

# POMPONIO LETO'S LIFE OF SALLUST:

between *vita* and *invectiva*\*



By Patricia J. Osmond

*Pomponio's vita Salustii appeared in both the first printed edition of Sallust's opera (Rome: Eucharius Silber, 1490) and the presentation copy written for Agostino Maffei (BAV, Ms. Ottob. lat. 2989), and was frequently reprinted thereafter. It was by no means the first or only vita of Sallust in this period, for alongside the medieval vita auctoris that survived in manuscript and print, we also have the lives by Girolamo Squarzafico, Giovanni Crisostomo Soldi and Pietro Crinito. Pomponio's stands out, nevertheless, as the most critical of the author, perhaps because much of it was based on anti-Sallustian sources, especially the (ps.-) Ciceronian Oratio in Sallustium.*

Sallust was one of Pomponio's favorite authors – or so it would appear from the considerable time and effort he devoted to his two monographs, the *Conspiracy of Catiline* and the *Jugurthine War*. In 1480 Pomponio taught a course on the *Jugurtha* at the *Studium Urbis*, from which we have the *dictata* taken down by a German student.<sup>1</sup> In 1490 he published at the press of Eucharius Silber what, for the times, might be called the first critical edition of Sallust's *opera*, including the two monographs, the surviving set of speeches and letters from the *Historiae* and the letters to Caesar: a work that, he tells us, had taken him some three years to complete, collating old manuscripts and carefully emending the text.<sup>2</sup> A handsome presentation copy of the manuscript, in the hand of Giacomo Aurelio Questenberg, was made for his patron, Agostino Maffei.<sup>3</sup> In addition, Pomponio filled his own

---

\* I thank Patrick Baker for his helpful comments on the original draft of the paper and Marianne Pade and Robert Ulery for many improvements in the editing and the translations of the *vitae* included in this article.

<sup>1</sup> See Osmond & Ulery 2003, 291–292.

<sup>2</sup> Rome: Eucharius Silber, 3 April 1490.

<sup>3</sup> Ullman 1973 (2) and Pade 2011 (2). After the *editio princeps* of 1490 we find the *vita* in some 12 other reprints or new editions of Sallust in the last decade of the fifteenth century: 1492.6, 1492.7, 1493.1, 1493.8, [1493], 1494.11, 1495.1, [c. 1496–97], [c. 1497–99], 1497.1, [1497], 1500.7. It also appeared in numerous editions of the sixteenth century and later (1502, 1513, 1514, 1546, 1547, 1564). In these later editions, however, it often appears

copy of the 1490 edition of Sallust (BAV Inc. Ross. 441) with extensive annotations in the margins and in additional blank quires bound with the printed text, a commentary that is also found in the same or similar form in some four other copies of the 1490 edition of Sallust that belonged to his students or members of his humanist circle: New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, 51414.2; Modena, Biblioteca Estense, gamma B 6 25; Fermo, Biblioteca Comunale “Marco Speziali”, 4C8 395-34390; and Glasgow, University Library, Sp Coll. BD7-e.1. Another copy in the Royal Library of Copenhagen, Inc. 3587, contains only a few notes from Pomponio’s commentary but at present it is the only one that, thanks to its coat of arms, can be traced to a specific owner, a member of the Stati family of Rome, perhaps Alessio Stati, a member of Pomponio’s circle.<sup>4</sup>

And yet, despite all the evidence we have of Pomponio’s interest in Sallust’s monographs and the importance they had in his teaching and editing, the *Vita Sallusti*, appended to his 1490 edition of Sallust’s *opera*, and also included, in a more correct version in the presentation manuscript to Maffei, gives the impression that he had little or no use for either the author or his work. Not only is it very short – shorter than most of his other lives – but it reads more like an *invectiva* than a *vita*.

### C. Crispi Sallusti vita\*

Crispus Sallustius genus ex Amiterno Sabinorum ducit,<sup>a</sup> C. Sallustio patre genitus. Ex liberalibus artibus, in quibus educatus erat, praeter eruditionem nihil accepit: omnibus voluptatibus turpissime indulgit; paternam domum vendidit ut crimine adulterii se redimeret.<sup>b</sup> Ex questura & tribunatu nullam laudem est adsecutus.<sup>c</sup> Favente C. Caesare praetor Aphricam sortitus;<sup>d</sup> provinciam expilavit et exhausit tantumque inde pecuniarum reportavit ut amoenissimos hortos sub Quirinale extra pomerium ad Collinam Portam titulo sui nominis empto loco habuerit<sup>d</sup> atque adornaverit, non vulgares illius seculi & posterorum aetatibus delitias atque secessum,<sup>f</sup> usque ad exactam aetatem libidinis avidus & potens. In amicitia varius & inconstans, saepius tamen livido dente momordit. Habitus est ore improbo & animo inverecundo.<sup>g</sup> Manis Pompei Magni, existimans hac via se Cæsari gratiorem fore, lace rare ausus est, unde in Sallustium Laeneus Pompei libertus scripsit moresque eius sigillatim paucis vocabulis expressit: nebulonem, lurconem, popinionem, et lastaurum appellans.<sup>h</sup> Vox postrema indicat

---

anonymously, under the title “C. Crispi Salusti vita”, sometimes followed by the words “incerto auctore” (by an unidentified author). In fact, as Ullman 1973 (2), 366–367, pointed out, this led a modern scholar, A. Kurfess, to mistake it for an *ancient* life of Sallust.

<sup>4</sup> See Osmond 2003, 2010, 2011 (1), 2011 (2) and 2011 (3); Farenga 2003; and Ulery 2003.

fuisse hominem validae libidinis. Scripsit stilo non abhorrente a veteribus.<sup>i</sup> Extant Coniuratio Catilinæ & bellum Iugurthinum & quaedam contiones [-cionem *ed.*] e libris bellorum Civilium. Ut secreta inimici fidelius intelligeret [-gere *ed.*], Terentiam a Cicerone repudiatam duxit uxorem [-re *ed.*], quae [et quae *ed.*] tertio nupsit Messalae Corvino.<sup>j</sup>

\*BAV, Ms. Ottobonianus lat. 2989, fol. 146. Readings from the *editio princeps* (Rome: Eucharius Silber, 3 IV 1490) are in square brackets.

<sup>a</sup> Hier. chron.a. ann. Abr. 1930. <sup>b</sup> Ps. Cic. *in Sall.* 13-14. <sup>c</sup> *Ibid.* 15. 17. <sup>d</sup> *Bell. Afr.* 8,3. 97,1. <sup>e</sup> Ps. Cic. *in Sall.* 19. <sup>f</sup> Cf. Pomponius Laetus, *Excerpta a Pomponio dum ... reliquias ac ruinas Urbis ostenderet*, in de Rossi (ed.) 1882, 61, ll. 13-17, and in Valentini-Zucchetti (eds.) 4 (1953), 429, ll. 22-26. <sup>g</sup> quod eum [*i.e.*, Pompeium] oris probi, animo inverecundo [*sc.* Sallustius] scripsisset Svet. *gramm.* 15. <sup>h</sup> *Ibid.* <sup>i</sup> Cf. Svet. *Aug.* 86. <sup>j</sup> Hier. *adv. Iov.* 1,49.

(Crispus Sallustius was born into a family of Sabine Amiternum, the son of Gaius Sallustius. From his study of the liberal arts, in which he had been educated, he received nothing other than (mere) learning; he indulged disgracefully in all pleasures; he sold the paternal home in order to save himself from the charge of adultery. From his quaestorship and tribunate he won no renown. As praetor, with the favor of Caesar, he obtained the province of Africa, which he plundered and drained and from which he carried away so much money that he became owner, after purchasing the site, of the very valuable gardens behind the Quirinal outside the *pomerium* near Porta Collina, which he adorned as a place of no ordinary delights and retreat for his own times and for posterity, greedy for pleasure and powerful right up to the end of his life. In friendship variable and inconstant, he often bit, however, with a spiteful tooth. He was considered to have an impudent face and shameless character. He dared tear to pieces the shade of Pompey the Great (believing this to be the way of pleasing Caesar), whence Lenaeus, Pompey's freedman, took up his pen against him, describing his character and habits in a few succinct words, calling him a good-for-nothing, glutton, tavern-goer and debauchee. The last term shows that he was exceedingly dissolute. He wrote in a style not unlike that of the ancients. His extant works are the *Conspiracy of Catiline*, *Jugurthine War*, and certain speeches from the books on the civil wars. In order that he might learn more faithfully the secrets of his enemy, he married Terentia, whom Cicero had divorced; her third husband was Messala Corvinus.)

We'll come back to this *vita* later but first, in order to see Pomponio's life in the context of other biographical sketches of Sallust, we need to take a look at the major *vitae Sallustianae* that existed in manuscript or print in the sec-

ond half of the fifteenth century. The field is vast, for Sallust had a virtually uninterrupted *fortuna* from antiquity through the Renaissance. He was read in the schools as a model of elegant Latinity, a source of historical and antiquarian information and a repository of moral precepts and *exempla*. He also provided a model for the writing of monographs (on a single historical event); and, especially during the age of the communes and in republican Florence, his account of Rome's rise to power (and subsequent decline) inspired many of the arguments promoting the ideals of civic humanism.<sup>5</sup> More than 200 manuscripts of his work have survived from the late ninth to the late fifteenth century, of which close to 50 contain an *accessus*. With the advent of printing Sallust immediately led the bestsellers list of Roman historians: between 1470 and 1500 some 69 editions of his works were printed (according to current figures in the *Incunabula Short Title Catalogue*, including translations in modern European languages), compared with 21 of Livy, 10 of Florus and 16 of Caesar, and many of these editions of Sallust contained some kind of biographical sketch in dedicatory letters, prefaces or postfaces.

