

CHAPTER 5

Introduction to the Latin Text

Sigla

B = MS London, Brit. Libr. Cotton Cleopatra C.V (folia 112–41). Sec. XVI. (*Iter* 4:140b.) See also A.G. Watson, “Thomas Allen of Oxford and His Manuscripts,” in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries: Essays Presented to N.R. Ker*, ed. M.B. Parkes and A.G. Watson (London, 1978), 279–314, at 300 and 309. B¹ = hand of modern (eighteenth/nineteenth century?) annotator who corrected the text against an authoritative copy. Seen in person.

F = MS Florence, BN Magl. XXIII.126 (folia 65–93). Sec. XV. Autograph. (*Iter* 1:139.) F¹ = Lapo’s own hand, correcting himself; F² = second hand (folia 95–107); F³ = possible nonautograph annotating hand. Seen in person.

G = MS Florence, BN Ser. Pan. 123. Sec. XV. (*Iter* 1:145.) G¹ = contemporary annotating hand. Seen in person.

N = MS Naples, BN VIII.G.31. Sec. XV. (*Iter* 1:428.) Seen in person.

P = MS Paris, BN Lat. 1616 (folia 137–62). Sec. XV. (*Iter* 3:215b.) There is a description of this manuscript in P. Lauer, ed., *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, vol. 2 (nos. 1439–2692) (Paris, 1940), 90–92. P¹ = contemporary annotating hand. Seen in person. In addition to the information in Lauer, one can add a codicological note. The paper is almost undoubtedly from the 1450s to 1460s and French. Compare the three different watermarks (on, e.g., ff. iii, 26, and 156) with C.-M. Briquet, *Les filigranes*, 4 vols. (nos. 365–88, 1680, and 6911) (Leipzig, 1923). The scribe was surely French; in addition to the look of the hand, the numeration (done in the hand of the scribe) gives this away. At f. 181, for

instance, it is as follows: “CiiiiI,” with two small *x*s on top of the small *i*s (so Centquatrevingtun etc.).

V = MS Vatican City, BAV Vat. Lat. 939 (folia 195–215). Sec. XV. For a complete description of this manuscript, see A. Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini*, vol. 2, pt. 1, *Codices 679–1139* (Vatican City, 1931), 368–74. Seen in person.

Sch. = R. Scholz’s reading (of V), in his “Eine humanistische Schilderung der Kurie aus dem Jahre 1438, herausgegeben aus einer vatikanischen Handschrift,” in *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 16 (1914): 108–53.

add. = addidit, addiderunt.

canc. = cancellavit.

cod./codd. = codex/codices.

coni. = coniecit.

corr. = correxit.

mar. d. = margine dextra.

mar. inf. = margine inferiore.

mar. sin. = margine sinistra.

mar. sup. = margine superiore.

om. = omisit, omiserunt.

Description of F

The base text of this edition is F, the only manuscript version that is traditionally believed to be an autograph. Although there are ample citations from this manuscript in the work of Luiso,¹ it has nonetheless hitherto not been fully described in any of the standard catalogues. A fifteenth-century paper manuscript, F has 107 numbered folia, plus seven unnumbered (three at the beginning, four at the end), here designated as i, ii, iii, and rear i, rear ii, rear iii, and rear iv, written in two hands (sec. I, ff. 1–93; sec. II, ff. 95–107).

Folia i and i^v: blank.

Folio ii: in a seventeenth-century hand, a table of contents. The page is interesting and deserves to be reproduced in full:

[*Later hand*] XXIII, 126 [*indicating the Magliabechiano number*]

1. See, e.g., Luiso, 273–78, 290 n. 3, 293 n. 1.

[Seventeenth-century hand:]

N^o 588

Lapi Castelliunculi, Vita Artaxersis 1

et Arati ex plutarco 19

De prefectis equitum ex xenophonte 49

Dialogus de Curie Romane commodis

eiusdem 65

Originale

Eiusdem prefatio in Isocratis oratione ad Demonicum 95

Luciani libelli duo in latinum per ipsum lapum

conversi 101 nel 1438 in circa

Del senatore Carlo di Tommaso Strozzi

1670

The position of the word *originale* indicates that the inventory writer believed that everything up to this point was from the hand of Lapo himself and that there is a change of hands beginning at folio 95 with Lapo's translation of Isocrates' *Oratio ad Demonicum* (cf. *infra*).

