

## XVIII.—Giovanni Tortelli's Commentary on Juvenal

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE

One of the supposedly lost works that Remigio Sabbadini hoped to discover by his long and fruitful research in the Italian collections of Renaissance manuscripts was a commentary on Juvenal's *Satires* by Giovanni Tortelli. In an earlier study of "Renaissance Commentaries on Juvenal"<sup>1</sup> I expressed tentative agreement with Mancini's objections to Sabbadini's ascription to Tortelli of the commentary in ms 85 of the Bibliothèque Municipale at Nice, and with his suggestion that the many references to Juvenal in Tortelli's *Commentarii de orthographia* are probably all that he actually wrote on his favorite satirist.<sup>2</sup> Investigation of the Nice manuscript, which Sabbadini apparently knew only through Beldame's description,<sup>3</sup> and of other commentaries that cite Tortelli's interpretations, together with a careful study of the *Orthography* itself, have since led me to feel that Mancini did not state the case strongly enough. Not only are the citations of Tortelli by other commentators directly derived from *De orthographia*, but there are statements in Tortelli's entry under the word *prologus*, which I shall quote later, that clearly show the author's conception of *De orthographia* as comprising his contribution to the exposition of Juvenal and other writers, whom, however, he treats in less detail. Other classical works are quoted to illustrate the interpretation of difficult words, and these citations were much used by the commentators. But Juvenal alone is assigned a substantial introductory essay that demonstrates Tortelli's thoughtful study of the problems connected

<sup>1</sup> *TAPA* 79 (1948) 92–112, especially p. 101. This paper, as I stated in the summary, was based on printed materials only. During a sabbatical leave in 1950, with the generous assistance afforded by a Fulbright grant for study in Italy, I investigated a large number of commentaries and glossed MSS of Juvenal, as well as printed works not hitherto accessible to me. I have in preparation further studies based on this material, including a paper on the so-called "Cornutus" commentaries mentioned below.

<sup>2</sup> R. Sabbadini, "Uno Scoliaſto di Giovenale," *Rivista Etnea* 1 (1893) 97–99 (consulted at Biblioteca Nazionale, Palermo); G. Mancini, "Giovanni Tortelli Cooperatore di Niccolò V nel Fondare la Biblioteca Vaticana," *Archivio Storico Italiano* 78 (1920) 161–282, esp. 234–235.

<sup>3</sup> C. Beldame, "Scolies Inédites de Juvénal," *RevPhil* 6 (1882) 76–103.

with his life and work. Unless a commentary is discovered which is clearly identifiable as Tortelli's, and does not merely contain extensive selections from the *Orthography*, as the Nice manuscript does, there seems no reason to continue the search. Tortelli provided in *De orthographia* a sound basis for his reputation as a commentator on Juvenal.

Giovanni Tortelli of Arezzo had lived for several years in Rome under the patronage of Nicholas V, and was employed by him in building up the new Vatican Library, when a violent outbreak of the plague in the summer of 1449 obliged him to withdraw to the purer air of Alatri. Here he devoted his leisure to completing his major work, the *Commentarii de orthographia*, a guide to the spelling, etymology, and interpretation of Latin words, especially those derived from Greek. Such a book was an essential aid to scholarship at a time when the proper spelling of many Latin words was much disputed, when many recently recovered works of ancient writers were less widely circulated than they would be a generation later, after humanistic libraries had multiplied and the printing press had greatly increased the possibilities of book production, and when interest in Greek, despite the opposition of some convinced Latinists, far outran the opportunities to acquire an adequate knowledge of that language. Tortelli's two years' residence in Constantinople a decade earlier, his long studies in Italy, and his experience in translating Greek works, with his current access to the resources of the papal library, equipped him admirably for this task. His work must have been planned, and his material collected, long before the summer's unexpected leisure from his usual obligations enabled him to complete it.<sup>4</sup>

Several treatises on orthography had appeared in the half-century since Coluccio Salutati urged the importance of this subject for humanistic studies, but Tortelli's book superseded those of his predecessors and became an indispensable reference work. Gaspare Veronese, in a letter to Nicholas V appended to his own commentary on Juvenal's sixth satire, hailed it as a great and most useful work, adding that in his opinion, nothing better had been written in the

<sup>4</sup> R. Sabbadini, *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 87 (1926) 374-376, established the date of completion as 1449, a dating now generally accepted. The date depends on that of Gaspare's commentary on *Satire* 6, in which he mentions Tortelli's book as just completed, and which was written in the year before the Anno Santo of 1450, as he himself says.