Given the abundance of material we can select only a few samples even from Pomponio's own time, but these may give us an idea of what readers of Sallust were learning about the author and, in turn, a better perspective on Pomponio's own contribution. I present them in chronological order, according to the sequence in which they were written.

Starting with the *accessus*, an introduction to the reading of an author that is found in a large number of Sallust manuscripts throughout the Middle Ages, we can see from the typology developed by Robert Ulery in the article on Sallust in the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* 8 (2003) that it can be divided into five different groups, depending upon the choice of topics (or questions), their number and order.

I. The traditional requirements of the *accessus* are stated, and each is then briefly answered for Sallust and the particular text (*Catilina* or *Iugurtha*). There are basically two forms: (a) traditional (up to early s. XI) with 6–8 requisites, and (b) “modern” (c. s. XI) reduced to 3 or 4. Either set may be named in one of three ways: (1) *auctor, titulus, materia, numerus librorum, qualitas* or *genus, intentio, utilitas, cui parti philosophiae*; (2) *quis, quid, ubi, cur, quomodo* etc.; and (3) *causa efficiens, causa materialis, causa formalis* etc.

II. (*Catilina*) *accessus* in four parts beginning directly with either (a) *materia*, (b) *intentio*, (c) *vita*, or (d) *ordo*.

---

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance, the section on Sallust's *fortuna* in Osmond & Ulery 2003, 186–217, and the earlier articles by Osmond 1995 and Osmond 2000.

III. (*Iugurtha*) *accessus* beginning directly with (a) *materia*, (b) *materia* followed by *prologus*, (c) *materia* of *prologus*, (d) *intentio* of *prologus*.

IV. *Vita auctoris* alone

V. Historical introduction (perhaps arising from discussion of *ordo*).<sup>6</sup>

The *vita auctoris*, which was meant to provide a few facts (or conjectures) regarding origins, family and education, usually begins the series but not always, and in some cases even stands alone. *Titulus*, *materia*, *ordo librorum* and *qualitas* or *genus* deal briefly with the titles, subject matter, sequence and genre of the author's works, while *intentio* and *utilitas* seek to explain the purpose and utility of the works, especially in terms of moral philosophy. A few samples from the many *accessus* from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries illustrate some of the different typologies: type I.a.3, the traditional model with a full set of topics in what might be called the "scholastic" tradition; type II, which begins directly with *materia* and *intentio* but then moves into the *intentio* of the prologue; and type IV, which deals only with the life of the author.

Type I.a.3. Naples, Bibl. Nazionale, IV C 3, fol. 1r (s. XIV-XV)<sup>7</sup>

Circa istum librum salustii sex requiruntur, viz. causa efficiens, causa materialis, causa formalis, causa finalis, quis titulus libri, cui parti philosophie supponatur. Causa efficiens salustius fuit. Causa materialis est coniuratio Cateline [...] Titulus libri est Incipit liber salustii.

(Regarding this book of Sallust there are six requirements, that is, efficient cause, material cause, formal cause, final cause, the title of the book and the part of philosophy to which it belongs. Sallust was the efficient cause. The material cause was the conspiracy of Catiline. The title of the book is "Here begins the book of Sallust".)

Type II (abbreviated form). Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14515, fol. 125r (s. 12)<sup>8</sup>

In hoc opere intentio est Salustii describere bellum quod fuit inter Catilinam et Romanum populum. Causa autem intentionis [i.e., intentio] est hortari bonos ad defensionem patriae per exemplum Ciceronis et aliorum, malos vero deterrere ab impugnatione patriae per exemplum Catilinae. Et quia quidam imposuerant pigritiae quod maluit dicendo quam faciendo vitam parare, facit hunc prologum, in quo contra tales

---

<sup>6</sup> Osmond & Ulery 2003, 194, with further bibliography on the medieval *accessus*.

<sup>7</sup> On the manuscript see *ibid.*, 234: "Anonymus Italus (M. Ambrosius?)" and 241: "Laurentius Valla (?)".

dilaceratores excusat se, et extollendo omnibus modis ingenium ostendit callide suum otium hortando ad virtutem rei publicae plus profuisse quam aliorum negotium.

(In this work the intention [that is, the subject] of Sallust is to describe the war between Catiline and the Roman people. However, the cause of his intention [that is, his intention] is to exhort the good to defend the homeland through the example of Cicero and others, but to deter the bad from attacking the homeland by the example of Catiline. And because certain persons attributed to laziness that he preferred to pass his life in speaking rather than doing, he wrote this prologue in which he defends himself against such detractors, and, extolling the intellect in every way, cleverly shows that his leisure, by exhorting to virtue, had brought greater benefit to the republic than the public engagement of others.)

Type IV. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14477, fol. iv (s. 11)<sup>9</sup>

Mos erat Romanorum ut unusquisque nobilis apponeret filium suum studiis per XV annos. Quibus finitis interrogabantur utrum vellent manere in studiis an morari in re publica. Similiter iste Salustius fuit nobilissimus et tali modo a studiis retractus est et consul effectus. Qui cum diu mansisset in dignitate vidit maiorem laudem acquirere scribendo quam consulatum regendo. Qua de re verum retraxit se ad studium et complures historias composuit, de quibus tamen non utimur ulla nisi *Catilinaria* et *Jugurthina*.

(It was the custom of Romans that every noble would have his son educated for 15 years. When this period was over, they were asked whether they wished to continue their studies or engage in public life. Similarly this Sallust was very noble and thus was removed from his studies and made consul. When he had remained for a long time in a position of dignity, he saw that he acquired greater glory by writing than by holding the consulship. Doubtless for this reason he returned to his studies and composed several histories, none of which we use, however, except for the *Catilinaria* and *Jugurthina*.)

One especially interesting case is the *accessus* introducing a commentary attributed to the humanist scholar Ognibene da Lonigo at the time it was printed in Venice in 1500 but which Ulery has identified with a version already found in a manuscript dated s. XII–XIII (Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 411)

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 228: “Anonymus Ratisbonensis B”.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 231: “Anonymus Monacensis B”.

and in several manuscripts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.<sup>10</sup> The moralizing intent is obvious, as the author states that Sallust wrote his two works in order to refute those who attack their homeland out of ambition or avarice and to praise those who defend their homeland by good counsel. In the *Conspiracy of Catiline* the Roman revolutionary Catiline embodies the former; Cicero, consul in the year of the conspiracy (63 B.C.), the latter, and the lesson we must draw from the text is thus quite simple: seeing what a terrible end Catiline came to, we should not attack our homeland, and seeing the rewards that were bestowed on Cicero, we should defend our homeland. It is also a good example of the many pseudepigrapha, that is, writings, and in this case commentaries, that were mis-attributed to humanist scholars. Most likely, the printer of the 1500 edition believed that it would sell more copies if it were published under the name of a prominent humanist like Ognibene than as the anonymous work of an unknown medieval school teacher. It is possible, of course, that Ognibene himself may have used the commentary in his own classroom. What is surprising, nevertheless, is that no one, until Ulery pointed it out some ten years ago, recognized its medieval origins.

Various forms of the *accessus* continued to appear in Sallust manuscripts even in the early sixteenth century.<sup>11</sup> In the meantime, however, a new type of *vita* had already made its appearance in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries in the first humanist collections of “famous men”, that is, the lives of illustrious poets, orators, historians and other writers, which in turn had their models in the ancient collections of lives from Nepos and Suetonius to Jerome. In Avignon Petrarch’s friend Fra Giovanni Colonna composed his “De Salustio” for his (still unpublished) *libri de viris illustribus* (c. 1330–1338).<sup>12</sup> Petrarch himself included a little portrait of Sallust in his *Rerum memorandarum libri*, 1,17 (1343–1345).<sup>13</sup>

Crispus Salustius, nobilitatae veritatis historicus [AVG. civ. 1,5] – sic enim de illo apud auctores verissimos scriptum video – quo fidelius res Africae complecteretur, libros punicos perquisivit peregrinamque

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 225–227: “Anonymus Bernensis” (later attribution: “Omnibonus Leonicensis”) and Ulery 2005. On the attribution of other commentaries to Ognibene, see Monfasani 1988.

<sup>11</sup> Some fifteenth-century manuscripts contain a collection of different *accessus* side by side with the new humanist *vitae*, as was the case in a manuscript that once belonged to Aulo Giano Parrasio, now Naples IV C 3 (see Osmond & Ulery 2003, 234). In the early sixteenth century one can still find traces of the *accessus* in Badius’s *De historia et eam concernentibus collecta per Ascensium* (see Osmond & Ulery 2003, 246–247).

<sup>12</sup> BAV, Barb. lat. 2351, fols. 121v–122v. See Ross 1970.

