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As noted before, Paolo Marsi was not immune to the attacks of rivals and nay-sayers. We can be sure that he glossed the rite of the Mute Goddess at *Fasti* 2.571 with a degree of personal interest. For his explanation of the mystifying ritual, he recounts an experience from his trips with Bernardo Bembo in 1468 and Nicolò Canal in 1469. How it precisely happened that the ancient divinity silenced the lips of calumniators, Marsi says,

the poet Ovid does not reveal. Still, let me interpret his words according to the secret rite itself, which is easy enough for me, since I have witnessed it in many places just as Ovid reported. Furthermore in Euboea there was a certain holy man both Greek by birth and learned in Greek letters; I left ship to go see him at a certain time while I was spending the winter in Chalcis. Now and then, in fact, he wanted me to show him something of our literature. Once I found him with a book whose title was *On Arcane Magic* by a certain Thessalian. Among the other rites I noticed this one written in Greek, which he wanted to try out because there were some slanderers who would not stop harassing him with abusive words. Wonderful to say: he suppressed their verbal attacks. The
same thing happened in my presence also when I was in Seville and later on in Rhodes.1

Poeta tamen id non aperit. Nos tamen sua verba cum mysterio interpretemur, quod facilli mum est nobis qui vidimus id idem fieri pluribus in locis eoque modo quo a poeta refertur. Praeterea religiosus quidam in Euboea erat qui, ut genere Graecus, ita Graecis litteris eruditus. Ad quem aliquando cum per hiberna in Chalcide essamus e triremi configiebam. Volebat enim interdum ut aliquid nostrarum litterarum aperirem. Hunc semel repperi librum tenentem cuius inscriptio erat “de arcanis Veneficiis” cuiusdam Thessali. Inter cetera Graece scriptum hoc sacrum adverti, quod ille eo tempore voluit experiri cum essent aliquot maledici, qui eum conviciis lacesere non desinebant. Mirum quidem dictu est; compescuit illorum maledicentiam. Idem accidit et me praesente in Hispali et postea Rhodi.

The influence of Ovid, declaring personal participation in ceremonies (“I myself jumped through the flames placed three in a row” / certe ego transsilui postitas ter in ordine flammas, he says on the Palilia F. 4.727), would have been emblematic for Marsi. In this instance, Marsi’s eyewitness experience provides proof for the information in Ovid about the Mute Goddess. Although Marsi does not delve further into mystic ritual, his comment on the Mute Goddess reveals both a curiosity and an awareness of theurgy, the operation of miracles through supernatural or divine intervention. It may also explain, at least to a degree, his search for the tomb of Pallas with the burning lamp that could never be extinguished. If we continue to think about Western esotericism, we should recall that Marsi was on good terms with Ludovico Lazzarelli, a briefly active member of Pomponio Leto’s Academy who was called doctus by Marsi.2 In 1481, Lazzarelli met the

---

1. For the Romans, Thessaly was the proverbial land of witchcraft: see Horace, C. 1.27.21; Plaut., Amph. 1043; Juvenal 6.610. On the other hand, could Marsi be referring to a version of the astrological De virtutibus herbarum by Thessalus of Tralles (1st century AD)? Compare the property of maidenhair, mixed in a potion at 2.6.6: “and if someone drinks from it, he cannot be hurt by criminal misdeeds” (et si quis ex eo biberit, non potest a facinoribus ledi); cited in Friedrich (1968, 244). For the text’s fortuna see Pingree (1976). Marsi’s account is quoted by Rodolphus Hospinianus (1547–1626), De festis Iudaeorum et Etrurcium, hoc est, de origine, progressu, ceremoniis et ritibus festorum dierum Iudaeorum, Graecorum, Romanorum, Turcarum, et Indianorum libri III (Tiguri: in officina volphiana, 1611), 66 (Mutae Deae festum).

2. spectamus alumnos / iam Marsum doctos Sulpitiumque viros; Lazzarelli’s autograph Fasti christianae religionis, BAV, Vat. lat. 2853, fol. 77v, repeated on fol. 164v. The second reference is to the Academician Sulpizio da Veroli. Marsi is but one member of the Roman Academy who wrote a poem in honor of Lazzarelli and his work; see New Haven, CT, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS 391, fols. 243r–246r.
prophet Giovanni “Mercurio” da Correggio in Rome. As Correggio’s disciple, Lazzarelli converted to Christian hermeticism and completed Marsilio Ficino’s translation of the Corpus Hermeticum. Lazzarelli’s ideas of transformation and regeneration at that time became more overtly Christian.

Perhaps we can attribute the one example of Christian allegory in Marsi’s Fasti commentary to the influence of Lazzarelli and other humanists like him. Marsi enters a long excursus on the fabled death of Pan at the mention of the Greek god’s name at Fasti 1.397. He quotes at length the story about the Egyptian sailor Thamus from Plutarch’s “On the Obsolescence of Oracles” (De defectu oraculorum). During the reign of Tiberius, while sailing to Italy by way of the Ionian islands of Paxi, Thamus was mysteriously called upon to proclaim opposite Palodes, “Great Pan is dead.” The moment he did so, great wailing arose from the shore. Marsi prefaces his rendering of Plutarch’s story with “although the story is reported by Eusebius, I will take it from a Greek manuscript of the author himself” (quamvis ab Eusebio referatur, a graeco tamen codice ipsius auctoris accipiemos). The implication of a Greek manuscript—and of its translation by Ermolao Barbaro—may very well be a red herring, intended to act as corroborative proof for Marsi’s own reading. Marsi’s retelling of Plutarch follows the author completely, except for one additional phrase shown in italics below. Marsi says that

Thamus himself was summoned by Tiberius Caesar, and Tiberius placed such confidence in the story that he launched an investigation and inquiry into the identity of Pan, for he was to be understood as God. However, the numerous philosophers whom he consulted assumed that he was the son of Mercury and Penelope.

For further literature see Moreschini, Saci, and Troncarelli (2009), Copenhaver (2009), Hanegraaf and Bouthoorn (2005), Crisciani (2000), and Ruderman (1975).

Marsi refers to the [Περὶ τῶν Ἐκλελοιπότων Χρηστηρίων] quem nunc divini ingenii iuvenis, tam graecis quam latinis litteris ornatissimus atque utroque genere praestantissimus simul et omni studiorum laude cumulatissimus, Hermolaus Barbarus magnificentissimi equitis Zachariae filius, me hortante latinum facit. No translation has come down to us that I am aware of. There is mention of it in the claim by Ioannes Trithemius, De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis (Basileae: Johann Amerbach, 1494), as reported in Stickney (1903, 31), that among Barbaro’s unpublished works were Latin translations of Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride and Dialogus quare oracula defecerint. Barbaro, in his Corollario, refers only to the former work, and it appears that this was in fact not a translation but a compilation gleaned from ancient sources; see Dionisotti (1968, 157).
Marsi has interpolated “he was to be understood as God” (quem nam deum interi
gi oporteret), and in so doing suggests that the Roman emperors rec-
gnized the presence of Christ as if by instinct and that the pagan world
prefigures Christianity. He builds upon the authorial wisdom of Plutarch;
he furthermore rejects the allegorical interpretation transmitted by Euse-
bius, that the wailing at Pan’s death came from the pantheon of demons
expelled forever when Christ defeated the Devil (haec ille verum Eusebius,
haec et similia accidisse refert ad illud Tyberii tempus quo quidem tempore
Salvator et Dominus noster cum hominibus conversatus omne daemonum genus
ab humana vita depulit). Marsi interprets the death of Pan as the passion
of Christ, for

other, most holy men of our religion claim that the voice was heard from
Paxi on the night which followed Passion Sunday, in the nineteenth year
of the reign of Tiberius, indeed when Christ died. By this voice, a kind of
miracle that came from the silence of the deserted crags, it was announced
that our Lord and God had passed away. For what does Pan signify but
“all,” and so the Lord of the whole entire world had died.

Marsi’s Christian allegory on the death of Pan had such a lasting impact on
his readers that it later entered the work of Rabelais and has been identified
as the ultimate source of Pantagruel 4.28, and it also found its way into the
E. K. gloss to Pan in May of Spenser’s The Shepheardes Calendar.  

---

5. Cf. Praeparatio Evangelica 5.17.6, ed. K. Mras, Eusebius Werke 8:1 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag,
1954), 254.
6. See Screech (1955, esp. 41–44). Compare the Medicean Florence versions of Pan; an en-
throned Pan, representing the “divine power” over everything in heaven and on earth, appears in
Luca Signorelli’s painting Court of Pan (Bober 2000, 234–35).
THE ROMAN ACADEMY AND ANNIVERSARIES

The Fasti commentators attempted to unlock the mysteries of the ancients and cultic practice. Ovid’s poem was an antiquarian’s dream. In Ovid’s calendar the humanists could see something of their own feast year and customs and beliefs. The commemorative nature of the calendar allowed for identification and participation, and even imitation.

Ovid claims to have participated in the Palilia, and likewise members of Leto’s Roman Academy celebrated it. The Roman Academy’s commemoration of the Palilia, the ancient Roman festival dedicated to the divinity of agriculture Pales, believed to coincide with the founding and hence “birthday” of Rome, is well documented. In his funeral oration for Pomponio Leto, delivered on June 10, 1498, Pietro Marsi affirms that his professor had resurrected the Palilia and won for it the Roman Academy’s right to crown poets on this day.⁷ The celebration, held at Leto’s house on the Quirinal, was typically accompanied by several opening speeches, a banquet, and a poetic contest. Not surprisingly, the poems were often Genethliaca for the city of Rome. Domizio Palladio composed his Carmen in Romae Urbis Genethliacon for the commemorative birthday celebrations of 1484, and in it he too glorifies Leto for having restored the ancient observance (Hic [sc. Laetus] tibi, diva Pales, antiqua volumina volvens / candidior voluit restituatur honos).⁸ A manuscript in the Vatican Library preserves another poem, this one anonymous, but likewise entitled in urbis Romae natalem celebratum die 21 mensis aprilis 1484.⁹

Leto had received the privilege to crown poets from the emperor Frederick III while in Germany during the winter of 1482–83.⁴⁰ April 1483 is the first year, it has generally been conceded, for which we have documented proof of the Palilia celebrations; this was the first “official” ceremony. Jacopo Volaterrano has left a record of the events of that day:

---

⁷ Sed, inquiis, animus . . . non contentus, non fessus, ut urbis natalem a se renouatum ac religioso celebratum, poetica laurea honestaret, ac posito ingenii premio, ardentes animos inflammaret, annuente Xyxo quarto pontifice maximo, ut id de more, ac setusto iure Codicis, facere liceret, media hyeme, calcatis Germaniae niuibus, et Alpium prauinos uertice ritu Herculis expugnato, imperatorium diploma emeruit.


