

INTRODUCTION – THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE CLASSICS.
PRACTICES, FORMS, AND FUNCTIONS OF EARLY MODERN
COMMENTING

Karl A.E. Enenkel

Recently, a vivid interest in commentaries came into being, as did a sense of the important role commentaries have played in the transmission of the classical heritage, especially in the early modern period.¹ Early modern intellectuals rarely read classical authors in a simple and “direct” form, but generally via intermediary paratexts: dedications, prefaces, and other introductory texts; *argumenta*; indices; illustrations; and above all, all kinds of commentaries – *annotationes*, *notae*, *commenta*, *commentaria*, *commentariola*, *animadversiones*, *paraphrases*, etc. These intermediary texts presented the classical text to modern readers in certain ways that determined and guided the reader’s perception of the text being commented upon. After all, the classical texts were composed in ages so very different from the period ca. 1450–1700. They were not only 1,000–2,000 years old, but they were written in a culture that in many respects had become alien to early modern readers. It was not self-evident to readers from 1450–1700 in what way these texts should be read, interpreted, and used. Take, for example, Martial’s *Epigrams*, which are full of explicit, partly homoerotic sexuality; they describe sexual practices and positions of lovemaking; they describe oral and anal sex, both heterosexual and homosexual; and many times they address pederasty. As Martial says in the first book of his *Epigrams*, his ‘verses cannot please without a cock’ (‘non possunt sine mentula placere’).² In 1450–1700, however, sexual culture was directed on the one hand by Catholic Church, which – via a long tradition – had restricted not only the representations of sexual practices but the practices themselves

¹ Cf. Inter alia, Assmann J. – Gladigow B. (eds.), *Text und Kommentar. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation* (Munich: 1995); Campi E. et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe* (Geneva: 2008); Grafton A., “Commentary”, in Grafton A. – Most G.W. – Settis S. (eds.), *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA – London: 2010) 225–233; Enenkel K.A.E. – Nellen H. (eds.), *Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1300–1700)*, *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia XXXIII* (Leuven: 2013).

² Martial, *Epigrammata* I, 35.5.

to a bare minimum: sex was allowed only between a husband and wife, only for the purpose of procreation, and only to a certain “decent” degree that excluded much lust.³ And talking explicitly about such matters was certainly not encouraged. Protestants, on the other hand, were at least as eager as the Catholics to take a decent, restrictive, and moral stand. Thus, what could be the use of Martial’s verses?

Niccolò Perotti (1429–1480), Archbishop of Siponto, for example, composed an extensive commentary (completed in 1478) on the first book of Martial’s epigrams that numbered more than 1,000 folio pages, which would be some 3,000 modern standard pages. This commentary is at least 40 times as long as Martial’s text and overpowers it to such a degree that Martial’s verses get almost lost. What Perotti offers is in fact a manual on the authentic Latin language of antiquity, as its title indicates: *Cornucopiae seu Latinae linguae commentarii locupletissimi* [...] – *Cornucopiae or Very Rich Commentaries on the Latin Language*.⁴ Via his commentary, Perotti transformed Martial’s text into a manual on the Latin language. To modern readers, this may seem to be a very strange project. Today, it would be a hopeless effort to sell a book of 3,000 pages, let alone a commentary of this length. In the early modern period, however, Perotti’s work was very successful: it became one of the basic texts of modern, advanced humanism. The classical writer Martial, on the other hand, would be more than surprised to see that in the 15th and 16th centuries he had become a lexicon; that the first 100 pages of his work – had he ever published a work of such a length? – would be a far cry from the frivolous humor for which he was famous. The Curio edition indeed starts with the paradigm of serious scholarship – a word index of 100 pages, with each page containing five columns of approximately 40 entries each, a total of some 20,000 entries. And Martial would be even more astonished if he discovered that the index entries do not refer to his poems but to an extensive commentary of about 3,000 pages that comprises the whole of the Latin language.

Perotti’s commentary on Martial, of course, represents an extreme form of early modern commenting; nevertheless, it may serve as a paradigm for the processes by which early modern commentators transformed the

³ Enenkel K.A.E., art. “Neo-Latin Erotic and Pornographic Literature (ca. 1400–ca. 1700)”, in Ford Ph. et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Neo-Latin Literature* (forthcoming).

