

Gesine Manuwald

# Cratander's Edition of Cicero (1528) from Humanist Basel

## Introduction

Basel is well known to have been an intellectually flourishing city in the early sixteenth century, when there were a number of active Humanists, scholars and reformers. This context was conducive to an increased interest in the writings by authors of classical antiquity, demonstrated by numerous editions, commentaries and translations published in Basel; the movement was facilitated by the spread of the printing press and the availability of several printers based in Basel.

Among these printers was not only Johann Froben (c. 1460–1527),<sup>1</sup> who published, among other books, several of the works of Erasmus of Rotterdam (c. 1466–1536; resident in Basel 1514–1516, 1521–1529, 1535–1536), including the edition of the New Testament that became the basis for translations into the vernaculars (first published in 1516),<sup>2</sup> but also the perhaps less well-known Andreas Cratander, who equally published an edition of the New Testament by Erasmus (1520).

Andreas Cratander (c. 1485–c. 1540) was born as Andreas Hartmann in Strasbourg; from 1502 to 1503 he studied at the University of Heidelberg, acquiring a Bachelor of Arts degree. From 1515 onwards he seems to have been active in Basel; he ran his own printing shop there from 1518 (after having worked as a printer's assistant in Basel and Strasbourg). In 1519 he was made a citizen of Basel and became a member of a local guild ('Zunft zu Safran') and later (1530) of another, more prestigious one ('Zunft zum Schlüssel'). In 1536 he sold his printing shop and was then active as a bookseller. Starting with the first editions he printed in his own workshop from 1518, he called himself 'Cratander' (by a Graeco-Latin adaptation of his name).<sup>3</sup> Cratander was in touch with numerous

---

1 On Froben see Sebastiani 2018; and the contribution by Thomas Vozar in this volume.

2 The 1522 edition (= USTC No. 678650) is available at: <http://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-3936> (last accessed 20/05/24).

3 See *DRAGMATA GRAECAE LITERATVRAE, A IO. OECOLAMPADIO CONGESTA* (= USTC No. 641210, available at: <http://data.onb.ac.at/rep/10310BBB>, last accessed 20/05/24); the introductory remark to readers is opened by ANDREAS CRATANDER STVDIOSIS S. and dated to 1518. In this text the book is described as *primum officinae nostrae partum, & uelut rudimentum quoddam* ('first product of our workshop and a kind of experiment as it were'). By contrast, in an edition of 1516, published by another printing house and prepared by Cratander, he is called ANDREAS HARTMANNI ARGENTINUS (= USTC No. 640313; bibliographical information and digital copy available at: <https://www>).

scholars, other printers and the artist Hans Holbein (1497/8–1543). Cratander's printing house published more than 200 works, particularly in Latin, but also in Greek, German, French and Hebrew. Like Johann Froben, Cratander printed Humanist school editions and new editions of a wide range of ancient authors (including Homer, Pindar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Xenophon, Isocrates, Plutarch, Theophrastus, Theocritus, Hippocrates, Galen, Plautus, Cicero, Sallust, Pliny, Apuleius und Prudentius) as well as biblical texts and writings by reformers (such as Johannes Oecolampadius, 1482–1531).<sup>4</sup>

Among these books Cratander's complete edition of the works of Cicero (published in 1528; apparently without later reprints) is particularly significant:<sup>5</sup> it appeared in a period in which Cicero's role as a paradigmatic author was discussed intensively and his works were edited multiple times.<sup>6</sup> In the same year, for instance, Froben published Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* (1528), which deals with the extent to which Cicero's Latin style should be the only model.<sup>7</sup>

Against this background Cratander's edition of Cicero's works shall be explored with respect to its structure, the underlying editorial principles and the assessment of Cicero it displays. Such a study can contribute to a more differentiated portrait of the reception of Cicero in Humanist Basel.

---

ustc.ac.uk/editions/640313, last accessed 20/05/24). – On the change of name to 'Cratander' see also Meier in Meier *et al.* 1966, 27.

4 On Cratander's biography see e.g. Heitz/Bernoulli 1895, xxiv–xxv; Steiff 1903; Meier in Meier *et al.* 1966, 27–42; Wolkenhauer 2002, 216–225; Hieronymus 2004; Reske 2015, 72–74; on Cratander's publishing activity see Schmid in Meier *et al.* 1966, 89–99; on Cratander's printer's marks see Wolkenhauer 2002, 216–225; on Cratander's Cicero edition, see Canfora 1996.

5 USTC No. 675046 = VD 16 C 2814 (<http://gateway-bayern.de/VD16+C+2814>, with links to digital versions, last accessed 20/05/24). Here the copy of the edition held by the Universitätsbibliothek Basel has been used for reference (shelf mark CB I 1–2; <http://dx.doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-1306>, last accessed 20/05/24); this copy has recently been reissued as a printed reproduction of the full text with an introductory essay in a supplementary volume (Scheidegger Laemmle/Manuwald 2022). While this publication appeared after the completion of the current contribution, the translations of excerpts from Cratander's dedicatory epistle have been aligned with the version in Scheidegger Laemmle/Manuwald 2022.