⁹ Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2836, fols. 322r–324v; in Tournoy-Thoen (1972, 220–23). For other genethliaca, and for later revivals of the Palilia celebrations, see Muecke (2007, 114–18).

On the Esquiline at the house of Pomponio, on the Sunday which followed, the birthday of Rome was celebrated by the literary Academy. After the solemn rites, presided over by Demetrio of Lucca, prefect of the Vatican library, Paolo Marsi delivered the oration. They took repast at the church of San Salvatore, where the sodality had prepared a sumptuous banquet for the lettered men and university students. Six bishops were present at the banquet, and very many scholarly and noble youths. The privilege which had been granted to the sodality by the emperor Frederick III was read at table, and many verses were recited, even from memory, by various learned young men.

In Exquiliis prope Pomponii domum, die dominico qui sequutus est, a sodalitate litteraria, celebratum est Romanae Urbis Natale. Sacra solemniter acta, Demetrio Lucensi, bibliothecae pontificiae prefecto operante, Paulus Marsus orationem habuit. Pransum est apud Salvatoris sacellum, ubi sodalitas litteratis viris et studiorum studiosis elegans convivium paraverat; sex antistites convivio interfuerunt et eruditi ac nobiles adolescentes quamplures; recitatum est ad mensam Federici III Cesaris privilegium sodalitati concessum, et a diversis iuvenibus eruditis versus quamplures etiam memoriter recitati.\(^\text{11}\)

We are told that Paolo Marsi delivered the inaugural speech for the 1483 ceremonies. The Roman Academy almost certainly celebrated the birthday of Rome earlier than 1483, as Marsi’s commentary attests. In the editio princeps from December 24, 1482, his Genethliacon already appears at F. 4.31, where Ovid explains the genealogy of ancient Rome.\(^\text{12}\) Most likely Marsi inserted his poem as the commentary went to press, with the knowledge that Leto was in Germany right then, petitioning for the right to crown poets; Marsi’s Genethliacon was his own contribution for the festive occasion that would be held but a few months later. That the composition was intended for recitation on some occasion of Rome’s birthday, there can be no doubt. In his dissertatio, Baptista Guarino boasts about Marsi:

Wondrous is that man’s talent at speaking, and it is all the more worthy of admiration in that his natural disposition was more inclined to poetry than prose orations; there is no more extemporaneous poet alive. His poem has been inserted in the Fasti . . .

\(^{11}\) RIS 23:3, p. 117. The Esquiline and Quirinal hills were still confused at this time; see chapter 4, fn. 45.

\(^{12}\) A transcription of the poem appears in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ms. 3111, fols. 69v–73v; see Pontari (2008, 744).
Moreover, there is internal proof that Marsi’s Genethliacon existed in some form even before December, 1482, suggesting that indeed, such poetic contests had been going on for a long time. In his commentary Marsi notes that the Genethliacon printed at 4,31 is but a shortened version of what he had composed years before:

The genealogy that has been explained by a various number of writers, I have excerpted from the most accurate historical accounts, both Greek and Latin, and in the last years have reduced into a brief compendium, the Natalis Romanus.

Rosella Bianchi has discovered that Marsi quotes from his metrical composition in his Lucan commentary. On fol. 5r of an editio princeps of the Pharsalia, Inc. II.3 at the Vatican Library, Marsi (or a copyist) has written: in natali diximus “Iam cum fundamina primum / designanda forent . . . ,” corresponding to the verses of the Genethliacon as they can be pieced together from the Fasti commentary at 4,812, 816, and 818. Although we do not have a precise date for Marsi’s Lucan commentary, he had already presented it to his patron Giorgio Cornaro by the time of his Fasti commentary, as he makes clear in the preface. From the references to the Genethliacon on fol. 5r and elsewhere in the Pharsalia, it appears that its title varied between Natalis Urbis and Natalis Romanus, suggesting that

---

15. Non enim sola Fastorum gloria tete manet sed quae ad institutionem vitae humanae pertinent. Tuo etiam nomine dedicantur officialia ipsa praecepta, tanto a nobis labore et diligentia lucubrata ut prodire ex ipsi verae academiae fontibus videantur. Quin et ingens ipsa Pharsalia et artis rhetoricae praecepta summa cum vigilantia et fide a nobis interpretata tuoque itidem nomine dedicata, fore quidem existimo immortalem tibi gloriam paritura. . . . Presumably Marsi hoped Cornaro would help publish his commentary on the Pharsalia, as well as a commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herrenium.
even at the time of the Lucan commentary, the poem was still a work in progress. Commemorations of the Palilia were therefore not a recent invention of Academy members in 1483.

Marsi’s obsession with Rome’s birthday extended beyond poetic composition, however. He was determined to ascertain the day of Rome’s founding, and his mission culminated in his exegesis on the Fasti. Marsi instituted April 20 as the date to celebrate Rome’s birthday, and in 1483 the celebration did take place on the day for which he had made his case. Marsi wished to prove this date regardless of the difficulty, but also with what appears to have been an ulterior motive, as discussed below. The date of Rome’s founding was, in fact, a much debated point in the Roman Academy; at Fasti 4.721, Marsi says: “there are some who want the birthday of Rome to fall on April 22” (sunt tamen qui volunt xxii die Aprilis esse). Indeed, Antonio Volsco pled for the Palilia falling on the 22nd (quae celebrantur secundo et vigesimo die Aprilis), in so doing most likely echoing his mentor Pomponio Leto. In the Maffei manuscript (Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea, II.141), Palis et natalis Romae has been written in next to April 22 on the calendar on fol. 4r, and x kal. Mai Natalis Vrbis Romae (i.e., April 22) appears in the margin of fol. 71v in red, although a later hand has changed this to xi kal Mai (April 21).

Why would there be such uncertainty concerning a Roman date? We should not forget the fluidity of the calendar even in Caesar’s time, as well as the regional variants in calendars that Ovid reminds us of (F. 3.87–98, 6.59–64). Anniversaries were thus not strictly anniversaries. In 45 BC, Julius Caesar undertook a reform of the calendar; by his decree, on January 1 of that year, the days now followed the cycle of the sun rather than the moon. The lunar calendar of the Republican period was replaced so that the Roman year became more or less aligned with the tropical year, calculated from one spring equinox to the next. Adjustments needed to be made to the Julian calendar over time, however, since dates did gradually fall behind the sun. Yet the immediate problem for Caesar was converting from Republican to Julian time. Commemorative occasions no longer corresponded between the two systems.

Scholars therefore focused their energies on calculating anniversaries. The Romans had always possessed an “anniversary mentality,” more so than the Greeks, and were preoccupied with the recurrence of significant

17. April 20, 1483, was a Sunday, the Sunday referred to in Volaterrano’s account. See Tournoy-Thoen (1972, 212, fn. 1).
Days. “Days” were more important than “dates,” and if that meant changing a date on the new civil calendar, so be it. This gave Caesar quite a lot of authority over the calendar, the chance to mold it; Cicero jokingly remarked on Caesar’s power when he replied to someone’s observation that the constellation of the Lyre would be rising the next day: “Yes, by decree.” In the Fasti, Ovid wrote, “even now the times were in error until this too became one of Caesar’s many concerns” (sed tamen errabant etiam nunc tempora, donec / Caesaris in multis haec quoque cura fuit, 3.155–56). Of course, Ovid adapted the calendar for his own motives as well.

Considered special as commemorative occasions were “birthdays,” not just of individuals, but also of historic battles and events, and of permanent religious monuments. The dedication day of a temple was referred to as its dies natalis, for example. Naturally, the anniversary of Rome’s founding held particular significance. Ovid, while offering seven competing causes behind the origins and the importance of the Palilia, solidified its association with Rome’s founding on April 21. His last interpretation of the agricultural festival explains that Romulus gave orders to his people to transfer to new homes and to set fire to their old houses. The event was commemorated annually from that time on (Fasti 4.801–6). In due course, additional occasions were marked and attached to this day. In 45 BC, the same year he reformed the calendar, Caesar (a new Romulus) initiated games on the Palilia and people wore crowns in his honor to celebrate his victory at Munda. Later, in AD 121, Hadrian dedicated the cult and temple of Venus and Rome on the date of the Palilia. Imperial associations accrued. The Italian antiquarian Foggini (1713–83), who is credited with excavating remnants of the marble Fasti at Praeneste, comments that under the Christian emperors, April 21 was not in fact suppressed but augmented, and it was used also as the birthday of Constantinople, the “new Rome” (Nova Roma).