⁴ For example, Basel, Valentinus Curio: 1532. The index is placed in front, before the main text. Its length is approximately 100 folio pages, with five columns on each page; each page contains approximately 50 entries. For Perotti’s *Cornucopiae*, see Furno M., *Le Cornucopiae di Niccolò Perotti. Culture et méthode d’un humaniste qui aimait les mots* (Geneva: 1995).

texts of antiquity. In many cases, a much longer and more extended commentary accompanied a comparatively small antique text that the reader entered via large (entrance) halls of *annotations* and other paratexts. Of course, it was up to the reader to figure out how to move around in this large and complex textual building, and to be very selective. At least theoretically, he was free to ignore all comments and move straight ahead to the classical text. We have evidence, however, that readers sometimes first consulted the commentary text and only looked at the “main text” second. In cases such as the Curio edition of the *Cornucopiae*, the index refers to the commentary only, but not to the main text. This means, of course, that the reader who oriented himself via the index would automatically go to the commentaries first.

Such observations may challenge the notion of “paratext” that has become common since it was introduced by Gérard Genette (1987).⁵ In the case of early modern commentaries, it is sometimes hard to say what the “(main) text” is. This is also the case with the commentary by Joachim Vadianus, a humanist and reformer from Switzerland, that was composed on the geography of Pomponius Mela. Vadianus’s commentary (first edition 1519; second edition 1522) is discussed in this volume by Katharina Suter-Meyer. Sometimes the commentator Vadianus takes over the role of the author: for example, when he writes on topics with which the ancient author was not familiar. This is true, for example, for the description of the Rhine: Mela was not acquainted with Switzerland and Helvetian towns such as St. Gallen, Vadianus’s home town. St. Gallen did not even exist in Roman times. In this case, the modern commentator, via his commentary, transforms the ancient *periplus* chorography into a modern regional geography. It is even more remarkable that this regional geography is focused on ideological questions: Vadianus has carefully constructed it as a founding text of the early modern “national” identity of Switzerland.

Among the early modern intellectuals, the humanists excelled as the most prolific commentary writers, text editors, and collectors of knowledge, with an almost irresistible inclination to comment on all kinds of texts. The commentaries they composed had an enormous impact on education; reading and writing practices; the formation, organization, authorization, and transmission of knowledge; and the reception of the classics. Early modern intellectuals got in touch with Latin commentaries in the

⁵ Genette G., *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: 1997; origin. *Seuils*, Paris: 1987).

first years of their school education, and many of them stayed involved with the ‘commentary business’ their whole life. Commentaries shaped university education; various professional activities; professional scholarship; private learning and intellectual entertainment; printing and publishing; religious life; and even segments of life that were seemingly far removed from scholarship and learning, such as warfare, engineering, and agriculture. Whereas up to ca. 1400 commentators dealt with only a limited number of canonical texts, in the 17th century they ended up with the whole body of classical Latin literature and even more than that.⁶

Different from scholarly commentaries from the 19th century until today, early modern commentaries were not primarily or exclusively focused on explaining (or reconstructing) the supposedly authentic meaning of works of the past in a historical sense. Their primary concern was about the present-day use (*usus*) and application of antiquity’s writings in every possible sense. In their commentaries they tried to mediate the classical text in a way that would guarantee a maximum profit with respect to general knowledge (“Bildung”, encyclos paideia), moral education, knowledge of facts in various fields and disciplines, identity formation (culturally, socially, “nationally”, and otherwise), school and university education, mastery of the Latin language (grammar and style) with regard to both reading and writing, and so on.

Since a substantial overview of the various forms, functions, and contents of early modern commentaries (by Henk Nellen and myself) has appeared recently, it does not seem necessary to repeat its findings and remarks here in detail.⁷ The reader may consult this overview or my lemma on “Neo-Latin Commentaries” in the *Encyclopedia of Neo-Latin Literature*. On the history of commentaries in the classical tradition, there exists an excellent lexicon entry by Anthony Grafton.⁸ In his lemma, Grafton has called the Italian 15th century the ‘century of commentary’; this is true, however, for the 16th and 17th centuries as well. In those centuries, the number of commentaries was almost exploding: still more commentaries were written, and with the help of the now established printed

⁶ Enenkel K.A.E., art. “Neo-Latin Commentaries”, in Ford Ph. et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Neo-Latin Literature* (forthcoming).