6 Editions of Sallust, including Cicero's *Four Catilinarian Orations*, had been published by Cratander's printing house in 1521 and 1525 (USTC No. 617598 and 617583; digital versions available at <https://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10993709.html> and [https://www.e-rara.ch/bau\\_1/doi/10.3931/e-rara-1426](https://www.e-rara.ch/bau_1/doi/10.3931/e-rara-1426), both last accessed 20/05/24).

7 On Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* see the contribution by Gregor Vogt-Spira in this volume.

## Cratander's edition of Cicero's works

In this edition the works of Cicero (in three volumes, covering rhetorical treatises, orations, letters, philosophical treatises) are preceded by additional texts.<sup>8</sup> The edition opens with a long prefatory dedication to the diplomat and Humanist Ulrich Varnbüler (1474–1545), who was a friend of Erasmus of Rotterdam (c. 1466–1536) and of Albrecht Dürer (1471–1528).<sup>9</sup>

In this section Cratander explains his aims and methods (α2r–v):

Exit igitur in uariantia hominum iudicia Princeps linguae Latinae, amplitudine augustae tuae dignitatis, tanquam clypeo, praelata securus. Non quod illi ipsi tantopere timeamus Ciceroni, ne scilicet parum plausibiliter excipiat, ut qui extra omnem ancipitis aleae iactum positus, unanims, quod dixi, omnium calculis, inter omnes eruditos eruditissimus, & eloquentissimus habitus & pronuntiatus fuerit. Ab hoc enim solo magistro formam Latine scribendi petendam esse contendunt, quotquot de literis censendis iudicium ad se recipiunt: hunc unicum discendum, ediscendum, uorandum, concoquendumque & quodammodo in succi ac sanguinis naturam conuertendum. Nam, ut semel omnium pace dicam, quod & ipse de Cicerone sentio, quod Sol est reliquis collatus stellis, uniuersarum scilicet rerum prora & puppis, qui solus uitam suppeditat, & rebus sufficit id quod uere sunt: tametsi aliis suam uirtutem non ademerim: id mihi plane uidetur esse Tullius, ad eos compositus quicunque Latinum sermonem, ab ineunte suae institutionis aetate, literatis lucubrationibus, quantouis studio & uigilia meditatis elaboratisque iuuare, excolere, & posteritati consecrare aggressi sunt.

Thus, the foremost representative of the Latin language goes out to the varying judgements of people, protected by the greatness of your [i.e. Varnbüler's] august dignity, like a shield, put in front of him. Not because we fear so much for that Cicero himself, that he might possibly be received with insufficient favour, as he, placed outside every throw of an ambiguous dice,<sup>10</sup> according to the unanimous, as I said, votes of all, has been regarded and

<sup>8</sup> Collation: T. I: [36], 143 [= 153] fols; T. II: 281, [1] fols; T. III: 392, [68] fols. (in the Basel copy [see n. 5] the first and the second *tomus* are bound together in one volume). – References to passages from Cicero's works in Cratander's edition are indicated by the foliation of the leaves in Arabic numerals provided in the edition, which starts anew for each *tomus*. On each of the folios subdivisions of the text are marked by capital Roman letters. The introductory section of the edition does not have a foliation: for the texts in that section the quire signatures (Greek letters with Arabic numerals) are given as a finding aid. – For a more detailed description of the edition and a full modern reproduction and translation of the dedicatory letter see Scheidegger Laemmle/Manuwald 2022.

<sup>9</sup> Ulrich Varnbüler was portrayed by Albrecht Dürer in a woodcut, a signed copy of which is now in the Städel Museum in Frankfurt, Graphische Sammlung, inv. no. 31722 (<https://sammlung.staedelmuseum.de/en/work/portrait-of-ulrich-varnbueler>, last accessed 20/05/24).

<sup>10</sup> This phrase is probably inspired by the preface to Pliny's *Natural History* (Plin. *HN* 1, *praef.* 7: *praeterea est quaedam publica etiam eruditorum relectio. utitur illa et M. Tullius extra omnem ingenii aleam positus et, quod miremur, per advocatum defenditur: nec doctissimis. Manium Persium*

proclaimed as the most learned among all learned and the most eloquent among the eloquent. For from him as the only master, they maintain, the style of writing Latin is to be sought, all who claim for themselves to have a considered view on judging literature, that he alone is to be learned, learned by heart, devoured, digested and in some way turned into the nature of lifeblood. For, so as to say it once with the permission of all, what I myself feel about Cicero: that he is the Sun compared to the other stars, like the prow and stern of all things,<sup>11</sup> who alone furnishes life and provides what makes things exist properly. Even though I would not take away their virtue from others, Tullius clearly seems to be this: suitable for all those who, from an early age of education, by literary lucubrations, which they thought about and elaborated by a lot of effort and vigils, have approached the task of supporting, improving and consecrating for posterity the Latin language.