The founding of Rome continued to be a day held in esteem by Renaissance humanists. The foundations of cities were closely connected with the foundations of buildings, a throwback perhaps to the ancient Roman concept that a temple’s inauguration was its dies natalis. Astrologers in the

---

20. The anecdote about Cicero is given in Plutarch, Caes. 59.3 (Feeney 2007, 196); for Ovid, see ibid., 202–3.
21. Ibid., 148.
22. Ovid omitted this victory, one that ended the civil wars against the republican armies but caused much bloodshed. See Herbert-Brown (1994, 118–19).
employ of Agostino Chigi went to some trouble to draw up an election chart and to propose April 22, 1506, as the foundation date for Chigi’s villa in Rome.\(^{25}\) Chigi often played host to the Roman Academy, and he would have known the Academician Lorenzo Bonincontri, who authored a De rebus coelestibus and Tractatus electionum. In Marsi’s circle some argued April 22 was the birthday of Rome, as Marsi himself comments at F. 4.721; this had become an accepted date again in Chigi’s time.\(^{26}\)

Ovid had invoked April 21 as the Palilia. Paolo Marsi played with this date in order to achieve a particular goal, however, giving a convoluted explanation for the validity of April 20. His methodology, and the reason for what he has trouble proving, can be traced as follows, beginning with roundabout and wordy remarks at Fasti 4.721:

> The Palilia will be on the 12th of the calends of May, that is, April 20 . . . if we interpret the poet [Ovid] correctly, we will understand the 20th, [and] if we follow Plutarch,\(^{27}\) Pliny,\(^{28}\) and Varro\(^{29}\) logically, we will do so likewise. Plutarch says \(\pi\rho\sigma\ η\delta\epsilon\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\sigma\nu \ κά\'\ ΛΗνΔϖν \ μαί\nu\nu\ [sic],\) that is, “on the day before the 11th of the calends of May,” and as for those who say “12th,” you should reason this way, that one way of speaking is “the 12th of the calends” and another “the day before the 12th,” for you include as the first day in the reckoning, the day which you are counting from. Whether Plutarch then says “before the eleventh” or “the twelfth,” you will count eleven or twelve from that day of the Calends and understand “the day before.” There should be no difference in expression between “on the eleventh of the calends” and “before the eleventh,” or similarly “the eleventh.” I therefore deduce the Palilia to be on the 20th of April.

\(\text{xii calen. Mai. hoc est } xx \text{ die Aprilis erunt festa Palilia. . . si recte poe-} \)
\(\text{tam interpretamur, } xx \text{ diem tenebimus, idem si Plutarchum, si Plinium, si} \)
\(\text{Varronem sequimur. Plutarchus inquit } [\pi]\rho\sigma\ η\delta\epsilon\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\sigma\nu \ κά\'\ ΛΗνΔϖν} \)

---


26. It is possible that April 22 was a favored date for the Palilia because then the celebrations would fall closer together with the Pasquinalia on April 25. See D’Onofrio (1990, 49) and A. Reynolds (1987).


29. R. R. 2.1.9: Romanorum vero populum a pastoribus esse ortum quis non dicit? Quis Faustum nescit pastorem fuisse nutricium, qui Romulum et Remum educavit? Non ipsos quoque fuisse pastores obtinebit, quod Parilibus potissimum condidere urbem?
μαίϖν [sic], hoc est “ante undecimum calendarum Maiarum,” et qui dicunt xii calen. ita accipias, ut aliud sit dicere “xii calen.,” aliud “ante duodecimum,” nam primum numerabis ab ipso die calendarum. Cum vero dicet “ante undecimum” sive “duodecimum” numerabis xi aut xii ab ipso die calendarum et tenebis postea diem antecedentem. Nonne differentia aliqua esse debet in sermone cum ita loquimur “ad xi calendarum” et “ante xi,” sic cum “undecimo” dicimus. Qua ratione ex his colligemus xx die Aprilis esse Palilia.

Plutarch, the only author Marsi quotes, clearly gives a date of April 21; Pliny is in agreement, while Varro sets the foundation of Rome on the day of the Palilia but does not specify the date. Deference to textual authorities does not help if Marsi wants to persuade his audience of an April 20 birthday. Marsi demonstrates that he understands the Roman system of calendric computation: “Ab” (ante diem) is a standard part of the formula and can be taken for granted in terms of translating the date. He logically concludes that “on” or “before” the eleventh day yields the same date on the calendar. There is a wanton disconnect, however, between this statement and the next: “I therefore deduce the Palilia to be on the 20th of April,” he announces, ignoring that the eleventh in the Julian calendar for May is still not equal to April 20 by any reckoning. Why has Marsi misinformed his audience? Does he hope that the student writing down the lecture notes at the time is too busy to notice what he has just said? It helps to return to the beginning of Marsi’s exegesis: “the Palilia will be (erunt) on the 12th of the calends of May,” he claims, and this is the heart of the matter. Marsi is insinuating a realignment of the calendar.

He gives his audience further “evidence,” asserting, “should these reasons not be convincing, let me add others” (sed haec nihil valeant, afferantur aliae rationes). He brings in authoritative witnesses that culminate in empirical observation for support, but he does not specify his sources:

In the indices of the ancient Fasti calendars and in the oldest codices that day is marked as the 20th of April. Nor is this the proof; let us finally put our trust in the marble fragments, where the day has been inscribed thus.

In indicibus Fastorum veterum et codicibus vetustissimis xx die Aprilis festum illud notatum est. Nec his creditur; credatur tandem marmoribus, in quibus eodem die idem inscriptum est.

There is no mention of which manuscripts Marsi looked at, if indeed any, and he alludes to epigraphical evidence that is seemingly non-existent.
Marsi saves his most trusted explanation for last, however, relying on Ovid himself. Marsi declares that he will tally the days in Ovid in consecutive order, and by counting the dates from April 13 to the end of the month, he will demonstrate that the Palilia does fall on the 20th:

What does Ovid say next? “On the following day make for safe harbors, sailor” [4.625], and this stands for the 14th day of the month. Next he says “When the third light has dawned after Venus’s Ides, make a sacrifice, priests, with a forda cow” [629–30]. That means the third day from the Ides, that is, the 15th day of the month. Lest anyone hem and haw and laugh as though I talk nonsense, because by this method I am taking you all the way to the end of the month and showing you that it is so and can’t be otherwise, [note that] Ovid says next: “Once Cytherea ordered this day to go more quickly, and hurried the heavenly steeds” [cf. 673–74], and here he is still talking about the 15th day of the month, and he appends: “so that as soon as possible on the following day the favorable signs would give the august youth the title of command” [cf. 675–76] and designates the 16th day. Next he says, “But when your fourth Light-bringer looks back on the Ides that have just passed, on this night the Hyades occupy Dōris” [cf. 677–78], and he reveals that this is likewise the 16th day, for counting four days from the 13th will be the 16th. There follows next “when the third light has risen after the Hyades’ departure, the Circus will have horses separated in the starting gates” [679–80], and this means on the third day from the Hyades’ setting. So that will be the 18th day of the month of April. . . . Then “Night has gone, and Aurora comes up. I am asked for the Parilia” [721], and this stands for the 20th day. Is this enough, or do you wish me to say more? Or have I not calculated correctly? No indeed, if one doesn’t calculate the days as I have done, he will upset the whole order.

Quid postea? “Luce secutra tutos pete, navita, portus” [4.625], et significat xiii diem mensis. Deinde “Tertia post Veneris cum lux surrexerit Idus, / pontifices, forda sacra litate bove” [629–30]. Significat tertio die ab idibus, hoc est xv die mensis. Ne quis tergiversetur et rideat tanquam vana loquamus, quia hac ratione deducam vos usque ad finem mensis constareque faciam

30. “Let us cull from passages in Ovid, and so that we can’t be misled, let us start from the Ides. We know that that day is the 13th of April: ‘Jupiter takes possession of April’s Ides with the cognomen Victor.’” (. . . colligamus ex poetae locis et ne decipi possimus, incipiamus ab Idibus. Certum est illam diem esse tertiam decimam mensis Aprilis “Occupat Aprilis Idus cognomine Victor Iuppiter” [621–22]).

Marsi succeeds at his task by combining the 16th and the 17th of April into the 16th, thus moving the founding of Rome up one day.31

Marsi has dealt plausibly with a passage in Ovid, 4.673–78, that has puzzled modern critics. In his commentary and edition, Bömer initially goes about solving this dating by counting from the Ides of April as Marsi does. In that case luce secutura (625) must mean the day after the Ides, that is, the 14th of April, and Tertia lux (629) the 15th. Quartus Lucifer (677) should accordingly be the 16th; however, this does not correspond with what we know from the Julian calendar, namely, that the setting of the Hyades occurred on the 17th. Ovid had spoken of luce sequenti two lines earlier, on 675; should this not be accepted as the 16th, sequentially speaking? Although luce sequenti and quartus Lucifer ought to refer to the same day simply in terms of the Latin prose, the calendar is returned to the correct alignment only if they are interpreted as the 16th and the 17th respectively. The Cerialia then falls correctly on the 19th, tertia lux post Hyadas, and the rest of the month is synchronized.32

Marsi accepts Ovid’s literal meaning, counting luce sequenti (l. 675) and quartus Lucifer (l. 677) two times as the 16th. This allows him going forward to arrive at a date of April 20 for the Palilia. Marsi has succeeded in substantiating a date which he had trouble proving earlier on, and his logic here is not out of line. Of course, in the meantime he has misdated certain

32. Bömer, 2:262–3. Fantham (1998, 219) agrees that Quartus Lucifer (l. 677) heralds April 16, but she calls this “poetic dating” to solve the discrepancy between the Republican and Julian calendars caused by Caesar’s addition of a day to the month. By combining two days into one, Ovid is able to celebrate the Cerialia on April 19.
Chapter Five

events, such as the horse races which took place during the Cerealia on April 19. Moreover, if he continues with his own professed logic of counting the days until the end of the month, he will have only twenty-nine days instead of thirty.

Nonetheless he assures his audience how “easily it will be apparent when the end of the month is reached” (quod facile cognoscetur, cum ad finem usque prosecuti erimus). He fudges a date of April 28 for the Robigalia (F. 901), and he subsequently misinterprets the sun’s thrice rising in the heavens and the ongoing games in celebration of the Flora (F. 943–44) to mean a single date of April 30, three days from the Robigalia.