field of literature for five hundred years. In the same passage, he mentioned Tortelli among the very few men who really understood Juvenal, and who therefore had no need of his commentary.<sup>5</sup>

Tortelli's title, as printed in the first edition, is as follows: *Joannis Tortelli Aretini commentariorum grammaticorum de Orthographia dictionum e grecis tractarum*. His preface, offering the book to Nicholas V for the use of students in his great library, summed up its method and purpose:

Ceperam olim beatissime pater Nicolae quinte summe pontifex commentaria quedam grammatica condere: quibus omnem litterarum antiquitatem: et orthographie rationem cum opportunis ystoriis pro poetarum declaratione connectere conabar. . . .<sup>6</sup>

The preface ends with a eulogy of grammar and a brief survey of the chief grammarians, a table of contents, and a long list of authors cited, among them a considerable number of grammarians.

The first section of *De orthographia* contains brief accounts of the consonants, vowels, and diphthongs, with special reference to problems of transliteration from Greek, and to changes in Latin orthography, particularly as a result of the current trend toward the standards of the Ciceronian and Augustan Ages. In this section Juvenal is cited occasionally, but less often than Vergil, Horace, and others. I cite from a characteristic entry, that *De E littera*.

. . . Nos vero veterum scriptorum Augustique ipsius scripturam et non Quintiliani nostro tempore observamus atque .i. littera *heri* finimus. Iuvenalis autem qui tempore ipsius Quintiliani fuit *here* secundum eius etatis consuetudinem .e. littera finivit cum in tertia satyra ait "Res hodie minor est *here* quam fuit atque eadem cras . . ." (*Sat.* 3.23).

Here is a reflection of his interest in the vexed problem of Juvenal's date, as well as in the attempt to revive the orthography of the best classical period. Another statement illustrates the difficulties involved in the spelling of the many classical names that occur in the *Satires*. On *Satire* 1.16: "consilium dedimus Sullae," the manuscripts vacillate between Silla, Sylla, and sometimes even Sulla,

<sup>5</sup> Letter to Nicholas V at the close of Gaspare's commentary on *Satire* 6, in MSS Casanatensis 397 and Vat. lat. 2710.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from the *editio princeps* (Rome, Udalricus Gallus 1471). All citations from *De orthographia* in this paper are from this edition. The title varies considerably in different editions, but the book was generally referred to as *De orthographia*. As pagination varies greatly in the different editions, and the alphabetical arrangement of the contents facilitates reference, I have omitted page numbers.

the same scribe often using two forms interchangeably. A part of the entry *De Y Littera* was intended to solve their problem :

. . . Nam *Syllam* quem iam dicimus *Syllam* in antiquis codicibus et emendatissimis: cum .v. scriptum: et sepiissime aspeximus et a doctissimis viris nostre etatis et conterraneis meis Leonardo et Carolo Arretinis sic scriptitasse confirmari audivi.

Here Tortelli's reference to his fellow-Aretines, Leonardo Bruni, and Carlo Marsuppini, is interesting, since both were listed among authorities on Juvenal by other fifteenth century scholars, though, as far as I have been able to discover, no proof has yet been found that they composed commentaries on the *Satires*. Since Gaspare Veronese also quotes their opinions and praises their comprehension of Juvenal, I am inclined to attribute their reputation in this field to such informal contributions to exposition of the *Satires* as Tortelli and Gaspare mention, and to incidental references in their books on other topics.<sup>7</sup>

The second and major portion of *De orthographia* is a dictionary, an alphabetical list of words, chiefly those derived from Greek, that presented difficulties in spelling, definition, etc. The individual entries differ considerably in length, and include a wide range of illustrative materials drawn from Greek and Latin authors and from inscriptions that Tortelli himself had studied, together with accounts of the mythological, antiquarian and historical connotations of the words under discussion. The long article on *Roma* is a conspicuous example of the more detailed studies that far exceed the ordinary bounds of a work on orthography. To a considerable degree, therefore, this book performed the functions of a modern classical dictionary.