<sup>13</sup> Copies of Sallust’s monographs and the two invectives were in Petrarch’s library, and it seems that another copy or copies of Sallust belonged to his friend, Fra Giovanni Colonna. Sabbadini 1967, 1, 24 and 27; 2, 56, and Ullman 1973 (3), 118–119.

linguam per interpretem flagranti studio scrutatus est; quin et maria transgressus dicitur, ut oculis suis crederet de conditionibus locorum. Bellum Iugurthinum coniurationemque Catilinae compendioso et ad unguem, ut dici solet, castigato complexus est stilo. Sed nullo famosior quam Historiarum libro, qui aetati quoque nostrae – ne tertium eius sileam dedecus – amissus est: veterum quidem testimonio illustris et apud nos solo iam nomine superstes.<sup>14</sup>

(Crispus Sallustius, historian of ennobled truth – for so I see written about him in the works of the most truthful authors – in order that he might comprehend more faithfully the affairs of Africa, eagerly searched for Punic books and through an interpreter accurately examined the foreign language with great passion; and furthermore, he is said to have crossed the seas in order that he might see and believe with his own eyes the local conditions. He encompassed the Jugurthine War and Conspiracy of Catiline in a style that is neat and compact, “down to a hair”, as one is accustomed to say. But [the book] of Histories, than which none was more famous, was lost to our age – lest I keep silent regarding its third cause of shame – [a book] illustrious indeed by the testimony of the ancients and now extant among us only in name.)

In the early fifteenth century the Paduan notary Sicco Polenton included a biography of Sallust in his *Scriptores illustres latinae linguae* (c. 1437), what has been called the first history of the major Latin authors. Although it was published only in 1928 by B.L. Ullman in the Papers and Monographs of the American Academy,<sup>15</sup> it circulated widely in manuscript. One of the most popular lives of Sallust in Pomponio's own time was, in fact, an abridged version of this biography, printed under the title *Crispi Sallusti oratoris clarissimi vita* (Appendix, no. 1).<sup>16</sup> It first appeared anonymously in an edition of Sallust's works printed in Venice in 1471 by Wendelin of Speyer. In a later edition of 1478 it was attributed to Gerolamo Squarzafico, a humanist scholar who was working chiefly in Venice in this period, collaborating with Venetian printers and publishers.<sup>17</sup> Squarzafico was the author, or editor, of other lives (Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius; Petrarch and Boccaccio) and he probably was responsible for adapting Sicco's *vita* to a format suitable for a printed edition. Alongside the traditional categories of

---

<sup>14</sup> Petrarch, ed.: Billanovich 1943, 1,17. Diphthongs have been added. The other two “causes of shame” are perhaps to be identified with the loss of the books of Varro and of Cicero's *De re publica* (see 1,15). Older editions have the reading “certum” instead of “tertium”.

<sup>15</sup> Polenton, ed.: Ullman 1928.

<sup>16</sup> Osmond & Ulery 2003, 250–252.

<sup>17</sup> On Squarzafico see Allenspach & Frasso 1980, 277–278.

biography – the name and family origins of the author, his education and career, the titles, sequence and subject matter of his literary works – we see evidence of the new humanist interests and tastes: the frequent citation or paraphrasing of ancient, especially classical, sources; a greater attention to Sallust's language and style; and a shift from the rigid, schematic organization of the *accessus* to a more discursive approach, one that attempts to weave the various topics into a fuller, composite portrait of the author's life and work (with some pretensions of literary elegance) and to convey a sense of the author's personality and fame.

The ancient sources on Sallust's life and work presented a dilemma, however, to anyone intending to compose a *vita*. Since we have no ancient biography of Sallust, one had to rely on the widely scattered *testimonia* for the various aspects of his career or writing.<sup>18</sup> More seriously, these sources reflected very divergent views, influenced largely by the personal and partisan rivalries of the late Republic, ranging from Sallust's own "apologia" for his youthful excesses and misguided political ambition in the prologues to the *Catilina* and *Jugurtha* to the viciously *anti-Sallustian Oratio in Sallustium*. (This invective, which today is considered the work of the rhetorical schools, probably of the early first century A.D., was widely believed in Pomponio's time to be a *genuine* work of Cicero, in response to the (ps.) Sallust *Oratio in Ciceronem*.)<sup>19</sup> As for Sallust's historical writing, there were also mixed reactions. A few ancient writers criticized his fondness for archaisms; in general, however, the judgments on his work as historian and stylist were favorable, much more positive in any case than those on his personal life or political career.

The Polenton-Squarzafico *vita* attempted to solve the problem of the contradictory accounts by trying to balance the negative with the positive and, where possible, to construct the image of a "morally reformed" Sallust, even if this meant blatantly ignoring or arbitrarily re-interpreting parts of the sources. We thus read that Sallust had begun his career as an extravagant and dissipated young man, had been expelled from the senate on charges of adultery and had been forced to sell the family home to pay his debts, thus driving his aged father to his death. In his later years, however, as the following passage relates, after he had changed his way of life (*mutatis moribus*), he not only recovered those things he had squandered, but was even managing his finances so wisely (it is implied) that he was able to purchase

---

<sup>18</sup> See Osmond & Ulery 2003, 186–192. The first published collection of ancient sources on Sallust's life and work appeared in the Venice 1563 edition of Sallust's *opera* by Aldo Manuzio the Younger (*ibid.*, 265–266). For modern collections of *testimonia*, one may consult the Teubner editions of Sallust.

<sup>19</sup> On the pseudo-Ciceronian invective, see Santangelo 2012, 29ff.

the very valuable estate of Caesar, the *horti Caesariani* (later known as the *horti Sallustiani*) and Caesar's villa in Tivoli! If he ultimately abandoned politics in order to return to his studies and devote himself to the writing of history it was because (as a loyal republican) he disapproved of Caesar's autocratic rule and the growing influence of "barbarians", especially the Gauls, with whom Caesar had packed the Senate.

Quae sane Crispus mutatis moribus iam gravescente aetate per libidinem atque flagitia prodegisset non modo recuperavit sed pretiosissimos in urbe hortos Tiburtinamque villam ab ipso Iulio emit [Ps. Cic. *in Sall.* 19]. Cuius nutu, bello civili iam peracto, omnia regebantur, nec leges maiorum amplius in re publica administranda servabantur. Sic (Si *ed.*) externo atque barbaro cuique, si Caesari lubebat, in senatum aditus patebat ac sententiam non consularis sed Gallus aut ignobilis ac sordidus quisque dicebat. Quibus rebus indignatus Sallustius rem publicam deseruit atque ad intermissa studia rediens quaeque a populo Romano praeclare gesta fuissent scribere decrevit, ne id ipsum otii quod elegerat ignavia atque desidia tereret [*Catil.* 4,1].<sup>20</sup>

Our next life of Sallust (Appendix, no. 2: Lorenzo Valla?) also originated as an anonymous *vita*. It introduces a school commentary on the *Catilina* and begins as a gloss on the *incipit* of the text, *omnis homines*. It is found in two different versions in manuscripts probably dating in at least one case to the mid-1460s.<sup>21</sup> At the time the commentary was first printed in Venice in 1491 alongside Pomponio's text of Sallust's *Catilina*, it was attributed to Lorenzo Valla, another leading humanist who could guarantee good sales. Whether or not it was written by Valla is doubtful, but the *vita*, if not the commentary that followed it, shows affinities with various themes in Valla's work and, too, some of his polemical spirit.<sup>22</sup>

Here, as well, traces of the *accessus* persist, especially in the observations towards the end of the *vita* on the purpose and utility of the monograph, in which the author draws upon Sallust's prologue to the *Catilina* to explain his withdrawal from politics and decision to devote himself to intellectual pursuits, in particular the writing of history. But otherwise there is only a passing reference in the first and last sentences to Sallust's life and controversial political career. The bulk of the life is devoted instead to the nature and importance of Sallust's work as historian: his distinctive style, which Quintilian compared with that of Thucydides and contrasted with that of Livy and Herodotus; the relevance of his so-called "philosophical" pro-

---

<sup>20</sup> Venice: Vindelinius de Spira, 1471. For the full text see Appendix, no. 1.

<sup>21</sup> For the manuscripts containing versions of the "Valla" commentary and relevant bibliography, see Osmond & Ulery 2003, 237–241.

<sup>22</sup> For a discussion of the question of Valla's authorship, see Osmond 2005 (2).

logues to the actual history of the *Catilina* and *Jugurtha* (despite the objections that Quintilian had reported, *inst.* 3.8.9); the unfortunate loss of his major work, the *Historiae*, which has survived only in fragments (many of which, he says, were collected by Nonius); and the characteristically humanist appeal, as the following passage emphasizes, to preserve, study and especially to disseminate the few remains that had escaped the destruction of invading armies and the ravages of time.

Quod si tantorum virorum testimonio primum in historia locum obtinet, summa nos ope niti decet ut praeclara eius monumenta, si qua adhuc restant, non tantum ipsi studio condiscamus sed, si fieri etiam possit, quam plurimis nostra industria omni sint ex parte conspicua.

At the end the *vita* resumes its initial function as a gloss on the *incipit* and expands into a typical pedagogical commentary, paraphrasing words and phrases and explaining points of grammar, rhetoric and simple matters of Roman history.

Another biographical sketch that originated in this period is the *vita* by Giovanni Crisostomo Soldi of Brescia (Appendix, no. 3), prefacing his commentary on the *Jugurtha*. Written, or at least begun, in Verona in 1469–70 and dedicated to the author's brother, who was preparing to teach a course on Sallust's *Jugurtha*, it was printed in Brescia some 25 years later, in 1495, alongside the text edited by Pomponio Leto and revised by Giovanni Britannico. Here we find further references to Sallust's reputation for loose morals and particularly his womanizing, notably ps.-Acro on the charges of adultery that reportedly led to his removal from the senate (50 B.C.). But Soldus also reports Sallust's own reasons for abandoning politics, paraphrasing parts of the proems to the *Catilina* (3) and *Jugurtha* (3–4), and praises his historical work, in which, as he tells us, the historian had achieved great renown ("in qua re [...] claruit"). Citing Quintilian, he calls attention to Sallust's "mira brevis quaedam et affectata rerum ubertas" (a certain wonderful brevity and studied abundance of subject matter).

