

Jakob Wimpfeling and the Early Reception of Perotti's *Cornu copiae* in Germany

JOHANN RAMMINGER

Estratto da:

Studi Umanistici Piceni – XXV/2005

Istituto Internazionale di Studi Piceni – Sassoferrato

Jakob Wimpfeling and the Early Reception of Perotti's *Cornu copiae* in Germany

JOHANN RAMMINGER

Recently, an edition of a little-known work by the German humanist Jakob Wimpfeling has been posted on the internet. The work consists of a poem of hundred verses with a commentary by the humanist himself, printed in Strassburg in 1495.¹ I was intrigued, because at one point in the commentary the humanist names *Perottus* as his source, in a passage which the editor has traced to the *Cornu copiae*. Since our knowledge of the reception of the *Cornu copiae* north of the Alps is patchy to say the least, Wimpfeling's work, even though of little intrinsic worth, merits our attention. The aim of this paper is to establish a context for the quotation from the *Cornu copiae* within the larger picture of the reception of Perotti's work.

Niccolò Perotti's *Cornu copiae*² is a dictionary and encyclopedia organized as a commentary to the first 147 epigrams of Martial, more or less finished when the humanist died in 1480. The work was famous from the beginning, even though not accessible to the public until first printed nine years later in Venice in May 1489.³ Perotti's name was well known amongst his prospective readers; many would probably have learned Latin from his enormously popular school-book, the *Rudimenta grammatices*, which on average had been reprinted once every three months since it first appeared in 1473.⁴ Exaggerated expectations of the *Cornu copiae* initially led to a negative assesment by some of the leading humanists of the day, Angelo Poliziano and Ermolao Barbaro.⁵ However, its unique combination of diverse information about the Latin language and antiquity in general made it too useful to be ignored, and even somebody like Ermolao Barbaro, one of the *Cornu copiae*'s most explicit critics, consulted it regularly, though without acknowledging more than its mistakes. The meteoric success of the work has usually been defined in terms of its printing history which, considering the size and scope of the encyclopedia, is just as impressive as that of the best-selling *Rudimenta*. In the first twenty years after the initial publication it was printed no less then 23 times, mostly in Italy. Although it is thus quite clear that a large number of people bought and used the *Cornu copiae*, we are still far from having a complete or at least continous picture of its reception.

The largest field of influence of the *Cornu copiae* is Latin lexicography. Together with Barbaro's *Castigationes Plinianae* it furnished a large part of the material used for Calepino's dictionary⁶ and was extensively quar-

ried for subsequent Latin dictionaries, such as Robert Estienne's *Thesaurus*. Some quotations remain even in Forcellini's *Lexicon*, Lewis & Short, and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.⁷

In other areas the presence of the *Cornu copiae* is more difficult to document. One of the rare instances where Perotti's influence has been traced directly into the vernacular is the *Hypnerotomachia Polifili*, printed by Aldus in Venice in 1499.⁸ In the index to their edition Giovanni Pozzi and Lucia Ciapponi refer to Perotti's influence in about 70 instances.⁹ If their assessment is correct, large parts of the *Hypnerotomachia* would have to be dated to the 1490es. Naturally, Perotti is never named in the work itself. Polydore Vergil's *On discovery*, also printed in Venice in 1499, is another work for which the *Cornu copiae* has been extensively used without ever being named. Polydore Vergil had edited the *Cornu copiae* in 1496.¹⁰ Even though works by Italian humanists where Perotti and/or the *Cornu copiae* are both used and actually named are few, names like Filippo Beroaldo, Pietro Crinito and Lilio Gregorio Giraldi can convey an impression of the diversity and extent of the influence of the *Cornu copiae* in the early sixteenth century.¹¹ Later, at a time when the importance of the *Cornu copiae* as a philological tool was decreasing, the work was quoted a number of times in the *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus*, written in his Italian exile by the Swedish churchman Olaus Magnus and printed in Rome in 1555.¹²