Marsi achieved his goal. But why was he so adamant about changing the date of the Palilia from April 21 to April 20? The clue is partially provided by his subsequent remark:

Therefore let it be agreed by all and especially by the members of the Academy that the Palilia and birthday of Rome falls on April 20, a day which this literary sodality most solemnly observes, since it is the feast day of the most holy martyrs Victor, Fortunatus, and Genesius, the patrons of our Academy. And therefore this day is celebrated by all of the faithful [members].

Constet ergo omnibus et nostrae in primis Academiae xx die Aprilis esse Palilia et natalem urbis, quem diem sodalitas nostra litteraria religiosissime colat, propter festum sanctissimorum martyrorum Victoris, Fortunati, et Genesii eiusdem sodalitatis protectorum, quod eodem die a fidelibus cunctis celebratur.

Once the Roman Academy was reinstated under papal control in 1479, it needed a religious overtone. The selection of the feast day of the three martyrs Victor, Fortunatus, and Genesius, falling conveniently only a day before April 21, is not accidental. The names Victor and Fortunatus, evocative of ancient Roman temples or shrines to Victory and Fortune, suggest the favored destiny of Rome. The name of St. Genesius might have

33. “In medio cursu tempora veris erunt” [902]; et demonstrat vigesimum octavum diem mensis.

34. This is pope Victor I, native of Africa, whose feast day falls on July 28 in the church calendar, although there are attestations to April 20 in some martyrologies. See Monachino (1969), cols. 1281–85.
etymological echoes for the birth, i.e. genesis, of Rome. De Rossi noted also that the combined feast day of these three saints was not a traditional or well-known one; it occurs only in the Martyrologio Usuardi. He highlights the figure of St. Genesius in particular, a mime actor in Rome who converted to Christianity and was martyred during the persecutions under Domitian. The choice of St. Genesius as a patron saint for the Roman Academy would have been quite appropriate, since under Leto the Academy revived the reading and production of ancient Roman drama. In fact, students performed from Plautus and Terence during the Palilia celebrations, and Antonio Volsco’s Fasti manuscript contains many references to those two dramatists.

It is unclear how many times the Roman Academy celebrated the Palilia on April 20, other than in 1483. The following year, the ceremony took place on April 21. If the date of April 20 did not always remain steadfast, the association with St. Victor certainly did, underscoring the importance of a “day” over a “date.” For this, there is evidence in the student miscellany, Ottob. lat. 1982. The feast of St. Victor is cited in combination with the dies natalis, found in the calendar on fol. 79r. The same person who annotated the Fasti on fols. 71v–73v has marked this April commemoration, and he transcribed the epitaph for Andrea Brenta on fols. 79v–80v as well. Since Brenta died in February 1484, it is logical to assume that the calendrical notation of Rome’s birthday on fol. 79r was written in 1483. Although no specific date is mentioned, Victor is represented, the patron saint for whom Marsi argued in his Fasti commentary. The names of saints Fortunatus and Genesius seem to have fallen away, probably out of convenience.

In his Fasti christianae religionis, a composition emulating Ovid but chronicling the feasts of the liturgical year, Ludovico Lazzarelli explains how the Palilia is still honored in the Christian calendar. In the early 1480s, Lazzarelli was in Rome and had found friends and mentors in Leto’s Academy. He gives his explanation of the Palilia in a passage marked as April 22 (Lux decima at Maias praeceedat laeta kalendas). He recounts the joy at

35. De Rossi (1890, 89). See also Lanciani (1892, 360).
38. Corfiati (2003, 251) believes that Lazzarelli arrived in Rome in 1479 with his then-patron Lorenzo Zane; previous scholars have given a date of 1473. Cf. Arbizzoni (2005, 181–82). For a succinct summary of scholarship on Lazzarelli, see the introduction in Moreschini (2009); for a good overview of Lazzarelli’s life and work, see Saci (1999).
39. Lazzarelli began his Fasti christianae religionis in 1469 or shortly thereafter. The verses concerning the Palilia were written most likely at the end of 1483 or beginning of 1484. See Fritsen
the observance of Rome’s founding, now as then (Nos ad laetitiam condita Roma vocat, / gaudebant festa veteres hac luce Quirites). After declaring that the birth of Christian Rome, site of the new Jerusalem, surpasses that of pagan Rome, Lazzarelli describes which saint is now honored, and whose patron he is:

The same day that restores the [ancient] rites is present for you, Victor, when you, Victor, have the annual tribute for your death. On this observed day the Palilia has retreated: now the day which had bestowed its honors on Pales has you, Victor. Rome worships you on the Esquiline; the dear society of poets ahead of others assembles at the altars and worships you. Grant them the everlasting honor of the laurel leaf! You, Victor, have the rank of both Apollo and Bacchus.


Now it is St. Victor who awards the laurel crown at the poetry competition, and St. Victor who presides over the accompanying banquet, a clear allusion to the celebration of Rome’s birthday that was first sanctioned in 1483. In fact, the sodality was renamed Societas Literatorum S. Victoris in Esquiliis after its reform under the authority of the Church.\(^40\)

THE OLD AND NEW ROME

Lazzarelli’s Fasti invites the question, How religious did the poetry composed by antiquarians in this period become? Did the statutes and privileges, set up in the papacy of Sixtus IV and watched over by his brother, Cardinal Domenico della Rovere, really effect an atmosphere of intellectual

---

\(^40\) With variations in the title; De Rossi (1890, 85) gives this particular example.
stagnation and turn the reinstated Roman Academy into nothing more than a “religious confraternity,” as Egmont Lee has suggested. What was the position of Roman humanists who—allowing for differences in individual reactions—were caught between ancient pagan and modern Christian Rome?

The dilemma is not unlike that faced by Ovid, composing his Fasti under the emperor Augustus. Lazzarelli has been shown to exhibit “a kind of anxiety of Ovidian influence,” negotiating a balance between his classical model, the Fasti, and his polemics, the Christian faith. For example, Lazzarelli reminds the triumphant city of its former deception by the pagan gods to whom it offered sacrifice, gods who had been brought in from elsewhere. He lists and describes the transferred deities (Saturn, Hercules, the Trojan Penates) in language that is reminiscent of the Fasti, however.

In a primitively drawn miniature in his autograph manuscript, Lazzarelli has depicted his Muse presenting the Fasti christianae religionis to Sixtus IV, who is shown in papal tiara. An accompanying verses declares, “I humbly kiss the ground at your holy feet, / Sixtus, and I give to you the work of my excessive toil” (Ante pedes sacros humilis figo oscula terrae, / Sixte, tibi immodici doque laboris opus). As Lazzarelli had been stranded in Rome when his employer, Lorenzo Zane, newly elected papal legate to the Turks, journeyed to the East, he now approached the pope for literary patronage. On fol. 2r, above a miniature portraying Lazzarelli speaking to his Muse, the poet writes, “Certainly Sixtus will be able to stop cruel fate and shift the course of the uncivilized menace which has thundered forth” (Sixtus enim poterit crudelia sistere fata / et mutare feras quae tonuere minas). Using wordplay (Sixtus / sistere), he pleads for a change in his fortunes while he praises the pope’s ability to curb the pagan tide. Lazzarelli glorifies his sought-out patron on many occasions throughout the poem, portraying Sixtus IV as the leader of Rome’s urban and spiritual renewal, as alter Augustus in terms clearly reminiscent of Ovid (Tu quoque templorum positor reparator et urbis fol. 201r; cf. Fasti 2.63).

---

41. Lee (1978, 204).
42. Miller (2003, 179).
43. Tu vanis, heu, Roma, deis decepta, litabas / translatos venerans numina vana deos. / Cum Carmente dei venerunt Arcades olim / . . . (fol. 163v of the autograph manuscript). For Lazzarelli’s four examples of transferred divinities, Miller (2003, 182) cites Fasti 2.279 and 5.644: 1.233–36; 5.645; and 1.527–28 and 4.77–78 for comparison.
44. Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 2853, fol. 3r.
45. The miniature is reproduced as figure 3a in the appendix of Schröter (1980). On fol. 246v of Lazzarelli’s autograph manuscript, a version of the dedication to Sixtus IV (ante pedes sacros) appears again.
The theme of Sixtus IV as *alter Augustus* is a well-attested literary conceit, one that Sixtus himself approved of. In his epigram *De urbe Roma a Sixto iterum condita*, Roman Academy member Aurelio Lippo Brandolini writes that before Sixtus, Rome was no longer a city but a cadaver (*non urbs, iam Roma cadaver erat*), but the pope “established a new Rome; he gave back the city its beauty” (*... Romam immo condidit ipse novam; / redidit hic urbi formam...*, ll. 28–29). Repeating the famous analogy of Suetonius (*Aug.* 28.3) that Augustus found Rome a city of bricks but left it in marble, Giannantonio Campano writes in an epigram to Pietro Riario: “the Rome of Augustus which through the ages was of brick / the reign of Sixtus has now turned into marble” (*Cocilis Augusti fuerat per saecula Roma: / Nunc Sixti factiunt tempora marmoream, ll. 1–2*). This does not mean that everyone associated with the Academy and Roman humanism in general approved of the pope’s renewal of Rome. Evangelista Fausto Maddalenì Capodiferro, for example, criticized the reuse of ancient stone, such as bits of the Colosseum fitted for the building of the Ponte Sisto.

Nonetheless, humanists very frequently flattered Sixtus IV, and they looked to him for literary patronage in the same way that Ovid may have looked to Augustus or Germanicus. Brandolini praised Sixtus IV for his creation of the Vatican Library, which surpassed ancient Rome’s Palatine Library, and he compared the Vatican itself to a home of the Muses. Sixtus supported a broad spectrum of learning, even if his own literary interests were limited to theology. To say that antiquarian intellectual pursuits became religious, and the Roman Academy a dull institution when it was reinstated under Sixtus IV, is an overstatement. Instead, the relationship between the humanists and the papacy was symbiotic.