It was also with a view to introducing his lectures on Sallust that the Roman humanist Pietro Paolo Pompilio (Appendix, no. 4), former student of Pomponio and teacher in Rome, prefaced his *Dictata* on the *Catilina* and *Jugurtha* (c. 1481) with a *vita Sallustii*. Unlike the previous *vitae* this one was unfortunately never printed – unfortunately, because it contains some interesting observations regarding Sallust's language and style. Along with traditional features of the *accessus*, e.g., a summary of Sallust's life and *cursus honorum*, a list of the titles and subjects of his works and at the end a brief explanation of the author's purpose, we find, for instance, a long series of quotations or paraphrases illustrating the various characteristics of his writing. From Quintilian and Suetonius he cites Sallust's predilection for

archaisms (antique words or forms borrowed or “stolen” from Cato); from Seneca’s *Controversiae*, his *brevitas*; from Quintilian again, the comparison with Thucydides and contrast with Livy, along with his imitation of Isocrates in regard to the writing of prologues apparently unrelated to the subject of his histories. As we read in the following passage, the poet Martial called Sallust the first, or foremost, among Roman authors in the writing of history; as the Elder Seneca recognized, his brevity was as perfect as Cicero’s riches; and as Quintilian pronounced, reporting the words of Servilius Nonianus, Livy and Sallust excelled in equal measure, albeit in different ways.

Martialis [14,191] historicorum principem facit cum inquit: Crispus Romana primus in historia. Cicero et Sallustius diversum dicendi genus secuti sunt atque ita ut merito illud vulgatum sit bonis rationibus utrimque placere. Cum Sallustianae brevitati nihil addi concinne possit [*cf. SEN. contr. 9,1,13*], Ciceronis vero divitiis si quid demas statim aliquid desiderari. Ideoque immortalem illam Sallustius velocitatem [*QUINT. inst. 10,1,102*] diversis rationibus consecutus est, nec minus egregiae eiusmodi differentiae, cum dixisse videtur Servilius Nonianus [*ibid.*] Titum Livium et Sallustium pares esse magis quam similes [...]

Especially interesting is Pompilio’s comment on Sallust’s family at the end of the first section of his *vita*:

Demum cum tribunus plebis fuisse dicitur, patricii generis non fuit; nam aliud est esse patricium, aliud esse senatorem; patricii enim fieri tribuni plebis non poterant nisi se in optionem plebei hominis traderent. Quod de Sallustio nusquam comperi.

(Finally, when it is said that he was a tribune of the plebs, he was not of patrician rank; for it is one thing to be a patrician and another to be a senator; for patricians could not become tribunes of the plebs unless they gave themselves over to the choice of plebian status.)

Here, in fact, for the first time we find a trace of historical criticism: a response, it might seem, to the incorrect statements in the Valla *vita* and in Squarzafico’s epitome that Sallust was a patrician, *vir patricius*. Clearly Pompilius had a better understanding of Roman political and social history than most of his contemporaries.

Finally, if we extend our survey of *vitae* just a few years beyond the death of Pomponio in 1498, we have the biography of Sallust by Pietro del Riccio Baldi (Petrus Crinitus), (Appendix, no. 5). Although intended for his work on Latin historians and orators, the *De historicis ac oratoribus latinis*, which was evidently lost or never finished, the life was published separately in 1503 in a Giunta edition of Sallust’s *opera* and again by Aldo Manuzio in

his edition of 1509, along with the life by Squarzafico.<sup>23</sup> Of all the *vitae* from this period it is the most comprehensive and the most critical – not surprisingly, given the fact that Crinitus had been a pupil of Poliziano. Although he repeated the stories of Sallust's supposedly wild and dissolute youth, he took into account the widespread corruption of the times, that is, the contemporary social and moral climate. He related the accusations against Sallust by Lenaeus, Pompey's freedman, but pointed out that Lenaeus had been provoked by Sallust's offensive remarks about his former master, whom he naturally felt obliged to defend. The invectives exchanged between Sallust and Cicero furnished few facts, he observed, since neither author appeared to have taken sufficient account of himself while attacking the other. He also raises for the first time the question of the authorship of the two Invectives, an issue that was just beginning to emerge, although in the end he accepted both of them as genuine works on the authority of Quintilian and Jerome. As for Sallust's reputation as historian, Crinitus reported both the criticisms of Livy and Asinius Pollio and the (far more numerous) praises of Aulus Gellius, Seneca the Elder, Quintilian and others, adding: "est enim eius oratio tam absoluta, tam casta, innocens, ut merito ab eruditis divina brevitatis censeatur" (his speech is so perfect, so chaste, blameless, that it is deservedly judged divine brevity by the learned).

\* \* \*

If we now go back to Pomponio's life, it appears to be something of an anomaly. Aside from the various *accessus* that introduced Sallust manuscripts, it is the shortest of all the lives. It is also the most one-sided in its appraisal of Sallust, focused as it is on his life and character, rather than the nature and reputation of his work, and at the same time the most negative, even hostile. By contrast, the other authors cite not only the ps.-Cicero *Oratio in Sallustium* but a variety of sources in an attempt to set out side by side the various accounts, including Sallust's own defense. Or they balance the negative accounts of his private and political life with praises of his work as historian and stylist. Pomponio, on the other hand, devotes the entire *vita* to cataloguing his vices and crimes, allowing only a few words of (dubious) appreciation to his archaizing style – "not unlike that of archaic writers of Latin", he says (which is hardly much of a compliment) – although in the dedicatory letter of his *Romanae Historiae Compendium* (1499) he warmly praises his *brevitas*.<sup>24</sup> As for the description of Sallust's very beautiful gar-

---

<sup>23</sup> Ricciardi 1990, however, mentions only a later edition of 1527.

<sup>24</sup> Laetus 1499, "Praefatio": "Laudatur etiam in historia brevitatis: quae sit aperta ac lucida ut illa Crispi Sallustii". (Brevity is also to be praised in history, of the kind that is clear and lucid like that of Crispus Sallustius.)

dens, which could have been based on his own explorations of the imposing ruins (*cf.* the *Excerpta*),<sup>25</sup> as well as on the reference in the *Oratio in Sallustium*, 19,<sup>26</sup> it serves only to underscore the historian's greed for pleasure and luxury.

What, then, can we make of Pomponio's *vita*? At this time I cannot propose any single answer, especially since we need to compare this life with the many others that he wrote, and also, I suggest, with his treatment of biography in the *Romanae Historiae Compendium*. But in conclusion I would like to indicate a couple of areas that we might continue to explore: (1) the way Pomponio shapes his portrait of Sallust and how it may reflect his personal attitudes and self-image, and (2) the more general cultural and moral issues regarding the relationship between a person's private life and his/her identity as an author.

First, in regard to Pomponio's interest in or understanding of biography, we notice a very selective use of sources, a feature that distinguishes his *vita* from the others we have examined. Does this mean that, rather than set forth various, divergent reports, which would have provided a more complete and "rounded" portrait of Sallust's complex and contradictory life – as, it seems, the other authors attempted to do – Pomponio chose only those he felt would bring out the *essential* nature of the man? In biography, it is often said, the truth resides in the particular: the particular trait or anecdote, a particular bit of gossip ("il pettegolezzo"), which may reveal better than any lengthy account of a person's words and deeds his "real" character. Nor does it necessarily matter if the detail is factually true – as long as it is *verisimile*. In a recent book, *The art of biography in antiquity*, Tomas Hägg sums up this point:

Biography, if it is to be more than a bare *curriculum vitae*, must try to gain insight into an historical person's mind to connect and explain the person's doings and give an impression of a living character, of a 'life' [...] The biographer has to rely on conjecture, interpretation, reconstruction, in the end on his or her own creative imagination [...] [The search for any] form of higher truth – be it poetic, psychological,

---

<sup>25</sup> Laetus, ed.: Valentini & Zucchetti 1953, 429: "Intrinsecus a porta Salaria a sinistris est vallis longa, ubi fuerunt horti Sallustiani, versus ventum Libym, circumdati pulcherrimis aedificiis qui fuerunt non modo pomorum, sed etiam propter sumptum et ornamentum aedificiorum satis amoeni: aquae subterraneae manu factae irrigabant hortos". (On the inside of the Salarian gate, to the left, is a long valley, where the *horti Sallustiani* were, facing south-west, surrounded by very beautiful buildings, gardens which were not only of fruit trees but quite pleasant on account of the expense and decoration of the buildings; subterranean waters [in channels] made by hand irrigated the gardens.)

<sup>26</sup> "hortos pretiosissimos" (very valuable gardens).

philosophical, or religious – overrules demands for the truth of facts”.<sup>27</sup>

Still, we have to ask why Pomponio selected only the most *negative* evidence – producing what might almost be called a “vituperative” or “iconoclastic” portrait.<sup>28</sup> Petrarch, too, as we saw, had written a very short sketch, but of an entirely different tone, praising Sallust as a trustworthy source of historical information, a mine of *exempla* and a model for historical writing.