Cratander demonstrates that he is aware of the discussions about Cicero's position, siding with those who regard Cicero as an outstanding model. This high appreciation of Cicero justifies the dedication, when the addressee is compared to Cicero as regards his literary education and his political activity. Slightly later in the dedicatory text Cratander says (α2v–3r):

An non, ut unum ex multis protulero, quod ille olim fuit suis Romanis, id tu hodie es tuae Germaniae? nempe in eum Reip. locum constitutus, ut iure cum ipso, sed in hunc modum exclamare possis: O fortunatam natam me consule Germaniam. Nam, ut & hoc obiter dicam, non uideo quem alium Consulis nomine intellegas, quam eum qui Reipublicae salutis & incolunitati, in qua re tu totus es, quamoptime consultum esse cupiat. His igitur nominibus, atque aliis quae singula in medium adferre nimis longum foret, persuasus sum tibi Ciceroniana opera nuncupare, uel si mauis, muneri apportare.

Or are you not, so that I adduce one aspect out of many, what that man once was for his Romans, today for your Germany? Certainly, you have been placed in such a position in the state that you could rightfully say with him, but in this way: "O fortunate Germany, born in my consulship." For, so that I also say this in passing, I do not see whom else you might understand by the name of consul than him who desires to have looked after the welfare and safety of the state, in which you are completely absorbed, as well as possible. Thus, by these reasons and others that it would be too long to bring up individually, I have convinced myself to dedicate Cicero's works to you or, if you prefer, to bring them as a gift.

The allusion to the famous line from Cicero's epic about his consulship (Cic. F 12 FPL<sup>4</sup>: *o fortunatam natam me consule Romam*), quoted, for instance, in the (pseudo-)Sallustian invective against Cicero, included in Cratander's edition ([Sall.]

---

*haec legere nolo, Iunium Congium volo. quod si hoc Lucilius, qui primus condidit stili nasum, dicendum sibi putavit, Cicero mutuandum, praesertim cum de re publica scriberet, quanto nos causatius ab aliquo iudice defendimur?).*

<sup>11</sup> The expression *prora et puppis* occurs as a Greek proverb in one of Cicero's letters (Cic. Fam. 16.24.1: *mihi prora et puppis, ut Graecorum proverbium est, fuit a me tui dimittendi, ut rationes nostras explicares.*).

*In Cic.* 5), is an initial indication that Cratander not only organized the printing of Cicero's works, but also engaged with these texts, here pointedly reversing the negative interpretation of the verse in its transmission context. That Cratander is a true editor becomes obvious further from the explanation of his editorial principles. Therein the admiration for Cicero is accompanied by a critical attitude to the transmission and to the activities of earlier editors. As Cratander outlines, he has made an effort, with the support of others, whom he mentions by name with thanks (α3r–4v),<sup>12</sup> to view a good number of relevant manuscripts and check them for the purposes of establishing the Latin text. These additional pieces of information have helped him, he says, in his “war [. . .] with faulty manuscripts” (α3r).<sup>13</sup> Konrad Peutinger (1465–1547) is singled out since he obtained manuscripts of the speeches *Pro Flacco* and *In Vatinius*. Indeed, some modern editions of *Pro Flacco* include a reference to a manuscript *P*, denoting a *fragmentum Peutingerianum* (Cic. *Flac.* 75–83), which was adduced for the first time in Cratander's edition.<sup>14</sup> In the preface Cratander also mentions the names of others who acquired manuscripts

---

12 The following men are mentioned by name (with these versions of their names): Iacobus Sturmius, Chunradus Peutingerus, Hartmannus Hartmanni, Iacobus Kirserus, Bilibaldus Pyrkheimerus, Guernherus Vuolfflinus, Io. Sichardus, Michaelis Bentinus, Ioannes Chelius, Georgius Casselius.

13 See α3r–4r: *Chunradus Peutingerus*, [. . .] *Pro quibus quo animo depugnet, uel inde satis apparet, quod mihi aliquot Ciceronianarum orationum reliquias, & uenerandae uetustatis exemplaria transmisit, tanquam auxiliatrices copias, ut belli, quod nobis cum mendosis codicibus tanquam hostibus gereretur, certiolem uictoriam obtineremus.* [. . .] *Orationes longe castigatiores reddidi, quam ad hoc usque tempus lectae fuerunt. Quarum duas, alteram pro L. Flacco, alteram in Vatinius, ex exemplaribus, quae Chunradus Peutinger ad me misit, magna sui accessione adauximus* (“Konrad Peutinger [. . .]. With what attitude he fights for these is sufficiently apparent even from the fact that he has handed over to me the remains of some Ciceronian orations and copies of venerable antiquity, just like auxiliary troops, so that we would obtain a more certain victory in the war that is being fought by us with faulty manuscripts like enemies. [. . .] The orations I have rendered far cleaner than they had been read up to this time. Of these we have augmented two, one on behalf of L. Flaccus, the other against Vatinius, from the copies that Konrad Peutinger sent to me by a substantial addition to their text.”).

