερ ὁ θεὸς τὴν τεσσαράν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀρεπτίων ἀφεδρούμενοι.

Turning to other dialogues, the false philosophers referred to by
Chrysius (p. 36) are reminiscent generally of those in Piscator 34 ff.,
but the idea may have come from Menippus 4 or Icaromenippus 5 ff.
Also Chrysius’ promise of immediate delivery of the things he has
promised (pp. 38-39):

At ego tibi, ὅ Misopenes, ista actutum confestimque praestabo,
ita ut repente fortunatum te beatumque homines dicant, salutent,
comitentur, deducant, assentiantur, arrideant, mittant munera,
ad cenam vocent, excapitentur, ingeniculentur, paresque tibi
pene ac diis immortalibus honores exibant

perhaps has its source in the remark of Micyllus at Gallus 13 ὡςτε τι ἄν
σοί τό ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἔτι λέγωμι, ὅσας μὲν χεῖδις παρέχεται ὁ θεὸς, ὃς
δὲ ὅσ ἐν πάρῃ καλούσ τε αὐτούς καὶ σοφούς καὶ θεοὺς ἀφερ.
ζεταί τιμὴν καὶ βοήθειν προσάρτου καὶ ἐκ ψυχῶν καὶ ὀφθαλμῶν
ἐν ὄντω πεπλέπτως καὶ ὁσίμους ἐν βεβαίει τίθησι.

Besides these particular suggestions, the scheme whereby Chrysius takes
Misopenes up to a high place (p. 28 ff.) in order to see the various orders of people and hear their faults is perhaps borrowed from Charon, or even Icaromenippus, both of which dialogues use this satiric technique.

But if Misopenes is the most demonstrably influenced by Lucian of the dialogues, Filotimo is perhaps the best place to look for the most pervasive effects of his knowledge of the Greek author, since it was composed without the aid of books. This Colleuccio told Ercole in a letter dated 18th January 1497 from Innsbruck where he was engaged in an embassy on the Duke's behalf.46 The work, quale in summa taxa l'ambitione...e lauda la virtu, e dichiara quali sono li veri honori47, is a dialogue between a head and the cap which it wears. The cap complains bitterly of its lot, that it should be pushed into so many different shapes and positions, and that it should be raised willy-nilly to anyone who seems to the head to be worthy of such greeting. The discussion continues until, by chance, the pair meet with Hercules, who is prevailed upon to settle their argument, and who supports the cap's opinions in explaining the true purpose of raising the hat and the question of real honour. The form is once again the fantasy dialogue, and although the characters are Aesopian in style, this reflects the overall influence of Lucian. There is also the further point that in a general way the conduct of the argument, its satire of the head and of various social classes, is reminiscent of Lucian's Gallus. Indeed, that work could well have suggested to Colleuccio a good way of tackling the moral questions which he had in mind. The only point at which there is anything approaching a

46. Tuctavia recordisi V. Signoria...che questo à facto senza libri. The letter is published by Negri, p. 548.
47. Negri, p. 548.
specific borrowing, however, is where (p. 72) the head asks the cap how she knows so many things, having never studied. Her answer

Di questo non hai da meravigliarti, perché io son stata sopra tanti capi di industriosi, di dotti, di savi, di stolti, di ostinati, di vani e di tante sorte di omini, ch'io seria molto degnà di reprensione se in tanta pratica con loro qualche verità non avessi imparata.

for a moment gives a hint of the cock and his great experience of life learned through many metamorphoses.

In Filotimo we again see little of Aesop, and are reminded by the overall structure of Lucian, especially of the serio-comic moral author which the Quattrocento considered him. But the three narrative pieces from Apologi Quattuor, Agenoria, Alithia and Bombarda present a less clear-cut picture. In each of them the story, which in Agenoria deals with the triumph of Labor, Virtus and Ars over Inertia, in Alithia with the battle between Alithia and Vanitas, and in Bombarda with the invention of the cannon, consists of an allegory, whose characters are moral personifications and pagan gods. The only positive suggestion that these pieces might be related to Lucian is given by the appearance of Nomus in Alithia. He is described as a combatant on the side of truth, who keenly observes the designs and arts of his enemies. At the end of the piece he is given as husband to Alithia. This use of the satiric god is suggestive of a moralistic and allegorical reading of Lucian's dialogues Deorum Concilium and Jupiter Tragoedus (both available in Ferrara in Leonico's version), where Nomus pours scorn on the gods for the contradictions which exist in their world. We have seen in the context of Alberti that such an approach to Lucian could lead to the fabrication of a moral mythology, supposedly derived from his works, which in turn supplied figures for an allegorical treatment of moral subjects.
If these works are based upon Lucian, then their relation to him must be discerned in the light of such an interpretation.

There is, however, a further possibility, which must not be overlooked. The moral interpretation of Lucian above described was also common to Alberti. In addition, among his *Intercœnales* there are several works which might be described as *apologì* (Nubes for instance), and which employ the allegorical and mythological techniques seen in these works of Colleuccio. Besides which, Alberti had produced, in 1437, one hundred *Apologi*, dedicated to a Ferrarese, Francesco Marescalchi. If Colleuccio knew these works, he may well have been influenced by them, rather than by his own moral assessment of Lucian. There is, in fact, one piece of evidence which suggests that some *Intercœnales* were to be found in Ferrara during the latter part of the century, and that Colleuccio knew them. It is contained in a letter from Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus appended to his edition of a work with the title *Pythagorica praecopta mystica a Plutarcho interpretata*, in reality probably the Convalata from book eight of the *Intercœnales*. Gyraldus informs his correspondent that he found the work in a manuscript of his *perscriptus manus Pandulphi Colleunctii viri omnis antiquitatis studiosissimi*.

Nonetheless, it must be admitted that even if Colleuccio knew and was influenced by the writings of Alberti, he was himself capable of making an assessment of Lucian which could lead to a similar type of composition. This may be seen by the relation between *Misopenes* and the *Vitarum Auctio*. Furthermore, he knew enough of Lucian's works to produce something reminiscent of his style of composition even without reference, as may be seen in the case of Filotimo. But this gives us some idea of his method also. For despite a good range of

48. Mancini, 'Vita', p. 148

49. This information is given by Garin, 'Intercœnalesi', p. 193 note 1.
reference in the Greek author's works, he rarely produces anything which is obviously derivative, general formal characteristics aside. If he works, like Alberti, at a distance, however, he does not have the same imaginative power as the Florentine, and although he shares with him a productive attitude to Lucian's works, he is well behind in terms of literary merit. Once again in Collemuccio's case, Lucian's literary influence is shown to be in line with the reputation which he enjoyed during the Quattrocento, but the modern author is, if enterprising, limited in his scope, and in his range far below the best products of the satirist's impact.
VII Matteo Maria Boiardo (1434-1494)

Boiardo's dramatic reworking of Lucian's Timon and its dedication to il illustissimo principe signor Hercule Estense, Duca di Ferrara 50 affords a further glimpse into the favour extended to the satirist in Ferrara during the late Quattrocento. No firm date can be given for the composition of II Timone, but it probably belongs to the period from 1486 onwards, when classical drama began to be performed in Ercole's palace. 51 The piece was almost certainly produced at Ercole's personal request for in the Prologo Lucian says (p.475):

Ma la benignità di quel Soprano

Qual quivi regna, per darvi diletto,

Di greco oggi mi fece italiano,

and Boiardo, who in revising his grandfather's version of Apuleius' Metamorphoses had during the 1470's already taken advantage of Leoniceno's translations of Lucian 52, once more availed himself of these favourite works of the Duke in his new composition. 53

Lucian's Timon with its episodic structure, and frequent changes of scene between heaven and earth, retains many of the characteristics of comedy. It was, therefore, a good candidate for adaptation to stage presentation. But Boiardo's work is more than just a dramatic adaptation, and as will be seen, his approach to the original dialogue results in a change in its character which is fundamental. 54

In the first place his terze rime employ the text very loosely,

50. Text from Boiardo, Vol II, pp. 473-528. Page references are to this.
50a. See n. 45, p. 257.
51. Rossi, V., p. 531.
52. See above chapter I p. 53.
54. For an earlier discussion of Boiardo’s Timone in relation to Lucian see Caccia, 'Luciano', pp. 29-49.
paraphrasing, adding, leaving out. Compare, for instance, this section from the first scene of Act One (p.478)

Ogni tua possa in fabula è conversa
Et a guisa di fumo in su salita
Tanto monta nel ciel che in terra è persa

with the original (Timon 1): ἀπάντα ποταμία πάνω ήρεις ήδη κυνάνειμε καὶ καλύφθας ἀτεχνῶς ποιητικὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ πολιτείου τῶν ὅμορφων. The chief result of this is that the ironic overtones of Lucian vanish into nothing. Take, for example, the finely chiselled verbal humour of this piece from Timon 3

In the realm of dramatic action Boiardo also makes changes, though the material from Lucian remains largely intact. Some of these alterations are suggested by the text, and are aimed at clarifying the action for the audience. Such is the speech of Timon in Act Three, scene 1, (p. 496), where as Mercury arrives with Richeza he is seen on stage digging, and complaining about the human race. In Lucian, Timon 31, it is Hermes who describes what Timon is doing, and he makes no comment himself. Of this type also is the introduction of Fama at the beginning of Act Four (pp. 504-6), to inform the audience that she has told the people of Athens about Timon’s new-found wealth. In Lucian the discovery of the treasure-trove is followed immediately by the arrival of the flatterers, with Timon surmising
that they must have smelled the gold. Since no other link was provided, Boiardo was obliged to invent one. The appearance of Fama is facilitated by the addition (p. 504) to Timon's speech at the end of Act Three (corresponding to Timon 45) his intention to hide the new found wealth. This latter, of course, is an intention far removed from the thoughts of the Lucianic character, whose sole concern after the discovery of this new fortune is to bait and satirise and injure with it those who were responsible for his impoverishment in the first place. But it is not the only addition which is in contradiction to the nature of the Greek work. Right at the beginning, in the Argomento, we learn that Timon became poor through his own wastefulness, rather than his generosity (p. 477)

Cosi sovente aviene a lo infelice

Che spende indarno e il speso non recupera.