As far as countries other than Italy are concerned, the evidence we have confirms the important role of the *Cornu copiae* for studies within the field of Latin language and culture. The humanist Bernardus Andreas, Bernard André, used the *Cornu copiae* for his commentary on the eleventh book of Augustin's *De civitate Dei*.¹³ Between 1620 and 1636 the great French antiquarian scholar Peiresc made excerpts from the *Cornu copiae*.¹⁴ Nostradamus owned a copy of a Paris imprint of 1510 (now in the public library of Toulon). Some sixteenth century German owners of the *Cornu copiae* have been identified by R. Hilgers,¹⁵ the earliest is none less than the nobleman and humanist Ulrich von Hutten, owner of a copy of the Milan print of 1502. Vadian recommends the *Cornu copiae* in the highest terms in his *De poetica* of 1518:¹⁶ *Inter magnos Latinae linguae auctores Perottus est quem probo* («Amongst the great Latin authors it is Perotti whom I approve of») and later: *... praesertim quod Festum hodie Pompeium, Nonium Marcellum, Marcum Varronem, et delicias Latinae linguae Nicolaum Perottum in tanta optimorum librorum copia nulla molestia legere possumus* («... especially as we can read today Pompeius Festus, Nonius Marcellus, Marcus Varro and Niccolò Perotti, the delight of the Latin language, without effort, since books of high quality abound»); the latter quotation alludes to the Aldine edition(s) of 1513 and 1517 which contained precisely these authors.¹⁷ A South-German humanist, Heinrich Bebel (1472-1518), active in Göttingen, cites Perotti's *Cornu copiae* twice in

his *Brevis expositio difficilium terminorum in hymnis* from 1501.¹⁸ In both quotations Bebel names the author, but not the work he is quoting from; obviously, at the turn of the century Perotti was sufficiently well known in humanist circles in Southern Germany for a quotation with his sole name to suffice as indication of the source.

The case which is at the center of this paper is even earlier. The Alsatian humanist Jakob Wimpfeling¹⁹ was born in 1450 and died, 78 years old, in 1528. He is exceptional amongst German humanists of that period insofar as he never went to Italy to study. He obtained the degree of *magister artium* in 1471, that of a *baccalaureus theologiae* in 1479 at Heidelberg. In the same year he was elected dean and two years later rector of the university. In 1483 Wimpfeling on account of the plague fled from Heidelberg and established himself in Spire, where he lived in the possession of an ecclesiastical benefice. He was to remain there until 1498, when he was called back to Heidelberg to occupy the newly established chair of the *lectura humanitatis*.

Wimpfeling thus lived in assured, if modest circumstances, but – as all humanists – he was nonetheless constantly on the lookout for patronage. An opportunity to ingratiate himself arose when the count of Württemberg Eberhard V.,²⁰ a very successful longtime ruler of his territory, in the summer of 1495 was elevated to the rank of duke (at the diet of Worms, 21.7.1495). On this occasion Wimpfeling composed a poem of 100 verses²¹ which praised the duke's long reign and his achievements and virtues. The preface of the print is dated 1 August, thus the booklet must have appeared within a couple of weeks of the event. Wimpfeling's attempt to secure princely patronage did not meet with success. The Duke, although praised as «righteous like Trajan and crafty like Ulysses» (*Traianum iustus: prudens imitatoris Ulixem*, sig. b6v), did not respond; Wimpfeling complained about the lack of remuneration in a letter to Konrad Celtis. Towards the end of the year, Wimpfeling sent his product to other prospective patrons and humanist friends. The matter of patronage became obsolete when the Duke died in the February of the following year, 1496.

The *opusculum* combined the hundred verses in praise of Eberhard with a commentary, which according to Wimpfeling had a double aim. Firstly, it contained «some items befitting a prince and useful for a state» (title: *Cum eius explanatione: Que nonnulla principibus decora. Et rebus publicis salutaria continet*, sig. a1r), i.e. a 'mirror of princes'. Secondly, the humanist intended the poem for school use and thus, to ensure a wider circulation amongst the teachers of Latin as well as their pupils, had inserted into his commentary explanations of some more obscure words of his poem (*vt ... poema non solum ipsis praeceptoribus et gymnosophistis, sed etiam eorum alumnis et pueris facilius sit intellectu*, sig. b6v). These are of an uneven level; e.g., the explanation of the term *heroicum carmen* as 'song about the famous deeds of heroes and princes'²² can only have been useful at a rather elemen-

tary level. Wimpfeling had, however, also furnished his poem with more precious words and this is where the *Cornu copiae* could be useful to him.