For the nature of the relationship, one might further note Lazzarelli’s revisions in his autograph *Fasti* composition. They reveal his constant search for patrons between 1482 and 1484, and they suggest the frustration he would have felt at the pope’s death on August 12, 1484. In his working draft Lazzarelli looked not only to Sixtus but also to the Aragonese rulers of Naples (*I, mea Musa, precor, regem pete Parthenopeum, / Ferdinandus est gloria summa ducum*, fol. 175r; 182r) and the French king Charles VIII (*I...*)

---

50. Lee (1978, 201), cataloging Sixtus’s reading list, notes that it did not transcend “in subject matter or approach, the fields of Church history, Canon law, or scholastic philosophy and theology.”
mea Gallorum regem pete Musa verendum, / qui tenet a magno nobile nomen / avo / Carolus . . . fol. 175r). Among drafts of dedications on fol. 178r, Lazzarelli has scribbled ten lines of verse that begin,

Sweet sodality, oh most famous band of poets,
you who have established the fountain of the Muses on the Esquiline,
take the concluded little books as my pledge,
accept this work for judgment with an impartial heart.

Dulce sodalitium turba o celeberrima vatum,
Castaliam Exquiliis qui statuistis aquam,
suscipite exactos haec pignora nostra libellos,
librandum aequo animo suscipite istud opus.

This passage should be read in conjunction with a set of verses on the flyleaf: “Sacred throng of allied poets, the reason why Rome is brilliant, I send you these books in the original. There is no need to direct my poem to Clarian Apollo; what the band of poets approves, even Apollo himself approves” (Sacra sodalitii vatuum qua Roma coruscat / Turba, tibi archetypos hos ego mitto libros. / Non opus est Clario mea mittere carmina Phoebou; / Quae chorus iste probat Phoebus et ipse probat). The sodality of poets to whom Lazzarelli refers is of course the Roman Academy, who not only read his work, but had also suggested a range of dedicatees. A list of the humanists’ names appears in the April verses celebrating Rome’s birthday, and many of these humanists later congratulated Lazzarelli on his composition. A Yale manuscript of the Fasti christianae religionis has thirteen poems appended in Lazzarelli’s honor, verses written by Bartolomeo Platina, Sulpizio da Veroli, Paolo Marsi, and Aurelio Brandolini, among others. The antiquarians were the real audience for Lazzarelli’s Fasti imitation; Lazzarelli intended them to be his definitive readership. Of course, as dual recipients of the poem, Leto’s circle and the pope did share a common

51. Dedications to Ferdinand of Aragon, King of Naples, and his son Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, appear also on fol. 173r and 178r. A deluxe copy of the Fasti christianae religionis made for Ferdinand of Aragon and his son is preserved in New Haven, CT, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS 391, and two manuscripts for Charles VIII are in San Severino Marche, Biblioteca Comunale, MSS 3 (CCV) fasc. 1, and 207 (IV) fasc. 3. See Fritsen (2001).
52. Lazzarelli tells the rulers of Aragon that he submitted his work “to a number of learned men for reading and perusal” (libros . . . legendos complurimis doctisissimis viris proposui) and that “each and every one added his opinion about the work’s dedication” (addebatque de dicando opere quilibet suam sententiam); MS 391, fols. 2v–3r. Lazzarelli is referring to the dulce sodalitium to whom he had given his draft. The list of Roman Academy members was continually revised by Lazzarelli.
bond in their conviction that the old and the new Rome were part of a continuum. Both groups shared a belief in Rome’s inevitable hegemony, its political destiny based upon former greatness. In his Fasti commentary (1.582), Marsi had reported with enthusiasm the unearthing of a colossal bronze statue of Hercules during the destruction of a temple near the Ara Maxima. This statue later formed part of Sixtus’s collection donated to the Capitol, in a calculated, symbolic display that the curia now dominated the former municipal heart of Rome. Under the auspice of papal authority, Rome’s medieval symbol of a lion was being replaced with the wolf and other similar reminders of the city’s mythic origins and ancient pedigree. Henceforth the Capitoline was transformed from a communal center into a Christian cosmopolis, or empire.\textsuperscript{53}

In the decades following the papacy’s return from Avignon to Rome, humanists too began to regard their city as the inheritor of imperium.\textsuperscript{54} Paolo Marsi himself regarded the Capitol as one of the seven wonders of the world, which he confidently predicted would last until eternity.\textsuperscript{55} When Marsi stopped along the coasts of the Adriatic and Mediterranean on his journey to Spain in 1468, he beheld all the sights with distinctly Roman eyes. Addressing the Syracusans in verse, he claimed that he and his employer, Bernardo Bembo, had come “to see in all lands the monuments / of our ancient leaders, monuments of our ancestors” (veterum monumenta ducum, monumenta parentum / omnibus in terris cernere) and the citadel “where formerly the Roman fathers prospered” (quondam Romani quo viguere patres).\textsuperscript{56} It is specifically the bias of Roman imperial culture that colored Marsi’s outlook on ancient ruins. This bias is evident in his description of the Croatian city Pula, “which formerly was called Pietas Julia” (que quondam Pietas Julia dicta fuit). Pula became a stronghold of Caesar between 46 and 45 BC, and after the commander’s death and the transition to Octavian’s reign, the city came to be called Pietas Julia Pola.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{53} See Miglio (1982).
\textsuperscript{54} For the development of this idea in the Renaissance, see especially Stinger (1998). Note chapter 5, “The Renovatio Imperii and the Renovatio Romae.”
\textsuperscript{55} “The famous seven wonders of the entire world are praised / and recounted by our ancient fathers. / . . . / As greatest is boasted the Capitol of exalted Rome / and its glory will live to the very last day” (inclyta laudantur toto miracula septem / orbe per antiquos enumerata patres. / . . . / Maxima iactantur celsae Capitolia Romae / gloria et extremum vivet adusque diem). In “Ad illustrem don Herricum de regali palatio Hispalensi” of the Bembica peregrina (Bembice), Vatican City, BAV, Reg. lat. 1385, fol. 28v. The Capitol had already entered the canon of mirabilia in some late antique and medieval sources; the “Romanization” of the seven wonders is a distinct product of imperial tendencies. See Lanowski (1965), cols. 1020–30, and Madonna (1976).
\textsuperscript{56} In “Senatus Populoque Syracusio Marsus et Cronicus,” fol. 8r of the Bembice.
\textsuperscript{57} Tamaro (1971, 17); Girardi-Jurkíc (1986, 17).
The Augustan period heralded a phase of grand architectural construction, transforming Pula into a proper imperial city. Marsi enthusiastically reports, “you might see as testimony the arch of parian marble” (\textit{Aspicias arcus pario de marmore testes}), referring to the triumphal arch of the Sergii, erected in honor of three brothers, civil and military functionaries, after the victory at Actium.\textsuperscript{58} As is often the case with imposing ruins, however, the monuments were a reminder to Marsi of former Roman greatness. At the end of his poetical description of Pula, he laments,

\begin{quote}
When shall it pass that you return to your glory
progenitor Rome? Would that former honors might be restored
and all your former power, illustrious Rome;
may you extend your embrace to the ruled world again.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Quando erit ut redeas ad decus ipsa tuum}

\textit{Roma parens? Utinam prisci referantur honores}

\textit{et quicquid poteras, inclyta Roma, prius;}

\textit{regnatis iterum pandas tua brachia terris.} (ll. 20–23)\textsuperscript{59}
\end{quote}

Marsi held Rome to be the rightful heir of \textit{imperium}, of former imperial glory.

Marsi and the humanists in Rome believed not only in the city’s cultural \textit{imperium} but also in its linguistic \textit{imperium}, a conviction whose origin and strength can be traced to Lorenzo Valla. From his \textit{Fasti} commentary, we know that Marsi wanted to follow in Valla’s footsteps.\textsuperscript{60} For Valla, the Latin language was a medium of commerce, a mercantile method of exchange whereby Rome might pass on her values, her cultural and spiritual goods, to other nations.\textsuperscript{61} According to Valla in his remarks in the 1440 \textit{Elegantiae}, “there is the Roman Empire, where the Roman language rules” (\textit{Romanum Imperium ibi esse, ubi Romana lingua dominatur}).\textsuperscript{62} He elaborated on and extended this claim in his 1455 inaugural lecture at the University of Rome. In the published \textit{Oratio in principio [sui] studii}, the humanist argued,
... it seems to me that holy religion and true learning coexist, and where there is not the one there cannot be the other, and because our religion is eternal, so Latin letters will be eternal.

... mihi videntur religio sancta et vera litteratura pariter habitare et ubique altera non est, illic neque altera esse posse et quia religio nostra eterna, etiam latina litteratura eterna fore.

The humanist who earlier had attacked the temporal claims of the Church through the Donation of Constantine now held that the Christian empire of Rome and its language, with all the concomitant benefits for civilization, were geographically co-extensive. Valla’s new emphasis was that Latin letters and the arts flourished thanks to the authority of the Apostolic See. As to the decline in learning in Asia and Africa in particular, Valla claimed that this happened “because the Latin language was expelled with the imperium; consequently all the good arts were in like manner expelled and barbarism took its former hold” (quia lingua latina cum imperio eicta est, ideo omnes bone artes pariter eictae sunt et pristina barbaries rediit in possessionem).63

The idea that Christian Rome had transmitted Latin culture, which was ultimately ousted from Africa, is repeated in Marsi’s poem in the Bembice dedicated “To Saint Augustine in Africa in the city of Hippona on his feast day and at his temple on August 28, 1468” (“Oratio ad Divum Augustinum in Aphrica et urbe Hipponae in eius die festo ad eiusdem templum v. kalendis septembribus 1468”). In his own kind of Christian Fasti, and representing his interest in the recurring rites of the Roman calendrical year, Marsi writes:64

At length we moored our bark on the sands of Hippona
and the barbarous shore was pressed with Latin imprint.
You were once bishop and most distinguished father of this clime,
and the Barbary Coast bowed to your eloquence.

Nothing but the name of Christ was honored,
religion was spread widely through your speech
and your name was illustrious over all the earth.