14 The discovery of this manuscript is listed separately in the overview on the transmission of Cicero's speeches by Rouse/Reeve. This survey also attributes the printing, not only the discovery, to Konrad Peutinger, while according to the information in the edition Cratander was responsible for the printing (Rouse/Reeve 1983, 92: “Between Poggio's discoveries and the first decipherment of Ciceronian palimpsests 400 years later, only one event enlarged the corpus of speeches, and it did not give the world a new speech. Conrad Peutinger obtained from Hieronymus Rorarius of Friuli a text of *Pro Flacco*, 75–83 and printed it in Cratander's edition (Basel, 1528). It runs to the same length as the text of 47–53 in V (§4, above) and thereby shows that the source of the humanistic tradition (§9, above) had lost the same number of leaves at two points. No other traces of Rorarius's manuscript have been detected either in Cratander's edition or elsewhere.”).

for him and the places where they were found or checked, but such information does not feature in individual notes on the text.

## Cratander's methods for establishing the text

Cratander explains that the careful study of the laboriously obtained manuscripts enabled him to establish a more precise text than previously possible (α3v–4r):

Hactenus causas reddidi, quibus mihi persuasum fuit, te, prae omnibus quos colo, idoneum esse, in cuius nomine Ciceronem meis characteribus scriptum publicarem. Nunc illud haudquaquam mihi silentio prætereundum est, & quod tu fortassis non nolis scire, & cuius lectorem operae precium fuerit admonuisse. Imprimis usus sum codicibus haud mediocriter uetustis: quorum alii non paruis impendiis, neque uulgari peregrinatione conquisiti: alii uero amicorum beneficio tam in me, quam in omnes eloquentiae studiosos perquam officioso exhibiti sunt: [. . .]. Vnde factum est, ut cœptum negotium principio difficillimum, paulo minori negotio confecerim: quod libenter & ingenue & fatemur & cognoscimus, amicisque acceptum ferimus: multas enim inde mendas sustulimus, quae priores aeditiones occupant: atque id ante omnia in epistolis ad Atticum. Attamen sicubi forte propter mendarum diuersitatem eliciendae sententiae difficultas suboriebatur, reliquimus tum ibi eos locos, præfixis literarum formis, signi uice, lectori acutioris iudicii excutiendos, & coniectura colligendos. Accesserunt praeter multa, quae prius passim desiderabantur, epistolis ad Brutum sex aliae, quas hucusque nulli imprimere contigit. Orationes longe castigatiores reddidi, quam ad hoc usque tempus lectae fuerunt. [. . .] Verum ea in quibus alicubi uariabant codices, id quod plerumque contigit, ad marginem more nostro adnotata sunt, ut integrum esset, quod cuique maxime probaretur sequi, & exactius iudicare, utraque lectione ob oculos posita.

Up to this point I have rendered the causes by which I was convinced that you, before others that I respect, are suited so that I publish in your name Cicero, written by my moveable types. Now that is in no way to be passed over in silence by me and what you perhaps do wish to know and what it is worth the effort to have reminded the reader of. I have chiefly used rather old manuscripts; of those some were sought out with not a little expense, and not by the usual routes; others, however, have been presented by the exceedingly obliging goodwill of friends both towards me and towards all students of eloquence. [. . .] Thus it happened that I completed a task, initially begun as very difficult, with a little less trouble; gladly and openly we admit and acknowledge that and put it down as a debt to friends. For thence we have resolved many faults, which had taken their place in earlier editions; and this, before everything else, in the letters to Atticus. But where by chance because of the diversity of faults the difficulty to select a meaning arose, we have then left those passages there, with signs of letters prefixed, with the function of a mark, for a reader of sharper judgement to be investigated and put together by inference. Beyond much that was widely missed in the past there have been added to the letters to Brutus six others, which up to this point nobody has managed to print. The orations I have rendered far cleaner than they had been read up to this time. [. . .] But those items in which the manuscripts somewhere vary, what happens frequently, have been marked in the margin according to our custom, so that

it was open to anyone to follow what was most approved by each and to make a judgement more exactly, with both readings placed before the eyes.

Thereby Cratander highlights his endeavours to bring together numerous manuscripts with the help of others: by comparing different manuscripts, he managed to eliminate mistakes in earlier editions, presumably by putting into the text readings that he regarded as more suitable and are found in other manuscripts. On some occasions, when the decision for or against a particular reading was unclear, he says, he put one of the variants in the text, marked the passage with a reference sign and indicated alternatives in the margin (though without identifying the individual manuscripts), so that readers have access to all the information and are able to make their own decisions based on the evidence.<sup>15</sup> This procedure is appropriated as typical for himself and described by *more nostro* ("according to our custom").