I would like to begin my short analysis of the commentary with the passage where Perotti is named as a source. Very early in his poem Wimpfeling warns the ruler not to listen to trivial and deceitful gossip (vv. 13-15):

Turpe est principibus. si nugas forte dolosque
Audierint quales nebulo deblaterat excors
Inuidus et tristis, veri contemptor et aequi.²³

«It is unseemly for princes to listen to foolish or sly blabbering by stupid scoundrels, who out of foul envy despise truth and fairness».

Wimpfeling links the commentary to his verses with capital letters in the margin of the poem. Under the letter (G) there is the following commentary (the capitalization of the lemmata is mine):

«TURPE EST PRINCIPIBUS. Quid mali ex facili principum credulitate sequatur. Inter cetera vicia vix turpius est aliquid principi: quam facile credere et altera parte non audita sententiam ferre. NEBULO dictus est qui non pluris est quam nebula aut qui non facile perspicui possit qualis sit nequam. nugator. Festus Pompeius auctor est. BLATERARE. est confingere per mendacia Nonius Marcellus Aut blatterare incondite et inaniter loqui: Perottus. Inde blattero. onis. EXCORS. Exanimis stultus.»

«TURPE EST PRINCIPIBUS. About the evil consequences of a prince's credulity. Among all the other vices there is hardly anything more disgraceful for a prince than being easily swayed and giving judgement without having heard the other side. NEBULO is somebody who is as worthless as the fog, or who cannot easily be seen for the fatuous fool he is (from Pompeius Festus). BLATERARE means 'to invent with lies' (Nonius Marcellus). Or *blatterare*, 'to talk incoherently and foolishly' (Perottus). Thence *blattero*, -onis. EXCORS, dismissed,²⁴ silly.»

The first commentary introduces a prose paraphrase of the passage. The other three are of the type of semantic explanation which interests us here. The explanation for the word *nebulo* is taken directly from Festus (i.e. from the abbreviated version compiled by Paul the Deacon, P.Fest. p.164), and Wimpfeling also indicates his source. Then Wimpfeling considers *blatterare*, for which he offers two explanations, the first from Nonius ('to invent with lies', p.78), the second from the *Cornu copiae*²⁵ ('to talk incoherently and foolishly'). Wimpfeling does not explain the word actually occurring in the verse, *deblaterare*, but its simplex, *blaterare*. A reason for this shift may very well lie in the frequency with which these two words were used in antiquity and in the Renaissance. The compound *deblaterare* is rare both in classical and in Renaissance literature. It occurs once in Plautus, twice in Gellius and once in a quotation from Lucilius in Nonius. There are several examples from late antiquity, after which the word practically disappears until the Renaissance. Here, however, it does not occur in any of the major

works about the Latin language which Wimpfeling might have consulted, Valla's *Elegantiae*, Tortelli's *Orthographia*, or indeed Perotti's *Cornu copiae*. I have only been able to find isolated instances of its use, the earliest example being Bartolomeo Facio's first invective against Valla; north of the Alps roughly contemporary examples come from Erasmus' *Adages* and *Colloquies*, and, amongst others, from the correspondence of Beatus Rhenanus and the writings of Luther and Calvin. *Blaterare*, on the other hand, was a slightly more frequent word, attested in Horace and Apuleius as well as Gellius and Nonius. In the Renaissance both Tortelli (because of its supposedly Greek origin) and Perotti discuss it. A number of authors use it, amongst them Bocaccio in a letter to Petrarch, Angelo Decembrio in the *Politia litteraria* (5.55.7), Giorgio Merula in the *Annotationes contra Philippum Beroaldum* and Petrus Crinitus in *De honesta disciplina* (1.7). It also occurs in a wide variety of Italian Neo-Latin poets of the time, amongst them Panormita and Leonardo Dati. It is equally attested in Renaissance latinity north of the Alps, apparently with a preponderance in poetry. Pedagogically Wimpfeling's explanation of the simple verb made good sense, since, once *blaterare* was explained, the meaning of the compound *deblaterare* in the poem could easily be guessed at. That Wimpfeling switches between two spellings *blat-/blatt-* would have been less of a problem for contemporary readers who were used to such fluctuations, than for the modern scholar.²⁶

The need for two - to some extent mutually exclusive - explanations of *blaterare* is carefully motivated by the verse they explain, where the objects *nugae*, 'nonsense' and *dolus*, 'deceit', demand a double meaning of the governing verb, i.e. 'to talk nonsense' and 'to deceive'. The thought expressed in the verses may seem rather contrived, since the poet discusses the disastrous influence of deceitful courtiers on a credulous prince, and listening to idle talk might be a waste of time, but not obviously harmful. Again, the motivation may be pedagogical: being aware of two divergent meanings of *blat(t)erare*, Wimpfeling uses the occasion to enlarge the vocabulary of his readers by composing a verse which showed that both meanings could coexist depending on the objects the verb governed. The reference to the noun *blattero* derived from *blatterare* would thus be useful, even though irrelevant for the explanation of the verse.