---

63. Rizzo, 79; text of Oratio, 198.
64. Fols. 12r–12v.
Marsi plays on the cultural and geographical meaning of *barbaries*.\(^{65}\) Clearly, in Marsi’s opinion the Church Father and model of Christian Latin eloquence St. Augustine had spread Christian religion and classical letters simultaneously in coastal North Africa.

In attempts to reconcile a curriculum of classical, “pagan” authors with the Christian faith, it was in fact the very example of the Church Fathers, who had been trained in Roman rhetoric, that the humanists often employed. Antonio Costanzi, for example, takes the time in the preface of his *Fasti* commentary to defend Ovid against the theologians who do not understand that they themselves with a degree of impiety oppose Saints Augustine, Lactantius, and Eusebius, the holiest of men, who borrowed both liturgies and eloquence from our ancestors and so added a certain splendor and beauty to our religion.

\[non\ inteligunt\ se\ non\ sine\ impietate\ quadam\ divo\ Augustino,\ Lactantio,\ Eusebio\ atque\ alii\ praeterea,\ viris\ sanctissimis,\ adversari,\ qui\ a\ maioribus\ nostris\ et\ ceremonias\ et\ dicendi\ copiam\ mutuati\ religioni\ nostrae\ splendorem\ quendam\ ac\ pulchritudinem\ adierunt.\]

Furthermore, the Augustinian ideal of a new City of God, that earthly restoration of the heavenly realm, would not have been lost on Marsi.\(^{66}\) Flavio Biondo had already earlier dedicated his antiquarian interests to the service of a renovated papal Rome, declaring in the proemium of the *Roma Triumphans* (1459), addressed to Pius II,

---

\(^{65}\) See the entry in *Firmini Verris Dictionarius. Dictionnaire Latin-Français de Fermin Le Ver*, ed. B. Merrilees and W. Edwards (Turnholt: Brepols, 1994), 41. This lexicon is dateable to 1440 and is therefore an accurate reflection of contemporary linguistic usage.

\(^{66}\) For an account of the importance of Augustine in the age of humanism, see Kristeller (1969, esp. 362–64) for the classical ideal that Augustine and other Church Fathers represented. Something of the popularity of *The City of God* in Italy can be gauged by the holdings in the Vatican Library, documented by Buonocore (1996).
And so I tried to see if I could place and submit before the eyes and mind of the men of our age, who are robust in talent and learning, Rome flourishing in just the manner Augustine wished to see it triumph, acting as a mirror, example, image, and lesson of every virtue and correct, blessed, and happy living.  

Itaque coepimus tentare si speculum, exemplar, imaginem, doctrinam et omnis virtutis et bene, sancte ac foeliciter vivendi rationis, Urbem Romam florentem ac qualem beatus Aurelius Augustinus triumphan tem videre desideravit, nostrorum hominum ingenio et doctrina valentinum, oculis et menti subitcere ac proponere poterimus.

Marsi no less visualized the ruins of Rome within the context of a great Christian empire. He equated ancient Rome and its colonies with the Renaissance seat of the papacy and Christian religion, as is evident in his lament for the basilica at Hippo Regius, in whose apse the cathedra of St. Augustine had stood. Wanting to see what was left (et cupimus templi sacra videre tui), Marsi apostrophizes:

Carthage your parent bore you, Hippona received you,  
on this soil were temples consecrated to you.  
Oh unspeakable crime, oh ignominy of our age!  
Now they have fallen into ruin, the vegetation and shade of the woods cover them.  
Woe, this nation adverse to such a great parent destroyed them, and the Berber stranger has oppressed your flock.  
A faithless nation is insensible now to a faithful people, and there is no love of Roman religion.

Te peperit Cartago parens, Hippona recepit  
hocque dicata tibi templa fuere solo.  
Heu scelus infandum, heu nostri dedecus aevi!  
diruta nunc silvae gramen et umbra regit,  
diruit heu tanto gens haec adversa parenti  
derpaesitque tuas barbarus hostis oves.  
Perfida gens populo nunc est insensa fidei  
nullus et Ausoniae religionis amor. (ll. 27–34)

In his reaction to the crumbled church in Hippona, Marsi betrays his preconceived notions. He travels with a cultural bias that is both classical and Christian.\textsuperscript{69}

**PROPAGANDA FOR THE CHURCH**

Antonio Costanzi likewise believed in the political supremacy of Rome and the sovereignty of the Church. While Marsi visualized Numidian Africa as a colony of Rome, Costanzi did not have to go as far afield. For Costanzi, the March of Ancona belonged in Rome’s orbit. He dedicated his *Fasti* commentary and antiquarian research to the interests of the Church and to the protection of Fano.

Costanzi made three trips to Rome, where first-hand contact with the City surely sealed his opinion of her cultural superiority. His first trip came about as a result of meeting the emperor Frederick III, who stopped in Fano on his way to Rome, where he was to discuss measures against the Turks with the pope. Costanzi gave a welcome oration in Fano on December 17, 1468, which so impressed the emperor that he invited Costanzi to join his entourage. In Rome, the emperor then knighted Costanzi and crowned him poet laureate.\textsuperscript{70} At the death of Pope Paul II on July 26, 1471, Costanzi, now a member of the *Consiglio dei Cento*, was sent as Fano’s ambassador to the College of Cardinals. It is this second trip to which Costanzi refers in his comment on the Janus temple at *Fasti* 1.245. Costanzi spent several months in curial circles, pressing suits on behalf of Fano’s communal independence against the lord of Rimini, Roberto Malatesta, and on September 1 he was joined by two other prominent orators to congratulate the newly elected Sixtus IV and to remind him of papal protection and responsibility toward Fano.\textsuperscript{71} Costanzi’s final trip to Rome occurred in April 1474, a diplomatic mission to prevent Fano from becoming, like its neighbor Senigallia, a papal vicariate under Sixtus’s nephew Giovanni della Rovere.\textsuperscript{72}

---

\textsuperscript{69} Pomponio Leto undoubtedly also influenced Marsi; his published walking tours of Rome (*Excerpta*) betray an interest in Christian as well as classical topography. Moreover, a mix of Christian elements are present in the Varro *De lingua Latina* student lecture notes from 1484–45, Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3415. See Accame (2008, 174–75) and Accame Lanzilotta (2000, 80).

\textsuperscript{70} Formichetti (1984, 371).

\textsuperscript{71} Castaldi (1916, 287–88). Compare the communal records from August 23, 1471, which say about Costanzi *omnes . . . comendaverunt [sic] solertiiam et diligentiam oratoris predicti* (288, fn. 2), with Costanzi’s remark at *Fasti* 1.245, *cum ad urbem me contulissem orator misus a senatu Fanensi ad Sixtum iiiii Pontificem Maximum*. Sixtus IV was elected pope on August 23.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 292.
Costanzi’s commentary is dedicated to Federico da Montefeltro, not only as literary and artistic patron of the Court of Urbino but also as condottiere. Federico normally rendered his military services on short term and to the highest bidder. For example, he fought both on behalf of Florence (1469) and against Florence (1479) in the wars against the papacy. But when it came to the Malatesta family, especially Sigismondo—his peer, neighbor, fellow condottiere, and most bitter rival—Federico was a staunch ally of the pope, who promoted him to Captain General of the Church in 1462.73

Federico da Montefeltro and Pope Pius II both had their reasons for feuding with Sigismondo Malatesta, and thus they came to a unanimous accord. The contest between Federico and Sigismondo began in 1444 and centered on territory. Sigismondo’s holdings included the coastal cities of Fano, Senigallia, and Rimini. Federico wanted access to the Adriatic; Sigismondo challenged Federico’s right to rule as Lord of Urbino.74 The two princes were also rivals when it came to lifestyle. For his part, Pius favored Federico. The latter’s personal conduct and his synthesis of Christianity and antiquity fell more in line with the tastes and preference of the pope. Sigismondo had a reputation for violence and perversion, and he leaned too much to paganism.75

In the years 1459–63, Pius increasingly stripped Sigismondo of his territories.76 The antagonism culminated in 1462. In April, Pius actually canonized Sigismondo to Hell and burned him in effigy in Rome.77 Battles ensued in the summer; Sigismondo occupied Senigallia on August 12, 1462, but was routed by the papal troops of Federico the very next day. The final conflict took place in Fano on September 25, 1463, when Sigismondo capitulated to the army of Federico. A few weeks later Senigallia and other towns fell. Sigismondo was left with the sole holding of Rimini, which was preserved for him by the peace treaty.78

Costanzi finds cause to celebrate the successful siege of Fano at Fasti 1.691, a verse on keeping the fields free from darnel, a weedy grass that can damage the eyes if eaten. “Darnel (loliun),” Costanzi says,

---

74. Ibid., 28.
75. Ibid., 30, 35–41.
77. Pius drew on slander from a letter by Federico that had circulated sixteen years before. Federico was present at the burnings of straw effigies in Rome, but he believed that the pope had gone too far (Pernis and Adams 2003, 29, 34).
mixed with grain, will both harm the eyes and induce sleep. The famous scientist and physician Mario dei Bartolelli, and the luster and pride of Fano’s nobility Ugolino Palazzi, explained this... when the troops of the Supreme Pontiff Pius II were besieging my home Fanum Fortunae, with you [Federico] acting as Captain General. Indeed [the effect] was possible to see in all the crossroads, throughout the streets, in the marketplace, in common places of business, when deep slumber had taken by surprise those sleepers who had eaten bread corrupted by darnel.

It would seem that part of Fano’s success was due to an experiment involving bread, laced with darnel, proffered to Sigismondo’s soldiers.79

These events form the background for Costanzi’s dedicatory preface. Addressing Federico of Urbino, he writes:

Who indeed is more worthy of the title of these commentaries, which for the most part dwell on roman affairs? For not to mention that which among the citizens of Fano no stretch of time, no forgetfulness will ever erase, Fanum Fortunae, my native home and a celebrated Roman colony, was restored by you to the dominion of the Supreme Pontiff Pius II.