Indeed, similar principles had been used in the edition of Lactantius published by Cratander in 1521.<sup>16</sup> There he describes this method and its advantages for readers (α1r):

Huius itaque disertissimi uiri egregia opera, candidi lectores, a nobis uenustioribus transcripta typis, & quanta potuimus diligentia, ad plurium exemplariorum fidem recognita, in manus uestras damus. In quibus nonnunquam, uarietate codicum oblata, aliam lectionem apponi curauimus: ut si unum istum libellum semel nacti fueritis, multa & diuersa Lactantii exemplaria uos adeptos libere affirmare possitis.

Thus, the outstanding works of this most eloquent man, fair readers, transcribed by me with rather pleasing printing types and examined with as much care as possible as regards the reliability of numerous copies, I give into your hands. In these [works], where differences in the manuscripts surfaced, I have sometimes arranged for another reading to be added: thus, if you have once acquired this single booklet, you can claim that you have obtained many and different copies of Lactantius.

---

15 In the introductory letter Cratander provides information on some manuscripts supplied to him (α3v). In this respect he can be regarded as a forerunner of Hieronymus Ferrarius (see Rouse/Reeve 1983, 96: "Published statements about what manuscripts have what readings are another matter. Do they begin in 1542, when Hieronymus Ferrarius in his *Emendationes in Philippicas Ciceronis* consistently reports the readings of a 'liber Colotianus' (lost) and a 'liber Langobardicis litteris scriptus' (Vatican lat. 3227)? Editions of the later sixteenth and early seventeenth century are explicit enough to show that the older and more important manuscripts V, H, and E were already in use; the oldest editions fullest in their report of manuscripts collated by various scholars are those of Gruter (Hamburg, 1618) and Graevius (Amsterdam, 1695–9).").

16 Cratander 1521: USTC No. 671383; available at: <https://www.e-rara.ch/zut/doi/10.3931/e-rara-34207>, last accessed 20/05/24.

Thereby, Cratander essentially provides a precursor of the modern text-critical apparatus. To what extent the textual decisions were the result of collaboration in the workshop is difficult to ascertain; at any rate in the dedication Cratander acknowledges the huge contribution made by Michael Bentinus (c. 1495–1527), who unfortunately died prematurely just before the edition was finished (a4r–v). In the description of the preparations for this edition Cratander emphasizes the effort made to obtain and consult a large number of manuscripts, though without ranking them. He does not mention any earlier editions, though; either he regarded them as less relevant than the manuscripts providing the actual sources, or it was a measure meant to increase the value of Cratander's book. Scholars now believe that Cratander used the second version of Jodocus Badius Ascensius' (1462–1535) edition of Cicero's works, published in Paris in 1521/22.<sup>17</sup>

Cratander's method of recording textual difficulties can be illustrated with examples from the Cicero edition. A passage from the *Third Philippic Oration* (3.10) reads in modern editions *una in domo omnes quorum intererat totum imperium populi Romani nundinabantur* ("in a single house all who were interested traded the entire dominion of the Roman People"). Instead of *populi Romani* Cratander prints *Reip.*, i.e. *rei publicae*, and notes in the margin '† Vide num legendum sit, populi Rom.' (tom. 2; 254r,A). Modern editions do not indicate variations in the text-critical apparatus for this passage; but *populus Romanus* and *res publica* are not infrequently confused in the manuscripts as both terms can be abbreviated in similar ways. Thus, one has to infer that Cratander read or believed to read *rei publicae* in the manuscripts, but had noticed that this word leads to the collocation 'dominion of the Republic', which is unusual and does not express the required concept of the complete sale of everything under Roman control, and therefore suggested a correction, though without putting it into the text as it was not attested. A little further on the opposite case occurs: there Cratander notes in the margin '† Rep.' as a comment on *pro populo Romano* ("for the Roman People") in the text (3.11: *postremo Tarquinius pro populo Romano bellum gerebat tum cum est expulsus; Antonius contra populum Romanum exercitum adducebat tum cum [ . . . ]* – "finally, at the time when Tarquinius was driven out, he was waging war on behalf of the Roman People; Antonius was leading an army against the Roman People when [ . . . ]"). Presumably, a rhetorical contrast is intended in the Ciceronian text between this expression and *contra populum Romanum* ("against the Roman People") in the following clause; thus, a change is not advisable, and modern editions do not have any indications in the text-critical apparatus.

<sup>17</sup> See e.g. Wiener 1998, 151.



Later in the *Third Philippic Oration* (3.30) the transmission is split between *senatum stiparit armatis* and *armis*; both readings can be found in recent editions, i.e. “he surrounded the Senate with armed men” or “with arms”. Cratander puts *armatis* in the text, which may be more plausible despite the repetition of the word immediately afterwards, and notes the variant *armis* with a reference sign in the margin (tom. 2; 255v,C). Thereby, in line with his principles, he leaves the decision to readers. The only piece of information that he does not provide in comparison with modern editions is an indication of the manuscripts in which the various readings can be found.