At the end of Act One, while Mercury is on his way to find Richeza (another piece of action not included in Lucian) Timon crosses the stage on his way to the little cottage which he owns, soliloquising on the vileness of mankind. He ends (p. 484)

Credete a me, che n'ho la esperienza,

Pegior bestia de l'omo non ha el mondo.

In Act Four, Scene 2, Timon again soliloquises, this time about the cares which wealth has brought to him, and finds a place to hide his riches, the tomb of Timocrates, where he finds another hidden hoard (pp. 506-8).

These latter additions centre around the character of Timon, adding to the theme of misanthropy and turning into a dominant motif something which in Lucian merely serves the satirical action. They also prepare for the major alteration brought about by Boiardo in the outcome of the piece, for, in obedience to the rules of Roman comedy,
he has added a fifth act, whose purpose is to give completion to the unfinished action of Lucian's dialogue. The new section is introduced by Ausilio, who criticises Timon's philosophy of solitude, and demonstrates the maxim that everyone needs to be helped by the story of Timocrates, in whose tomb Timon has left his money. This man before his death decided to save what he had gathered after his own death, for the aid of his son. To which purpose he had himself buried in a dark tomb, and left his son a letter to be opened there ten years from his death. During these ten years Filocoro has fallen on bad times, having quickly spent what wealth he had, and is now in debtors prison. Nevertheless, he sends his freedman Parmeno with the letter, and he is accompanied by Siro. After imparting this information Ausilio departs, and once more we see Timon, complaining of the worries imposed upon him by riches. His sleep has been haunted by the dream of two ants, digging away at the gold he has hidden. When he sees the two slaves approaching, he halts, and we hear them talking. During the discussion Siro opens the letter, and discovers the secret of the tomb. They are about to test the truth of its contents when Timon challenges them with his characteristic brusqueness. During the discussion which ensues, Siro makes some comments upon liberty which start Timon thinking about his own position, and he decides from now on to resume his former life without the riches which cause him such anguish. He is still resolved nonetheless to prevent Parmeno and Siro from entering the tomb, and they hide in the vicinity until he goes. Timon delivers some final words, and Ausilio returns to the stage to tell us the outcome of the story, which is happy for Filocoro, Parmeno and Siro.

Clearly Boiardo was dissatisfied with the abrupt ending which Lucian gives to his dialogue. In his eyes the chief theme, the effect of wealth upon Timon, was cut short, and he remedied this by the invention described above. In altering the character of Timon to fit
in with this new coda he was fulfilling what to him was probably the inherent moral implication of the work. This reading of Timon cannot have been unusual in the Quattrocento, and it is further evidenced by the many moralistic additions to the text. Moreover, that it was considered near enough to the spirit and probably the letter of the Lucianic text is clearly shown by the subscript to the title given in the editions (p. 469) - *comedia...tructa de uno dialogo de Luciano*. But Boiardo's method, even when using the text of Lucian itself, if productive of the type of literature congenial to the readers of the Quattrocento, does not touch the foundation of the satirist's most characteristic features. There is no irony, no fantasy, no linguistic inventiveness, only the body of humorous piece made to serve the ends of a philosophy largely imposed upon it from outside.
VIII Galeotto del Carretto (d.c. 1531)

Del Carretto, a native of Piedmont who spent his life in the court of Monferrato, besides other verse dramas composed Timon Greco, another reworking of Lucian's dialogue. It was written in 1497, and in 1498 sent to Isabella d'Este. In a letter addressed to her in 1497, he admits his source

Io ho fatto al presente una nuova Commedia e l'ho cavata da Luciano, libro a noi altri latini venuto a notizia da pochi anni in qua,

and in another in 1498 he indicates that it was translated by him from Greek and Latin

gli mando etiam la Commedia de Timon composita per me et traducta de greco et latino in rima.55

This probably implies that he used the translation of Bertholdus alongside the Greek text. As in the case of Boiardo, one must note the lack of conflict perceived between composita and traducta.

While Boiardo uses only terzine in his version, Del Carretto makes use of ottava rima also. Like Boiardo, he begins with a Prologue and Argument, in the manner of Roman comedy, not spoken by Lucian, however, but by the poet. A further divergence from the earlier version is the content of the Argument, which in Del Carretto is clearly an accurate appraisal of the contents of Lucian's dialogue. Again, there are five acts, as in Boiardo. Here, however, they follow the action of the original, the breaks occurring at opportune points.

The first act covers Timon's speech to Zeus and the discussion of Zeus with Plutus (Timon 1-19), the second the conversation of Hermes

55. The dates are those of the two letters sent to Isabella. The quotations are from Caccia's account of Del Carretto's version in 'Luciano', pp. 49-56. Text is published by Minoglio, (from Ms. Modena, B. Estense, Racc. Campari, App. 311= y. S.2.27.) Page references are to Minoglio.
and Plutus (Timon 20–30), the third the persuasion of Timon to accept wealth again (Timon 30–40), the fourth Timon's discovery of the treasure to the exit of Philades (Timon 40–48), the fifth the entry of Demes to the end (Timon 49–58). The only divergence in the action proper is, as in Boiardo, where Hermes is told by Zeus to take Plutus to Timon. Del Carretto here adds a few lines in which Mercurio explains Giove's plan to Richeza, and asks him to come to see him. The scope of this alteration is in no way comparable to those made by Boiardo.

Like Boiardo, Del Carretto amends the text itself in various ways. In Timon's speech upon his discovery of the treasure-trove (Timon 42), for instance, he inserts the following lines (incidentally reminiscent of Gallus 13) about gold (p. 46):

L'oro ha parecchie proprietà secrete
Che fanno molti Effecti ha chi l'ha seco.
Fa le persone triunfanti e liete,
Fa bona vista a chiunque ha l' occhio bieco,
L'or fa le genti stolte esser discrete,
O sian latine o di paese greco.
L'hor ha un mantel ch'ogni magama copre;
E chi nel crede se referisca a l'opre.

Sometimes he paraphrases very sparsely, as at the end of Timon's first harangue (Timon 6). All that is left of Ἡθή ποτὲ οὖν ὡς
κεύσου καὶ ῥεῖς ὑπὲρ, τοὺς βαδόν τούτον ὑπον ἀπαρίσταμενος καὶ νήσυμνου ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἐπιμενίδην γὰρ κεκοίμησε τὸν ἐνδείξας τὸν κεφάλαν ἣ ἐκ τῆς Ἀιτίνης ἐναυσάμενος μεγάλης ποιῆσας τῇ φλόγῃ ἐπιδείξας τίνα ὁλὴν καθεῶσας καὶ νεκρίκου Διὸς, εἰ μὴ ἀληθῇ ἔστι τα ὑπὸ τῶν Κερδῶν πεεί σοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐκεί ταφῆς μυθο- λογούμενα
is the weak

Dorme pur Giove e non cercher faticha;
Serra gli orecchi e di chi ha male suo danno,
E come pud chi ha fame se matrica,
Et io vivrommi cum miseria e affanno. (p.17)

Some parts vanish completely, for instance the references to Zeus’ broken thunderbolt (Timon 10 and 19). The result of these procedures, as in Boiardo, is the loss of Lucian’s characteristic irony and humour.

Even where Del Carretto sticks fairly closely to the text his verses fail to capture distinctive qualities in the original. An example is the speech of Zeus (Timon 9), and its counterpart in Act One.

καὶ μὴν οὐ παρεπτέος ἄνδρες οὐδὲ ἁμελητηέος· εἰκότωσ γὰρ ἡμν. ἀκτεί δυστυχῶν ἔπει καὶ ὀμπι σῳ ποιήσωμεν τοὺς κατεκτοίς κόλπους ἑκεῖνοι ἐπικελεσμένοι ἄνδρος τοσότια μην ἔρεων τε καὶ ὀδὴν πιστᾶνα καύσαντος ἤμιν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν· ἔτει γοῦν ἐν ταῖς ένει τὴν κυνίδαν αὐτῶν ἔχω.

Non è da disprezar questo Timone,
Che del suo stato non si lagna a torto.
L’aspra vendetta e gran punizione
Da questi adulator nel petto porto,
E posto non ho già in oblivione
De gli iuvenci il cumul che m’ha sporto,
Che ancor ho ne le nare il proprio odore
De gli holocausti fatti per mio onore. (p. 19)

Del Carretto’s straightforwardness in the face of the jingling παρεπτέος, ἁμελητηέος, and his recasting of the structure of the sentence from εἰκότωσ onwards show a complete lack of appreciation for the fine ironic touches of Lucian’s particles and his word order.
Del Carretto, then, is more stolid and less inventive than Boiardo. But the view of the dialogue which they take is similarly moral, even if Boiardo changes the scope of the original. Del Carretto's opinion is conveyed to the reader not only in his frequent moralising additions, but also in an epilogue, which he addresses to the audience. Since it is instructive of the interpretations of this piece in the Quattrocento, as well as of Del Carretto's own approach, it is worth quoting in full (pp. 62-3).