If this suggests that Wimpfeling collected the material for his commentary prior to composing the verses he meant to comment, it fits well with a third, implicit agenda of Wimpfeling's commentary, namely to display his own erudition and to show the breadth of his semantic research. The role of Perotti's name in this will become clear, when we take a closer look at the authors Wimpfeling names as sources:

A «ex Lucano sumptum»

F «Aristotelis sententia ethicorum iiij» (arestolis *ed. pr.*)

F «Alludit Tullius in officiis» (*offi ed. pr.*)

F «vtitur ibidem Tullius hoc tragico»

F «Iuuenalis testis est»
 F «Seneca tragedia sexta»
 G «Festus Pompeius auctor est»
 G «Nonius Marcellus»
 G «Perottus»
 G «Plautus»
 G «Sebastiano Murrhone teste in suo laudum germanicarum epithomate»
 T «Seneca tragedia septima»

There are only twelve names in the commentary. And, even though semantic explanations and reflections on the virtues of princes are evenly distributed in the commentary, these names occur at completely irregular intervals: one name in chapters A and T of the commentary, five in F and G, no name quoted in the other eighteen (the letters J and U are not used) which means that Wimpfeling does not mention any source at all for a large part of his work.²⁷ The list of authors raises two related questions: how much material do these authors contribute? and: are there authors which Wimpfeling uses, but does not mention?

A specific problem are the sources for the topic 'virtues of princes', which certainly was popular in the Middle Ages and later, but for which Wimpfeling does not indicate any source at all. We can make an informed guess about the authors Wimpfeling might have cited from other works of his on the theme of 'virtues of princes', especially a work written three years later, called *Agatharchia Id est bonus Principatus vel Epithoma condicionum boni principis*, which is a work of roughly comparable length.²⁸ Here Wimpfeling refers twice to sources from antiquity. One is Macrobius (l. 174), the other a quotation from a letter of Jerome, on whom Wimpfeling was lecturing in Heidelberg at the time (l. 402; *ep.* 128.2)²⁹. He also names one humanist source, the famous tract *De liberorum educatione* of Enea Silvio Piccolomini to King Ladislaus (l. 262); for further reading Wimpfeling suggests two medieval authors, Jean Gerson (l. 264) and Iohannes Galensis (John of Wales, l. 265). Again, the authors named disguise the authors used. Even though Wimpfeling mentions John of Wales³⁰ only once, a work of his is actually the main source for the *Agatharchia*, namely the *Communiloquium*, an enormous collection of quotations and exempla, of which more than 140 mss. are known. Other sources identified by Singer, all of them medieval, include the *De regimine principum* of Giles of Rome (Aegidius Romanus, ca. 1280), the so-called Pseudothomas, *De eruditione principum*, also from the 13th century (ca. 1265, Paris, printed 1570), and similar works. Non of these is even hinted at by the author.

All this can contribute to the understanding of our commentary in various ways. First, the impression created in the *Agatharchia* by the authors explicitly named, that traditional medieval doctrine apparently was interwoven with the new humanist learning, is completely misleading and does not

at all reflect the sources actually used. This strategy has a close parallel in the *Hecatosthicon* commentary. Secondly, if Wimpfeling in the commentary did not mention any medieval authors on the subject of the virtues of princes, this was a conscious decision, since he showed himself closely acquainted with the medieval literature on the topic in the *Agatharchia* and did not hesitate to mention (some of) it, if he deemed it appropriate. Obviously Wimpfeling wanted to emphasize the new *studia humanitatis* and therefore chose not to cite medieval authors by name.

