

*Sonderdruck aus*

# MITTELLATEINISCHES JAHRBUCH

Internationale Zeitschrift für Mediävistik und Humanismusforschung

Revue internationale des études du moyen âge et de l'humanisme

International Journal of Medieval and Humanistic Studies

Rivista internazionale di studi medievali e umanistici

Als E-Journal ab Band 1 (1964) verfügbar unter  
[mjb.hiersemann.de](http://mjb.hiersemann.de)

BAND 57

JAHRGANG 2022

Heft 3



ANTON HIERSEMANN · VERLAG

STUTTGART · 2022

## INHALT

### AUFSÄTZE

- PAULO FARMHOUSE ALBERTO  
The metrical prologues to the Visigothic *Excerpta Canonum* . . . . . 339
- MIRKO BREITENSTEIN  
Die *Consolatio optima in temptationibus*. Zu einer Gruppe von Texten  
gegen Kleinmut und Gewissenskrupel, mit Edition . . . . . 384
- THOMAS HAYE  
Das Prosimetrum *De precepto Prudentie* des Nichasius de Planca (gest.  
vor 1307). Eine Verteidigung der paganen Poesie im Milieu der Pariser  
Universität . . . . . 428
- EKKEHART SYSKA  
Drei sapphische Hymnen: ein anonymes *Carmen Saphicum de sancto  
Georgio* und Piccolominis *De passione* und *De nativitate domini* . . . . 442

### BESPRECHUNGEN

- The Oxford Handbook of Latin Palaeography, hg. von Frank T. Coulson  
und Robert G. Babcock, Oxford 2020 – besprochen von Philipp Lenz 491
- El libro delle Cento Parole di Ptholommeo*. Saggio di edizione critica del  
volgarizzamento fiorentino del *Centiloquium* pseudo-tolemaico (Bib-  
lioteca di carte romanze, series minor 2), ed. Agata Calcagno, Milano  
2021 –
- El Libro delle Cento Parole di Ptholommeo*. Volgarizzamento inedito del  
*Centiloquium* pseudo-tolemaico (Testi e documenti di letteratura e di  
lingua 45), ed. Michele Rinaldi, Roma 2021 – besprochen von Emanu-  
ele Rovati . . . . . 513
- Verzeichnis der zitierten Handschriften von Band 57 (2022) . . . . . 520

tisch ausgerichteten Überblick mit hohem Anteil an transkribierten Schrifttafeln (Kapitel 15).

Das hier besprochene Handbuch wird wegen der oben angeführten Lücken und konzeptionellen Schwächen sowie wegen einiger, punktuell gehäuft auftretender inhaltlicher Mängel nicht uneingeschränkt und nicht in allen seinen Kapiteln als ein maßgebendes Nachschlagewerk der lateinischen Paläographie (und Kodikologie) dienen können. Diese Defizite schmälern aber nicht die hohe Qualität und den großen Nutzen der meisten Beiträge, welche die entsprechenden Abschnitte der älteren Lehr- und Handbücher teilweise ersetzen oder mindestens gewinnbringend ergänzen und insgesamt mit ihrer Materialfülle die paläographischen und kodikologischen Horizonte vieler Leserinnen und Leser erweitern werden. Die ausgezeichneten Übersetzungen von mehreren substantiellen Kapiteln ins Englische erlauben es zudem einem viel größeren Publikum als bisher, direkt auf die Ergebnisse der lebendigen italienischen und spanischen paläographischen Forschung zurückzugreifen.

Philipp Lenz  
Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen  
philipp.lenz@stibi.ch

*El libro delle Cento Parole di Ptholommeo*. Saggio di edizione critica del volgarizzamento fiorentino del *Centiloquium* pseudo-tolemaico (Biblioteca di carte romanze, series minor 2), ed. Agata Calcagno, Milano 2021 (Ledizioni), 140 S.

*El Libro delle Cento Parole di Ptholommeo*. Volgarizzamento inedito del *Centiloquium* pseudo-tolemaico (Testi e documenti di letteratura e di lingua 45), ed. Michele Rinaldi, Roma 2021 (Salerno Editrice), XXXII + 163 S.