Voi ch'ascoltate intentamente havete
Questa morale de Timon Comedia,
Exempio sopra lui pigliar possete
Che quando l'huomo è in povertade e inedia,
E refutato e da ciaschun fugito
Si come quel ch'ogni vivente tedia,
Se lui altre fiaste ha ben servito
Mentre fu riccho el suo servir fu vano
Che poi scordato e ognun el vede invito,
Se poi vien riccho appresso e da lontano
Corre ciaschuno el suo commertio brama,
Beato chi tochar gli può la mano,
Ogniun segue il favor e il bon tempo ama,
Si come la cicogna che va al nido
Quando le fronde son per ogni rama.
La povertà non ha proximo fido,
E la virtute non transpare in quella
Però che nacque sotto un tristo sido.
Richeza è quella relucente stella
Che in questo mar mondan ne scorge el passo,
E ne defende d'ogni ria procella.
El maneggiar denar e un dolce spasso,
E chi non ha sel mal suo in pace porta
Ed ogni cura et avaritia cassa.
Un altra cosa in la comedia ho scorta
Per lamentarsi el bon Timon di Giove
E fatto riccho e listo se conforta.
Però ch'in povertà par che si trove
A Dio ricorra e quello pregar voglia
Che sopra i iusti la sua gratia piove,
E fa che lor adempiano sua voglia.

Del Carretto's simplistic view of the dialogue's message, that riches are desirable, poverty is undesirable, and the just can obtain relief in a material sense by prayer, is at one with that of Boiardo. Both writers attain their purpose at much cost to the intentions and the innate qualities of Lucien's work. But in terms of versification and dramatisation, it must be admitted that Boiardo's version is far more adventurous and skilful. While Del Carretto's piece remains another reworking, Boiardo's leads towards a new lease of life for the classical drama.56.

56. The character of Timon seems to have struck a chord in the Quattrocento. Apart from these reworkings, two plays, one by Gigliolo Gigliolo (written in prison in Ferrara 1439) and the other by Titus Livius de Frulovisi (1432/33) have personae called Thimo, as Ludwig has noted in his recent article, p. 360 and note 1.
Conclusion

If one thing is clear from the preceding sections, it is that Lucian had an important influence in the creation of a new genre of moralistic writing. To all the writers here treated, he lent a new scheme in which the exposition of their own humanistic preoccupations could gain a fresh impact and perspective. The Dialogues of the Dead, the god dialogues, the paradoxical encomium, the sale of lives, the ironical fantasy journey, all were startling departures from conventional techniques in presenting moral arguments. They could give well-tried ideas new life. Even the encomiastic efforts of Quirino and Valagussa are endowed with a kind of freshness and vigour, the use of non-human participants bestowing upon the views which they propounded a strange authority.

In more specific techniques, however, Lucian's influence does not seem to have had much impact. Every so often a Vegio or a Pontano makes efforts to mix moralism with humour and irony, and a Contarini shows himself capable of playing Lucian at his own game. But in its deepest aspects Lucian's legacy came to Alberti, not to his contemporaries. While the prevalent moral interpretation of Lucian was no obstacle to his creative comic genius, lesser mortals could not convincingly sustain the serio-comic style.

Nonetheless, these imitators were not without imagination, even if it did not in most cases extend to the realms of linguistic inventiveness conquered by Alberti. Even where a specific scheme has been borrowed from a particular dialogue, as in the case of Quirino, for example, with Charon, Colleuccio with Vitarum Auctio in Misopenes, and even Boiardo with Timon, plagiarism is eschewed, and each has his own ideas around which the borrowed scheme is made to fit. The mere suggestion of Gallus was enough to set Colleuccio on the imaginative
trail which led to the Filotimo. Individual passages from Lucian are sometimes ransacked for motifs, but almost invariably these are altered so considerably in their new context that their suggestion as a source seems often disputable. The method of Boiardo and Del Carretto, particularly the latter, in relation to a specific text illustrates, however, the prevalent attitude to Lucian's ipsissima verba, and the distance of the borrowings of others from their source need occasion no surprise when put in the context of these "translations". Indeed, one gets the impression generally from the comparison between the imitations and their model, that so far as the works of Lucian were concerned, the technique of reading notebook in hand was little, if at all, employed.

The legacy of Lucian to the Italian writers of the Quattrocento (excluding, of course, Alberti) was, then, in the main that of form. For, even if the technique of ironic writing had to be relearned by later writers, paying closer attention to the particular qualities of Lucian's works, the Dialogue of the Dead, the dialogue of the gods (indeed the whole range of the fantasy dialogue), the paradoxical encomium, the ironic fantasy journey were now naturalised into European literature. But that such a naturalisation could occur was in the first place attributable to Lucian's acceptability as a moral writer. In all areas, that initial perception was the raison d'être of his influence in the Quattrocento.
General Conclusion.

Lucian's availability in Italy during the Quattrocento is not in doubt. Most of his genuine works were obtainable in Greek manuscripts by 1425 and all of them certainly by 1459. Remembering that these are both the latest dates for the manuscripts to which they pertain, we may be assured that the real dates are somewhat earlier. Furthermore, the figures are based only on surviving manuscripts which we know to have been in the possession of Italian scholars during the period, and do not take into account the undoubted existence of others at the same time.

Nonetheless, one must bear in mind that the ability to understand Greek was never commonplace in Italy during the Quattrocento. In fact only about fifty scholars may be traced in connection with Lucian in this century who were capable of reading him in the original. For the rest, it was a question of translations, in both Latin and Italian. This wider audience had a much more restricted access to the works of Lucian, as may be seen from the chronological table (below p. 283-5). Someone wishing to read all the available translations of Lucian in 1450 would have been able to obtain only 21 works (out of 159), while an ardent enthusiast in 1500 would still have found a mere 54. Moreover, such an enthusiast would probably have needed to travel through much of Italy in order to make his collection complete. The map (on the page following) shows the centres where translators, imitators and owners of Greek manuscripts were placed, and it may be seen at a glance that Florence, Rome, Venice and Ferrara would have been more promising points for his purposes than, say, Milan or Naples.

Lucian's popularity, then, must necessarily be set within certain basic limits. To the wider public until the introduction of printing into Italy, relatively few of his works were available. Even when
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publishers began to produce editions of Latin translations from Lucian they gave a very limited selection. Nevertheless, these editions are a telling sign of a vogue for his writings in the latter half of the century which is noticeable in the smaller circle of the Greek scholars also. Several of these owned manuscripts, but the production of the Greek editio princeps in 1496 indicates a greater need than could be fulfilled by scribal endeavour. The addition of an Aldine edition in 1503 confirms this argument. For Greek scholars' interest in Lucian during the whole century, one may cite the evidence gathered by Dr. Bolgar on Greek manuscripts in Italy during the XV century.¹ Purely on statistics, he emerges as one of the top ten Greek authors, prose or verse.

Lucian's reputation, unsullied during this period by the suspicions of impiety and even atheism which surrounded him in the early Byzantine epoch and later in the Reformation, aided the dissemination and popularising of his works. He was regarded as a learned orator who had gained just fame for his talents during his own lifetime, and a moral philosopher whose precepts were helpful in guiding one through the snares of life. Furthermore, his work was made innately more attractive because it was couched in comic form, though it dealt with serious matters beneath the surface.

The basis for this reputation was two-fold. On the one hand the selection of works was biased towards those which had a great deal of moral comment readily discernible in them. On the other it was supported by a system of interpretation which allowed even the least serious passages to be penetrated for the perception of a serious message. The first process is best exemplified in the citations of Poggio from Charon, Piscator, Menippus, Gallus and De Calumnia, and by the implicitly moral interpretation of Timon by Boiardo and Del

¹ Bolgar, Appendix I.
Carretto. The second is seen in the approach of Luca d'Antonio Bernardi to *Vitarum Auctio*, but is given its definitive form in the works of Alberti. He, invoking Quintilian's scheme *ironia*, explained how the figures of the gods and goddesses in Lucian were to be understood, by a process of reversal from the absurd universe to which they belonged in his works, as types of vice and virtue. Thus even the most fantastic and comic works of the Greek author could be brought into line with the currently accepted assessment of his writing by what amounted to a type of allegorisation. Alberti's method, first used in the *Intercoenalis Virtus Dea*, and explained in the prologue to *Momus*, made it possible for him to use the techniques of Lucian, and even some of his material, without restriction. This he did, most particularly and with the greatest scope in *Momus*, a comic-satiric fantasy far beyond any work produced by Lucian, and, despite its adoption of the Greek author as its model, totally original in its execution.

Those who followed Alberti in using Lucian as their model, though influenced to a man by the current modes of interpreting his works, were in the main less capable of discerning the path by which they might most successfully combine his techniques with their own preoccupations. In general they were concerned to examine only in a very superficial way the methods of their literary mentor, and so, as a rule, their imitations display only formal characteristics which can be related directly to the works of Lucian.