Folio ii^v: blank.

(Folio iii [with iii^v] is one of two vellum folia binding the manuscript; on iii there are inventory numbers.)

Folio iii^v: a partial table of contents and an elegantly fashioned drawing of the melancholic Lapo; at the bottom of the page there is an epigram: "Mori nella cit<t>à di Vinegia, anno MCCCCXXXVIII, del mese d'ot<t>obre d'età d'an<n>i XXXIII di morbo."

Folia 1–18: Plutarch, *Vita Artaxerxis*, trans. Lapo, with preface to Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, 1–2v. See Sammut, *Unfredo*, 168–71, for an edition of the preface, which was finished "ex bononia iii nonas decembris Mcccxxxvii," that is, 3 December 1437.

Translation:

ARTOTERXIS PERSARUM REGIS VITA PER LAPUM CASTELLI-
UNCULUM IN LATINUM CONVERSA.

[*inc. f. 3*] ARTOXERXES Ille primus Xerxe patre natus ex persarum
regibus tum facilitate humanitate tum maxime animi magnitudine presti-
tit . . . [*expl. trans. f. 18*] . . . mansuetudinis et clementiae existimationem
assecutus est quam non mediocriter auxit ochus, qui immanitate cunctos
et crudelitate superavit. FINIS FELICITER P(RI)DIE IDUS OCTOBRIS
Mcccxxxvii [14 October 1437]. INCIPIT ARATUS EODEM DIE.

Folio 18v: blank.

Folia 19–46: Plutarch, *Vita Arati*, trans. Lapo, with preface to Giuliano Cesarini, 19–20v. See Celenza, “Parallel Lives,” for an edition of the preface, which was finished “ex feraria xviii kalendas augusti 1438,” that is, 15 July 1438.

Translation:

ARATI SICYONII VITA PER LAPUM CASTELLIUNCULUM LATINUM CONVERSA INCIPIT.

[*inc. f. 21*] Chrysippus philosophus tritum quoddam veteri sermone proverbium eius credo tristitiam reformidans, convenisse mutatoque verbo leniorem ad partem traduxisse videtur . . . [*expl. trans. f. 46*] . . . Itaque Antigonic regni sublatis haeredibus eius omne genus interiit. Arati autem genus Sicyone et Pellene usque ad nostram pervenit aetatem. FINIS FELICITER ἡμέρα τῆ ὑστάτη τοῦ ὀκτοβρίου μηνὸς [*lege μηνὸς*] ὠρᾶ ἕκτη τῆς νύκτος, ἔτει χιλίῳστῳ καὶ τε[ο]τ[α]ρακοσίῳ καὶ τ<ρ>ιακοσίῳ καὶ ἑπτῳ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου γενέσεως [*31 October 1437*].

Folia 46v–48v: blank.

Folia 49–62v: Xenophon, *Praefectus equitum*, with preface to Guaspar Villanovensis, 49–50v. See Luiso, 293–95, for an almost complete edition of the preface.

Translation:

XENOPHONTIS SOCRATICI ORATORIS CLARISSIMI PRAEFECTUS EQUITUM INCIPIT FELICITER.

[*inc. f. 51*] PRINCIPIO QUIDEM CAESIS HOSTIIS A DIIS IMMORTALIBUS precari oportet, ut dent nobis ea cogitare, loqui, atque agere . . . [*expl. traductio f. 62v*] . . . Est autem consentaneum ipsos magis iis hominibus consulere velle qui non modo quid faciendum sit, cum necessitas instat, sciscitantur, verum etiam secundis in rebus et pro voluntate fluentibus quae possunt religiose casteque deos et colunt et venerantur. Τέλος θεῶ χάριν.

Finis viiii^o Kalendas Octobris post horam iiiii^{(a)m} noctis bononiae in domo reverendissimi patris Domini F(rancisci) CAR(dinalis) VEN(erabilis) S(ancti) D(omini) N(ostri) Camerarii.

Lapus Castellunculus ex Xenophonte traduxit ex Greco.

Folia 63–64v: blank.

Folia 65–93: *Dialogus de curiae commodis*. The letters designating interlocutors in the dialogue are written in red ink until section VIII, 4 at f. 85v.

Folia 93v–94v: blank.