The *Centiloquium* falsely ascribed to Claudius Ptolemy is a remarkable text in several respects. It is the oldest extant collection of astrological aphorisms and one of the most widely disseminated premodern scientific texts, with its base-text and related commentaries preserved in over 500 manuscripts and 30 prints in nine different languages. The history of the *Centiloquium* reflects *in nuce* the main scholarly practices that account for the transmission of premodern scientific literature across time and cultures, such as translation movements and commentary traditions. A lost Late Antique predecessor of the *Centiloquium* seems to have reached the Arabic world in the context of the Graeco-Arabic translation movement of the 8<sup>th</sup>–9<sup>th</sup> c. The combination of this Late Antique

substrate with Persian and Arabic material gave rise to the *Kitāb al-Thamara*, the oldest surviving form of the text. As other astrological texts of Greek origin, it was commented upon by Arab scholars of the 9<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> c., most notably by the mathematician and historian Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad ibn Yūsuf ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Dāya (d. 940–951). Base text and commentary were subsequently translated from Arabic into Persian, Hebrew and Byzantine Greek and fostered novel commentary traditions in these languages (for an orientation, see David Juste, *Pseudo-Ptolemy, Karpos / Kitāb al-Thamara (Greek / Arabic)*, in: *Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus. Works*, URL = <http://ptolemaeus.badw.de/work/24>).

Such an authoritative text did not escape the attention of 12<sup>th</sup> c. Latin translators, who were keenly interested in the works attributed to Ptolemy. The collection, newly rebranded *Centiloquium*, quickly rose to prominence in Europe, with seven different Latin translations circulating by the first half of the 13<sup>th</sup> c. Its influence extended beyond the domain of astrology, as shown by numerous quotations in medical and philosophical treatises. Fresh humanist translations from Byzantine Greek and related commentaries later replaced the obsolete Medieval versions, meaning that the *Centiloquium*’s success was to continue uninterrupted throughout the Renaissance and Early Modern Era (for the Latin *Centiloquium* tradition, see David Juste’s entries with siglum B.1 and C.3 in *Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus. Works*, URL = [https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/works\\_latin](https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/works_latin) with literature).

After isolated efforts by scholars ahead of their time (especially Emilie Boer and Richard Lemay), research on the *Centiloquium* has well and truly taken off over the last 25 years. For instance, the various Medieval *Centiloquium* versions have been the object of an impressive string of papers by Jean-Patrice Boudet, while Michele Rinaldi has been comprehensively mapping the Renaissance commentary tradition (their contributions are listed in David Juste, *AstroBibl. History of Western Astrology – Bibliography*, in: *Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus. Resources*, URL = <https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/astrobibl/start>, under section 3.5 and 4.1 respectively). Two important editions have appeared: that of the Arabic and Byzantine versions of Abū Ja‘far’s commentary (Aḥmad ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Dāya, *Commento al Centiloquio Tolemaico*, ed. Franco Martorello and Giuseppe Bezza, Milano/Udine 2013), and that of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī’s (d. 1274) highly influential Persian commentary (*Sharḥ-i Thamara-yi Baṭlamyūs dar aḥkām-i nujūm. Shāriḥ-i khawāja-yi Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī*, ed. Jalīl Akhawān Zanjanī, Tehran 1999). Several volumes on the *Centiloquium* are in preparation for the *Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus* book series by Brepols, including Maria Mavroudi’s comparative study of the Arabic and Byzantine versions, Michele Rinaldi’s edition of Giovanni Pontano’s translation and commentary, as well as editions and studies of the Medieval Latin versions by Jean-Patrice Boudet and myself.

The two books under review are most welcome additions to this corpus of scholarship. Their respective authors Agata Calcagno and Michele Rinaldi engage with yet another aspect of the rich *Centiloquium* transmission, namely its vernacular tradition. At the core of both books is the critical edition of an anonymous 15<sup>th</sup> c. Florentine Italian version based on the Arabic-into-Latin translation by Plato of Tivoli and containing Pseudo-Ptolemy's base text, Abū Ja'far's commentary and copious glosses. Regrettably, neither editor became aware of the other's work in good time, and the two editions could not benefit from each other.