There are, of course, exceptions. Vegio's *Disputatio inter Terram Solem et Aurum* displays a clear appreciation of the methods of the ironic encomium. Contarini's *Dialogus* employs comic fantasy, and even involves Lucian in an ironic conceit. Pontano, too, shows a real understanding of the combination of fantasy, irony and pure verbal humour which characterise Lucian's writing. Nonetheless, they,
like Alberti, wrote with the moral aim in view, even if it was couched in satiric garb.

The genre of satire, of course, was not new to the Quattrocento. There had been a healthy tradition running right through the Middle Ages, and the works of the Roman satirists, Horace, Persius and Juvenal, had never been forgotten. Lucian, albeit he had a different approach from these writers and used different forms, was nevertheless regarded as an author who aimed at the same targets, pointing out the vices of society as a whole, and of specific parts of society for all to see and shun. Alberti's view of the way in which the gods were to be understood, the feeling expressed by Secco Polenton that *Parasitus* was a condemnation of what it purported to acclaim, and the indication by Lilius Castellanus that *Verae Historiae* had a satiric purpose are examples which show that even the facets of Lucian's work least susceptible to analysis as serious social criticism were examined from precisely such motives. As other writers in the past had done, so Lucian exposed vice and folly, though in a new and exciting way.

It was Lucian the satirist, the social critic, the moral instructor that the Quattrocento accepted as its own. It was, therefore, in works of a satiric and moral nature that his chief impact on creative writing lay. But the adoption of his forms and techniques, when attempted with some sensitivity and rigour, led directly to the introduction into modern literature of fantasy and irony. Thus, almost insensibly, the imagination was unleashed, and the author given a new power over his material. Alberti was without doubt the greatest practitioner of these innovations. The breadth of invention in *Momus* is staggering, and the persistent implication of unspoken meanings is quite without parallel. But Vegio, Contarini and Pontano must in this respect also be given their due.
One must add that, albeit in a small way, since comparatively few readers prized his comedy above his moral qualities, Lucian provided a stimulus towards comic writing in the Quattrocento. For he helped towards the acceptance of humour as a worthwhile, and not merely a trivial element in literature, and such acceptance was a necessary step before writers dared take the plunge. We may see this side of his influence in the advice given to dedicatess by several translators, urging them to take particular note of the purely comic aspects of the work in question. We know that Alberti at least took the advice seriously!

The early XVI century saw the spread of Lucianism in Northern Europe. Erasmus and More not only translated works of Lucian, but produced imitations also. Erasmus' *Colloquia Familiaria* and *Encomium Moriae*, and More's *Utopia* show the techniques of irony, fantasy and satire already learned by several of their XV century predecessors. They were joined by a host of other converts: Clément Marot, Bonaventure des Périers, François Rabelais, Ulrich van Hutten, Wilibald Pirkheimer and the authors of the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* were among those who used his writings. The spread of Greek studies and the growth in competence of those who subscribed to them carried enthusiasm for the Syrian satirist along with it, as long as the intellectual climate retained that tolerance which it had learned in Italy. But like a bombshell the Reformation shattered Lucian's reputation, so good for so long, and cast doubts upon his moral stature, where there had been none before. In the space of a few short years he fell from the position of one of the most popular and creditable of the ancients to that of a dangerous influence, who had to be well sifted before he could be read. Even so, he had been responsible in this period also for the introduction of some quite new developments in literature (notably irony and fantasy), and few of the great satiric authors of the XVI century escaped his influence.
This brief résumé of later developments serves as a reminder of the limited repercussions of Lucian's impact in the Quattrocento. With the exception of Alberti, whose works were not generally known, and did not catch the attention of authors even when they did become available in print, and Pontano and Vegio, whose dialogues were in circulation but uninfluential, the XV century imitators were either unknown to their Northern successors, or insufficiently representative of Lucian's peculiar genius to transmit his influence, in areas other than the purely formal. The new Lucianists anyway went back to the fountain-head, or to the more recent products of his influence. In terms of literary development, the lessons learned in the Quattrocento were wasted, since they were relearned in the XVI century from their common source.

Nonetheless, Lucian was both a popular and influential author during the Italian Quattrocento, and if that popularity and influence was in large measure due to modes of selection and interpretation with which the modern reader would quarrel, there is here a lesson to be learned. The influence of an author is not necessarily related to his own essential being, nor can it necessarily be assessed by another age from its own viewpoint. It is in large measure a product of the perception of those who are subject to it, and of their own reading of the works of their model. Thus the single most important aim in studying influence must be to discern the current interpretation of the author in question in the epoch under scrutiny. Lucian's case is a startling example of the necessity for such a procedure. For it is only within the framework of an understanding of his status as a moral author, and the modes of interpretation used to reduce his comedy to seriousness, that the question of his impact on the Quattrocento may satisfactorily be answered.
### Chronological Table of Lucian’s availability and impact in the Italian Quattrocento.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1396-1403</td>
<td>Bertholdus’ <em>Timon</em>, Anonymous <em>Charon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>A. da Romagno and P. Marcello correspond on <em>Timon</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1403-8</td>
<td>Guarino’s <em>De Calumnia</em>, <em>Muscae Laudes</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415-19</td>
<td>Guarino’s ms. from Greece, <em>Parasitus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1419</td>
<td>Sicco Polentoni’s <em>Catinia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1423</td>
<td>Aurispa’s complete ms. from Greece.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1425</td>
<td>A. Corbinelli’s books to La Badia: 66 separate works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71 out of 78 genuine works known in Gr. mss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424-5</td>
<td>Aurispa’s <em>Dialogus Mortuorum XII</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1427</td>
<td>Rinuccio’s <em>Dialogus Mortuorum X</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>Filelfo’s ms. from Greece. (Prob. 3 works).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1428</td>
<td>Poggio’s <em>Juppiter Confutatus</em>, <em>De Avaritia</em> (quotes <em>Charon</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1430</td>
<td>Aurispa’s <em>De Amicitia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before 1434?</td>
<td>Alberti’s <em>Virtus Dea</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>Alberti’s <em>De Picture</em> (quotes <em>De Calumnia</em> 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1434-8</td>
<td>Lapo’s <em>De Calumnia</em>, <em>Patiae Laudatic</em>, <em>Tyrannicida</em>, <em>De Somnio</em>, <em>De Sacrificiis</em>, <em>Longaevi</em>, <em>De Fletu</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1440</td>
<td>Poggio’s <em>De infoelicitate principum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440-3</td>
<td>Guarino sends <em>Muscae Laudes</em> to Scipio Mainente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1440-50</td>
<td>Rinuccio’s <em>Vitarum Auctio</em>, <em>Charon</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441-3</td>
<td>Alberti’s <em>Momus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guarino sends <em>Muscae Laudes</em> to Alberti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>Alberti’s <em>Musca</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1441</td>
<td>Lilius Castellanus’ <em>Verae Narrationes</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representation of <em>Dialogus Mortuorum XII</em> in Naples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443</td>
<td>Leuro Quirino’s <em>Dialogus in gymasiis florentinis</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>Aeneas Sylvius’ <em>De miseriis curialium</em> (Résumé of Menippus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maffeo Vegio’s <em>Philalethes</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td></td>
<td>Maffeo Vegio's <em>Philalethes</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>Maffeo Vegio's <em>Palinurus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1446</td>
<td>Guarino's letter to Tobia Borghi <em>De historiae conscribendi forma</em> (Using <em>Quomdo historia conscribenda sit</em>.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1450</td>
<td>Poggio's <em>Asinus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>Perle's <em>Piscator</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1455</td>
<td>Contarini's <em>Dialogus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>Maffeo Vegio's <em>Disputatio inter terram solem et aurum</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1459</td>
<td>Francesco Griffolini's <em>Dionysus</em>, <em>Harmonides</em>, <em>Scytha</em>, <em>De Sacrificiis</em>, <em>Herodotus</em>, <em>Saturnalia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Giorgio Valagussa's <em>Deorum Dialogus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>All the genuine works of Lucian known in Gk. mss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>Francesco Griffolini's <em>De Calumnia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1464</td>
<td>Anon. <em>De Calumnia</em> (Italian imitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 1467</td>
<td>Nicolao Leonceno's Italian tr. of 35 works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Pontano's <em>Charon</em>. before 1470</td>
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Amicitiam exhortanti mihi que bona ex ea noscuntur quas laudes habeat in primis dicere par esse videber quod quidem pro ingenio fecisset nisi cum locum multi clarique auctores fuissent executi (sic) summan rei tamen non tacebo gratiam scilicet amoremque esse quibus et re gunt omnis et augmentantur odium vero atque discordiam quibus decrescunt et dissolvuntur. Quom igitur patres vestri duo clarissimi atque munificentissimi per omnem Italianam principes tanta inter se benivolentia tanto amore coniuncti sunt ut non mo dem solum aut publicis sed antiquis et privatis amicitiae confer ri possint. Vos hortor ymmo oro et obsecro ut cum in ceteris vir tutibus que multe clareque sunt tum precipue in amicitia illos imitemini ac non minori cura benivolentie quam regnis genitorum succedere studentis. Quod et si vestra excellenti natura satis secuturos opinor tamen ut ad eam rem alacriores vos redderem opus lucani de amicitia viri inter grecos doctissimi et eloquentissimi latum feci in quo intelligestis et pausca aut nulla ferme esse que pro salute amicorum amplecti non debeamus. Dubitatum enim inter antiquos prestanti ingenio ac doctrina viros nec dum declaratum est quantum pro amico facere teneamur Chylonis enim sententiam fere omnes repudiant quare si quid fortuna eve merit quod greci quod scyte facere non dubitarint id vos non exequi turpe ducatis. Toxaris vir ex scythia desiderio litterarum grecorum athenas accessit ubi cum diu versatus fuisse in ser monis contentionem cum mnisippo venit utri magis fidi magisque firmi in amicitiae sint grecine an scythe ac tandem ita convenerunt ut uterque eorum quinque
sui temporis amicorum paria e // narraret. Quod cum fecissent et dis-
ceptationis indicem // non statuissent omissa questione summa ipsi
amicitia coniunguntur // ac exordium dictionis mnisippo datur.