I have remarked that the references to specific authors appear very unevenly distributed. Furthermore, if they are supposed to validate the interpretations proposed, they seem selected very arbitrarily. For example, under the letter (A) Wimpfeling indicates that the phrase *iustitiae cultor* (and, as a matter of fact, the whole verse) is taken from Lucan (2.389). This remains the only time Wimpfeling acknowledges the classical models for his verse, although he reuses lots of material from classical verse (see n. 23). The same is true for the semantic material, as witnessed by one of the many pieces of the commentary without attribution (my capitalization of the lemma):

Wimpfeling, *commentary* (G): «CATAPULTA. genus machine bellice. dicitur a pel-
lendo. Vel est genus iaculi celeris siue sagitte Plautus. atque ita te neruo torquebo vt
catapulte solent»

Perotti, *Cornu copiae* 105.14: «Et catapulta a depellendo genus iaculi celeris siue
sagittae, item machina bellica. Plautus: Atque te ita neruo torquebo, ut catapultae
solent.»

Nonius 552: «CATAPVLTA, iaculum celer vel sagitta. Plautus in Curculione: atque
ita te nervo torquebo ut catapultae solent.»

Plautus, *Curculio* 690: «atque ita te nervo torquebo, itidem ut catapultae solent.»

There is no need to discuss the example extensively. The dependences between the various quotations listed above are clear. The words *machina* and *bellica* connect Wimpfeling's commentary to the *Cornu copiae* and exclude Nonius as a source. Perotti in his turn had used Nonius; neither he nor Wimpfeling checked the quotation from Plautus in the original, which has the word *itidem* omitted in Nonius and the subsequent authors.

Wimpfeling has used Nonius and Festus only the one time he names them; also Perotti is named only once, but actually Wimpfeling had found him more useful. The *Cornu copiae* is the source of nearly all the lexicographic material found in the commentary.³¹ Clearly, if Wimpfeling appears to indicate his sources, this has very little to do with a desire for precision or information of the reader. And, we might add, if the readers were to be schoolboys and their teachers, that kind of documentation was neither expected nor necessary.

A case in point is the reference to Murrho under G (sig. b2r): *Bombarde. a sono, quarum germani sunt inuentores. Sebastiano Murrhone teste. in suo laudum germanicarum epithomate* («*BOMBARDAE*, cannons: called after the sound. Invented by the Germans according to Sebastian Murrho in his *Short praise of the Germans*»). Sebastian Murrho³² had been a personal friend of Wimpfeling; the work which Wimpfeling quotes is probably the same as the *De virtutibus et magnificentia Germanorum*, already mentioned in 1492 by Trithemius, but never printed and now lost. As an authority Murrho was neither a happy choice, since his work was unknown, nor needed, since the German claim to the invention of the cannon was a universally recognized commonplace.³³ At best, the reference showed that the author had access to the research of his fellow humanists, and was generous enough to promote the fame of the recently deceased friend. The rest of the list is just as haphazard. Names like Aristotle, Lucan, Seneca and Juvenal perhaps have more of a medieval flavour, humanist scholarship is represented by three authors, Festus, Nonius and Perotti. Clearly, the erudite display of learned scholarship from a variety of classical as well as contemporary sources was largely ornamental. In the passage which I have used as point of departure Wimpfeling displays the depth of his semantic research by pointing out conflicting or complementary opinions amongst the various authorities. That Perotti was amongst those would indicate that the author was *au courant* of the most recent Italian humanist scholarship.

This brings me to a final point I would like to make. I have given 12 names of authors cited by Wimpfeling, besides Perotti. Of these six are cited with the work in which the quotation occurs: Aristoteles' *Ethics*, Cicero's *De officiis*, Seneca's tragedies, etc. Six names remain alone, without the quotation of a specific work. In the case of Juvenal, Wimpfeling probably just saw no easy way for a more precise reference to the satires. Plautus, as we have seen, was a second-hand quotation, and Wimpfeling did not have a more precise indication. Finally, some were authors who had left only one work. Everybody would know, that Nonius Marcellus meant the *Compendiosa doctrina* and Festus the *De verborum significatu*, mostly in the version abbreviated by Paulus Diaconus. Obviously, although Perotti was known for a variety of works, Wimpfeling expected his readers to be familiar with the most recent publication, the «extremely useful»³⁴ *Cornu copiae* of 1489. Thus, within only six years, Perotti's *Cornu copiae* had entered the canon of standard reference works on Latin; a remarkable feat for the work, and an impressive testimony for Italian cultural leadership in the *studia humanitatis* of the time.