⁷ Enenkel K.A.E. – Nellen H., “Introduction: Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1300–1700)”, in idem, (eds.), *Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge* (Leuven: 2013) 1–76.

⁸ Grafton, “Commentary” 225–233.

book, the commented editions became the standard form in which classical texts appeared.

A new paratextual means that in early modern editions was used for the new transmission of classical texts, were printed images (woodcuts, etches, copper plates). Images accompany, present, adapt, and transform the “main” texts in a way similar to the commentaries. In a sense, images also may be regarded as early modern comments on classical texts. They focus the reader’s attention on aspects the early modern transmitters considered important or essential for the understanding, interpretation, and usage of the texts. Commentary by images had already become important at a comparatively early stage of the printed book, between 1490 and 1570 (see below). Of course, not all classical authors were equipped with figures, but some were, such as Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, Plautus, Terence, Pliny the Elder, and Cicero. It is fascinating to analyze the ways in which the various comments by images function.

The contributions of this volume testify both to the present vivid interest in early modern commentaries and to the abovementioned characteristics. Seven of them go back to the 15th International Conference of the IANLS, which was held in Münster (Germany) last year and in which a substantial section of some 14 papers was dedicated to commentaries, a section that was extremely well visited and brought forth vivid discussions. For this volume, seven papers were selected, and these were supplemented by six other contributions. All of the contributions demonstrate the important role commentaries played in transmitting classical texts and in handing them down to early modern readers. They deal not only with Italian commentators, who surely dominated the first phase of humanist exegesis in the 15th century. Italian commentators are, of course, present in this volume, albeit in a minority: in the articles by Gergö Gellérfi (on Bartolomeo Fonzio [1447–1513]), Susanna de Beer (Nicolò Leonicensi [1428–1524], Pietro Andrea Mattioli [1501–1578], and Gabriele Faloppio [1523–1562]), Christoph Pieper (Cristoforo Landino [1424–1498] and Antonio Mancinelli [1452–1505]),⁹ and Ekatarina Iliushechkina (Marcantonio Sabellico [1436–1506]).

More importantly, the fact that from ca. 1490 commenting on classical authors had become a truly European phenomenon is reflected in the majority of the contributions: they deal with commentators from the

⁹ Pieper’s contribution, however, is dedicated primarily to the German commentator Jakob Locher Philomusus.

German Empire, such as Jakob Locher Philomusus (1471–1528; Pieper), Beatus Rhenanus (1485–1547; Ronny Kaiser), Eobanus Hessus (1488–1540; Trine Arlund Hass), and Caspar von Barth (1587–1658; Valery Berlin-court); from France, such as Jodocus Badius Ascensius (1462–1535), who was born in the Low Countries but worked in Lyons and Paris (Marijke Crab), Étienne Laigue, alias Stephanus Aquaeus (+1535; Iliushechkina), Jacques Daléchamps (1513–1588; the same and de Beer), and Pierre Gaultier Chabot (1516–1598; Floris Verhaart); the Low Countries, such as Petrus Nannius (1500–1557; Marc Laureys) and Justus Lipsius (Jeanine De Landtsheer); Switzerland, such as Joachim Vadianus (1584–1551; Katharina Suter Meyer); and Tchechia, such as Zikmund Hrubý, alias Sigismundus Gelenius (ca. 1497–1554; Iliushechkina).

Only one third of the contributions deal with commentaries on classical texts that had been commented upon already in antiquity (Virgil and Horace). In a sense, this is characteristic of the commenting practices of the early modern period: the spectrum was much broadened, and scholars constantly added “new” classical texts to the list of “illustrious” authors that received commentaries. The new commentaries significantly contributed to the reception of these authors; they focused attention on them, added to their importance, and guided the readers to a new understanding of them. This is certainly true for Tacitus (contributions by Kaiser and De Landtsheer), Pomponius Mela (by Suter Meyer), Pliny the Elder (by de Beer and Iliushechkina), Juvenal (by Gellérfi), and Claudius Claudianus (by Berlincourt). In the second half of the 16th century not only did a revival of the largely forgotten Tacitus come into being, but so did an enormous boom that led to the phenomenon of early modern Tacitism. Tacitus was used as the central author in vivid debates on politics, especially with regard to the foundation of the monarchy and the attitude of the ruler toward changing religious matters. Lipsius’s new and more correct editions (contribution by De Landtsheer) paved the way for the new role Tacitus was about to play in 16th- and 17th-century intellectual life.