R. first published some extracts of the Italian text in 2015 (Un inedito volgarizzamento quattrocentesco del *Centiloquio* pseudo-tolemaico, in: Bruniana & Campanelliana 21 [2015] 663–670) and has now devoted a full book to this source. The introduction elaborates on his earlier publications and surveys the *Centiloquium*'s history from Antiquity to the Renaissance (XI–XXV). There follows a bibliography (XXVI–XXXI). The edition of the Italian text (1–100) is accompanied by numerous footnotes. They provide a comparison with Plato's Latin text and his Arabic model and succinctly expound the challenging Italian wording, occasionally from an astrological-technical point of view. The appendices contain the text of the Italian glosses to the *Centiloquium* (103–116) and of two astrological chapters conflated with it in the Italian tradition (117–119 and 120–121 respectively). The extensive »nota al testo« starts by describing the *unicum* manuscript of the vernacular version (Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Pal. 641 = *P*), a fine manuscript written in Florence in or after 1479 (125–127). *P*'s orthographic and linguistic features are detailed in the best tradition of Romance philology (127–135). After that, the *ratio edendi* is set forth in a clear way (135–137), the non-trivial corrections to *P* discussed (137–147) and the transcription criteria explained (148–150). Finally, a glossary of selected astrological terms and *notabilia* is provided (153–161), along with an *index nominum* (162).

Just weeks after R.'s, a second edition of the text was published by C. The book is available in open access at the address <http://digital.casalini.it/9788855261968>. Like R., C. opens her book by adequately contextualising the *Centiloquium* (5–21). There follows a description of *P* (*F* in her nomenclature) and its history (21–28). A 14<sup>th</sup> c. Latin *Centiloquium* manuscript (Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Magliabech. XX.22 = *M*), whose importance will become apparent in a moment, is likewise discussed (28–30). After some considerations on the dissemination of the *Centiloquium* and of scientific texts in general (30–32), the content of the Italian version is outlined and compared with that of Plato's Latin (33–35). C. argues at length that *M* is the direct Latin source text of the Italian translation (35–43). Then, the transcription and edition criteria are briefly outlined (43–45) and plates of *P* and *M* provided (46–47). The Italian text is

edited on 49–128. Sporadic footnotes compare *P*'s readings with *M*, a further Latin manuscript and the Arabic version. The book ends with a bibliography (129–139) and a statement by C. that R.'s edition was brought to her attention too late for it to be considered (140).

Both C.'s and R.'s introductions competently summarise the state of research in the field. Despite overlapping to a certain extent, they complement each other in many respects and should ideally be read in parallel. For instance, C. alone dwells on the supposed mysticism characterising the opening section of the *Centiloquium* (14–16; Jean-Patrice Boudet, *Astrology Between Rational Science and Divine Inspiration. The Pseudo-Ptolemy's Centiloquium*, in: *Dialogues among Books in Medieval Western Magic and Divination*, ed. Stefano Rapisarda and Erik Niblaeus, Firenze 2014, 47–73 should be compared). On the other hand, the Byzantine *Centiloquium* reception is discussed in some detail in R.'s book only (XX–XXI).

A point of contention between C. and R. is the reconstruction of the textual transmission. Both authors are aware of an earlier publication suggesting that the *Centiloquium* and further Italian texts in *P* may have been translated from *M* (cf. Lorenzo Mainini, *Notes sur les traductions scientifiques en langue vernaculaire (XIV<sup>e</sup>–XV<sup>e</sup> siècles) et le manuscrit palatin 641*, in: *Le Moyen Âge* 123 [2017] 295–310, here 310). R. argues that the source text of the Italian *Centiloquium* was a manuscript similar to *M* but not *M* itself (135–136 with fn. 34). This claim is substantiated by the supposed presence, in *P*, of three segments either absent (E45 *o in alcuno altro segno*, E64 *minore è la congiunzione [...] perché la expositione*) or very different in *M* (E60 *dalla media congiunzione, e così le revolutioni degl'anni diterminano quello confusamente P vs. a maiori et cum qua illarum concordaverit ipsa figura coniunctionis medie M*). However, it seems that none of R.'s examples are ultimately meaningful (E45: the additional passage in *P* was taken from a gloss in *M*; E64: the additional passage in *P* is supplied in the margin and is an alternative translation of the preceding section; E60: as a consequence of an eye-skip on the part of the translator, *P*'s text reflects a passage found some lines further below in *M*).