Folia 95–101 (F² begins): Isocrates, *Oratio ad Demonicum*, trans. Lapo, with preface to Prospero Colonna, 95–95v. See Luiso, 290–91, for a partial edition of the preface.

Translation:

[*inc. traductio f. 96*] <C>Um in aliis permultis bonorum atque improborum sententias et opiniones inter se differre, demonice, licet intueri tum in usu vite et consuetudine maxime dissidere . . . [*expl. trans. f. 101*] . . . Ac vix ullus poterit impedimenta nature huiusmodi industria diligenciaque superare. Finis Huius operis ysocratis.

Folia 101–7: [Luciani De fletu et De somnio], trans. Lapo, with preface to Pope Eugenius IV, ff. 101–2. See Luiso, 276–78, for an almost complete edition of the preface.

Translations:

[*inc. De fletu f. 102*] <O>pere precium videtur esse que in fletibus a multitudine fiunt queque c(ir)cuitum observare et que contra a consolantibus eos . . . [*expl. De fletu f. 105*] . . . quod multitudo hominum mortem suppreum terribilem omnium esse opinetur.

[*inc. De somnio f. 105*] <C>UM PRIMUM essem ad pubertatem etate ipsa proventus et puerili institutioni iam modum statuissem, patet consilium capiebat habitis amicorum colloquiis inquam me petissimum disciplinam perdiscendam traduceret . . . [*expl. De somnio f. 107 but with interrupted text*] . . . Denique ex me brevi rerum omnium . . .

Folia rear i–rear iv: blank.

F, Folio 1–93 as an Autograph Manuscript

The notion that F is an autograph is reasonable. Many things about folia 1–93 (before the change of hands) make F up to that point seem like an author’s copybook rather than the work simply of a scribe, even one who corrected himself a lot. First, there are numerous corrections. F is rife with erasures and substitutions for these erased passages. The hand of the writer and corrector in these first ninety-three folia is consistent, and the numerous corrections are also consistently in the same hand. The same symbols for corrections and insertions are used throughout. In addition, at the end of each piece of work in the manuscript, Lapo tells where and when he was when the work was completed (“ego Lopus absolvi” etc.); this information, at least for the *De curiae commodis*, is lacking in the other manuscript copies of the works. Finally, throughout the manu-

script there are passages as well as individual words written in Greek. Lapo's hand in Greek has been identified, and the Greek in F is written in the same hand.² There is thus no reason at this point to doubt the traditional identification of this manuscript as autograph.

A comparison with the readings of the other manuscripts leads to the conclusion that F was seen as an authoritative text that may have been used for an intermediate version, a hyparchetype, now unavailable.³ V, P, B, G, and N uniformly follow the main corrections in F, corrections that are sometimes somewhat involved. The variations are mainly orthographical, but there are some passages where the scribes seem to have skipped a line, misread a word, or perhaps suggested their own version of a specific text in question.

There are a few suspicious mistakes and particularities that V, P, G, and N share but that are not present in F.⁴ Yet it does not seem likely that any of these served as a root for the others in that group, since there are also certain particularities that they do not share.⁵ Thus it could be that they were copied from an intermediate version now unavailable. Perhaps this hypothetical hyparchetype was a (dedication?) copy redacted by

2. See the Greek *Schriftprobe* of Lapo in P. Eleuteri and P. Canart, "Lapo da Castiglionchio il Giovane (c. 1406–1438)," no. LXXIV in their *Scrittura greca nell'umanesimo italiano* (Milan, 1991). See also D. Harlfinger, *Die Textgeschichte der pseudo-aristotelischen Schrift Περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν: Ein kodokologisch-kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Klärung der Überlieferungsverhältnisse im Corpus aristotelicum* (Amsterdam, 1971), 431; "Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der eudemischen Ethik," in *Akten des 5 Symposium Aristotelicum*, ed. P. Moreaux and D. Harlfinger, Peripatoi I (Berlin, 1971), 1–50, at 50. It is unsurprising that Lapo's Greek hand resembles the early Greek hand of his teacher Filelfo, although there are some distinctions to be made, such as the way each forms the letters ξ, λ, π, and τ; cf. P. Eleuteri, "Francesco Filelfo copista e possessore di codici greci," in *Paleografia e codicologia greca: Atti del II Colloquio internazionale (Berlino-Wolfenbüttel, 17–21 ottobre 1983)*, ed. D. Harlfinger and G. Prato, 2 vols. (Alessandria, 1991), 1:163–79, 2:107–14, at 1:166.