Was it the moral reputation and authority of Cicero that determined the importance Pomponio gave to the *Oratio in Sallustium*? Certainly, Cicero was one of Pomponio's favorite authors and he cites him frequently in his notes on the art of history that are bound with his copy of the 1490 Sallust. He also figured prominently among the authors studied and published in Pomponio's circle. Agostino Maffei, to whom Pomponio dedicated his 1490 edition of Sallust, had commissioned an edition of Cicero's Letters in the same year, a work undertaken by Bartolomeo Saliceto and Ludovico Regio, to which Pomponio also contributed.<sup>29</sup> Was it, therefore, a way of identifying himself with Cicero and at the same time distancing himself from the “disreputable”, “dissolute” Sallust, whose personal life style, at least in his youth, seemed to violate traditional moral values and social norms? In this respect we might recall that in 1467 Pomponio had been interrogated by the Consiglio dei Dieci in Venice on charges of sodomy (for writing an “immoral book”) and for a long time remained the target of accusations ranging from Epicureanism to heresy.<sup>30</sup>

Sallust's *Catilina*, moreover, could be read as both a condemnation of conspiracies against the state and, in some conservative circles, as a possible incitement to young revolutionaries. As the medieval *accessus* never tired of repeating, Sallust taught the importance of obedience to established government: “follow the example of Cicero, who had defended his homeland; eschew the example of Catiline, who had perished as a traitor to his homeland”! But, as Machiavelli was soon to point out in *Discorsi* 3,6, the *Catilina* could also provide lessons for young men conspiring to overthrow a government.<sup>31</sup> A later Italian writer, the Jesuit Agostino Mascardi, author of the *La congiura del conte Gio. Luigi de Fieschi* (1629) went so far as to consign Sallust's *Catilina*, Tacitus' *Annals* and Machiavelli's *Prince* all to

---

<sup>27</sup> Hägg 2012, 3–4.

<sup>28</sup> On these types of biography, see *ibid.*, 6.

<sup>29</sup> M. Tullius Cicero, *Epistolae ad Brutum, ad Quintum fratrem, ad Atticum*. (Ed: Bartholomaeus Salicetus and Ludovicus Regius. With additions by Pomponius Laetus), Rome: Eucharius Silber, [after 17 July?] 1490.

<sup>30</sup> See Accame 2008, 46ff.

<sup>31</sup> See Osmond 1997 and Osmond 2005 (1).

the same category of potentially dangerous books.<sup>32</sup> Reading about conspiracies and revolts, he believed, might put subversive ideas into the minds of young men, encourage disobedience and revolution. Here, too, Pomponio's own experience – his imprisonment in Castel Sant'Angelo in 1468 on charges of participating with other members of the Roman Academy in the conspiracy against Pope Paul II – may have left its mark. Was it simply safer (more politically-correct) to take his stand with Cicero as *pater patriae* and defender of public order?

The second point involves our view of the relationship between a subject's private life and his/her public career, in this case the relationship between Sallust's *mores* and his identity as author and, specifically, historian. Today, as in Pomponio's own time, we are still inclined to ask how one might reconcile the scandalous stories of Sallust's life (assuming they contain some elements of truth) with the generally high esteem for his historical work and, in particular, with the sternly moralizing tone of his histories. And yet we might also ask if it is *necessary* to try to reconcile these apparent contradictions. Does it really matter, in assessing his achievements as historian, whether Sallust was a corrupt and disreputable politician, adulterer and "harlot", as his enemies alleged? By the seventeenth century, scholars were, in fact, beginning to separate the two strands of his biography. Summing up the reports on Sallust's private life and *cursus honorum* in his *Vita Sallustii* (1627), Gerardus Johannes Vossius declared: "Haec ostendunt vitam eius laudari a nemine posse. Nempe omnis eius gloria a praeclaris scriptis proficiscitur" (These show that his life cannot be praised by anyone. Truly all his glory springs from his most outstanding writings.)<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> See Osmond 1997.

<sup>33</sup> Vossius 1627, 71.

## Appendix

### 1. [Hieronymus Squarzafricanus] *Crispi Salustii oratoris clarissimi vita* in C. Sallustius Crispus, *Opera*. Venice: Vindelinius de Spira, 1471.\*

Crispus Salustius vir patricius ab ineunte aetate bonis artibus imbutus ad rem publicam gerendam animum applicuit in qua non pauca adversa passus prudentia sua superavit. Et res publica, iam Carthagine atque Numantia eversa Asiaque domita <...>, ut nec nobilitati nec virtuti sua redderentur praemia [*Iug.* 3,1] atque impudenti atque audacissimo cuique plebs obsequeretur. Hinc dominatus L. Syllae et proscriptionis tabula Romanis civibus prius ignota prolata est, hinc flagitiosa Catilinae coniuratio, hinc bellum civile inter Caesarem et Pompeium exortum libertatem civitati ademit. His igitur hominum moribus conflictatum Crispi ingenium suapte natura integrum iuvenili ac flagranti aetate proclivem ad adulteria libido rapuit atque corrupit [*cf. Catil.* 3,3–4] neque id impune diu admisit. Nam, ut Varro tradit [*GELL.* 17,18], ab Annio Milone domi deprehensus et grandi pecunia multatus est; bis ad subsellia accusatus atque absolutus a iudicibus non sine pecunia, ut fertur [*Ps. Cic. in Sall.* 14], discessit; domum avitam tanto patris dolore iam aetate confecti vendidit ut vita decedere cogeretur. Consumptis igitur opibus patriis et quaestura prius functus, deinde tribunus plebis creatus est. Ac postremo praetorem ulterioris Africae designatum eum proconsulem cum exercitu regno Iube, rege necato, Caesar [*BELL. Afr.* 97,1] praefecit atque in provinciam redegit.

Quae sane Crispus mutatis moribus iam gravescente aetate per libidinem atque flagitia prodegisset non modo recuperavit sed pretiosissimos in urbe hortos Tiburtinamque villam ab ipso Iulio emit [*in Sall.* 19]. Cuius nutu, bello civili iam peracto, omnia regebantur, nec leges maiorum amplius in re publica administranda servabantur. Sic (*Si ed.*) externo atque barbaro cuique, si Caesari lubebat, in senatum aditus patebat ac sententiam non consularis sed Gallus aut ignobilis ac sordidus quisque dicebat. Quibus rebus indignatus Salustius rem publicam deseruit atque ad intermissa studia rediens quaeque a populo Romano praeclare gesta fuissent scribere decrevit, ne id ipsum ocii quod elegerat ignavia atque desidiosa tereret [*Catil.* 4,1], aut illiberalibus officiis intentus minus utilis rei publicae foret quam antehac extitisset [*Iug.* 4,4]. Agressus igitur bellum contra Catilinae coniurationem atque Iugurtham Numidarum potentissimum ac prudentissimum gestum, tanta cura atque diligentia perscripsit, ut non annales Romanos modo sed Punicos et Aphros ac peritos illius linguae <perquirens?> Romanorum gesta diligenter evolveret, atque in Africam traiecit, neque <ut?> legeret (*legerat ed.*) tantum sed visu certiora etiam facta posteris

narraret [*cf.* PETRARCH *rer. mem.* 1,17]. In hoc autem genere scribendi tantum laudis assecutus ut Quintilianus [*inst.* 10,1,101], gravis atque severus iudex <eum> Thucydidi graeco historiarum scriptori aequet, quem Cicero [*De orat.* 2,13,56] tantopere laudat atque sententiis crebrum autumat, ut pene verborum copiam sententiarum frequentia consequatur.

Amicos habuit Cornelium Nepotem eodem scribendae historiae studio delectatum ac P. Nigidum Figulum omnium doctrinarum genere non inferiorem Varroni. Cicero vero ex familiari inimicus factus nescio qua de causa. Terentiam uxorem ab eodem Cicerone repudiatam in uxorem duxit, ut ab ea quamdiu summa benivolentia cum Cicerone vixerit atque suorum consiliorum non ignara aliquid turpe eliceret [*cf.* HIER. *adv Iov.* 1,49], quo acrius atque turpius in eum inveheretur, cuius in Ciceronem extat Invectiva quam frequenti senatu habuisse fertur. Natus Amiterni in Sabinis bello Iugurtino Romae educatus, Crispus habitavit iuxta Minervam ubi nunc templum Sanctae Mariae veneratur. Atque in hunc usque diem Salustiana domus vocatur. Vixit usque ad sexagesimum secundum annum septimum post Caesaris obitum. Cuius Terentia uxor postea Messalae Corvino praestantissimo sua aetate oratori nupsit.

\* Based on the copy at the Vatican Library, Inc. Ross. 570. The *vita* appeared for the first time in print under the name of Hieronymus Squarzafeicus in the edition of [Venice]: Filippo di Pietro, 22 June 1478. The text printed in the edition of Hagenau, 1529, with the *scholia* of Melanchthon, was published in Osmond & Ulery 2003, 252.