(b) Part of Lapo's dedicatory letter to Giannozzo Manetti, from ms.
Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale "Augusta", 520 (H.4s), f. 51r, 1. 3-f.
51v, 1.18.

itaque his adeo inquis vite spatiiis circum // scripti nec ad perfectam
virtutem ac // cedere. nec disciplinam ullam aut ar // tem absolute
percipere possimus aut si // hoc cuiquam divinitus contigit illud cer //
te ut iis ipsis posteaquam perceiverit docen // do scribendo erudiendo
et sibi et patrie // et amicus prodesse posset aut nemo unquam // quod
quidem opinor magis aut pauci // admodum consecuti sunt. Quo quid
miserius iniquius dici aut // excogitari potest immanis homines et //
agrestis vel potius feras non homines // qui nec sibi nec aliis iam
sui culta est ratio // ac moderatio vite. tam cito quasi flo //
sculos quosdam occidere ut ingenium et industriae postquam dederit
natura // invidisse nobis videatur. Itaque hoc lecto // (f. 51v)
libello indignari continuo destiti quod // animadverti hoc nobis non
situ et natura // loci caelique sed nostro vitio evenire. Nam // si
quis ita se geret ita vivat ut nihil // agat unquam invita minerva id
est adversante et repugnante ratione sed in om // nibus naturam optimam
vite ducem sequatur ut ii facerunt quos lucianus // per multos colligit
huic mea sententia // minime desiderabitur vite longitudo // sed
plerique non ita faciunt sed cum ipsi // suis vitiiis et flagitiis
omnes sibi animi // et corporis nervos contriverunt et aut // mori
immature cogantur aut effetam // agant et languidam senectutem natu //
re id crimini datur qui si paruissent et // se ipsos insta vituperacione
et illam in // insta calumnia liberassent.
Iacobus Mucius perleo Ariminensis Seraphio Urbiniati // iureconsultissimo
Sal.pl.d./ Polycletus quum adhuc adolescens esset ami // co id sum-
opere diuque roganti mercurii i // maginem denegavit quam per eam
etatem // domi ipse pinxisset. non idcirco quod amico grati // ficari
non cuperet: sed quod eorum iudicium ve // reretur quos et etate et
studio in eo artificio // excellere existimaret preclara scilicet
modestia // adolescentis et eo digna qui postmodum in tan // tam hominum
admirationem venerit ob permul // gatum (sic) illud iunonis simul-
acrum quod ipse per // grandiorum etatam confecit. videbatur enim //
vir ille ita censere ut non prius vires animi // nostri atque ingenij
impudenter effunderemus // quam eas domi quante ipse essent graviter
experire // mur. cuius ego singulari exemplo adductus ita // multum
recusavi Seraphi pater tue morem gerere // voluntati. Nam quem cog-
itabam quam multa ad // esse oportest ei qui latine vel mediocriter
scribere // vellet quam grandem etatem quam longam librorm // (f.15v.)
lectionem quam denique in omnibus constantem // summanque memoriam
quarum rerum omnium // ne unius quidem minimum partem me as // secutum
intelligebam: non sine magna rephren // sione fieri posse arbitrabar
si ad scribendum etiam // te iubente me conferrem. Verum quid tandem
// facerem? num perpetuo tibi et optime de me // merito et tam iusta
potenti restitissem? // malui itaque in obsequendo improbus quam in
pre // termittendo tue negligens voluntatis indicari. // Ecce igitur .
Luciani viri clarissimi inprimisque // sapientis dialogum iam tandem
latinum per me // factum munerip tibi misimus quem totiens // a me ut
mitterem contendisti: Cuius quidem // dialogi summam quam perceperis
facile mirari // desines quod solebas interdum dicere quod Lucianus //
vir ipse omnium sapientissimus singulos philosophos pre // conis voce
(d) The dedicatory letter from Poggio's translation of *Jupiter Confutatus*,
addressed to Thomas Serezanos, from ms. Vat. lat. 3082, f. 98v.

Poggio pl. salutem d. Thome serezano viro cl. // Verti nuper in
latinum maxime te hortante // parvulum Luciani dialogum in quo vir
ille // doctissimus de fato ac providentia cum ipso Iove ludere vi //
detur. Converti autem non solum ut traductor verborum: // sed etiam
sentenciarum interpres. Nam ubi lingue latine // dignitas permisit
verba transtuli. ubi vero id durius atque // asperius fieri vide-
batur more meo locutus sum ita ut sen // sus integer salvaretur. Est
cum grecis vernaculus quidam // scribendi usus admodum dissimilis a
nostra loquendi consuetu // dine a quo nisi paululum recedas subasurda
(sic) reddetur scriben // tis oratio. Itaque non solum michi qui sum
ferme infans sed // etiam viris eloquentissimis difficillimum fuit in
eiusmodi tra // ductionibus dicendi copiam aut ornatum servare.
quod et // Ciceroni nostro contigisse testis est gravis auctor beatus
Iero // nymus. Sed ne videar me ipsum aut hanc traductiunculam //
aliquid estimare silebo de difficultate interpretandi. Id dici //
me quicquid hoc sit diligenter auctoris sentenciam express // sisse.
Leges igitur cum otium erit has meas ineptias // quas exercitii
gratia lucubravi et cum sis vir omnium nostro // etatis doctissimus
pro tua singulari doctrina indicabis // quantum facetissimi hominis
sententiis tribuendum // esse videatur. Vale.

(e) The dedicatory letters to the translations of Petrus Balbus, from ms.
Palermo, Biblioteca Nazionale, I, C. 9, f. 146r ff.

Petri balbi in dialogum alexandri et // diogenis prefatio ad guiller-
mum mamul // lum.
PETTISTI a me dilec // tissime ut traducio // nem illam quam ex //
luciano viro profecto // disertissimo in latinum sermonem con // verti
ad te darem: Quod quidem // equo ac iocundo animo facere de // crevi
quam petitionem tuam ma // iori apud me munere dignam exi // (f. 146v)
stimam: tum ex summa in te littera // rum diligentia tum ex benivolens-
tia // erga me tua: Que si primo intuitu // res parva tibi aut inornata
fortasse vi // deatur: non prius tamen de ipsa iudicium feras in
medium velim: quam ab // s te accuratissime perfecta sit: In ea
enim // invenies simul et oratoris festivitatem // et severitatem:
Nem periocundum quip // pe videtur diogenem pauperem hominem //: atque
deiectum summum ac gloriosus // simum non intrepido modo: sed alac //
ri penitus animo deridere Imperatorem // Severum vero si sene
animadvertimus // non plus alexandrum diviciis potentia, honore.
felicitate: quid ultra om // nium fere mortalium excellentissimum //
(f.147r.) quam humillimum diogenem ad inferos apportasse. Nisi forsitan ut ipse ait // aut solam de amissa gloria tristitiam // aut ex iniuriis in quosdam illatis quem // admodum iustum est det penam: Quamob // rem mi manuelle manusculum quod // tibi pollicitus sum accipe: Quod si non // magnopere ornatum verax tamen exi // stimes velim: Nequaquam enim sum qui // magis mendaciis cum apparentia quam ip // sa veritate que per se clara est amicis // morem gerere studeam.


(f.154r) Petri balbi prefatio super traductionem // dialogi diogenis et herculis ad pau // perem nicolaeum scholarium preceptorem.

POETE quanto in ho // more tum apud nostr // os tum apud grecos in primis temporibus habiti sunt omnes // fere libri qui a priscis illis nobis re // licti sunt dilucide testificantur: nam // apud romanos qui tantopere ea tempe // state litteris claruerunt tantam in // venerationem hoc nomen deventum // est ut et imperatores ipsi qui totum // orbem terrarum suo imperio rege // (f.154v) sunt: hoc etiam nomine muncupari // voluerunt: Greci vero qui non mi // nori studio quam nostri erga hanc disci // plinam versati sunt non humano dum // taxat nomine sed divino poetas esse // dignos existimaverunt: Deinde
tamquam // utilia admittant. Nam in eis sunt mul // ta adeo
turpis atque deridenda ut non // modo nobis christicolis verum his
qui // apud suam religionem sapientissimi // habebantur ludibrio
digna magno // pere visa sunt quorum unum ad hanc // rem testif-
icandem licet si opus foret // plures haberemus ego quidem addu //
xi: Qui quanti litterarum rerumque pe // ritia valuerit nequaquam
indigeo testibus // Quid ergo de eorum hercule ipse sen // tist de
eo dico qui tanto in honore // ac veneratione ab eis ut deus coleba //
tur accuratissime in hoc opusculo videos velim: Inest ei ut pater
iocû // (f.156v) iocunditas in dicendo subtilitas in //
disputando veritas denique in conclu // dendo: Qua de re et si
magnitudine // parvi nemo cum viribus pauci hoc // idem debet exist-
imare: Tu igitur // quem ego amo in memoriam mei cum // alii quis
e nostris habuisti transla // tionibus hanc simul ponas velim in //
qua quidem re ipsa intelligas me pe // titioni tua iam morem
gessisse. Vale.