3. For the term *hyparchetype*, see M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart, 1973), 33.

4. Shared by V, P, G, and N: III.28: hodie posuisse videor] posuisse videar hodie V; posuisse videor hodie PGN. IV.21: suppeditate] suppeditate abunde VPGNB. VI.5: cogitis] cognitis VPGN. VII.4: enim om. VPGN. VII.23: in om. VPGNB. VII.36: sit] est VPGNB. VII.38: invidiam] iniuriam VPGNB. VIII.16: L om. VPGN. VIII.28: eo om. VPGN. VIII.51: assidue om. VPGN. VIII.54: conformarit] conformant VPGN. IX.2: aut om. VPGN. IX.5: admirabilis] laudabilis VPGN.

5. Not shared by V, P, G, and N: III.19: semper om. PGN. V.5: huius aetatis om. VGNB; virum om. GN. V.12: ubertatem] libertatem VPNB. V.13: hominibus] hominibusque PGNB. VI.10: aliquod] quoddam VPN. VII.23: reliquis omnibus] omnibus reliquis PB; paratissimos] peritissimos PG. VIII.1: illis om. VPGB. VIII.27: magisque] magis PGNB. VIII.39: non] non modo non PGNB. VIII.46: recidendum] recedendum VPNB. IX.7: malunt] volunt VN.

Lapo himself. If it was, he would have done it soon after he finished his final draft in F, since he died approximately two months later. Basing the text primarily on F, however, is justifiable even if there was an intermediate version that is now lost, since F represents the closest thing we have to a final authorial redaction.⁶

Justification for a New Edition

There has been only one other complete version of the *De curiae commodis*, that of Richard Scholz, the noted scholar of medieval church politics and of the legal history of the church. He based his edition only on V, itself a fascinating manuscript possessing many interesting texts directly relevant to Scholz's own field.⁷ Either inadequacies in Scholz's edition or inadequacies in V (since his edition was based only on V) would be justification enough for a new edition of the text. In this case, both situations obtain. As one would expect, there are three types of inadequacies: inadequacies of V itself, inadequacies of Scholz's reading or mistaken conjectures because of inadequacies in V, and basic errors in Scholz's reading.

Examples of the first kind of inadequacy are as follows (ordered according to section numbers):

I.4: deletaeque] delecteque V.

I.7: haberis] habere V.

II.8: spectarent] expectarent V.

II.19: tantum vero abest ut verear me abste convinci] tantum vero abste convinci V.

III.10: iocos] locos V.

III.14: principiis] principis V.

III.23: moveatur *om.* V. religio] religione V. perstringat *om.* V.

IV.13: dementiae] clemencie V.

IV.26: expositas] exquisitas V.

V.5: huius aetatis *om.* V.

6. As mentioned earlier, this is not a diplomatic edition of F. Only occasionally, however, does F not present the best reading; in those cases, the changes are adopted in the text, and F's reading is noted in the apparatus.

7. See the full description of this manuscript in Pelzer, *Codices Vaicani Latini*, cited earlier in this chapter, at siglum V.

- V.12: expetendus] expectendus V. ubertatem] libertatem V.
 VI.2: deferuntur] differuntur V.
 VI.8: scribis *om.* V.
 VII.11: praecipuam] precipiam V.
 VII.29: coquos, fartofores, pulmentarios] quos factores pulmentaris V.
 VII.38: propositum est, ut tecta cuiusquam flagitia detegam, aut mihi
om. V.
 VIII.42: taetris] certis V.

Some examples of the second and third kinds of inadequacy are as follows:

- I.8: me Kl. Iuliis in] III^o Kl. Iulii *sic Sch.* recepissem] recedissem *sic legit Sch.* In this case, Scholz's misreading of the date led him to ignore the fact that the word *me* was present, indicating that *recipere* was to be taken in its reflexive sense, that is, as *se recipere*, "to withdraw to, to retire to." Owing to his misreading of the date, he was forced to read *recepissem* as *recedissem*.
 I.9: honestandae] honestam de *sic legit Sch.*
 I.10: refectus] reffertus *sic Sch.*
 III.10: Omitte] Dimitte *sic Sch.*
 III.13: concluderis] conduxeris *sic Sch.*
 III.14: remitto] peremitto *sic V*; permitto *sic Sch.*
 III.15: ex receptis] exceptis *V*; expetis *coni. Sch.* vi] in *sic legit Sch.*
 III.27: videantur] vedeantur *sic V*; reddantur *sic legit Sch.*
 IV.9: publico] preco *sic V*; presto *sic coni. Sch.*
 IV.22: inuxerunt] inunxerunt *coni. Sch.* 350. improbissimus; curialis bonus, homo *om. Sch.*
 IV.26: et praestantissimi *om. Sch.*
 VI.11: requirant *om. Sch.*
 VII.2: videre in] viderem *sic legit Sch.* et videri *sic coni. Sch.*
 VII.21: rerum] verum *sic legit Sch.*
 VIII.5: voluntates] voluptates *coni. Sch.* minus] nimis *sic leg. Sch.*
 VIII.6: eorum] rorum *sic V*; rerum *sic legit Sch.*
 VIII.11: cessatio] cessans *sic legit Sch.*
 VIII.13: nimis] minus *sic legit Sch.*
 VIII.19: concesseris] censeris *V*; censuisti *coni. Sch.*
 VIII.20: quinetiam] quini et *V*; quin immo et *sic legit Sch.*

VIII.26: abdicandi; si probi, nonne satius est] abdicandi si [*tum vocabulum desiderat*] nonne satius est V; abdicandi sunt; nonne sanctius est *sic Sch.*

IX.2: gratia *om. Sch.*

IX.11: et turbulentissimos *om. Sch.*

The examples given above constitute a small sampling of the total number of differences. But as one can see, there are a number of substantive variations in V as well as quite a few omissions and misreadings on the part of Scholz, all of which are enough to make the sense fuzzy around the edges at best and to violate the sense considerably at worst.

Lapo as Scribe and Author

F presents us with interesting examples of the process of Renaissance writing. In addition, the manuscript reflects a consistent attitude on the part of its author toward orthography and punctuation, and the text itself shows some of Lapo's stylistic particularities.

As mentioned earlier, erasures and corrections in Lapo's hand abound in F. The pursuant changes reflect the process of composition and usually tend toward sharpening the argument and making it more precise. Typically, Lapo, desiring to insert a section into the text, places a symbol in the text that corresponds to a symbol in the margin; next to (or underneath) this marginal symbol there is a small portion of text to be inserted. So that the reader may have an idea of the character of these changes, I offer a few examples (the principle loci of difference are italicized).

The first comes from section III, 2, where the interlocutors are beginning their discussion of happiness. Originally, the passage read:

L: Beatitudinem dico non humanam, de qua tanta inter philosophos contentio est, et quam alii in alia re ponendam censuerint; sed divinam illam quae castis, sanctis, religiosisque viris post mortem ab immortali Deo tribuitur.

[*L: And I'm not talking about a merely human happiness, about which there is so much disagreement among philosophers, and which some think should be placed in something else. But it is that divine happiness that immortal God gives to chaste, holy, and religious men after death.*]

Revised, however, the text reads:

L: Beatitudinem dico non humanam, de qua tanta inter philosophos contentio est, cum eam alii in virtute, alii in honoribus, alii in divitiis, alii in bona valetudine, alii in voluptate, alii item alia in re ponendam censuerint; sed divinam illam quae castis, sanctis, religiosisque viris post mortem ab immortali Deo tribuitur.

[*L: And I'm not talking about a merely human happiness, about which there is so much disagreement among philosophers. Some think the locus of human happiness should be placed in virtue, others in [worldly] honors, others in wealth, others in good health, others in pleasure, while others still think it should be placed somewhere else. But it is that divine happiness that immortal God gives to chaste, holy, and religious men after death.*]

In revising his thought, Lapo has given things a bit more *akribeia* and has also taken greater account of the arguments at the beginning of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (I.4–5), where Aristotle discusses his predecessors' opinions about the nature of happiness.

Another place, in section III, 11, shows the same tendency toward greater precision. The interlocutors are in the course of the same argument, that the curia is a good place because it is a concentrated seat of religion. Originally, the passage read:

L: Ita prorsus. In genere enim bonorum quanto maius, tanto praestabilius et melius. Illud quoque perspicuum, gratius Deo esse frequentius coli quam rarius, et a plurimis quam a paucis.