## 2. Laurentius Valla (attrib.) in *Laurentii Vallensis in C. Crispi Salustii Catilinarium Commentarii*. Venice: Philippus Pincius, 11 May 1491.\*

*Omnis homines* (*Catil.*1,1). Patricia gente Crispus Salustius Romae natus, post rem publicam civili discordia concussam, cum nulla illius administrandae ratio bonis superesset amplius, se ad scribendi otium contulit [*ibid.* 4,1–2]. In quo genere, Quintiliani iudicio [*inst.*10.1.101], qui eum Thucydidi in historia eminentissimo opposuit, praecipuam inter eos qui res Romanas litterarum monumentis tradidere est laudem adeptus. Etenim quo Thucydides est Herodoto maior, cui secundae tribuuntur partes, eo certe hic noster Livio praestantior, quem Herodoto ille comparat. Accedit et Martialis [14,191] urbanissimi poetae carmen: Hic erit, ut perhibent doctorum corda virorum // Primus Romana Crispus in historia, quo haud dubie apparet doctorum hominum iudicio Crispum ceteris Romanarum rerum scriptoribus praelatum. Quod si tantorum virorum testimonio primum in historia locum obtinet, summa nos ope niti decet [*cf.* *Catil.* 1,1] ut praeclara eius monumenta, si qua adhuc restant, non tantum ipsi studio condiscamus

sed, si fieri etiam possit, quam plurimis nostra industria omni sint ex parte conspicua. Atque id ipsum hoc enixius praestandum, quod post tantam nostratium litterarum iacturam, quantam Gothicis temporibus factam fuisse constat, paucissima quaedam vestigia, ne fragmenta dicam, ac illa ipsa paene evanescentia ex locupletissima Crispi ornatisimaeque historia ad haec tempora pervenere et, quod iniquius ferat aliquis, fuerunt haec progymnasmata quaedam, ut graeco utar verbo, castissimae illius Minervae, quae nobis reliqua cum temporis tum (tamen *ed.*) hominum fecit iniuria. Nam quod plenissimam Crispus scripserit historiam, quae non res Romanas solum sed externarum etiam gentium sit complexa, abunde constat, verum a Catilinae coniuratione, quasi ingenii experientiam daturus, eam videri potest auspiciatus, quod et ipsum operis prooemium haud dubie demonstrat, cui ad stili consummationem credibile est Iugurthae bellum subiecisse. Sed quanti illa momenti fuerint, quae prorsus interiire, ex iis quae hodie exstant facilis est coniectura, quippe cum nulla possit virtus in historia elucere, cum non in hac vel illa meditatione facile recognoscas, sed quo eius sunt virtutes altiores minusque vulgo proximae, eo maiore nobis studio, ut dixi, est nitendum, ne illae nostra vel inertia vel negligentia diutius in obscuro sint.

Etenim quam cognitu sint difficiles, vel ex eo potest intelligi, quod non pauci, ut video in prooemii fronte, allucinati dant illi vitio quod nefarium Catilinae scelus scripturus inde potissimum sit exorsus, ut dixerit animum corpori et ingenium viribus praestare [*Catil.* 1,3], velut nihil magis ab eo quod dicturus erat alienum dici potuisset [*cf.* *QVINT. instit.* 3,8,9], sed accurate omnia ac magis erudite quam verbis explicari possit. Redditurus namque sui consilii rationem quod a re publica digressus se ad historiam scribendam contulisset, nulla potuit honestior causa demonstrari quam eo se consilio id fecisse ostenderet, ut ea parte corporis uteretur quae potissima in homine esset, nec ita multo post non magis se ratione quam necessitate, ut id consilii caperet, adduci oportuisse demonstrat, quoniam ambitione malisque artibus civitate corrupta nullus videretur innocentiae locus huic qui ad eam capiendam accederet relictus. Verum quia (qua *ed.*) praeclara ingenia aut domi consulendo suorumque facta illustrando aut foris rem publicam administrando patriae videri possunt utilia [*Catil.* 3,1–4,2], sublata optimatum administratione omnique recte vivendi ratione mutata, merito unum hoc scribendi officium quod reliquum erat, quia et potuit et debuit, non minori ingenio quam pietate patriae civibusque suis, optime de ea benemeritis, praestitit Crispus.

\* Based on the text published in Osmond & Ulery 2003, 237–238.

**3. Johannes Chrysostomus Soldus** in C. Sallustius Crispus, *Opera*. Bre-  
scia: Bernardinus de Misintis, for Angelus and Jacobus Britannicus, 13 Jan.  
1495.\*

Salustius civis Romanus Senatorii ordinis fuit. Hic primo se ad rem publicam contulit et in ea aliquamdiu versatus est. Postea cum ei in senatu, ut tradit Acron [SCHOL. HOR. *serm.* 1,2,49] a censoribus obiectum esset, quod libertinarum sectator esset, tum ille non se matronarum sed libertinarum sectatorem esse testatus est, atque ideo senatu repulsus est, quod et in principio belli Catilinarium et in praesenti exordio excusat [*Catil.* 3,3–5; *Iug.* 3,1–4]. Dicit enim aliam fuisse causam quamobrem se ab administratione rei publicae removeret, quod videlicet virtuti honos non daretur, sed ambitio omnia virtutis praemia possideret [*Iug.* 3,1]. Sed revera constat Salustium infamia circa feminas laborasse. Nam, ut idem Acron refert [SCHOL. HOR. *serm.* 1,2,41], in Faustae [Faustinae *ed.* 1496] Syllae filiae et Milonis uxoris adulterio deprehensus ab ipso Tito Annio Milone flagellis caesus est. Igitur Salustius ob eiusmodi flagitia a senatu remotus.

Cum intelligeret sibi ob tantam ignominiam aditum ad honores penitus interclusum, omissa cura rei publicae, se ad historiam scribendam contulit. In qua re ita claruit, ut omnibus qui historiam scripserunt omnium iudicio anteponatur. Et quemadmodum apud Graecos Thucydides Herodotum ceterosque qui historiam scripserunt nobilitate et artificio dicendi superavit, sic apud Latinos Salustius Livium ceterosque historicos facile vicit. Unde Quintilianus [*inst.* 10,1,101] Thucydidi Salustium comparat, Livium Herodoto. Porro tam in Thucydide quam in Salustio mira brevitatis quaedam et affectata rerum ubertas commendatur. Nam uterque ita rerum frequentia creber est, ut verborum prope numerum sententiarum numero consequatur, genus autem dicendi pressum et nitidum et omnino rebus magis quam verbis redundans [*cf.* Cic. *de orat.* 2,13,56]. In hoc autem opere bellum quod Romani cum Iugurtha rege Numidiae gesserunt conscribit. Sed ante praemittit exordium in quo causam (ut diximus) ostendit quamobrem se ab administratione rei publicae ad historiam scribendam contulit, ne forte ignaviae daretur si vel taedio laboris vel metu periculi potius quam iusto iudicio animi rem publicam reliquisset videretur. Dicit enim sic [*Catil.* 3,1–4,2; *Iug.* 4]: cum multa sint studia et exercitia animi quibus summa laus et claritudo comparari possit, veluti consilio rem publicam regere, dare operam litteris et alia huiusmodi, hoc tempore mihi non placuit per administrationem rei publicae laudem et gloriam comparare, quia videbam hoc tempore imperia et honores et magistratus dari hominibus indignis et non virtute praeditis sed ambitione corruptis. Et propterea aliud studium atque aliud exercitium animi quaerendum esse putavi in quo laudem et gloriam comparare possem.

Sed ex omnibus studiis quae exercentur animo atque ingenio, utilissimum visum est historiam scribere et memoriae mandare res gestas. Et ideo ad hoc studium atque exercitium me contuli, omissa cura rei publicae. Sed videamus quomodo paulatim veniat ad exponendam hanc causam atque ad hunc sensum explicandum.

\* Based on the text published in Osmond & Ulery 2003, 293.

**4. Petrus Paulus Pompilius, *C. Salustii Crispi Vita: mores et mors* (c. 1481) in *Commentarii Pauli Pompilii in historias Sallustii Catilinianam et Iugurtham. Lectione publica Romae anno aetatis sue XXVI* (Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, Ms. 1351, fols. 1v–3r)\***

Crispus, natus Amiterni in Sabinis quo tempore in Iugurtham bellatum est, vixit annum circiter sexagesimum secundum; moritur septimo anno post obitum Caesaris. Terentiam quam Cicero repudiavit uxorem duxit, quae etiam ad tertium virum Messalam Corvinum, clarissimum sui temporis oratorem, Sallustio mortuo transiit. Prius quaestor, deinde tribunus plebis, tum praetor ulterioris Africae; Caesar proconsulem mortui Iubae regno praefecit. Atque ita primus Sallustius regno illi in formam provinciae redacto tum primum praefuit. Obicit Cicero [*in Sall.* 21] bis fuisse senatorem, ergo quandoque Senatu per ignominia [*sic*] amotus est. Item bis quaestorem, sic etiam quaestor longo post intervallo iterum fuit; hoc fieri potuit cum bis ad subsellia iudicum adulterii reus protractus est. Praeterea in Faustae filiae Cornelii Sullae adulterio a Tito Annio Milone domi deprensus, prius bene caesus est, deinde magna pecunia multatus [SCHOL. HOR. *serm.* 1,2,41]. Cicero in Sallustium [15]: Sumus diligentes in tuenda pudicitia uxorum nostrarum, sed ita experrecti non sumus ut a te cavere possimus. Sallustio censores in senatu obiecerunt quod moecharetur, dum ille non se matronarum sed libertinarum sectatorem esse testatus est et ideo senatu motus est. Ad historiam alludere videtur Horatius cum inquit: Ille flagellis ad mortem caesus, in primo Sermonum [SCHOL. HOR. *serm.* 1,2,41]. Demum cum tribunus plebis fuisse dicitur, patricii generis non fuit; nam aliud est esse patricium, aliud esse senatorem; patricii enim fieri tribuni plebis non poterant nisi se in optionem plebei hominis traderent. Quod de Sallustio nusquam comperi.