In the dedication Cratander stresses that he improved the text of the letters to Atticus in particular (α3v).<sup>18</sup> Indeed, the section containing the letters to Atticus includes numerous notes on the constitution of the text. For instance, with regard to a Greek word at the end of the first letter, which is placed between *cruces* in the *Loeb Classical Library* edition by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Cratander adds a note in the margin:<sup>19</sup> “Perhaps ἡλίου ἀνάθημα is to be read, as can roughly be inferred from the traces in an old manuscript, in which was written, in Latin letters, *eliu anaohma*.” Apparently Cratander distinguishes between variants, which he records in the margin with reference signs, and suggestions for conjectures, for which he provides comments.

## Cratander's principles for commentary notes

All the marginal notes refer to the constitution of the text; thus, readers can see the text on its own and read it relying on their own judgement. As Cratander says in the dedication, he preferred not to put comments by scholars in the margin, but rather to provide them separately in a specific section (α4r):

Insuper non libuit margineas illas annotationculas historiarum, uocum, scite dictorum, & insignium loquutionum, pro recepta consuetudine, uana ostentatione, e regione contextus adspargere: sed duximus cupido lectori potius probatum iri, si quicquid id est minutiarum,

<sup>18</sup> This section has therefore been an important piece of evidence for determining Cratander's sources and his principles of textual emendation (see Wiener 1998, with a summary of previous discussions, esp. Lehmann 1892, 52–85; Schmidt 1896, 697–710).

<sup>19</sup> Cic. Att. 1.1.5 [SB 10] (Shackleton Bailey's text in *Loeb Classical Library*): *Hermathena tua valde me delectat et posita ita belle est ut totum gymnasium † eliu ἀνάθημα † esse videatur. multum te amamus* [Shackleton Bailey has *eius* ἀνάθημα in the Cambridge edition and justifies the correction in the commentary]. – In the text (tom. 3; 112v,C) Cratander prints ἑρμαθῆνα (with ligature) and comments in the margin (with reference sign): *Forte legendum ἡλίου ἀνάθημα, ut ex ueteris codicis uestigiis propemodum colligi potest, in quo latinis characteribus scriptum erat, eliu anaohma*.

in unum indicem, certo ordine digestum, congereremus, quo in promptu sit quiduis inueniendi facultas.

Moreover, it did not please to spread those little marginal annotations of history, words, shrewd statements and notable phrases, according to received convention, in vain ostentation, in the area around the text; instead, we believed that it would rather be approved by an eager reader if we collected whatever there is of such minutiae, in a single index, laid out in a clear structure, whereby the opportunity of finding anything is easily at hand.

Obviously, Cratander does not intend not to provide assistance to readers or to withhold insights of scholars;<sup>20</sup> it is just a question of arrangement. Accordingly, a section with commentary notes of famous people is given at the beginning of the edition; its heading indicates again that these notes have been organized systematically (tom. 1; from  $\delta$ ). The main principle is the arrangement according to the authors of the comments. Within each person's comments the order follows that of the works of Cicero: their titles function as subheadings; references to the sources are given where appropriate, and indications in the margin identify the passages the comments refer to by volume and folio numbers in the present edition. This structure enables both reading the comments within their larger context and assigning them to the respective passages in the current edition; it does not reveal, however, whether there are any commentary notes on particular passages when one reads the Latin text. Cratander's aim, as he points out, is not to collate all existing commentaries comprehensively, which would require a separate edition, but rather to give an initial guide, so that interested readers will be able to find more information.<sup>21</sup> Comments of the following scholars have been included (as listed by Cratander): Aulus Gellius (2nd cent. CE), Angelus Politianus (1454–1494), Antonius Sabellicus (1436–1506), Philippus Beroaldus (1453–1505), Petrus

---

<sup>20</sup> See  $\alpha 4v$ : *Et ut semel finiam, nihil prorsus intactum reliquimus, quantum in nobis fuit, quantumque uetera exemplaria adiumento esse potuerunt, quod aut codici ad parandam concinnitatem & reuerentiam conducibile, aut ad iuvandam studiosi lectionem adminiculo futurum prospiceremus* ("And so that I finish once and for all, we have certainly left nothing untouched, as much as we could and as much as the old copies could be of help, what we foresaw as being conducive either to creating coherence and esteem for the book or as being an aid to support the reading of a student.").

<sup>21</sup> See the note at the end ( $\zeta 3v$ ): *Non fuit animus, candide lector, in praesens omnium omnes in Ciceronem annotationes persequi, quod hoc peculiare propemodum requirat uolumen. Studiosus quisque, data iam ansa, complures uulgo uenabitur, potissimum tamen ex Erasmi Chiliadibus, L. Caelio, Philippo Melanchthone, aliisque id genus autoribus* ("It was not the intention, fair reader, now to follow up all the comments of all on Cicero, since this would essentially require a separate volume. Once a handle has been given, every eager reader will catch many of them everywhere, especially, though, from Erasmus' *Chiliades*, L. Caelius, Philipp Melanchthon and other authors of this kind.").