[*L: Just so. For in the genus of goods, the more of something there is, the more preferable and better it is. This also is clear, that to God it is more agreeable to be worshiped more frequently than less and by many rather than by few.*]

The revised version reads:

L: Ita prorsus. In genere enim bonorum quanto maius, tanto praestabilius et melius. Ex hoc illud quoque perspicuum fit—cum reli-

gio Dei sit cultus—gratius Deo esse frequentius coli quam rarius, et a plurimis quam a paucis.

[L: Just so. For in the genus of goods, the more of something there is, the more preferable and better it is. In addition, *since religion is the worship of God, this makes* it clear that to God it is more agreeable to be worshiped more frequently than less and by many rather than by few.]

A final notable example from the same argument (at III.13) occurs as Angelo reveals that he understands Lapo's intention, which is to compel him to admit that the curia is a place where there is much religious practice and is therefore good. Originally, the passage had run as follows:

A: Sentio quo me his argutiis tuis concluderis, ut mihi necesse sit huiusmodi esse curiam confiteri; quod si antea percepissem, profecto nunquam effecisses, nec nunc quidem, ut id tibi concedam, a me ulla ratione *extorquere poteris*.

[A: I am beginning to understand that your arguments are leading me to a point where I'll have to admit that the curia is just such a place. But if I had understood this earlier, then you never would have carried it through, and certainly now you won't make me admit it with any argument.]

The revised version reads:

A: Sentio quo me his argutiis tuis concluderis, ut mihi necesse sit huiusmodi esse curiam confiteri; quod si antea percepissem, profecto nunquam effecisses, nec nunc quidem, ut id tibi concedam, a me ulla ratione *extorxeris*. *Quid enim a curia alienius quam religio esse potest?*

[A: I am beginning to understand that your arguments are leading me to a point where I'll have to admit that the curia is just such a place. But if I had understood this earlier, then you never would have carried it through, and certainly now you won't make me admit it with any argument. *For what can be more alien to the curia than religion?*]

While most of the changes tend simply toward greater precision and clarity, perhaps here we see a *dopopensiero*, where Lapo decided to take a risk and have Angelo mouth a radical, sarcastic bit of anticurial polemic.

The most important orthographical features (in addition to those noted at the end of the previous section “F as an Autograph Manuscript”) are as follows. First, in almost every case of words that with classical orthography are spelled with *ti* followed by an *a*, *o*, or *u* (e.g., *praestantia*, *etiam*, *Veneratio*, *hospitium*), the words in F are spelled with *ti*.⁸ In addition, Latin words that are either transliterated from Greek or have Greek roots and include an upsilon are spelled with a *y*.⁹ Finally, Italianizing usages of the initial *h* or lack thereof (as in the word *abundantia* being spelled *habundancia* etc.) are streamlined in F and brought into line with much of what we now consider classical orthography.¹⁰ The aforementioned characteristics thus reflect a fairly consistent concern on Lapo’s part for employing a classicizing orthography.

Lapo’s punctuation in F is interesting. Like most manuscript punctuation of the period, it is more phraseological than logical and could serve, if looked at from one perspective, almost as instructions for reading the text aloud. To mention just one case, question marks appear often when the voice would be raised interrogatively within an interrogative sentence, not necessarily only at the end of the sentence.

This is not the place for a study of Lapo’s Latin prose style, but some salient features do come into relief. First, Lapo presents some interesting wordplay, such as *difficile . . . deficientibus* (II.11); *casu . . . incidi* (II.15); *Deprehensum . . . reprehensio* (II.17); *cognitione dignissimum, cognitumque plurimi* (III.6); and *consentiunt . . . sententia concessuri sunt* (VIII.45).

There are a few features that might be characterized as Italianisms.¹¹

8. In V and P they are often spelled with *ci*; the rest are haphazard.

9. In most of the rest of the codices they are spelled with an *i*. So, e.g., one will see “tyrannus,” “Pythagoras,” etc. in F, versus “tirannus,” “Pitagoras,” etc. in V. The orthography of P and the others in this respect, however, is haphazard. Also, the words *mibi* and *nihil* are spelled in V and often in P and the other codices as “michi” and “nichil,” whereas in F they are consistently spelled “mihi” and “nihil.”

10. In V, P, G, N, and B this is not so.

11. On Italian humanist Neo-Latin particularities, see S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Rome, 1973), passim.