The same goes, *mutatis mutandis*, for the geographer Pomponius Mela, and Pliny’s geography, botany, and zoology in the *Naturalis historia*. Ermolao Barbaro’s critical commentary on Pliny’s text, *Castigationes Pliniana* (1492), paved the way for a new and much better understanding of Pliny, especially in the above-mentioned disciplines.¹⁰ It led to a revival of Pliny

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Davies M., “Making Sense of Pliny in the Quattrocento”, *Renaissance Studies* 9 (1995) 240–257.

as a botanical author (de Beer) and a zoologist (Iliushechkina). Pomponius Mela was hardly known in the Middle Ages, but via their commentaries Joachim Vadianus and other scholars introduced him as a serious *auctoritas* in 16th- and 17th-century intellectual life, which is especially remarkable because the 16th century was the age of new, important geographical discoveries – the Americas, of course, were absent from the Roman geographer's description of the earth. Between 1460 and 1520, Juvenal's *Satires*, similar to Martial's *Epigrammata*, was one of the favourite texts upon which to comment. Much like Martial, Juvenal was presented as a main transmitter of authentic Latin and as an important source for a newly discovered quality: antiquity's cultural alterity, or rather titillating and sparkling exoticism. Martial's and Juvenal's poems became a hot battlefield for scholars who excelled in authentic Latin. As Gellérfi demonstrates, Fonzio's forgotten commentary testifies to that feature: in his commentary, Fonzio battles constantly with his fellow commentators on Juvenal, especially Giorgio Merula, Giorgio Valla, and Angelo Poliziano.

All contributions offer in-depth analyses of the methods, strategies, and forms the single commentators used, and the focuses of attention, goals, and audience(s) they had in mind. Together, they present a picture of the various ways in which the classical authors were transformed by their commentaries over the course of the early modern period, and how they were adapted to various applications and usages that – at least partly – greatly differed from what the classical authors had once envisaged. When Tacitus wrote his ethnographical treatise *Germania*, he had no idea that it would one day serve to develop a new identity for a German nation that would wish to trace its origins back to classical antiquity (contribution by Kaiser); nor could Horace guess that his poems would one day function either as a school text used to teach Latin to non-native speakers, or as a founding manifesto for advanced German humanism used as a means to oppose the chauvinism of Italian humanists.

Nevertheless, these last two functions were the ways in which Jakob Locher transformed Horace and adapted him in his commentary to the German audience, consisting both of schoolboys and of grown-up humanists, as Christoph Pieper demonstrates in his contribution. Horace would have been at least as surprised to hear that his text was transformed by a commentary in a textbook meant to teach university students dialectic, logic, and rhetoric, as Floris Verhaart demonstrates in his article on Pierre Gaultier Chabot. Chabot's commentaries, in fact, open up an even larger field of applications that reflect both the Ramist focus on logical, methodical, and philosophical thinking, and the more general humanist

ideal of the commentary as a comprehensive manual on as many aspects of the *litterae humaniores* as possible. A special case is Horace's *Epistola ad Pisones*. Although the work clearly puts to the fore Horace's aesthetic principles and advises poets on what to do – or, better, what to avoid – the Roman poet would never have envisaged that his work would function as a manual on rhetoric. Nevertheless, this was the way in which the so-called *Ars poetica* was explained by the majority of commentators. But Horace also would not have dreamt of his *Ars poetica* being used as a means to teach encyclopaedian or antiquarian knowledge to university students. Nevertheless, as Marc Laureys shows, this was one of the most important goals Petrus Nannius, professor at the *Collegium trilingue* in Leuven, had in mind with his commentary on the *Ars poetica*.