Crinitus (1475–1507), Erasmus Roterodamus (c. 1466–1536), Budaeus (1476–1540) and Chunradus Peutingerus (1465–1547). In addition to a scholar from the period of antiquity, these are Italian Humanists from the immediately preceding period and selected contemporaries of Cratander.<sup>22</sup>

## The position of Cratander's work in the history of editing

Cratander is not the first printer and editor to provide explanatory material with an edition of ancient texts and to use reference signs and marginal notes. For instance, the edition of the works of the younger (and the elder) Seneca, printed by Johann Froben in Basel in 1515 and prepared by Erasmus of Rotterdam,<sup>23</sup> offers a text that Erasmus intended to be improved on the basis of consulting several manuscripts,<sup>24</sup> in addition to individual (explanatory) remarks, the margins contain alternative readings, conjectures and notes on passages Erasmus regarded as corrupt.<sup>25</sup> Passages deemed to be corrupt are indicated by an asterisk in the margin (\*). Differing readings are marked by a *crux* (†) in front of the respective expression in the

---

22 Cratander explicitly notes that he has provided a selection of commentaries. By contrast, the later work (1553) by Johannes Oporinus (1507–1568) aims at comprehensive overview of existing commentary on Cicero (USTC No. 666291; on this work see the contribution by Bram van der Velden in this volume). Oporinus' principles are similar in the sense that he also includes one item from the ancient world (Asconius) and otherwise early modern scholars. The commentary by Philippus Beroaldus is the only one to appear in both editions.

23 USTC No. 667432; available at: <http://dl.ub.uni-freiburg.de/diglit/seneca1515a>, last accessed 20/05/24.

24 Erasmus demonstrates an awareness of potential relationships between manuscripts. After complaining about the quality of two manuscripts supplied to him, he says in the introductory letter of dedication (a2r): *Illud tamen profuit, quod non consentiebant errata, id, quod accidere necesse est in his libris, qui ex eodem exemplari formulis excuduntur* ("This was still of use that the errors did not agree, which necessarily happens in those books that are printed with types from the same copy.").

25 See the introductory note (a1v): *AD LECTOREM. Quia admodum difficile est, in tam deprauatis exemplaribus, cuncta restituere. Igitur ubi autorem nimia uetustate corruptum arbitrati sumus, \* asteriscum apposuimus. ubi uero meliora interserenda putauimus, id quoque suis locis, ubi hoc signum † uideris annotauim'. Proinde haec boni consulito. Non enim ubique tutum fuit, uel etiam leuissimis coniecturis uti* ("To the reader. Since it is very difficult to reconstruct everything in such corrupt copies. Therefore, where I believed that the author had been corrupted by too much antiquity, I have added an asterisk \*. Where, however, I thought that something better was to be inserted, I have noted that each in its place, where you see the sign †. Hence have regard for this as an advantage. For it was not safe everywhere to use even the smallest conjectures.").

text; the corresponding alternative readings are placed in the margin introduced by ‘*Alr*’ (*aliter*). Passages in need of conjectures are equally marked by a *crux* in the text and display a suggestion introduced by ‘*forte*’ in the margin. Thus, Erasmus uses the same sign in the text for variant readings and conjectures. In comparison with this edition, Cratander has made progress methodologically since he distinguishes between variants and conjectures; and he provides the information in a more scholarly accurate way when he presents readers with all the material needed for them to form their own judgement.

Within the editorial history of Cicero’s works Cratander’s edition was not the first printed edition of all writings of Cicero. In particular, it was preceded by the comprehensive edition issued by Alexander Minutianus, published in Milan in 1498/99.<sup>26</sup> This edition, however, does not seem to include text-critical notes, even if Minutianus stresses at the beginning that an effort had been made to collect and take account of various manuscripts:<sup>27</sup> “Cicero’s works, which a rather benevolent fate has preserved for us, I have printed, distributed over four volumes, not in the order in which chronology arranged them, but rather in that which necessity proscribed: while I was waiting for copies to be fetched from different and distant places.”

Minutianus shows himself aware of the importance of access to manuscripts. Cratander, however, seems to be the first printer and editor of Cicero’s works who attempted to edit the entire oeuvre of Cicero systematically basing himself on the transmission, to use text-critical methods consistently and to document variants in an accessible format for readers.

## Additional material in Cratander’s edition

To complement the picture, between the dedication and the commentary notes, further texts are printed that provide background information to readers and are meant to ensure that all material is available within a single edition. This section opens with a Latin version of Plutarch’s biography of Cicero, preceded by a short letter by Achilles (Phileros) Bocchius / Achille Bocchi from Bologna (1488–1562).

<sup>26</sup> USTC No. 999629. For bibliographical information (and links to digital copies) see also the entry in the Incunabula Short Title Catalogue: <https://data.cerl.org/istc/ic00498000>, last accessed 20/05/24.