Quis enim te dignior horum commentariorum titulo, ubi magna ex parte de rebus Romanis agitur? Nam ut taceam id quod apud Fanenses nulla temporis longitudo, nulla unquam delebit oblivio, redactum abs te Fanum Fortunae,

79. Pietro Mario Bartolelli was born into a merchant family that dealt in spices. He was a civic humanist with interest in the works of (among others) Petrarch, Poggio Bracciolini, and Leonardo Bruni. He most likely taught as well as practiced medicine. See Uguccioni (2001, 14–16). Mario had an equally learned brother, Giovanni Peruzzo dei Bartolelli, nicknamed doxa (“glory”), who was a mathematician, mapmaker, architect, medalist, and mechanical engineer; see ibid., and Battistelli (1998, xviii). Costanzi refers to Giovanni at F. 4.422 (Perutius Doxa Fanensis, vir acri ingenio admirandoque qui omnes totius orbis provincias separatim expinxit). Giovanni designed a port in Fano in 1478 (is est quem anno salutis Mcccclxxviii senatus Fanensis triumvirum legit portui designando, qui nunc me quaestore magna impensa ad Ar[z]illam flumen extruitur). Ugolini Palazzi commanded Fano’s military again in 1473 (Guarnieri 1961, 124).
patrem meam, non incelebrem coloniam Romanorum, in Pii Secundi summi
Pontificis ditionem.

Since they concern Rome, the Fasti are appropriate to the history of Fano, which has returned to Roman, that is papal, sway. The proper dedicatee is subsequently Federico, Rome’s allied commander and military savior of Fano. The Fasti is a mirror of Roman dominance, recurrent and inevitable.

Costanzi expresses an intimately personal political preference. Sigismondo Malatesta had invited Costanzi to teach in Fano early on in his career, but Costanzi rejected the offer for a post in the Dalmatian city of Arbe, which was autonomous. He did not return to Fano until Sigismondo’s defeat in 1463, when he was recalled to help negotiate the surrender, according to the author of Costanzi’s funeral oration. Costanzi is frequently referred to as libertatis amator in this oration. Libertas is shorthand for libertas ecclesiastica, or Liberty under the Church; in effect, Fano traded one authority for another. At Sigismondo’s defeat, Fano, a signoria or subject commune, reverted to direct papal lordship. The papal overlord was in many ways comparable to the foreign signori, who as outsiders installed a small number of representative officials or troops in the territories under their control. This allowed for a greater degree of communal autonomy than the local ruling families did; usually the pre-existing engines of government were allowed to stay in place. Nevertheless, Fano was still a satellite of Rome, an outlying province of the Papal States, as Costanzi himself makes clear in the Fasti preface. He strikes a delicate balance, advocating Fano’s relative independence compared to its neighbors while still inside the spheres of the Church.

Within both the text of his commentary and the preface, Costanzi treats the Fasti allegorically in order to uphold the political supremacy of the Church. In his remarks at 4.954 he enters into a combined antiquarian and political digression. He describes a local historical landmark, the

---

80. Formichetti (1984, 371). Costanzi’s rejection of Sigismondo is better understood in light of Sigismondo’s father Pandolfo. In 1405 Fano successfully petitioned Pandolfo Malatesta and then enjoyed relative autonomy. Councilors represented the city and were modestly involved in finances (raising loans, farming taxes), legislation (presenting and hearing petitions), and security (organizing defense, granting troops, sending ambassadors). New councilors were even elected locally instead of appointed. See Jones (1960, 224–26).


82. For a clear analysis of the ruling families and forms of government in the Papal States, see Law (1981).
Arch of Fano, which was erected in 9 BC in the reign of Augustus and marked the Via Flaminia at the western entrance into Fano. The frieze on the upper portico of the arch was partially destroyed during the city’s siege by Federico of Urbino in 1463. In his 1480 manuscript Costanzi records the inscription that afterwards remained visible (see figure 9): “they were bronze and gilded letters almost a foot long, which were appropriate to the majesty of such a great emperor, and of his achievement” (erant enim aeneae litterae atque aurate pedali fere altitudine ac tanti imperatoris maiestati atque operis congruentes).

IMP. CAESAR. DIVI. F. AVGVSSTVS. PONTIFEX. MAXIMVS. COS. XIII. TRIBVNICIAE POTESTATIS. XXXII. IMP. XXVI. PATER PATRIAE. MVRVM. DEDIT. CVRANTE. L. TVRCIO. SECVNDNO. APRONIANI. PRAEF. VRB. FIL. ASTERIO. V. C. CORR. FLAM. ET. PICENI.

In the reproduction of the inscription Costanzi follows the tradition of the famous antiquarian Ciriaco d’Ancona, one of his boyhood teachers, who in 1423 recorded the original and undestroyed text of the arch. Years later Lorenzo Astemio compared and combined the silloge of Ciriaco and Costanzi so that he could reconstruct the inscription on the arch for his 1505 edition of Urbium, civitatum, oppidorum quaeque alia id genus sunt.83 The exercise in epigraphy attests to Costanzi’s antiquarian bent and can be compared to the insertion and use of inscriptions in the Fasti commentaries by Leto and Marsi.

The arch had been a longtime symbol of local pride in Fano, reproduced for example on medieval seals of the city, and Costanzi’s rendering of its inscription is not without political overtones. Indeed, he imparts a lesson on citizenship with a story about Ciriaco (F. 4.954):

Ciriaco d’Ancona, an illustrious man and a most skillful explorer of antiquity, read the inscription in a large assembly of Fanensian citizens and interpreted it for us boys. While he enthused at greater length, it was just as if the half-buried glory of Fano by his agency came back to life.

Cyriacus ille Anconites, vir inclytus et vetustarum rerum solertissimus indagator, magno Fanensium civium conventu [titulum] legit nobis pueros atque interpretatus est, cum exultaret maiorem in modum perinde ac eius opera semisepulta Fanensium gloria revivisset.

83. Ciriaco’s copied inscription is CIL XI. 2.1, n’6218–6219. See Weiss (1965, 352–54).
Ciriaco d’Ancona had climbed a ladder to transcribe the inscription on
the Arch of Fano, and afterwards, text in hand, had assembled the cit-
izens of Fano to rally them with civic pride and imperial nostalgia. This
act of rousing public allegiance by appealing to a classical monument is
not unlike Cola di Rienzo’s 1344 discovery of the bronze tablet with Ves-
pasian’s lex de imperio (whereby the Roman people invested the emperors
with power) and his political harangue in St. John the Lateran. Cola di
Rienzo wished to make the people sovereign over the Empire, but he also
wanted to restore Rome as caput mundi. Costanzi, for his part, wished to
celebrate that Fano was autonomous, but under the auspices of the Church.

The arch, as mentioned, had been erected at the Via Flaminia in the
reign of Augustus. The emperor had begun restoring the ancient Via Fla-
minia in 27 BC, and had already built a commemorative arch at its very
end, in Rimini. It was probably then that Augustus turned his attention
to Fano and the construction of its gate, as well as its city walls. Augustus’s
interest in Fano was not without reason: he had settled a colony of
his veterans there between 31 BC (the date of the Battle of Actium) and
27 BC. Consequently, the arch in Fano stood at a symbolic location. It
marked the axis of the Via Flaminia, where it ends at the Adriatic coast
and turns north towards Pesaro and Rimini. The arch therefore connected
Rome with her colonies, not only Fano but also Pesaro and Rimini.

Costanzi was well aware of Fano’s history as “a celebrated Roman
colony” (non incelebris colonia Romanorum in the commentary’s preface),
and in his view the ancient Roman colony becomes the precursor of the
contemporary papal colony. Costanzi demonstrates his knowledge of the
Augustan foundation of Fano and understanding of the subsequent politi-
cal significance of its arch in the passage again at the end of Fasti Book 4,
where he recounts:

It is a well-known fact that when Augustus apportioned the roads to be
paved in Italy with money from the victors’ spoils, that Rome might more
easily be accessed from all points, he took on the construction of the Via
Flaminia all the way to Rimini. The gate of Fano, which I have just men-
tioned, takes the Via Flaminia to the Adriatic sea. Near the gate a gold
coin struck by Augustus has been found. On one side there is an image
of the emperor not much advanced in age, on the other a sphinx with

84. Mitchell (1960, 470–71); also Weiss (1988, 40–41).
the inscription AUGUSTUS DIVI FILIUS TRIBUNITIAE POTESTATIS XVII.\textsuperscript{86}

Constat enim Augustum cum vias Italiae triumphalibus viris ex manubiali pecunia sternendas distribueret, quo facilius urbs undique adiretur, Flaminiam viam Ariminum tenus muniendam sibi desumpsisse. Eam ad mare superum excipit Porta Fanensis cuius modo fecimus mentionem, ad quam proxime repertus est nummus aureus ab Augusto percussus, ex una quidem parte expressa eius Imperatoris effigie non multum aetate provecti, ex altera sphynge hac inscriptione: AUGUSTUS DIVI FILIUS TRIBUNITIAE POTESTATIS XVII.

In this comment Costanzii emphasizes Augustus’s strategy of imperial expansion and self-fashioning as ruler and benefactor. This strategy would parallel the policy of the expansionist Church. In light of the dedicatory preface, surely Costanzii, defender of the Church and its secular “colonization” of Italy, has given the explanations he chooses for his Fasti commentary some forethought. Perhaps it is no coincidence that Costanzii’s digression occurs at the end of Book 4, the culmination of Ovid’s honoring Augustan Vesta;\textsuperscript{87} the sacred flame of Vesta was always carried to Rome’s new colonies.

Further instances of political readings are evident at the end of Book 6 of Costanzii’s Fasti commentary. At line 770 Costanzii writes that the Carthaginian general Hasdrubal

at that time [207 BC] was killed at the Metaurus river, which flows into the Adriatic at Fano, my native home. In my time the tusk of an elephant, testimony to the victory by the Romans, was discovered in the river’s bank.