¹ Jacobus Wimpfeling, *Carmen heroicum hecatosthicon*, [Strassburg], Johann Prüss 1495 (HC 16184*). The orthography fluctuates between *Hecatosthicon* (sigg. alr, a3r, gen. *Hecatosthici* blr twice), *Hecatosthycon* (a4v), *Hecatostyco* (abl., blr), *Hecatosthycon* (blr), *hecatostycho[n]* (dat., or -*ôn*, gen. pl.?, b6v). *hecatostichon* in the *ISTC* is an error. The internet edition is by Markus Müller, URL: www.phil.uni-freiburg.de/SFB541/B5/Eberhard/WI-Netz.html (08.03.2002); in all quotations I have collated Müller's

text against the copy of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (digital reproduction at GALLICA, URL: gallica.bnf.fr, no. N072109). I have expanded the abbreviations, but otherwise retained the orthography and (erratic) punctuation of the original. With 'ed. pr.' I designate (false) readings of the *editio princeps*, mostly corrected by Müller.

² Modern edition in Niccolò Perotti, *Cornu copiae seu linguae Latinae commentarii*, vol. 1-8 Sassoferatto 1989-2001, vol. 1 ed. by J.-L. Charlet and M. Furno, vols. 2-3 ed. by J.-L. Charlet, vol. 4 ed. by M. Pade and J. Ramminger, vol. 5 ed. by J.-L. Charlet and P. Harsting, vol. 6 ed. by F. Stok, vol. 7 ed. by J.-L. Charlet, M. Pade, J. Ramminger and G. Abbamonte, vol. 8 ed. by J.-L. Charlet, M. Furno, M. Pade, J. Ramminger and F. Stok.

³ Venice, Paganinus de Paganinis 14 May 1489 (H 12697*).

⁴ First edition Rome, Conradus Sweeney and Arnoldus Pannartz 19 March 1473 (HC 12643). No less than 66 editions are known before 1489, a number which will rise to over 130 by 1500, see W. Milde, *Zur Druckhäufigkeit von Niccolò Perottis Cornu copiae und Rudimenta Grammatices im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert*, «RPL» 5 (1982), pp. 29-42.

⁵ See J. Ramminger, *Die 'Irrtümer Perottis' von Ermolao Barbaro d. J. Ausgabe und Kommentar von Brief 135*, «WS» 114 (2001), pp. 677-700.

⁶ First printed Rhegii Lingobardiae, industria presbyteri Dionysii Berthochi 1502.

⁷ Lewis & Short, 1st ed. Oxford 1879, quote two etymologies proposed by Perotti (ss.vv. *asser, atrox*), in four cases they cite from the *Cornu copiae* passages from classical literature not otherwise known (ss. vv. *latibulor, phalangopalango, piscarius, pugnacula*). In the *TLL* Perotti occurs mainly as an authority for information that cannot otherwise be verified; cf. the lemma *p<h>alanganbant*, *TLL* X 1, Leipzig, München 1988-, col. 1994, l. 62-63 (Spath).

⁸ Venice, Aldus Manutius Romanus Dec. 1499 (HC 5501*).

⁹ Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Polifili*, a cura di G. Pozzi e L. A. Ciapponi, 2 vols., Padova 1980, [Medioevo e Umanesimo 38-39] II, p. 332.

¹⁰ First print of *De inventoribus rerum*: Venice, Christophorus de Pensis de Mandello 31 Aug. 1499 (H 16008*); modern ed.: Polydore Vergil, *On Discovery*, ed. and transl. by Brian P. Copenhaver, Cambridge, Mass., and London 2002, [itr 6], for Perotti see p. vii. The edition of the *Cornu copiae* is Venice, Johannes Tacuinus de Tridino 20 Dec. 1496 (H 12704*).