C.'s argument that *M* is indeed the source text of the Italian version (35–43) is more solid and ultimately compelling. However, in the introduction (29–30, 32), she acts as if *P* were the autograph of the vernacular translation. In fact, this manuscript does not resemble a translator's working exemplar, and some of its scribal errors (listed by R., 137–147 *passim*; cf. also XXIII–XXIV) point to the existence of a lost Italian exemplar.

Translations are methodologically challenging texts to edit. R.'s editorial principles are lucidly outlined on 136–137: only those readings of *P* that arose from scribal mistakes within the Italian transmission must be emended. Conversely, seemingly incorrect and even non-sensical readings must be retained

(i) when they can be explained as translation errors, or (ii) when they accurately reflect corrupt readings of the Latin source text. In line with these considerations, R. refers to M's readings throughout his edition to show that correcting P's substandard text would be ill-advised. In a handful of cases only does he emend P against M – this because, as aforementioned, he considers M to be similar to, but not identical with the source text of the Italian translations. But in light of C.'s findings, the following corrections by R. (discussed on 137–147 *passim*) must be rejected:

- P2 <differentia> R. : om. P, cf. *[[differentia]]* M  
 P6 sia <maggiore> R. : sia P, cf. fuerit M  
 P14 quanto sarà R. : el quarto sarà sarà P, cf. quartus erit erit M  
 E51 è l'ascendente <'n> caso R. : e l'ascendente caso P, cf. et ascendens casus M (with the genitive mistaken for a nominative)  
 E52 è R. : et P, cf. et M  
 E60 siano R. : sí come P, cf. sicut M  
 E64 università R. : verità P, cf. veritatem M  
 E85 e lla seconda nella predefcta parola R. : nella seconda decto la parola P, cf. in secundam premissis verbo M  
 E85 significato R. : significatore P, cf. significatorem M  
 P87 è R. : e P, cf. et M  
 E87 13 R. : 12 P, cf. 12 M  
 E93 pretermectevano R. : permectevano P, cf. premittebant (!) M  
 P94 significa R. : significano P, cf. significant M  
 E100 e <tr>a gl'aventi le chiome cioè aventi e crini salì R. : et agl'aventi le chiome sali cioè aventi e crini P, cf. et habentibus vero comas ascendit id est habens crines M

Furthermore, in two instances (P10 and P18), the Italian translator misread the Latin *infortunis* and *infortuna* as *in fortunis* and *in fortuna*, thus translating *nelle fortune* and *nella fortuna* respectively. R. restores *infortune* and *infortuna*, but these readings never existed in the Italian tradition and P's text should be retained.

Apart from these minor issues, R.'s edition is of the highest quality and a testament to his abilities as a philologist. Unfortunately, C.'s work is less satisfactory. Standard transcription conventions are ignored, thus leading to a rather clumsy text, the most conspicuous cases being the consistent rendering of Tironian *et* as *et* rather than *ed* in front of *e*- and *e* elsewhere; failure to distinguish between the article plural *e* and the personal pronoun *e'*; and the absence of elision (*gli antichi* instead of *gl'antichi*) or elision markers (*chel* instead of *che'l*). A closer look at a single page (62) reveals that the conjunction *o* was left out (l. 405); a common abbreviation wrongly deciphered (l. 406 *permesso* instead of *promesso*); *f* mistaken as *s* (l. 415 *sarà* instead of *farà*); and two words were mistranscribed or plainly misunderstood (l. 416 *prova* instead of *piova*, l. 420 *patenti* instead of *patienti*). Furthermore, C. occasionally alters

the Italian wording against the combined evidence of *P* and *M* to produce a more intelligible, but ultimately ahistorical text. Such instances include:

- l. 106 *non* C. : *o non* P, cf. *aut non* M
- l. 422 *quanto sarà* C. (also R.) : *el quarto sarà sarà* P, cf. *quartus erit erit* M
- l. 1240 *è* C. (also R.) : *et* P, cf. *et* M
- l. 1257 *è* C. (also R.) : *et* P, cf. *et* M
- l. 1871 *Marte* C. : *la morte* P, cf. *mortem* M
- l. 1992 *di Marte* C. : *della morte* P, cf. *mortis* M;
- l. 2200 *dall'Ascendente* C. : *absente* P, cf. *absente* M
- l. 2344 *significarà* C. : *significano* P, cf. *significant* M
- l. 2387 *gli effecti* C. : *e' difecti* P, cf. *deffectus* M
- l. 2513 *etere* C. : *etha* P, cf. *etha* M
- l. 2538 292 C. : 92 P, cf. 92 M