\textit{hoc tempore caesus est ad Metaurum flumen, quod ad Fanum Fortunae, patriam meam, in mare superum cadit, in cuius alveo temporibus nostris dens\textsuperscript{88} elephantis repertus est, testis victoriae Romanorum.}

The Roman victory happened at the Battle of Metaurus, when Hasdrubal was forced into combat and defeated. Fano is situated along the

\textsuperscript{86}. Costanzii has apparently confused a quinarius showing Victory with early imperial coins in the East, which showed a portrait of a sphinx (Weiss 1965, 353, fn. 6).

\textsuperscript{87}. For the honoring of Vesta on the Palatine hill, see Fantham (1998, 272–76).

\textsuperscript{88}. \textit{Dens} has dropped from the printed editions of Costanzii’s commentary, but it can still be read in the autograph manuscript, Urb. lat. 360.
left bank of the Metaurus river; it is in this valley that the decisive battle took place. Polybius relates that during the battle, six elephants were killed and four were captured. Costanzi displays in his comment an archeological interest in the past. The eighteenth-century historian P. M. Amiani quotes Costanzi and an archival record of the discovery of an elephant tusk in Orciano. Costanzi has gone further, placing the elephant tusk’s discovery in the context of Roman dominance and surely hinting at modern implications: the rivalry between Carthage and Rome figured mythically in the feud between Federico and Sigismondo Malatesta, and Costanzi would have known of Federico of Urbino’s symbolic association with the eagle and with Roman generals, Scipio Africanus in particular. Costanzi could then take advantage of Sigismondo’s identification with the elephant, the Malatesta family’s impresa. Sigismondo’s symbol bore military, triumphant, and imperial overtones. But Sigismondo’s enemies could use the symbol in reverse, as the defeat of Hasdrubal and his elephants at the Battle of Metaurus occurred right in Fano’s backyard. Indeed, what looks like the rump of an elephant can be seen in the key-stone of the Arch of Fano.

The Battle of Metaurus held significance for Fano. The history of Fano and the Roman victory in the second Punic War are interwoven. In 1453 Flavio Biondo compared the words of Livy to a local tradition, and he agreed that Monte Sdrovaldo, Mons Hasdrubalis, derived its name from the defeat of Hasdrubal in the Metaurus battlefield nearby, in the area of Fermignano slightly southwest of Fano. Costanzi altered Biondo’s location of the battle, however, through a toponym of his own making. He moved the battle site directly to the Fano environs:

[There is] at Metaurus a hill commemorative of this fight, which through a corruption for Aphricanus, they call Aphrianus. This is [the place] where Hasdrubal wanted his camp when Marcus Livius arrived with all his infantry arrayed ready for battle, as Livy writes. Good heavens! May whoever has considered the shape of this place, judge this historian not from Padua but from Fano.

90. Amiani (1751, 1:13–14). The elephant tusk was moved to the Museo Oliveriano in Pesaro.
92. Deli (1992, 7–8).
. . . apud Metaurum eius pugnae monumentum collis quem depravato vocabulo pro Africano Aphrianum appellant. Hic est ubi castra metari Asdrubal voluit, cum M. Livius omnibus peditum copiis ad conferendum proelium instructis advenit, ut T. Livius scribit [27.48]; quem historicum, dii boni, quicunque loci eius faciem fuerit contemplatus, non Patavinum existimaverit sed Fanensem.

Perhaps with Biondo’s mons Hasdrubalis in mind (in addition to the Livy reference), Costanzi has identified the collis, an embankment or dike known locally in Fano as the ripe di Friano. Relocating the Roman defeat of Hasdrubal was important enough to the Fano psyche and Costanzi to make the classical author Livy, now in agreement with the battle’s location, an honorary citizen of Fano.

Witness as well the etymology of Fanum Fortunae (i.e., Fano): scholars have hypothesized a link between the victory over Hasdrubal and the consecration of a fanum to the goddess Fortuna in Rome, since both events occurred on the same day, June 24. For Costanzi and so many of his peers and predecessors, a city’s origins, its history, could be traced in its name. Hence Fano’s very name would suggest that the events of 207 BC were prophetic. They were a harbinger of what would happen in 1463. Fano was fulfilling its destiny.

While the above remains implicit and thus to a certain extent speculative, Roman supremacy is an explicit motif in the final comments of the passage on the Battle of Metaurus. Costanzi mentions in passing Senigallia, which had been one of the strategic encampments of the Roman consular armies, allowing for the surprise confrontation with Hasdrubal. He then launches into a digression. Sixtus IV had recently turned Senigallia into a papal vicariate, and Costanzi glorifies the city’s custody under papal sway at F. 6.770:

Indeed the Sena river, where Livy encamped when he joined his forces with Nero, is the one which flows into the Adriatic at Senigallia. It is thirteen miles distant from the Metaurus river. At this time the most illustrious and magnificent Duke Giovanni della Rovere—nephew of the Supreme Pontiff Sixtus and a prefect of Rome, whom you, eminent Federico, not unworthily adopted into your bloodline, seeing as he has a most noble disposition and uncommon wisdom—is expanding the city,

93. Ibid., 11.
spaciously distributed into quarters and sectors, with a new ring of walls. He is restoring the city to its former compass. . . . Most recently we see paved streets, a port, public spaces, and splendid buildings, completed with incredible speed, as well as the most fortified citadel there is, constructed at such great toil and expense that it can rightly be considered impregnable.

_Sane fluvius Sena ad quem fuerunt castra Livii, cum Nero se illi adiunxit, est qui ad Senogalliam urbem mare ingreditur, quod distat a Metauro flumine ad xiii milia passuum. Eam hoc tempore illustrissimus duum atque magnanimus Ioannes Roboreus, Sixti summni Pontificis nepos ac praefectus urbis, quem tu inclyte Federice non immerito tibi generem asciivisti, ut est eminentissimo ingenio ac prudentia singulari, in regiones ac vicos apertissime distributam novo murorum ambitu auget et ad priscam amplitudinem redigit. . . . nos vidimus proxime viarum strata, portum, fora, aedes magnificas incredibili celeritate confectas, item arcem omnium munificentissimam ac tanto impendio et industria fabricatam ut iure inexpugnabilis censeatur._

In this paragraph, which still deals with the Battle of Metaurus, Costanzi establishes a direct connection between imperial Roman supremacy in the past and papal Roman supremacy in the Renaissance.

Senigallia had fallen to ecclesiastical troops on October 5, 1463, only two weeks after Fano's capitulation.\(^95\) Fano quickly stabilized as a direct papal dominion; we have seen how its citizens, under the ambassadorship of Costanzi, offered their continuing allegiance to Sixtus IV, eager, no doubt, to keep their communal autonomy. On the other hand, Senigallia was marked by revolt for the ten years following Sigismondo Malatesta's defeat. It overthrew the _signorie_ of Antonio and later of Giacomo Piccolomini, nephews of Pius II. Under the Piccolomini the reconstruction of the city, which had been conducted with great zeal by Sigismondo, ground to a halt, and this was a cause of malcontent among the citizens of Senigallia.\(^96\) Papal sovereignty was finally exerted and maintained through the machinations of Federico of Urbino and Sixtus IV. On October 10, 1474, Giovanni della Rovere, Sixtus's nephew, was married to Federico's daughter Giovanna di Montefeltro and assigned the vicariates of Senigallia and Mondavio.\(^97\) With the birth of a son, Francesco Maria, in 1490, a new

\(^{95}\) Mancini (1926, 183).
\(^{96}\) Ibid., 184–85, 198.
\(^{97}\) F. Petrucci (1989, 347).
local ruling family established itself.\textsuperscript{98} It is important to note that Fano was left untouched by a change in overlords, however. Costanzi’s diplomatic mission to Rome in 1474 was a success: Fano retained its communal independence and did not become a papal vicariate as Senigallia did.

In his praise for Giovanni della Rovere and the benefits he bestows upon Senigallia, Costanzi glosses over papal nepotism. He illustrates how Sixtus IV and his nephew have been able to win the goodwill of the citizens, who had previously been sincerely devoted to the Malatesta. Costanzi would have known that Sigismondo had brought new life to Senigallia, formerly a thirty-six-hut village and a hideout for bandits. Sigismondo first brought change by encouraging immigration,\textsuperscript{99} and then he also began an impressive building program, his intent being to give the city the ancient Roman \textit{forma quadrata} with triangular towers at the corners and a \textit{rocca}.\textsuperscript{100} When Antonio Piccolomini was invested with the \textit{signoria} of Senigallia after Sigismondo’s defeat, it was precisely the interruption of this building program that distressed the citizens.\textsuperscript{101} With this knowledge, Costanzi praises the building achievements of Giovanni della Rovere. Receptive to Sigismondo’s example, Giovanni della Rovere began restoration and expansion of the \textit{Rocca} in 1480–81.\textsuperscript{102}

It is precisely during this period of construction that Costanzi wrote his \textit{Fasti} commentary. Thus Costanzi’s commentary had a double function: besides presenting the text of Ovid, it was an antiquarian vehicle of propaganda for the new papal vicariate of Senigallia. In addition, since Giovanni della Rovere’s father-in-law, Federico of Urbino, was the dedicatee, politics and literary activity could conveniently converge.

Finally, what seems to characterize the Roman rulers, both classical and ecclesiastical, and link them in Costanzi’s commentary, are the roles of founder and builder. Augustus had settled Fano the first time; in 1463 Pius II initiated the phase in history when Fano was a papal province. And while Sigismondo Malatesta was the modern-day founder of Senigallia, Giovanni della Rovere and the papacy he represented were the restorers of the city. For Antonio Costanzi, Christendom’s \textit{renovatio imperii} was a natural extension of its \textit{renovatio urbis}.

\textsuperscript{98} Anselmi (1969, 22).
\textsuperscript{99} See Anselmi and Paci’s 1972 edition of Andreano (hereafter Anselmi and Paci), 15.
\textsuperscript{100} Anselmi (1969, 19).
\textsuperscript{101} Anselmi and Paci, 20.
\textsuperscript{102} Formichetti (1984, 348).