In Pliny's case, the important innovations in Renaissance medical botany did not lead to an abandonment of the ancient text as an outdated and scientifically insignificant relic of the past; on the contrary, they initiated a new revival of Pliny which instrumentalized the classical text as a means to present the new findings. As Susanna de Beer demonstrates, scholars with botanical expertise started to challenge, correct, and above all to supplement Pliny's botanical texts with new knowledge. De Beer analyzes exactly how this transformation of classical scholarship worked in practice. She argues that 'the role of ancient texts was transformed in such a way that it could still meet the requirements of the botanical discipline, its practitioners and its beneficiaries, by providing the organizational principle of botanical knowledge and lending authorization to medical botany as an autonomous discipline in general, and to the related scholarly competences and commercial benefits in particular'.¹¹

For the commentaries on Pliny's zoology, similar observations are relevant. The discovery of the New World did not mean that Pliny was principally regarded as outdated. On the contrary, early modern zoologists tried to explain the new discoveries by linking them to Pliny's text. Some commentators of Pliny tried to harmonize empirical observations with the old standard work, and to authorize the new empirical data with his *auctoritas*. One of the most important works of early modern zoology, Conrad Gesner's *Historia animalium*, is in fact an homage to Pliny, and in a sense also a *commentary on Pliny and his sources*. The modern author, Gesner, does his best to be regarded as "the new Pliny".

¹¹ See de Beer's contribution in this volume.

Book Illustrations as Commentary

Two contributions analyze the commenting functions of images (Pieper and Karl Enenkel). Pieper deals with one of the groundbreaking works of early modern book illustration, Grüninger's and Locher's edition of Horace (1498). In this edition the images are used to authorize and legitimize both the classical author (Horace) and his modern commentator (Locher) by closely connecting them with each other, if not blurring them. There are a couple of images where it is not clear whether the classical author or his commentator is being depicted. Horace gets the attributes of the commentator, who had been crowned as a *poet laureate* by the Roman King Maximilian, whereas the commentator – with the same attributes – appears several times as the “author”. This use of the images is parallel to the commentator's effort to legitimize German humanism as an important cultural power, and a cultural movement that is at least on the same level as Italian humanism.

Enenkel's contribution analyzes the ways in which woodcut illustrations – in combination with other paratexts – are used in Heinrich Steiner's edition of Johann Neuber's and Freiherr Johann von Schwarzenberg's (+1528) German translation of Cicero's *De officiis* (1530). Enenkel demonstrates that Heinrich Steiner and Johann von Schwarzenberg have transformed Cicero's treatise into a (proto)emblem book, *On virtue and civil service*. This is especially interesting since – according to the *communis opinio* – the first emblem book appeared only a year later, in 1531: Alciato's *Emblematum libellus*, from the same Augsburg publisher (Steiner). In Alciato's *Emblematum libellus* – different from *On virtue and civil service* – the images were neither invented nor intended by its author. In *On virtue and civil service* as a standard, each “emblem” has (1) introductory German verses composed by Johann von Schwarzenberg, usually between two and six lines, (2) a woodcut *pictura* invented by either Johann von Schwarzenberg or Heinrich Steiner, and (3) a prose text consisting of a certain short, well-chosen passage of Cicero's translated *De officiis*, singled out by Johann von Schwarzenberg and consisting mostly of two or three paragraphs of the modern Cicero edition (i.e. approximately one or one and a half page of Steiner's folio edition). Johann von Schwarzenberg did his best to present the emblematic prose passages of Cicero's *De officiis* as textual units. In order to achieve this goal, he deleted certain sentences of Cicero's text, such as connective remarks, and also added explanatory sentences (‘glosses’). In cases in which von Schwarzenberg was the inventor of the image, the image is always to be read in close combination

with the German verses. The title, the verses, and the image all reflect on Cicero's prose text, and they present a certain interpretation of it. All three devices aim to adapt the translated text of *De officiis* to the interests of 16th-century German readers. It is interesting to see that their interests and intellectual horizon differ from those of scholarly humanism. It is remarkable that the images play an important role in this process of transformation. They guide the processes of textual meditation and the storage of the philosophical contents in memory. This means that the specific tendency or interpretation offered by the images heavily influences the understanding and application of Cicero's *De officiis* by German readers.

Of course, in a collection of essays, not all aspects of early modern comments can be dealt with. Much still remains to be discovered and explained. Research in commentaries naturally implies a lot of research in detail, and therefore it is a lot of work. Being well aware of that fact, we hope that the contributions of this volume may provoke further research in this intriguing field.