Scrpsit libros aliquot qui perpetuae historiae dicti sunt; de coniuratione Catiliniانا librum unum, bellum contra Iugurtham. Perpetua historia vitio temporum amissa est. Distichon in hunc legitur apud Quintilianum tale [*inst.* 8,3,29]: Et verba antiqui multum furate Catonis. Crispae [*sic*] Iugurthinae conditor historiae. Ex quo intelligi potest Sallustium nimis imitatum fuisse Catonem Censorinum [*sic*]. Augustus ad M. Antonium in epistola haec [SVET. *Aug.* 86]: Tu quoque dubitas, Cimber ne Annaeus an Veranius Flaccus imitandi sint tibi, ut verbis,

quae Crispus Sallustius excerpit ex originibus Catonis, utaris. Leneus item Pompei Sallustium appellare solitum [*sic*] est furem eruditissimum [ineruditissimum SVET. *gramm.* 15]. Quintilianus [*inst.*10,1,101] Sallustium Thucydidi parem non veretur. Martialis [14,191] historicorum principem facit cum inquit: Crispus Romana primus in historia. Cicero et Sallustius diversum dicendi genus secuti sunt atque ita ut merito illud vulgatum sit bonis rationibus utrimque placere. Cum Sallustianae brevitati nihil addi concinne possit [*?cf.* SEN. *contr.* 9,1,13], Ciceronis vero divitiis si quid demas statim aliquid desiderari. Ideoque immortalem illam Sallustius velocitatem [QVINT. *inst.* 10,1,102] diversis rationibus consecutus est, nec minus egregiae eiusmodi differentiae, cum dixisse videtur Servilius Nonianus [*ibid.*] Titum Livium et Sallustium pares esse magis quam similes [...]. Gorgias Isocratis magister [...] laudat in Olympico eos qui primi conventus tales in sacris Olympii Iouis instituerunt; Isocrates etiam in Panegyrico vel in Laude Helenes conqueritur plus honoris corporum quam animorum virtutibus dari; Caius Sallustius et in Bello Iugurthino et in Catiliniana coniuratione utrimque [*sic*] secutus est, nam principii ex aliqua rei vicinia sed nihil ad historiam pertinentibus orsus est maximeque etiam argumento in Catiliniana Isocratem imitatus est [*cf.* QVINT. *inst.* 3,8,9]. Agitur peculiariter in hac praefatione de ingenii et corporis viribus utrae praestantiores, et quod qui fecere et qui facta aliorum scripsere laudantur, paulo tamen plus benefacere quam benedicere decoris promerere videtur [*Catil.* 3,1]; denique in calce de rei publicae fluctibus et aerumnis suis paulum conquestus, cur hanc potius quam aliam quamquam historiam aggrediatur aperit.

\* Based on the text in Osmond and Ulery 2003, 244–245. Source references are supplied in part from the transcription kindly made available by Rasmus Gottschalek (2006).

**5. Petrus Crinitus, *Ex libris Petri Criniti de historicis ac oratoribus latinis***  
in C. Sallustius Crispus, *Opera*, ed. Benedictus Philologus. Florence: Philippus Giunta, 1503.\*

C. Crispus Sallustius Amiterni natus traditur in agro Sabino, quo anno Atheniensium urbs a L. Sylla devicta atque vastata est, [ut *add. ed.* 1509] Romani annales referunt. Ex nobili Sallustiorum familia ortus est, quae diu in secundo ordine dignitatem servavit. Idem in urbe educatus creditur et a teneris annis operam ac studium impendisse optimis disciplinis. Sed cum in ea tempora incidisset, quibus corrupti civium mores variis partibus atque factionibus forent, neque virtuti praemia aut bonis ingeniis adessent in tam depravata civitate, quod idem Sallustius fatetur [*Iug.* 3,1], victum eius ingenium voluptatibus facile succubuit. Itaque cum ad rem publicam pro aetate foret delatus propter civium improbitatem et factiones multa adversa pertulit [*Catil.* 3,3].

Nam tum praecipue Syllanis partibus infecta civitas aestuabat. Constat ex veterum commentariis Sallustium ipsum ingenio fuisse acri et in studiis litterarum accurato, tum maxime in scribenda historia. Praeceptorem habuit inter alios Atteium Praetextatum, qui Philologum se appellavit et ab eo edoctus est de ratione recte scribendi, ut a Suetonio Tranquillo traditur [*gramm.* 10], qui et Asinium quoque Pollionem scribit ab eodem Praetextato eruditum atque instructum. Maxime autem M. Catonis studiosus fuit, ex cuius commentariis verba excerpit et velut breviarium ad usum proprium habuit [*ibid.*], quod Octavius quoque Augustus in epistola ad Marcum Antonium refert [SVET. *Aug.* 86,2–3], in qua ipsum Antonium ceu insanientem increpat, quod ea scribere vellet quae mirentur potius homines quam quae intelligant.

Sed interim ad Sallustii commentarios. Historiam composuit de L. Catilinae coniuratione contra Romanum Senatam et item de bello Iugurthae, qui Numidiae rex factus diu contra Romanos strenue rem gessit. Historiam praeterea de Romanorum gestis, ut de Mario et Sylla necnon de Pompeio contra regem Mithridatem, quod opus libris aliquot a Sallustio absolutum traditur. Et adhuc supersunt quaedam, veluti absolutissimi operis reliquiae, in quibus Sallustii diligentia in historia describenda atque gravitas appareat. In parte operis de rebus Punicis tanto animi studio incubuit ut a quibusdam scriptum sit eum regionem adiisse ac maxima solertia perlustrasse quo maiore fide atque officio veritatem exploraret [*cf.* PETRARCH *rer. mem.*1,17]. Avienus certe Ruffus plurimum Sallustii diligentiam atque studium commendavit [*or.* 36ff.], sed et Gellius [4,15,1], vir Romanus, qui veterum eruditio- nis Aristarchus habetur, ita de Sallustii oratione disserit: Elegantia, inquit, Sallustii verborumque facundia et novandi studium, cum multa prorsus invidia fuit, plures non mediocri ingenio viri conati sunt reprehendere pleraque et obtrectare, in quibus plura inscite aut maligne vellicant. Quin et hunc proprietatis servantissimum vocat [*ibid.*, 10,2,20]. T. autem Livius tam iniquus Sallustio fuit, sicuti ab Annaeo Seneca scribitur [*contr.* 9,1,14], ut quaedam ex Historia Thucydidis translata et eleganter assumpta velut depravata et corrupta illi obiecit. Idque ipsum non in Thucydidis gratiam effecit, ut Arellius Fuscus dicebat, verum putavit se facilius Sallustium vincere si prius Thucydidem ipsum praeferret [SEN. *ibid.*]. Asinius quoque Pollio librum scripsit, quo Sallustii scripta reprehenderet quod in his nimia quidem affectatione antiquitatem sequeretur [SVET. *gramm.* 10]. Fabius vero Quintilianus [*inst.*10,1,32], vir maturo et gravi iudicio, asseruit oratione Sallustii atque brevitate nihil fieri posse perfectius praesertim apud vacuas et eruditas aures. Neque veritus est idem Fabius [*ibid.* 10,1,101] auctori Thucydidi, in scribenda historia apud Graecos principi, Sallustium ipsum opponere, sicuti T. Livium Herodoto, quo

factum est ut, cum plures voluerint dicendi genus Sallustianum sequi, minime sint assecuti. Est enim eius oratio tam absoluta, tam casta et innocens, ut merito ab eruditis divina brevitatis censeatur. Nam et Aruntius [SEN. *ep.* 19,5 (114,17–19)], qui belli Punici historiam scripsit, Sallustio tantum concessit ut eius orationem maximo studio sequeretur, quod alibi diximus. Nec illud ignoratur consuevisse Sallustium magno labore ac studio scribere, ut nihil non absolutum atque perfectum videri posset, quod ex ipsa lectione facile colligitur.

Amicos in primis habuit doctrina et ingenio nobiles, ut Cornelium Nepotem, Messalam, et Nigidium Figulum, qui periisse in exilio traditur. Iulium praeterea Caesarem magno studio dilexit, a quo etiam, ut creditur, dignitate praefecturae honestatus est. Illud item a Suetonio refertur [*gramm.* 15], Lenaeum grammaticum, Pompei libertum, saturas contra Sallustium composuisse eumque mordaci et virulento carmine lacerasse, ut qui lurconem illum popinonemque et nebulonem ac lastaurum appellavit, tum vita scriptisque monstrosum ac M. Catonis (verborum *add. ed.* 1503] furem ineruditissimum, quod ipsum non alia ratione a Lenaeo factum creditur quam, ut studium suum atque officium erga patronum Pompeium probaret, quem virum Crispus Sallustius ore probo, animo autem inverecundo esse scripserat. Itaque mirandum non est si tam acerbe atque satirice libertus Lenaeus contra Sallustium aciem stili exacuit. Quantum odii atque inimicitiae inter hunc et M. Ciceronem extiterit notissimum est, quod utriusque violentae atque acerrimae orationes ita demonstrant, ut neuter videri possit satis sui rationem habuisse dum alteri male diceret. Qua in re non sunt multa referenda, cum ex Hieronymi [*?adv. Iov.* 1,148] ac Fabii [*inst.* 4,1,68; 9,3,89] auctoritate constet eos homines longe aberrasse qui confictas magis orationes ab aliis quam a Sallustio et Cicerone habitas crediderint. Et sane tam corruptis moribus Sallustius ingenio tam proclivi ad luxum fuit, ut paternam domum, vivente adhuc patre, turpissima ratione venalem haberet, quod illi inter alia vitia a Marco Cicerone exprobratur [*in Sall.* 14]. Sed a Varrone etiam et Gellio [17,18] traditum est eundem fuisse in adulterio deprehensum ab Annio Milone lorisque caesum ac data pecunia dimissum. Qua ratione factum est ut M. Cicero appellare illum non dubitaverit mensarum asseclam, cubiculorum pellicem et adulterum [*in Sall.* 21].