(f) The dedicatory letters to the translations of Antonio Pacino, from

PROHEMIUM IN OPUSCULO LUCIANTIE SACRIFICIIS E // GRECO IN LATINUM
SEMNEM CONVERSO PER AN // TONIUM TUDERTINUM AD NOBILEM IUVENEM
RODUL // FUM LOTTUM FLORENTINUM CIVEM FELICITER
INCIPIT.
SOCRATES PHILOSOHUS CUM INTERROGARETUR // quid iocundissimum
esse in vita disciplina inquit virtusque ac histo // ria earum
rerum que non tenerentur. Sapientissima profecto sen // tentia.
Nam nihil est alienum voluptatum quod tandem mentem // ipsam non
fatiget atque stomacetur et cum in privationem ventum est mul //
to plus mali tristitieque comparatur quam in ipsa voluptate

(f.35r) ANTONII PACINI PROHEMIUM IN OPUSCULO LU // CIANI DE LAUDIBUS PATRIE PER EUM ET GRECO SER // MONE IN LATINUM CONVERSO AD NOBILISSIMUM // IUVENEM PETRUM PAZUM CVEM FLORENTINUM FE // LICITER INCIPIT.

ULIXES HYPERCUS QUEN SUMMA PRUDENTIA // virum ferunt devicta troya longo errore multa maria peragravit // et ad circeu litora procacibus ventis appulit ubi cum diu circa // apud eam illum retineret
magnae honores magnisque voluptatibus // afficiet et summo studio
summisque viribus adnitetur ne eius praesentia ac familiaritate
privaretur. Quare post maximas cumulatissimasque omnium // volup-
tatum pollicitationes deum facturam illum inquit si obmissa redivit
// ad patriam secum vitam ducere velit. Ulixes tanquam ingentibus
pollicitatio // nibus honoraretur, tamen amore victus patriae ad
hytacam illam et parvam // saxosamque redire maluit quam iocundissim-
arum voluptatum et divinitatis // fruitionem susciperet. Quo fit
ut quam cara patria sit quamque admira // bili illius amore teneamur
huius prudentissimi viri sententia declaraverit // indicaveritque
omniae humanis rebus iocundiorem patriam esse praestim // (f. 85v)
cum nec micene nec lacedemonia nec athene urbes praecellarissime
horridum // sed solum patria illi fuisse. In quibus quidem opul-
entissimis urbibus // si natus extitisset minime illum in tanta
admiratione prosequendum // putaremus. Verum cum magis hytacam
vicum fedissimum et in iugis // saxisque positum repetere maluisse
quam deum fieri profecto non parvam // hoc admirationem mentibus
nostris iniicere videtur. Itaque cum vellem // donari te iis
fructibus quos peperere labores ac studia mea nesciebam // que pretios-
iora munera que iocundiora ad te mittere possem quam patriae //
laudes cum hac nihil tibi iocundius nihil amabilius esse debeat
quas // haud ingratas tibi futures arbitr. Nam summa homines
voluptate // affici solent si ea que magnopere amant sibi laudantur.
Accedebat // etiam quod cum habeas patriam tum splendidissimam tum
praecellarissimam // putabam cumulatius tibi gratificari si tuo
nomini illius laudes // e greco sermone ex luciano in latinum
converterem sed id quod me // summopere movit ut te dignum hac re
facerem fuit optima tua in // doles nobilissimum ingens // liberalitas
animi magnitudo ac studiorum humanitatis quibus multi // summam gloriorem
compararunt immensa cupiditas. Quibus rebus ma // gnem quidem de
te expectationem civibus tuuis praebuisti. Non enim // dubitant
hiis egregiis tuuis virtutibus si te parcae non funere mergunt acer //
bo in summum civem et clarissimum virum esse evasurum. Accipi //
es igitur hoc manusculum et quandoque me ad te maiora daturum
expectes.

(g) Dedicatory letter of Antonius Rossius to Rafaello Ria rio, Cardinal
of Spoleto, from ms. Parma, Biblioteca Palatina, Fondo Parmense
27.f.1r-1v.

Luciani viri eloquentissimi orationes // pro tauro eneo phalaridis
dicando per Antonium // Rossium e greco in latinum traducte ad.
domine oicio penitus // abuti quod tua nunc mihi absentia concedit
ad lit // teras me grecas retuli: idque non invitus // quippe qui
me his plurimum non inficer delectari.// Quare cum quedam Luciani
opuscula nuper lectita // rem in duas forte orationes suas incidi
quarum a // tera per legatos suos usum facit Phalaridem tyrannum //
pro dedicando tauro eneo apud sacerdotes apollinis // Delphici.
Altera vero est quam pro eadem re ac in eodem // conventu quidem
habet ex e tantibus sacer dotibus. Que cum // elegantissime aint
et ut cuncta a Luciano edita: quam plurima // admodum extant perspio-
acissimum1: quoddam ingenium redolentes // eas iudicavi dignas que
a me non modo crebrius lagerentur: verum // etiam ut maiorem mihi
concipserem voluptatem redderentur // Latine. Quod ut efficerem vide-

1. Ms. perspicavissimum
licet me non mediocriter movit quod // cum multi phalaridem cen-
seant hominem perniciosissimum tan // taque celebrem crudelitate
exitisse ut eum non dubitent // cunctis non modo aut grecis aut
Latinis tyrannis sed Diome // de etiam Lycurgo Polymnestore
denique sevissimis // in principatu thracibus crudeliorem indicare.
Ego id cupiam // falso haberi huncque virum qui (ut plane constat)
eloquentissi // mus fuit nominis usque eo crudelissimi non suo
merito // fuisse insimulatum. Has igitur ambas ad T. Dm mitto //
ut cum his curis quas a // christiana re.p. sustinet // (f.1v)
interdum ut nunc par est cum balneis indulget // relevata et eas
legere posset et me ut avi // dius expecto amendatam reddere. Quod
si sensero // factum maiora (ut qui integerrimo quodam iudicio //
mih i videbor confirmatus ) aggredi non formidabo;// amplumque ut aiunt
munus aliquando exiguum instaurabit.

See Chapter III, p.125 f. Anonymous essay on Calumny, addressed to
Helius Spineta de Campofregoso, from ms. Perugia, Biblioteca
Com unale "Augusta", F.78, f. 65r. ff. The following text is as close as
possible a reproduction & the original in orthography and punctuation,
and is not a critical edition, except insofar as the chief difficulties are marked.
AD.EXCELSUM.DOMINUM HE.//D. SPINETAM.DE. CAMPOFREGOSO //SOGLIONO
li mortali/ Magnifico et Presentissimo // Unico mio Signore per
continuo // studio et // longa experientia de // varie cose farsi
docti ciò arguì // de potere de molte materie rendere // rasone
et cum vere similitudine // demonstrare lessentia del humane cose
sottoposte ad // infiniti pericoli le quale poi dono diligentia &//
cura al guardarsi da quelli et anche qualche volta // stimolo a
delinquenti de contenersi et portarsi piu // humanamenti verso el
prossimo suo. Hinc est che // havendo io molte et infinite volte
provato quanta // forza habiano la detractione, et maligne lingue,
et // a quanti extremi mi habiano spesse fiaste voluto // condure.

maxime rivolgendo continuamente nel aIo // mio la recente cal-

amitate mi se apparegiava denanzi // atua Signoria, si la diurna

gratia mediante la tua // suprema prudentia non havessino al-

Innocentia mia// dato adiuto, quanto piu dignamenti poro secundo la // qualitate del mio debile et rude ingenio Invocando // (f.65v)

primamenti et implorando ladrizo del omnipotente // dio da cui // ogni cosa ha iustO et debito fine, me // sforzero de fare intendere descrivendo atua Signoria // qual sia de Calumnia la condicione,
et in che modo // denanzi al auditore accompagnata se ne vene, et
ci // quante simulatione, ypocrexia, assestonatione, fraude // et bugiarde fictione sindigna fer malcapitare laccu // saito. Et come la veritate habitante in cello p ordine // divino si parte de la

sedia, et vene a liberare linocen // tia de le false imputatione.
cum la quale poi remane // grata presso al auditore, et la quale

data et con // dictione non ho voluto descrivere in latino, non

perch // io non cognosca lingenio tuo essere dotato de magiore // intelligentia, ma perchC vengha meglio ad essere in // texa,
capitando in mano de qualunque persona // men che docta. Et ate //

Magnanimo mio Signore // ladrizo et destino, non che in te cognosca

credulitate // in detractatori, ma piu tosto che legendola, te venga //
in memoria el tuo sincero, et vero servitore et de la // continentia
depsa possi prendere piacendoti qualche // recreacione come mi par

essere certo, cognoscono // atua excellente natura per innumerable

virtute // (f. 66r) le malfacte cose essere exoxissime, et poi cum

lo tempo // harai da me una opereta in latino de li preclari et //
magnifici toi gesti de memoria dignissimi gia ordita per // recordo
de tua immortal et gloriosa fama.