<sup>27</sup> Note above the table of contents: *Ciceronis opera: quae nobis benigniora fata reseruarunt in quatuor uolumina digesta impressimus: non eo ordine quem temporum ratio disponebat: sed quem necessitas praescrispsit: dum uetustiora exemplaria ex diuersis & longinquis locis accersita expectamus.*

Bocchius had published a Latin version of Plutarch's biography of Cicero in 1508;<sup>28</sup> this is the cover letter by which he sent this work to bishop Achilles Crasus. In the letter Bocchius explains that the Latin text of the biography he had access to had Aretinus as the author, not as a translator. Therefore, he says, he emended the text to the best of his ability. Aretinus must refer to Leonardo Bruni, also called Leonardo Aretino after his birthplace (1370–1444), who published an influential biography of Cicero, entitled *Cicero novus*, in 1415. With the reprint of the letter Cratander indicates the basis for his text and suggests that he prefers to stay close to the ancient sources. He complements the biographical information from the ancient world by adding a fragment from the 120th book of Livy's Roman history, describing Cicero's death, as well as Cornelius Nepos' biography of T. Pomponius Atticus.

After these texts there is a section with translations of the Greek words in Cicero's letters into Latin, with an indication of the respective page numbers for the individual passages.<sup>29</sup> As the choice of a Latin version of Plutarch's biography also shows, Cratander does not expect all readers of this edition to be able to read Greek and therefore provides the necessary aids.

## The Ciceronian texts in Cratander's edition

The entire introductory part is followed by the actual edition (with Arabic page numbers). Beyond Cicero's rhetorical works, the first volume includes the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, whose authorship is not discussed, as well as the speeches of Aeschines against Ctesiphon and Demosthenes' defence (*Speech on the crown*), both in the Latin versions of Leonardo Bruni. The second volume contains 57 speeches of Cicero as well as Sallust's invective against Cicero and his reply, two texts whose authenticity is now questioned. The oratory covers all the speeches known today, except for the very fragmentary ones, as well as the speech allegedly given on the day before Cicero went into exile (*Oratio pridie quam in exilium iret*), now regarded as not genuine.

<sup>28</sup> USTC No. 815005; available at: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b55006034s/f1.image>, last accessed 20/05/24.

<sup>29</sup> See the remark in the dedication (a4v): *Quoniam multae Graecae & simplices uoces, & integrae orationes sparsim per uniuersum opus insertae, sese legentibus offerant, eas nos primum sibi restitutas, deinde Latinitate donatas, unoque fasce complexi, praemisimus* ("Since many Greek items, both simple words and entire phrases, inserted everywhere over the entire work, present themselves to readers, those, collated in a single bundle, we have placed at the beginning, first correctly reproduced as such, then endowed with Latinity.").



tracts from *De re publica* (apart from the *Somnium Scipionis*) and the very fragmentary orations are not included.

The editor intends to present all information regarded as relevant clearly in a single edition. Thereby he does not assume advanced knowledge of Greek, but expects at least some readers to be able to make text-critical decisions. The separation of text and commentary visibly demonstrates the distinction between the ancient texts and the work of later scholars, while the references facilitate linking notes to particular passages. Marginal notes accompanying the Latin text are reserved for text-critical notes; reference signs mark notes on variant or difficult readings, based on the careful study of several manuscripts. In addition, there are occasional suggestions for conjectures. This edition, therefore, can be regarded as a forerunner of modern text-critical and scholarly editions with notes. While Cratander made efforts to improve the text and put it on an evidence-based foundation, he seems to have been less active in the area of contents and satisfied with assembling a selection of existing commentary notes.

If one believes Cratander's statement in the dedication, his intention was indeed the creation of a tool for scholarship. He says (α3r):

Verum non solum mihi, etiamsi mihi maxime quidem: non in hoc tamen quod inde in spem uberioris lucri erigar: Nam Deum testor, quod iam tum ex quo libros domi meæ excusos publicare cœpi, id mihi semper animi fuerit, quo potius studiosorum commodum iuarem, quam meo ipsius quaestui inseruirem: tantum abest, ut sudoribus meis avare rem facere unquam statuerim.

But not only for me, even though for me certainly most; not for this purpose, though, that from there I get excited for the hope of richer profit. For I invoke God as a witness that, already from the time when I started to publish books printed in my house, this was always my intention that I rather aided the convenience of students than served my own gain; so far am I from ever deciding to make money greedily with my sweat.

It is probably not a mere coincidence that such a progressive edition, striving for accuracy and taking readers' needs into account, was published in Humanist Basel in the early sixteenth century, when the scholars active there provided incentives for printers and equally constituted a customer base. In modern scholarship Cratander's edition of Cicero's works seems to be given less attention than, for instance, the slightly later edition by Denis Lambin / Dionysius Lambinus (1520–1572) of 1566; perhaps Cratander is often seen just as a printer. At least with regard to the history of the reception of Cicero and the history of the development of principles of textual criticism, however, the limited attention paid to Cratander's edition does not seem fully justified.