Dignitates publicas gessit et quaesturae et tribunatus honorem assecutus est. Sed nulla quidem laude aut commendatione, adeo libidine magis quam ratione et publice et privatim vixisse, nam et bis vocatus est in iudicium et ad iudicium subsellia abstractus, fortuna extrema, ut inquit Cicero [*ibid.* 19], stetit. Scribunt autem grammatici ea causa de senatu eiectionem fuisse a censoribus, quod ingenti libidine matronas consecraretur [SCHOL. HOR. *serm.* 1,2,49]. Illud quoque de Sallustio

relatum est [*ibid.* 19–20], patrocínio et favore C. Caesaris, consecutum fuisse praeturam Africae interioris, ex qua dives factus, cum in urbem rediret, pretiosissimos atque amoenissimos hortos in regione ad Malum Punicum comparavit ac Tiburti villam, quae a Cicerone itidem illi obiciuntur. Neque desunt qui scribant [*cf. HIER. adv. Iov.* 1,49] Terentiam M. Ciceronis uxorem ab eo repudiatam Sallustio nupsisse ac deinceps Messalae Corvino, viro in eloquentia clarissimo, quod etiam suo loco scripsimus.

Sciendum est fuisse plures Sallustios. Nam et Gn. a M. Tullio celebratur, in Sallustiorum familia insignis et M. Ciceroni ac Gnaeo Pompeio maxime familiaris, quod ex his epistolis colligitur quas Cicero ad Pomponium Atticum scribit. Qua in re imprudenter quidam decepti sunt, cum Sallustii Empedoclea ignorarent, ut alibi demonstravi. Sunt qui tradant ad annum secundum et Lx eum vixisse et in patria annis aliquot post obitum C. Caesaris diem extremum obiisse, quod ex veterum commentariis colligitur. Illud praeterea de hoc ipso Crispo Romae circumlatum est, ut multi testantur:

Hic erit, ut perhibent doctorum corda virorum  
Crispus Romana primus in historia [MART. 14,191].

\* Based on the copy at the Vatican Library, Inc. Ross. 570. The text printed in the edition of Haguenau, 1529, with the *scholia* of Melanchthon, was published in Osmond & Ulery 2003, 250–251.

## Bibliography

- Accame, Maria 2008, *Pomponio Leto: vita e insegnamento*, Tivoli.
- Allenspach, Joseph & Giuseppe Frasso 1980, "Vicende, cultura e scritti di Gerolamo Squarzafico, Alessandrino", *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 23, 233–292.
- Billanovich, Giuseppe (ed.) 1943, Petrarch, *Rerum memorandarum libri*, Florence.
- Brown, Virginia (ed.) 2003, *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries* 8, Washington, D.C.
- Dunn, John & Ian Harris (eds.) 1997, *Machiavelli*, 2 vols, Cheltenham, UK (*Great Political Thinkers*).
- Farenga, Paola 2003, "In the Margins of Sallust. Part I. Di un incunabulo non del tutto sconosciuto e del commento di Pomponio agli *Opera* di Sallustio", *Miglio* 2003, 1–11.
- Gouwens, Kenneth & Sheryl E. Reiss (eds.) 2005, *The Pontificate of Clement VII: History, Politics, Culture*, Aldershot, UK.
- Hägg, Tomas 2012, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity*, New York.
- Henderson, Charles, Jr. (ed.) 1964, *Classical, Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, 2 vols, Rome (*Edizioni di storia e letteratura* 93–94).
- Laetus, Pomponius (ed.) 1490, Sallustius Crispus, Gaius, *Opera*, Rome.
- Laetus, Pomponius 1499, "Praefatio Francisco Borgiae Episcopo Teanen. et Pontificalis Aerarii Praefecto Pomponius Laetus", *Romanae Historiae Compendium*, Venice.
- Miglio, Massimo (ed.) 2003, *Antiquaria a Roma. Intorno a Pomponio Leto e Paolo II*, Rome (*RR inedita* 31, saggi).
- Modigliani, Anna, Patricia Osmond, Marianne Pade & Johann Ramminger (eds.) 2011, *Pomponio Leto: tra identità locale e cultura internazionale*. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Teggiano, 3–5 ottobre 2008), Rome (*RR inedita* 48, saggi).
- Monfasani, John 1988, "Calfurnio's Identification of Pseudepigrapha of Ognibene, Fenestella and Trebizond, and His Attack on Renaissance Commentaries", *Renaissance Quarterly* 41, 32–43.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 1995, "Princeps Historiae Romanae: Sallust in Renaissance Political Thought", *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 40, 101–143.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 1997, "Sallust and Machiavelli: from civic humanism to political prudence", Dunn & Harris 1997, 587–618. (Rpt, with additions

- and revisions, from *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23 (1993), 407–438).
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2000, “Catiline in Fiesole and Florence: The After-Life of a Roman Conspirator”, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 7.1, 3–38.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2003, “In the Margins of Sallust. Part III. Pomponio Leto's Notes on *Ars Historica*”, *Miglio* 2003, 36–49.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2005 (1), “The Conspiracy of 1522 against Cardinal Giulio de' Medici: Machiavelli and ‘gli esempli delli antiqui’”, *Gouwens & Reiss* 2005, 55–72.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2005 (2), “The Valla Commentary on Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*: Questions of Authenticity and Reception”, *Pade* 2005, 29–48.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2010, “Pomponio Leto's Unpublished Commentary on Sallust: Five Witnesses (and More)”, *Wagner & Reed* 2010, 135–149.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2011 (1), “*Lectiones Sallustianae*, Pomponio Leto's Annotations on Sallust: A Commentary for the Academy?”, *Pade* 2011 (1), 91–108.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2011 (2), “Testimonianze di ricerche antiquarie tra i fogli di Sallustio”, *Modigliani et al.* 2011, 179–198.
- Osmond, Patricia J. 2011 (3), “Alessio Stati”, *Repertorium Pomponianum*. URL: [www.repertoriumpomponianum.it/pomponiani/stati\\_alessio.htm](http://www.repertoriumpomponianum.it/pomponiani/stati_alessio.htm) (visited on 29 December 2013).
- Osmond, Patricia J. & Robert W. Ulery, Jr. 2003, “Sallustius, Gaius Crispus”, *Brown* 2003, 183–326.
- Pade, Marianne (ed.) 2005, *On Renaissance Commentaries*, Hildesheim (*Noctes neolatinae* 4).
- Pade, Marianne (ed.) 2011 (1), *On Renaissance Academies*. Proceedings of the International Conference “From the Roman Academy to the Danish Academy in Rome” (The Danish Academy in Rome, 11–13 October 2006), Rome (*ARID, Supplementum* 42).
- Pade, Marianne 2011 (2), “*Lectiones Sallustianae*. The 1490 Sallust Annotations, the Presentation Copy”, *Pade* 2011 (1), 109–122.
- Ricciardi, Roberto 1990, “DEL RICCIO BALDI, Pietro (Crinitus Petrus)”, *DBI* 38, 265–268.
- Ross, W. Braxton, Jr. 1970, “Giovanni Colonna, Historian at Avignon”, *Speculum* 45, 533–563.
- Sabbadini, Remigio 1967, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*. Edizione anastatica con nuove aggiunte e correzioni dell'autore a cura di Eugenio Garin, Florence.
- Santangelo, Federico, “Authoritative Forgeries: Late Republican History Re-told in Pseudo-Sallust,” *Histos* (2012), 27-51.

- Ulery, Robert W., Jr. 2003, "In the Margins of Sallust. Part II. The Sources and Method of Commentary", *Miglio* 2003, 13–33.
- Ulery, Robert W., Jr. 2005, "Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* in the Edition of Venice, 1500: the Medieval Commentary and the Renaissance Reader", *Pade* 2005, 7–28.
- Ullman, Berthold Louis (ed.) 1928, *Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum illustrium latinae linguae. Libri XVIII*, Rome (*Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome* 6).
- Ullman, Berthold Louis 1973 (1), *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 2nd ed., Rome.
- Ullman, Berthold Louis 1973 (2), "The Dedication Copy of Pomponio Leto's Edition of Sallust and the 'Vita' of Sallust", *Ullman* 1973 (1), 365–372.
- Ullman, Berthold Louis 1973 (3), "Petrarch's Favorite Books", *Ullman* 1973 (1), 113–133.
- Valentini, Roberto & Giuseppe Zucchetti (eds.) 1953, *Excerpta a Pomponio dum inter ambulandum cuidam domino ultramontano reliquias ac ruinas Urbis ostenderet, Codice topografico della città di Roma* 4, 421–436, Rome.
- Vossius, Gerardus Joannes 1627, *De historicis latinis libri tres*, Leiden.
- Wagner, Bettina & Marcia Reed (eds.) 2010, *Early printed books as material objects*. Proceedings of the Conference organized by the IFLA Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (Munich, 19–21 August 2009), Berlin–New York.