¹¹ According to Krautter Perotti is named several times in Beroaldo's commentary on Apuleius' *Golden Ass*; see K. Krautter, *Philologische Methode und humanistische Existenz. Filippo Beroaldo und sein Kommentar zum Goldenen Esel des Apuleius*, München 1971, p. 88. Perotti is named in Pietro Crinito's *De honesta disciplina* of 1504 (Florentie, opera & impensa Philippi de Giunta 1504 Calendis Decembris) at book 25, chapter 11 («*Quid sit 'sonticus morbus' in legibus decemviralibus et 'causa sontica', quove significatu accipiendum sit 'sontire' verbum ex sententia iurisperitorum*») «... De hoc ipso morbo et Perottus Sipontinus diligenter multa perquisivit, ne videar eius viri studium contempsisse, qui de omnibus quidem litteris est optime meritus». The reference is to *Cornu copiae* 3.466. Lilio Gregorio Giraldi quotes Perotti in book one of his *De deis gentium historia*, Basileae, Oporinus 1548, p. 75: «*Forculus, uel ut alii, Forulus, et Cardea, et Limentinus, tres fuerunt existimati dei, ianuus ac hostiis praefecti: et Forculus quidem foribus datus, ut ait Augustinus: Cardea uero cardini. hanc quidam libentius Carnam uocant, quae (ut canit in VI. Fastorum Ouidius) ab Iano compressa, acceperit cardinum potestatem, prius Crane nuncupata, dein per antistichon Carna. Hanc et Cardineam uiri alioqui eruditi, inter quos Sipontinus (i.e. Perotti), appellarunt*», from *Cornu copiae* 1.175 *Vnde Forculus deus qui foribus praeerat, sicut Cardinea dea quae cardinibus praeerat et Limentinus deus qui praeerat limini*.

¹² F. Stok, *Perotti e Olao Magno*, «SUP» 16 (1996), pp. 123-136.

¹³ C. Blackwell, *Niccolò Perotti in England - Part I: John Amwykyll, Bernard André, John Colet and Luis Vives*, «RPL» V,1 (1982), pp. 13-28: 17-19 and 25sq. n.50

¹⁴ J.-L. Charlet, *Perotti en Provence: sur quelques livres et manuscrits*, «SUP» 16 (1996), pp. 33-41, also for Nostradamus.

¹⁵ R. Hilgers, *Iter Perottianum. Studien zu Vorbesitzern von Niccolò Perottis Cornu copiae in Deutschland*, «RPL» 15 (1992), pp. 145-154, for Hutten, p. 147 and p. 151 n.30 (Mediolani, per Ioannem Angelum Scinzenzeler 1502).

¹⁶ Joachim Vadianus, *De poetica et carminis ratione*, ed. P. Schäffer, München 1973. [Humanistische Bibliothek II 21,1]; the quotations are on pp. 216 and 219 (VD16 no. V 33).

¹⁷ A.-A. Renouard, *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Alde*, 3rd ed. Paris 1834, repr. New Castle, Delaware 2003, p. 63:6 and p. 103:1.

¹⁸ Heinrich Bebel, *Liber hymnorum in metra noviter Redactorum. Apologia et defensio poeticae et oratoriae maiestatis. Brevis expositio difficultum terminorum in hymnis. Annotationes eiusdem in quasdam*

vocabulorum interpretationes Mammetracti [Tübingen], [Johann Otmar] [1501] (VD 16 no. B 1093). Of the two quotations, one is critical of Perotti (sig. f4v): *Ceteri autem dicunt inter quos et Perottus est nefas esse credere divum Ioannem huius cibi impuritate usum in eremo fuisse... parcant enim mihi manes Perotti hominis alioqui eruditissimi: multo enim plus tribuo divo Hieronymo quam cuiquam ex neotericis Graeci: et Latini: et Hebraici sermonis doctissimo*; cp. Perotti, *Cornu copiae* 1.156. The other is a mere reference (sig. g2v): *significat igitur incubare vulgo us-zbrieten sicut aves in suis pullis vivificandis faciunt. sed ut Perottus dicit: incubare proprie dicuntur*, cp. *Cornu copiae* 19.12.

¹⁹ For the biographical facts about Wimpfeling I have relied on B. Könneker, *J.W.*, in *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, III, Toronto, Buffalo, London 1987, pp. 447-50, and D. Mertens, *Jakob Wimpfeling (1450-1528). Pädagogischer Humanismus*, in *Humanismus im deutschen Südwesten. Biographische Profile*, hg. von P.-G. Schmidt, Stuttgart 2000, pp. 35-58. There is also an entry *Wimpfeling, Jacob* in *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, ed. P. F. Grendler, VI, New York 1999, pp. 311-12 (James H. Overfield).

²⁰ About him see *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, III, col. 1517-1518, Nr. 11 (P.-J. Schuler), and Herding-Mertens in: *Jakob Wimpfeling, Briefwechsel*, eingel., komm. und hg. von O. Herding und D. Mertens, 2 vols., München 1990, commentary to no. 56, p. 242.