An interesting case shows the vernacular creeping into Neo-Latin usage. Here is the sentence (VII.33).

A: [33] Nec vero privatim tantum et alienae domi hoc exequantur munus, sed qui paulo lautiores sunt, *apothecas conductas habent* et in publico epulas vendunt.

As we can see, Lapo has here employed a finite auxiliary verb and a participle to express the perfect, just as is done in many modern languages; he uses *apothecas conductas habent* when he could just as easily have used *apothecas conduxerunt*.

Another Italianism occurs when Lapo spells the word *transferamus* as *trasferamus* (II.15), probably exactly how he pronounced it (cf. modern Italian *trasferiamo*).

Lapo's use of the word *confabulonibus* (VII.24) has an Italian feel to it, with the *-on-* part of the word (i.e., *confabulonibus*) showing that Lapo means not just storytellers but men who tell very many stories or exaggerated ones. In modern Italian, the word *furbone* is used to describe someone who is not just savvy and clever, *furbo*, but rather overly so. In a modern Italian word formation analogous to our case, the word *mangione* describes someone who likes to eat, *mangiare*, a lot. Here the word to indicate the exaggerated state has no noun but is formed directly from the verb, in the same way, probably, that Lapo forms the word *confabulones* to describe men who like to tell stories, *confabulari*, a lot.

Another interesting instance pops up when Lapo uses the word *carentia* as a feminine nominative singular. The word (essentially the neuter nominative plural present participle of *careo*) is common enough as a feminine nominative singular in medieval Latin but unattested before Chalcidius and Boethius (where it is used to mean something like *privatio*, i.e., Greek *στέρησις*).¹² The sentence is as follows (VIII.22): “Necessitas enim et bonorum quibus indigemus carentia violentissima omnino res est, . . .” Perhaps Lapo was thinking of the Italian *carezza*.

Lapo presents us with an interesting case of tmesis, when he writes *non enim dum* to express *nondum enim* (III.10).

Finally, there are at least two instances where Lapo shows rhythmic awareness. The first is his quotation of a hexameter translation of

12. See, s.v. *carentia*, C. Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae ac infimae latinitatis* . . . , 7 vols. (Paris, 1840–50) and *Lexicon linguae latinae*.

Odyssey I.3–4 (IV.8): “*Varias iactatus in oras et mores hominum multorum novit et urbes.*”¹³ The second is Lapo’s proverb (IV.22): “*Curialis bonus, homo improbissimus; curialis bonus, homo scelestissimus et omnibus viciis cohoptus.*”¹⁴

Editing and Translating Principles

I have added section numbers and section subdivisions to the text to facilitate reference and have given the different sections my own titles, which appear in square brackets at the head of each section. Notes that have to do with variant manuscript readings as well as marginal annotations in the various manuscripts are placed in the apparatus to the Latin text. Explanatory notes and notes relating to Lapo’s allusions and quotations are placed with the translation. I have punctuated according to sense. In order not to break the back of a text already overburdened with notes, I have not noted in the apparatus spelling differences among the manuscripts that do not change the lexical or grammatical meanings of words.

Even the slightest of other variant readings have been noted. This calls for a word of explanation. If a manuscript has *iis* instead of F’s *his*, for example, I have always included this sort of admittedly minor difference in the apparatus. Given that we have what amounts to a final authorial, autograph redaction, some might argue that such textual differences are inconsequential. Indeed, if we were dealing with a classical text that would be the case. In other words, if one were editing a classical text and were so fortunate as to have an authoritative autograph (an impossible situation), the rest of the manuscripts would be simply *codices descripti* and could easily be eliminated from anything more than cursory consultation in creating an edition. In classical textual criticism one attempts to come as close as possible to the version that the original author intended, and this is also the goal in Neo-Latin textual criticism. However, since

13. I have not yet been able to determine whether Lapo used his own translation or an already existing one, although Prof. Walther Ludwig has kindly informed me that Latin translations of the *Odyssey* were much rarer in Lapo’s day than those of the *Iliad*, suggesting the possibility that the translation may be Lapo’s own.

14. This proverb is unattested in both H. Walther, ed., *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*, 5 vols. (Göttingen, 1963–67) and idem, *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit in alphabetischer Anordnung*, 3 vols. (Göttingen, 1982–86). In the first of the two works, however, there are several proverbial sayings criticizing the curia; see “Curia” and “Curia romana,” ad loc.