Monasterii, Kalendis Maiis MMXIII
Karl Enenkel

Select Bibliography

- ASSMANN J. – GLADIGOW B. (eds.), *Text und Kommentar. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation* (Munich: 1995).
- BLAIR A., “Organizations of Knowledge”, in Hankins J. (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge: 2007) 287–303.
- , “Student Manuscripts and the Textbook”, in Campi E. et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe* (Geneva: 2008) 39–74.
- BUCK A. – HERDING O. (eds.), *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance* (Boppard: 1975).
- CAMPI E. et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe* (Geneva: 2008).
- Catalogus Translationum et Commentarium. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries. Annotated Lists and Guides*, ed. by Cranz F.E., Kristeller P.O., et al., 8 vols. (Washington: 1960–).
- CÉARD J., “Les transformation du genre du commentaire”, in Lafond J. – Stegmann A. (eds.), *L’automne de la Renaissance, 1580–1630* (Paris: 1981) 101–115.
- DAVIES M., “Making Sense of Pliny in the Quattrocento”, *Renaissance Studies* 9 (1995) 240–257.
- DEAR P., *Revolutionizing the Sciences: European Knowledge and its Ambitions, 1500–1700* (Princeton: 2001).
- ENENKEL K.A.E., “Die humanistische Kultur Coimbras als Wiege des emblematischen Kommentars: Sebastian Stockhamers Alciato-Kommentar für João Meneses Sottomayor (1552)”, in Barbara M. – Enenkel K.A.E. (eds.), *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*, *Intersections* 21 (Leiden – Boston: 2011) 149–218.
- , “Emblematic Authorization – Lusus Emblematum: the Function of Junius’s Emblem Commentary and Early Commentaries on Alciato’s *Emblematum libellus*”, in van Miert D. (ed.), *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511–1575). Northern Humanism at the Dawn of the Dutch Golden Age* (Leiden – Boston: 2011) 260–289.
- ENENKEL K.A.E. – NELLEN H. (eds.), *Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1300–1700)*, *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia* XXXIII (Leuven: 2013).
- , “Introduction: Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge in the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (1300–1700)”, in idem (eds.), *Commentaries and the Management of Knowledge* (Leuven: 2013) 1–76.
- ENENKEL K.A.E. – NEUBER W. (eds.), *Cognition and the Book. Typologies of Formal Organization of Knowledge in the Printed Book of the Early Modern Period* (Leiden – Boston: 2005).
- GENETTE G., *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: 1997; origin. *Seuils*, Paris: 1987).
- GIBSON R.K. – Shuttleworth Kraus Ch. (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: History, Practices, Theory* (Leiden: 2002).
- GRAFTON A., “Commentary”, in Grafton A. – Most G.W. – Settis S. (eds.), *The Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, MA – London: 2010) 225–233.
- , *Defenders of the Text: the Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA – London: 1991).
- , “On the Scholarship of Politian and its Context”, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 40 (1977) 150–188.
- , “Renaissance Readers and Ancient Texts: Comments on Some Commentaries”, *Renaissance Quarterly* 38 (1985) 615–649.
- , “The World of the Polyhistor: Humanism and Encyclopaedism”, *Central European History* 18 (1985) 31–47.
- KEITH A. – RUPP S. (eds.), *Metamorphosis. The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Toronto: 2007).

- Le collection 'Ad usum Delphini'. L'antiquité au miroir du Grand Siècle*, ed. by Volpillac-Auger C. and Furno M., 2 vols. (Grenoble: 2000–2005).
- MATHIEU-CASTELLANI G. – PLAISANCE M. (eds.), *Les commentaires et la naissance de la critique littéraire* (Paris: 1990).
- MCKINLEY K.L., *Reading the Ovidian Heroine. 'Metamorphoses' Commentaries 1100–1618* (Leiden – Boston: 2001).
- MOSS A., *Latin Commentaries on Ovid from the Renaissance* (Summertown: 1998).
- MOST G.W. (ed.), *Commentaries – Kommentare* (Göttingen: 1999).
- PADE M. (ed.), *On Renaissance Commentaries* (Hildesheim – New York: 2005).
- VOLLMANN B.K., art. "Kommentar", in *LMA V*, cols. 1279–1280.