

Domizio Calderini, Commentary on Silius Italicus, edited by Frances Muecke and John Dunston†. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance N° CDLXXVII (Genève, Librairie Droz, 2011).

The edition of Domizio Calderini's (1446–78) commentary to the *Punica* of Silius Italicus (1st c. AD) began as a by-product of an edition of the *Punica* projected by John Dunston in the 1950s. On the way it resulted in important publications, such as the *Studies in Domizio Calderini* (1968) of Dunston and the *Silius*-entry in *CTC III* coauthored by Dunston, Bassett, and Delz (1976). In 1995 Frances Muecke joined the project and became after Dunston's death (2000) solely responsible not only for the final corrections, but also for what must have been a major rewriting of the whole book after the discovery in 2006 of what proved to be the major witness of Calderini's commentary. The text itself presents extraordinary challenges to an editor. Calderini lectured on Silius in a course at the Studium Urbis which finished in March 1473. Presumably Calderini based his lectures on his notes, and in the famous Προσφώνησις of 1475 announced that he had nearly finished a Silius-commentary, which he intended to publish after a final revision. This plan did not come to fruition; purportedly a ms. of the commentary was last seen in 1491 by Girolamo Avanzi in Domizio's library in Torri del Benaco. Calderini's lectures were also taken down by some students (amongst them Pietro Marsi); these *dictata* are attested in six sets of notes of varying scope, one in a ms of Silius, five in copies of the edition of the *Punica* by Pomponio Leto, the so called second Roman edition of 1471 (which despite this prominent role in the tradition was not the base text which Calderini used). Five of these stem from a common archetype, but are independent from each other. They differ widely in the amount of notes they contain. The most complete is Harvard, Houghton Inc. 3431, the only one to give Calderini's name and the sole witness to a *Vita Sili* composed by Calderini (also contained in the edition). Since none of the witnesses has a complete set of notes, Dunston in his "Studies" (where the notes were still *adespota*) had used two diagnostic tools to establish their provenance from the humanist. These may still be applied in doubtful cases. The first uses coincidences between references to the Silius-commentary in other works of Calderini and passages in the Silius-notes; the second relies on autograph annotations in the Silius-ms. BAV, Ottobon. lat. 1258 and tests their recurrence in the commentary (see the painstaking analysis by Muecke, "Domizio Calderini's lost 'edition' of Silius Italicus", *RPL* 28, 2004, 51–67). Still, uncertainties abound, since the copyists not only selected notes unevenly, but also may have abbreviated or reformulated them and introduced material from elsewhere. Special problems are posed by the notes in BAV, Stamp. Ross. 1446 (C), which in part come from a different exemplar than the others, and ultimately were written by a less advanced student. The edition also establishes the (huge) extent of the debt Pietro Marsi's commentary on Silius (Venice 1483) owes to Calderini. Marsi's extensive loans – based on the *dictata* from Calderini's lectures – even permit the establishment of Calderini's authorship in some cases.

In the early 1470s Calderini was engaged in a bitter controversy with Niccolò Perotti which also concerned questions of priority of research (aka plagiarism), and consequently in the edition much attention is paid to contemporary parallels throughout the commentary. A chapter of the introduction is devoted to the thorniest of these, the relationship between Calderini's commentary and the research of Pomponio Leto (see Muecke, "Silius Italicus," *Repertorium Pomponianum*, URL: www.repertoriumpomponianum.it/themata/silius.htm). Not only had Leto lectured on Silius before his imprisonment (1468–9), he also continued to work on Silius later on,

until his interest seems to flag in 1471. There are several sets of notes, but Leto never published or even produced a complete commentary on Silius. Leto and Calderini share much information from Pliny, Servius, a. o.; some of it may belong to the stock of humanist philology circulating freely, some may indeed be taken from Leto by Calderini, and in some cases material from Calderini reappears in Leto's later Aeneid-commentary, occasionally even prefixed with a "Domitius meus ait ...". Generally, methodological differences separate the two humanists: Where Leto is often content with paraphrasing passages and adding (sts. verbatim) explanations from the classical authors, Calderini's notes exhibit a far more thorough processing of the information he proffers.

In theory Calderini is in favor of naming his sources (and indeed criticizes Perotti for failing to do so), in practice he is as yet far from naming the major part or even the most important of his sources consistently. Still (and this is one of the rare points of disagreement of this reviewer), I believe Muecke's comparison of Calderini's *Silius* with Perotti's *Cornu copiae* (which is exemplary in its documentation of the sources) to miss the point. The latter retains few features from the commentary genre; a look into Perotti's commentary on Statius' *Silvae* (1469–70, BAV, Vat. lat. 6835), where named authorities are conspicuous by their absence, would have put Calderini's (albeit imperfect) practice into a more favorable light.

Muecke's introduction and the Index fontium show Calderini to be well acquainted with contemporary philology. Greek sources (amongst which Strabo has pride of place) are quoted from current Latin translations. Occasionally Calderini goes back to the Greek originals, and notably quotations from Homer are given in his own translation. The commentary only contains a few Greek words, and even those were then transcribed correctly by no more than two of the copyists. Amongst Latin sources there is little to surprise the student of Roman humanism; it should be mentioned, though, that Calderini (as well as Leto and Perotti) seems to have had access to a Servius auctior similar to the Servius Danielis. His knowledge of Festus, on the other hand, does not go any further than the epitome made by Paulus Diaconus and printed ca. 1471.

The presentation of the commentary itself is a model of clarity, which integrates the many factors in play into an easily accessible format. Each note is introduced by a lemma taken from Delz' Teubneriana; contemporary variants are given in the apparatus criticus. For the commentary itself, a single text has been established wherever possible, with the variants indicated in the critical apparatus; where C and the other witnesses are irreconcilable, the versions are printed in parallel columns. There is also a copious apparatus fontium (which even includes substantial quotations) and a judicious discussion of the problems posed either by the transmission or the contents. Also welcome is the addition of the parts of the commentary of Pietro Marsi which are indebted to Calderini. All in all this is a major contribution to the study of Calderini – far exceeding the nominal focus on Silius – which gives us an invaluable resource for the study of the commentary-genre in a crucial period of its development in Roman humanism of the 1470s.

Johann Ramminger
Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, München
j.ramminger@thesaurus.badw.de