²¹ The word *hecatostichon* (from Greek *hekatos* / hundred and *stichos* / verse), probably coined by Wimpfeling, remains in use in later German Neo-Latin poetry, see J. Ramminger, *Neulateinische Wortliste (NLW)*, URL: www.lrz-muenchen.de/~ramminger/neulateinische_wortliste.htm, s.v.

²² sig. b1r: «*Heroicum est carmen, quo praeclara magnificaque heroum ac principum gesta decantantur.*»

²³ There are several examples of *turpe est* at the beginning of a verse in classical authors, whom Wimpfeling will have known, e.g. Propertius, 3.9.5, Martial, 2.86.9, 6.90.2. The second half-verse of v.15 is lifted from Statius, *Theb.* 3.602-3 *superum contemptor et aequi / impatiens*.

²⁴ The gloss «*excors: exanimis*» is problematic, since *excors* only means 'stupid' (the meaning demanded by the verse), and *exanimis* 'lifeless' or 'terrified'. Wimpfeling had found it in the *Cornu copiae*, 42.23; Perotti had formulated it as an expansion of Nonius' observations (p.66 M.) on the compounds *excordes recordes concordes*, where *cor* was used in the meaning of *animus*.

²⁵ *Cornu copiae* 1.389: *Hunc maiores nostri modo a lingua linguacem siue lingulacem seu lingulacem, modo a blaterando blateronem dixere. Blatire et blaterare ueteres dicebant incondite et inaniter loqui.*

²⁶ See *TLL*, II, Leipzig 1900-1906, s.v. *blatero*, col. 2049.15-20

²⁷ The electronic edition of M. Müller traced some of the named quotations; otherwise no work has been done on the sources of the *Hecatostichon*.

²⁸ The *Agatharchia*, 'Rule of virtue', is edited by B. Singer, *Die Fürstenspiegel in Deutschland im Zeitalter des Humanismus und der Reformation*, München 1981, pp. 227-249, on whose identification of the sources my argument relies. The *editio princeps* is Strassburg, Martin Schott 21 Nov. 1498 (HC 16169*).

²⁹ Not identified by Singer, *Fürstenspiegel*, p. 247.

³⁰ See *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, s.v. *Johannes*, no.109, vol. 5 col. 577; and Singer, *Fürstenspiegel*, p. 212.

³¹ I give two further examples (for Perotti's sources I rely on the *apparatus fontium* of the modern edition of the *Cornu copiae*, see n. 2): *Hec. comm.* sig. b1r: *Panegyricum idest collaudatium. Panegyrici enim dicti sunt sermones qui in conuentu populi et sacris celebritatibus habentur, quales sunt quibus diui imperatores laudantur*, from *Cornu copiae* 98.8 (Perotti had abbreviated Tortelli). *Hec. comm.* sig. b4r-v *Satrape. sunt iudices et prefecti. Vocantur etiam dynaste principes potentes et hi qui magistratus gerunt et iudiciis praesunt hi etiam vocantur pretores et potestates*, from *Cornu copiae* 2.284 *Item potestates dicuntur principes potentes, quos Graeci Dynastas uocant, et ii qui magistratus gerunt et iudiciis praesunt. Vnde non inepte nec parum latine praetores urbium uulgo nunc potestates appellamus* (the dependence is especially striking here, because Perotti's reference to the Italian cities' «*potestas* / *podestà*» is meaningless in a German context).

³² For Sebastian Murrho (the Elder), ca. 1450 - 1495, see *NDB* 18, Berlin 1997, p. 620.

³³ See e.g. Polydore Vergil, *De inventoribus rerum*, 2.11.5 (ed. Copenhaver, p.260); Bartolomeo Platina, *De principe*, book 3: *Verum nullum bellum instrumentum eo melius est quod, paulo ante centesimum annum, certantibus inter se Genuensibus et Venetis, a Germano quodam inventum est. Bombardam a sono vocis nostri vocant* (ed. G. Ferraù, Palermo 1979, p.188). Celtis, *Odae* 3.8 (title) *Execrat Germanum inventorem bombardae; Epodae* 13.14 *Bombarda opus Teutonicum*.

³⁴ Thus Wimpfeling in a hand-written dedication of his own copy (Venice 1489): «*Hunc librum ad latinitatem et eloquentiam admodum utilem ...*», see the commentary of Herding-Mertens to letter no. 308 p.755sq. n. 7; for 'admodum' in the sense of 'very, extremely' see the documentation in J. Ramminger, *NLW* (see n. 21), s.v.