2. *Ms. Sic.*
GRAVE cosa certamenti e lignorantia // et de molti mali a noi
casone si come // quella che veritate ofuscando ale cose // humane
non pocha obscuritate rrende // et de varie tenebre la vita de cias-
cuno circunda. // Noi adunque siamo simili a quelli che per li obscuri
// loci errando vano, o vero come ciechi che impru // dentimenti se-
curi andare credendo sincapano alcuna // volta el desiderato loco
disavedutamenti passano // et a quello che anchora gli e lontano
de non cadere // timidi inanzi tempo levando vano i piedi et a questo
// modo sopra noi discorrendo mai non resta. Et pero // li poeti
tragici a fingere nove cose in Edippo nepote // de labdacco, Atreo
et Tuisti filioli de Pellope cum // loro descendentii et altri
simili la calamitate et // (f.66v) et (sic) miserie de li quali come
el tragico dice a recitarsi ne // le scene vidoti3* fureno, tutte
quasi da ignorantia pro // cedute. Et come piu considerando vado
quante // siano le patrie destructe quante Citate venute in //
ruyna, patri perpetrati contra filioli, filioli cont patri // odii
mortalii nasciuti tra lamante et la cosa amata // Amicitie disciolte
et molte famiglie confuse da Ca // lummia tanto cresce el desiderio
mio le conditio // de questo velemoso et pestifero morbo exprim-
mere et // liniuria nova indebitamenti recevuta mi glinvita // et
fa ardito. Et introducendo a nostro proposito una // ystoria. Dico
che Appele ephesio primo Iventore // del depingere molto domestico
et fidatissimo de Tho // lomeo come si Isieme cum Theodoto ne la
conjuratiue // de Tyro stato fusse, a detto Tholomeo per Antiphile //
suo compagno et discipulo persuaso da invidia et ma // ligna disposi-
tione fu accusato non havendo mai per // alcuno tempo veduto Tyro
ne anche Theodoto. Al // quale la cura et guardia de phenizia data
era. Affir // mando de tutto el tractato non solamente quello

3. Ms., sic.
esseré // stato consapevole ma in convivio cum Theodoto // in
phenizia esseré stato veduto et nel orechie luno // (f.67r) ad
altro gran tempo havere murmurato et da poi su // hito perduto
Tyro et tolto peluxio per consiglio d // Appele demonstrava.
Tholomeo che non pero ne// li gran facti molto la mente porgieva
come quello // che ne le regale delicie nutriti era de questa //
astutamenti formata accusa tanto lunimo accese ch // niente de
quello che sopra cio considerare doveva // puote discernere et li
piaque turbarsi et furiosa // menti per il regale palatio o
Ingrato o Insidia // tore o traditore cridando andava. Et se non
che // alcuni dal tractato consapevoli che li putti retenuti // erano
del Innocentia de Appele a compassione mosti4* // de alcuma cosa
quello non essere particepe afframaseno // cum pena capitale innoc-
etamenti la perdita de Tyro // haria patita. La qual cosa de
Tholomeo udita // et meglio che prima considerata cum grandi doni //
Appele fece liberare et Antiphile falso accusatore // de quello fece
schiavo. Et volendo descrivé // per similitudine lauditore et la
Calumnia cum lal // tre cose consequente. Sopra una sedia sta //
uno Principe cum due grandissime orechie che // a quella di Mida si
poriano asimigliare costui // (f. 67v.) a la Calumnia anchora da
lontano venendo la mano // distexa porgie cum la quale due altre
done sono // luna ignorantia et altra suspitione e chiamata // Questa
Calumnia e excessivamenti bella et ben // ornata affanata tamen et
comossa come quella // che rabia et iracundia significa. Ne la man
dextra // una facella de focho accexa tene nel altra un picolo //
fanciulo per li capegli levato da terra porta. Questo // e
Innocentia che levato al ciello le mane el somo // dio in adiuto et

4* Ms, sic.
testimonio supplica et chiama. De // costei el guida e un homo palido et deforme cum // acro et tedioso guardare che ad uno long-
amenti // stato 1ifimo si puo comparare. Livore chiamato // che del altrui bene honore et fama continuo par che // stiopi.5 Doppo li sono due altre done luna insi // dia laltra fraude chiamate et subsequenter una // de pani negri vestita scapigliate tutta straciandosi // se ne vene nominata Penitentia che ide reto semp // rivolgendosi cum molta confusione. la veritate // che piu di galoppo la segue ognihora expecta. // Nunc dir voglio qual sia de la calumnia maldi // centi et retractatori che assai gli ne e la conditione. //

(f.68r) CALUMNIA e una fictione fals a // pensata et ordinata nel animo prima // menti del calumniatore secretaisti // al auditore fatta in absentia del // accusato et alcuno non contradicendo creduta. // Laccusatore in iudicio sempre de humana et non // diabolica persona saria pessimo sententiato essendo // del altrui male caxone perche ali boni sapartiene // cerchare gloria et laude ne le cose che anche siano // utile ad altri et per aquistare la benivolentia daltrui // cum false et mentite accusatione la diminuzione del // honore detrimento et ultima consumptione dalcuno // non cerchare. Et questo tale calumniatore ben si puo chiamare Iniquo iniusto senza pietate ne legie et // tristissima et non mancho dolorosa esser sua conver // satione et compagnia et snaturato e coluy che // sopra el vero stimandosi a tutto el mondo si voria // egualare. Ciascuno adunque che Iniqua et secreta // accusatione si delecta de fare assassinino et robatore // meritamenti si puo dire perch et anche tanta astutia // et arte occupa et empie lorechie del auditore colo // rando le false

5. Ms, sic.
accusazione de qualche verisimile // (f.68v) che rarissime volte
scusa ne defexa del accusato vi // puo entrare. Questa e quella cosa
che Solone // et Dracco excellentissimi conditori de le legie do //
gni altra iustitia volseno essere la peiore stringendo // per cio
tutti li iudici a sacramento et obligo che cu // pare orechie prestas-
sseno ad ogni uno audientia // ne ad uno piu che ad altro benivolentia
mostraseno // fin che la raxone del accusatore et del accusato non //
fussino maturamenti et diligentemente intexe // Iudicando sempre
pessimo et iniquissimo essere qullo // iudizio nel quale senza defexa
del accusato sia oldito // laccusatore. Homero poeta de soma
uctorita // et scientia sopra questa materia dissi copiosamentet //
et sotilmenti affirmando et facendo manifesto cu // vere et efficac-
issime raxone alcuna iniustitia no // essere piu iniqua et pernitiiosa
che condnmare // alcuno a chi sia stato tolto et denegate el potersi
// defendere. Eliche sempre li detractatori calumnia // tori operano
che si facia et ogni suo ingenio et sen // timento afaticano cum uno
ornato dire una demon // stracione de integra fede et non de passione
persuade // a le orechie del auditore che habiano dignamenti // (f.69r.)
accusato. Questi inimici del humana natura et spiriti // diabolic

dal consortio de li boni homini meritamenti doveriano esser privati
et banniti perche come insi / diatori per viltate danimo et pocha
o nulla experi // entia de bataglia non veduti le loro saette occulta //
menti ballestrano et non essendo de comparere pale // xementi arditi
nel altrui ruyna et permitie semp // secretamenti adoprano che non
possendo cum aperte // arme li boni a loro nemici vincere al insidie
et // falsi ingani subito mettano mano. et in ogni parte // ma piu
ne le corte de principi che altrove dimorano // dove le familiaritate
et domisticheze de signori et // clarissimi homini che el piu de le
volte dano auctorita // a chi non la merita et al loro maldire dano
orechie li // fano arditi de insidiare altrui et cum loro detrahere // et calumniare si idio non li presta adiuto lasseno // ruynare.

Ibi sono grandissime invidie innumerabile // suspicione et infiniti odii che tutte nutriscano la // Calumnia false et mentite accusacione