In one instance, C.'s edition is historically more accurate than R.'s. Several Latin manuscripts include, at the beginning of the *Centiloquium*, two additional astrological chapters attributed to Ptolemy (see David Juste, Pseudo-Ptolemy, *Dixerunt Ptolemeus et Hermes quod locus Lune . . .*, in: *Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus*. Works, URL = <https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/work/42> and David Juste, Pseudo-Ptolemy, *De cometis*, in: *Ptolemaeus Arabus et Latinus*. Works, URL = <https://ptolemaeus.badw.de/work/43> respectively). This is the case in *M* and hence in *P* too. While the two chapters were edited in separate appendices by R., C. has opted for including them in the *Centiloquium*'s main text, which is a philologically sounder solution. On the other hand, *P*'s copious glosses have been neglected by C.; but since they were translated from *M* along with the main text, they are part and parcel of the Italian version and deserve to be printed as a supplement to the main text, as in R.'s book.

From this brief comparison, R.'s edition unquestionably emerges as the more carefully prepared and accurate one. Still, C.'s book remains useful (especially its introduction), and the two works should be consulted in parallel. Both scholars equally deserve our gratitude for editing and contextualising this source, and for opening new research perspectives on the *Centiloquium*.

Finally, two issues left undiscussed by C. and R. shall be briefly addressed. The first one concerns the nature of the text transmitted by the Italian tradition and its Latin model. *M* contains one of the most erratic texts found in the over 100 manuscripts of Plato's *Centiloquium* translation. Glosses and alternative readings were intentionally inserted into the main text, many passages deliberately reworked, and some material added. As such, *M* and its vernacular version *P* cannot be considered representative witnesses of Plato's version. Rather, they are fairly radical examples of the open transmission of Medieval scientific texts, and C.'s and R.'s editions allow us to better grasp this important phenomenon. It is remarkable that even a clearly ›impure‹ witness such as *M* en-



joyed enough authority to be selected as the source of a vernacular translation, and to be slavishly followed in the process.

The other point concerns the anonymous Italian translator. Neither C. nor R. venture a guess as to his identity, but they are apparently unaware of Francesco Sirigatti, an astrologer and Latin-into-Italian translator of astrological texts attested in Florence around the time *P* was written. Sirigatti produced vernacular versions of Guido Bonatti's *Tractatus astronomie* (extant and probably dating from 1484) and Alcabitius' *Introductorius* (lost but once in Leonardo da Vinci's library) (on this scholar and his works, see Renzo Baldini, *Astrologia Italica. Dal X al XVII secolo*, vol. 2, Firenze 2016, 825–827 and Graziella Federici Vesco-vini, Note di commento a alcuni passi del ›Libro della pittura‹. »L'astrologia che nulla fa senza la prospettiva ...«, in: Leonardo e Pico. Analogie, contatti, confronti, ed. Fabio Frosini, Firenze 2005, 99–129, here 123–127).

That Sirigatti may be the *Centiloquium*'s translator is a possibility worth entertaining as he can be linked with *M*, albeit indirectly. As discussed by C. (29–30, 32, 43), *M* was owned by Gino di Neri di Gino Capponi (d. 1487), a Florentine politician with a marked interest in astrology. C. wonders whether the translation of the *Centiloquium* and other Italian texts in *P* was carried out from *M* at the behest of Gino himself. Now, Sirigatti's translation of Bonatti's *Tractatus astronomie* is dedicated to the very same Gino (cf. Federici Vesco-vini, 125–127). If Gino did commission the translation of parts of his manuscript *M*, he may well have turned to the same scholar who translated Bonatti's work for him. The validity of this hypothesis should be tested by comparing Sirigatti's Bonatti translation and the Italian texts in *P* with respect to their language and translation technique.

Emanuele Rovati  
Universität Zürich  
emanuele.rovati@uzh.ch