In this section, citations from Juvenal are more numerous, but they are not out of proportion to those from other poets, especially when one considers the substantial incidence of Greek words in the *Satires*, and of personal and place-names that called for identification and comment. But these citations, among which are most of the lines that presented real problems for the commentator, provide an ample reservoir of parallel passages and antiquarian and historical data. Such entries as that on *amphitheatrum*, in which four passages

<sup>7</sup> I have found two references, by Pellegrino Allio in *ms* Ravenna 237, and Fonzio in Riccard. lat. 673, to comments on Juvenal in a work attributed to Carlo Aretino, which they both considered of very doubtful authenticity; Fonzio rejected the attribution on the ground that the work contained *multa absurda*.

of Juvenal are cited from three different satires, facilitated the practice of cross-reference in notes on individual lines. Tortelli's identification of place-names supplemented the scantier and sometimes less accurate data in the older glosses, and his wide reading in the ancient historians helped correct some absurd comments on personal names and directed attention, for example, to the value of Suetonius for the student of Juvenal. The alphabetical arrangement of the entries, which is more consistently sustained than in many works of the period, facilitated reference, and the reader of Juvenal would often find useful discussion of a puzzling word in a note that did not actually cite the *Satires*. The long note on *crocodilus* (cf. *Sat.* 15.2) is one such instance. In commentaries on Juvenal compiled during the following period one often finds obvious echoes of *De orthographia* in notes on the spelling, etymology and definition of a word, with no indication of their source. In fact, as I shall show, later fifteenth century commentators cited Tortelli by name chiefly when they wished to discredit his scholarship, but silently appropriated such statements of his as they found useful, a habit not, alas, entirely eliminated by modern laws of copyright.

Thus far, though Tortelli provided much good grist for expositors of Juvenal, he had not shown greater interest in him than in various other classical poets. But in the article on *prologus*, one of the most extensive in the entire work, occupying twenty-seven columns in the large folio first edition, he demonstrated not only his predilection for the poet to whom he frequently referred as *lepidissimus* (a choice of epithet that surely betokens ardent admiration), but also his intimate acquaintance with the introductory material commonly found in the anonymous commentaries and his wish to propound his own theories about the poet's life and work. One is tempted to conjecture that he had previously planned a consecutive commentary, but when he began to concentrate on a more comprehensive project, decided to salvage the best of his material by using it in this way. Thus he was freed from the necessity for paraphrasing, tracing the course of the argument, identifying figures of speech, etc., and could limit himself to points on which he felt that he had a substantial contribution to make.

It would have seemed more natural, perhaps, to include this account of Juvenal in the entry on *satyrus*, or in that on *satyra*. These words are discussed on a moderate scale, with citations in

the former from Pliny the Elder (*NH* 7.2.24), Isidore's *Origines* (11.3.21) and Jerome's story of St. Anthony and the satyr (*Vita Pauli Erem.* 8), all of which were used by various later commentators. For the article on *satyra* he drew from the long-popular type of *accessus* to Juvenal, but added, with his usual interest in literary genres, his own version of the distinction between satire, epic and elegiac poetry, and a brief history of Latin satire, from Quintilian's famous dictum, "*Satira tota nostra est*," to his own estimate of Juvenal as "*lepidissimus inter ceteros . . . de quo Quintilianus intellexit de satyricis loquens cum ait 'Sunt clari hodieque et qui olim nominabuntur' "*" (*Inst. Or.* 10.1.93-94).

The most widely circulated type of anonymous commentary, however, offered a point of departure for the transition from the word *prologus* to discussion of Juvenal. This Tortelli paraphrased, quoting *verbatim* its most familiar phrase, in a setting of his own invention, which again shows his interest in literary history. After explaining that *prologus* "*cum unico .l. scribitur, et dicitur a nobis prefatio, sive proloquium,*" he accuses Terence of misusing the prologue by devoting it to invective rather than to exposition, and then continues: "*Satyrici vero nec invocant: nec breviter quicquam primitus dicendum proponunt: sed ex abrupto incipientes a reprehensione sui: qua se primum expurgare posse putant exordiantur.*" Hence they abuse the prologue no less than Terence did, whereas the writers of Old Comedy

. . . non se ipsos ipsimet: sed alium inducunt *ex abrupto* alterutrum reprehendentem. Ut ex Aristophane licet latine versiculos aliquos referre: quos Leonardus Aretinus delitiae nostrae mecum olim ludens interpretatus est. . . . Satyrici etiam nostri poete *a reprehensione sui incipiunt*: ut id ipsum quod in se reprehendunt in alios verius prosequantur. . . .