Renaissance sources are so much nearer to us in time, we can come closer to the historical context of an author's work by having as much information about it as possible—by knowing, in addition to the author's words and intentions, the environments (orthographical, paleographical, and otherwise) in which his or her work was read.¹⁵

This edition is based on F, and overwhelmingly F's authority has been followed. The edition, however, is not a diplomatic edition of F. I have not used the word *sic* in the text itself, and when I believe that Lapo misspelled a word, as opposed to using what might now seem an unusual late-Medieval/early-Renaissance orthography, I have corrected the text, either indicating the correction with carets <> or correcting the text silently and noting the original reading from F in the apparatus.

I have chosen to maintain certain aspects of F, assuming that they might be of interest to scholars. For instance, in F Lapo indicates all *ae* and *oe* diphthongs either by writing them out or by using an *e-caudata*. Given that he thus notices all diphthongs, and given that in an analogous area, Greek diacritics, Lapo was especially precise (on the advice of his teacher Filelfo), I have decided simply to render the diphthongs in classical fashion, for the sake of consistency.¹⁶ Consistently understanding the diphthong was obviously important to Lapo, and this should be respected in the edition. However, as stated, this is not a diplomatic edition, and I believe that rendering the cedillas literally would simply have marred the text visually and would not have contributed to any greater historical or literary understanding; hence my decision to use classicizing orthography. Not all will be satisfied with this, of course.

There are other particularities. Lapo habitually renders *quamobrem* as *quam obrem* in F and is followed in this practice by V; the other versions are haphazard. I have chosen for the sake of consistency to render this spelling as it is in F, that is, as *quam obrem*. Lapo spells the word *cottidie* for the most part as *quottidie*, sometimes as *quotidie*; I have simply followed F. In two other cases Lapo redoubles consonants, writing *addiunctis* for *adiunctis* (I.11) and *iudicare* for *iudicare* (II.6). He spells *abste* as *abste* (II.6, 19), which I have followed. He renders *subactus* as *sub*

15. On Neo-Latin in general, see J. IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (Amsterdam, New York, and Oxford, 1977).

16. Lapo's exactitude with respect to Greek diacritics can be seen by examining his Greek hand—it is very rare that one catches him in a mistake. See Celenza, "Parallel Lives," 141. For Filelfo's practices, see M. Cortesi, "Umanesimo greco," in *Lo spazio letterario del medioevo*, pt. 1. *Il medioevo latino*, vol. III: *La ricezione del testo* (Rome, 1995), 457–507.

actus (IV.10). In two cases he uses the letter *x* interestingly, spelling *inusserunt* as *inuxerunt* (IV.22) and *inusta* as *inuxta* (VIII.8).

Lapo's Latin is elegant and functional and is well in line with the Ciceronian standards of his generation. Given this, he often employs long, periodic constructions, which would be impossible to maintain in their integrity in English, so I have often broken up Lapo's sentences into shorter sentences in my translation. I have also tried to steer as skillfully as possible between the Scylla of overliteralism and the Charibdys of trendy but ephemeral locutions. Suffice it to say that my goal has been to provide a translation that is readable but also a reasonable guide to the Latin. I have annotated what seemed to be the most important citations and, where I have been able to discern them, allusions or reminiscences. In section VI of the dialogue, the interlocutors discuss various offices in the curial hierarchy; I have annotated the explicit mentions of various positions and offices. However, for two recent and more complete overviews of the structure of the curia, I refer the reader to the work of John D'Amico and Peter Partner.¹⁷

Finally, given the malleability of various Latin words, it was necessary to translate the same Latin word differently where it seemed appropriate. For instance, Lapo uses the word *animus* in different ways. When he speaks (in IV.21) of *perturbationibus animi* he seems to refer to the non-material part of a person, so I have translated the word there as "soul." But when, in an angry, hortatory passage (IV.25), he hopes that something might *excitare* the *animos omnium*, he seems to use the word more generally, so I translate the word there as "spirits."¹⁸ There are other, similar cases where I have tried to let prudence and common sense function as a guide.

17. See D'Amico, chap. 1; Partner, *Pope's Men*.

18. In other words, in this case I have borne in mind that for technical, university-based Renaissance philosophers (which Lapo, like most humanists, was not), words like *animus*, *spiritus*, etc. would have been used with a much more precise meaning.