Et qesto // perchè dove maiore speranze si vedano sono majori // et piu occulti odii et dogni male soliciute cure ne // in alcun altra cosa si studia che o per recto o per // (f.69v) indirrecto caciare altrui dal piu sublime loco et metterlo // al fondo et alhora chi cum maiore fedolie dissimula // tione ypocrisy e detractione puo recharsi grata // audientia dal suo signore colui sopra tutti e tenuto // savio scorto et sagace et sopra gli altri comevinci // tore triumpha. Ma pur mutu divino el calumnioso // che da una sperante invidia tole el principio dolente // et miserabile fine sempre secho porta et questi non // sono pero facili a cognoscere anci grandissima prudentia et experientia de molte cose li bisogna ne // tanti maliporia Calumnia partorire si prima non // fusse cum verisimile parole modi et persuasione adapt // sta ne anche li poria venire facto de sottomettere // et suffocare una grande fede et una pura veritate // si prima cum una ornata eloquentia et mirabile // efficacia lamino del auditore de cose veri simile a se // non pro-
vocasse. Coloro adunque che ne la gratia del // suo Signore ne li grandi onori et famosi exercitij // dimorano sono piu presso et piu soggetti ad essere cal // ummiati perchè dove e maiore grandeza et gratia // piu si gli fa invidia. Inimica de la quale come radice // dogni male procede ogni malfatta cosa. Et nesuno e // (f.70r) che giettato l'accusato et spogliato dogni gratia et // del favore de li Amici non pensi se essere el primo che tal loco succieda. Come quelli che al posto pre // mio sogliono correre. Lasciata la corda
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el bon // corridore de venire al signo cupidò lanimo tutto // adrizza sperando la victoria ne li soi pedi portare // nesuna fraude exercita ne arte che contra gli altri // si posse operare. Laltro che male nel correre // e ammaestrato de vincere el corso giuttata via ogni // speranza a tutti gli ingani lanimo converte ne // altro cerca se non in che modo el bon corridore impa // zando retenendo o cadendo rivoltare possi et // fallendoli questo ingano et arte alcun altra speranza // de vincere li remane et cosi spesse volte advene al // sublime stato che trovandosi in dignitate et grado // al quale ognionesi debbe sforzare cum virtute per // venire li a ` guasti de molti vi se apparechiano et // desavedutamenti inretiti de la gratia de soi signori // miserabilimenti cacciai sono et molti sono che mon // strando ad altrui sapere ben nocere meglio che gli altri // veduti honorati et temuti sono monstrandosi pero // schifi et alieni che mai cosa men che ben facta ne // (f.70v) da razione lontana per loro non che facta ma pensata // sia. Imo spesse volte quello che al accusato pareva // favoreggiare in peiore parte et conditione transmutano // . Si come si uno medico accusare volessino maestro // de tosichi et de veneni quello essere dicessero. Uno // richo et potente Inimico et rebel de suo Signor // accusasino. Un altro del principe domestico et fidale // traditore appelassere. Et advene che colui che al // maldire attentamenti lorechie porgie al detractatore // molte volte caxone gionge et al desiderio et natura // del auditor questi calumniatori conformandosi qullo // sempre che piu li debia piacere et cadere in mente // imaginando vano. Come faria sil auditor gielxo // vedesser subito dirano Andando la tua dona ala // chiesa o stando ala finestra assai volte lamante // suo verso lei giettare gli ohi susirando vidi et // simile cose cum bel modo racolle verso lamante de // amorosi cagni7* calumniando
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Come fue la prexa de platone. Li tormenti de Zenone lexilio // de Rutilio et de boetio et Seneca lindigna morte. Et nel historia hebree. Moyses liberatore del-populo // et datore de le legie molte volte juistament fu calu // nisto. Josep da li fratelli inganato et venduto per // invidia. Ysaia et Daniele propheti circuenti // da inique sententie et come fu etiam lo Iuditio de // Susana per la falsa accusatione et molte altre hi // storie verissime si poriano introdure a n7 proposito // che per prolixitate se omitterano. Non debe aduin // alcuno principe signore ne magistrato aprire tanto // lorechie a detractatori ma cum la razone diligente // (f.72r). Guardia et cameriera del governo in terra passo passo // intendere et mettere bene el suo sentimento a dare la // fede che si convene a quello che ditto li sara in man // camento dalcune et ha a considerare quello de chi et // per che si parla et non guardar a la vita sembiante // industria o vero disciplina del Calumniatore perch //quanto piu efficacimenti et meglio dir sepeera tanto // piu si debe investigare et cum suma diligentia quel // che el dice. Essendo impossibile cosa a cognoscere laio // et io secreto del homo sagee et adulatore et non // credere al iuditio ne al odio del accusatore ma a se // medesimo si debe reservare el cognoscere del // vero. Et // si altrimenti fara comosso dal composito parlare del // Detractore reporteria del ira sua al fine malcontent // tamento et presso a dio castigatione et cosi conclu // dando lignorantia e principale et potissima casone // e de tanti mali la quale de tenebre lanimo de ciascun // circunda et senza la quale la calumnia non poria // stare in terra. Imo trovandosi senza guida et adiuto // bisognaia andasse in abisso fugitiva. Remanendo // tutta le cose da la veritate illuminate. Et per dire apertamenti et demonstrare la ethimologia // (f.72v) de le cose predicte a maiore intellignzia de legenti. Se //
debe sapere chel auditore posto a sedere non si // gnifica si non che essendo quasi tutti li humani // sentimenti inclinati et disposti ad udire male non // se dia sinistro ad alcuno membro. Et perché le orecchie // sono lo principale instrumento al odire grande se // mettano perché prompta et avida e la mente sua // de odire quello che de sapere desidera. La mano // chel porgie e chel chiamando a se colui che per maldir // vene si timiditate o rispetto de parlare nel detracta // tore fusse vedendosi chiamare se ne parta. Calm // nia in forma de dona si mette essendo a simile vitio // naturalmente piu sottoposta la femina chel homo et // mettasi bella et ornata cio e presumptuosa et de // parlare maestra perché al Auditore piu grata dovetti //. Cum due donzelle accompagnata Ignorantia et suspi //tione perché non essendo passo al auditore nel una // cosa nel altra in vano si fatichariano li Calum // niatori. Et guida suo e chiamato Livore come // de cavalcata principale et de quale tutta la compagnia segue lorme figurato magro scolorato cumanni straciatì perché tutti quelli che a tal passione // (f.73r) sottoposti sono tanto delaltrui grandeza et bene se stessi affligono che mal possano cibo ne reposso // prendere et si pur ne pigliano in pessimo nutrimento si converte et come desiderosi delaltrui //ruyna et male non curandosi de ben fare come // miseri danimo portano straciatì li panì. Da // due altre done Calumnia si trova accompagnata // Insidia et fraude che quasi sono de una specie pur // insidia secretamenti tradisse el bono et fraude pal // esamenti lingane ne altro vol dire se non chel // Calumniatore da Invidia principalmenti mosto et // conducto denanzi cum lusinghe et dreto cum tra // dimenti linnocentia offendere si sforza. Porta // Calumnia una facella de focho ardente
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in mano p // denotare che senza focho la ruyna daltrui non // possi cum soi intenti exequire. Et havendo per li // capigli levato da terra un picolo fanciulo che // a dio cum le man giunte par che chiami adiuto // Altro non significa chel Innocente falsamenti accusato tenuto ligato et stretto cum insidie et arte in // a fare difesa et purgare non possi sua innocentia // et nesunaltro subsidio li resta che la iustitia del // (f.73v) omnipotente dio implorare. Et perché molte volte // la ficta Calumnia per divine virtute si scopre dretto // magistralmenti si gli mette la penitentia de pani // negri vestita che tutthora piangendo soi capegli et pani // stracia veduta venire passo ley seguendola la // veritate. A denotare chel Calumniatore per lauditore inteso el vero et pentendosi per vergogna de // domandare al Innocente accusato perdono fra se // rimordendosi et tribolandosi nesunaltro remedio // al dolore suo che se stesso et panni straciare trova // ne mai resta fin che per divino ordine non corra // al doloroso et miserabile fine debito premio del // maldire et falsamenti accusare. Et ogni bono che si // trova maldicto et calumniato a torto debe verami // sperare che idio iusto Signore et Judice non deba // volere permettere al fine opprimere dal falso et mal // vagio detractatore la pura et sancta Innocentia // ma chel lassi molte volte correre questi tali sinistri // per purgatione et emendatione daltri peccati acio // che lo veniamo a recogoscere et che se abstemiamo // dal mal fare. Vindicans de Inimicis Inimicos // suos. Et non e dubio alcuno et de questo se ne // (f.74r) sono veduti innumerabile prove. Che questi tali Ca // lumniatori et maldicenti el piu de le volte et quaxi // sempre recercandosi el vero si trovano infidelissimi // in omni genere a soi principi et Signori et quello // che falsamenti et malignamenti hanno in altri im // prosperato in lorstassi cum veritate redundare pa // rendoli
cum lo credito et familiaritate che si ve // dano havere sotto lo scudo et velame de una // integra fede et sincera devotione che mostrano // havere et non lzano potere pensare formare // et esquire ogni sceleragine tradimento et malfacta // cosa et redure ogni grande facenda a suo proposito // che ultra al detrimento che ne puo sequare ali Signori // ne reportano anchora assai volte caricho grande // et odio secreto presso ali soi homini et Subditi li // quali si vogliono reguardare conservare non // lassandoli inuariare ne oltragiare da li soi piu come // e debitbo che siano oppressi indebitamenti ne // provocati da soi Signori de li quali li boni populi // homini et subditi sono le inexpugnabili forteze // et non li detractatori. Assentatori et bòi maligni // che piu studiano ne la loro spetialitate et bene che // (f.74v) del suo Signore del quale quando loro habiano ben cavato // el breno de la farina et capitasse male non se ne // curariano et mille volte

hora diriano no haverlo // cognosciuto. Guardasi adunque ciascuno // principe Signore et homo digno de prestare facile // audientia et credito a Calumniatori perché quello // che voluntieri olde laltrui detractione Ignorante et // de suspicione pieno convien che sia.

EXPLETUM DIE XII IUNII // MCCCLXII.

Next page (f.75r): Magnanimo et Potente signor mio // A chil servire contra voglia me tolto // Et tutto al infortunio son rivolto // Vedendomi de tua excellentia esser privo. // Non e pero che cum ogni sentimento // Col corpo et cum anima racolto // De tua Signoria al dolce porto // Non desidri retornare asalvamento // Nelche ti prieo vogli drizar la mente // Reducendoti a memoria la mia fede // Et quanto tho servito fidelmente // Questa operata mia alcuna volte // Tinclinara animo che non stente // A raquistare la gratia che me tolta // Indignamenti de qual divo Signore // A cui et ate son fidel Servitore. // Videas obsecro equa mente Magnificentissie // domine mi ea que nunc vulgari sermone // per me composita ad tuam dominationem // transmitto que et si minus diserta ellegiantiaeque //

I have a copy of the ms. only to this point: the poem, and the Latin which follows it, do, however, seem to have a bearing upon the preceding Italian text.