In many anonymous commentaries and glossed manuscripts the first comment on Juvenal begins: "More omnium satyrorum (*or* satyricorum) *ex abrupto* incipit." While individual manuscripts of this type exhibit countless variations in the quantity, selection and wording of comments, and in their additions to the basic material, they contain enough identical material to prove their dependence on a common source. This type of commentary, expanded considerably from the briefer mediaeval examples, was very widely circulated during the fifteenth century. In many instances either the entire commentary or individual glosses are attributed to the enigmatic

authorship of "Cornutus."<sup>8</sup> Humanistic commentators who prided themselves on their superiority to their unenlightened mediaeval predecessors were not proof against the temptation to appropriate this material, which, after all, had long been in the public domain.

Tortelli had apparently also used a commentary belonging to another large group, very similar to the *ex abrupto* type, but beginning with the clause, "Bene a sui ipsius redarguitione incipit." His substitution of *reprehensione* for the clumsy *redarguitione* was probably suggested by the constant reiteration of *reprehendere* and *reprehensio* in both types of commentaries. Since we see that he was familiar with two of the most widely circulated types of anonymous commentary on Juvenal, it is interesting to note that the first candidate for identification as Tortelli's supposed lost work (the commentary in ms Naples B.N.IV F 36) proves on examination to be merely a rather free version of a third type, which begins "Cum omnes luxurientur in scribendis." The subscription in this manuscript, by a scribe named Johannes, first suggested its attribution to Tortelli, but he is almost invariably referred to as Iohannes Arretinus (*sic!*), or Io. Arret., not as Iohannes alone. And, as Mancini pointed out, the Naples manuscript can hardly be dated later than about 1400,<sup>9</sup> a consideration that would debar Tortelli's authorship even if there were sufficient originality in its contents to distinguish this commentary from others of the same general type.

After his initial statements on satire and the satirists, Tortelli commented on Persius' satires for the space of four columns, after which he devoted five times as much discussion to those of Juvenal. He began with the familiar question, appropriate in this connection, whether the first satire was merely a prologue to the rest, and concluded, reversing the usual statement, that it could not properly be so classified, though it did have some of the characteristics of a prologue. He added his own reflections on the hampering effects of the loss of freedom of speech in imperial Rome on the writing of satire, and praised the ingenuity by which the poet veiled his

<sup>8</sup> The earliest manuscript I have noted of this type is Brit. Mus. Royal 15 B XVII, s. xi. There are tenth century examples of the other types mentioned. The first page of glossed manuscripts is often so badly worn, if not entirely missing, as to make identification difficult; the initial entry, in the upper or the outer margin, is often completely illegible.

<sup>9</sup> Mancini (above, note 2) p. 230.

attacks on notorious contemporaries *pulcherrimo artificio*, ascribing to Nero, for instance, traits clearly recognizable as those of Domitian, intermingled with others applicable only to the earlier emperor, so that the actual target of his irony might pass unnoticed by all but the erudite.<sup>10</sup> I have not found as careful an analysis of this point in any other commentary. Tortelli then carefully marshalled the evidence for assigning Juvenal's *floruit* to the reign of Domitian.<sup>11</sup> It does not seem to have occurred to him, or indeed to most other mediaeval and humanistic commentators, that Juvenal could easily have outlived the span of one emperor's reign. He concluded:

. . . unde secreto illum has satyras scripsisse coniecor: nec nisi amicis quibusdam eo tempore ostendisse ut Quintiliano: Martiali: Umbricio: et aliis nonnullis: in quibus se posse confidere iudicabat.

This, he thought, accounted for Quintilian's omission of Juvenal from his list of satirists.

He then discussed the Paris incident, so prominent in mediaeval lives of Juvenal.<sup>12</sup> Like other commentators, he accepted the story as authentic, but worked it out in fuller detail, and made effective use of Martial's epitaph on the pantomime.

Thus far, he had provided a more carefully planned introduction to the *Satires* than those in earlier commentaries, or in most later ones before the modern age of critical scholarship. He now turned to exposition of the first lines of *Satire 1*, with an introductory statement appropriate to a complete commentary:

. . . libet ad huius prime satyre introductionem redire, cuius sensus pre ceteris difficillimus esse videtur: et mentem lepidissimi poete indicare curabo: ac nonnulla illius variis in locis obscurissima contingam: que in aliis commentariorum libris non tetigimus: pro posse explanare illa curabo.

The comments on lines 1-17 that follow are notable for their frequent references to the usage of Greek and Latin poets, and for a certain amount of critical acumen and common sense. There is one violent attack on the other commentators he had read, who most ineptly interpreted lines 7-8 as the author's boast of proficiency

<sup>10</sup> This passage recalls the excellent study by Cora Lutz, "Any Resemblance . . . Is Purely Coincidental," *CJ* 46 (1950) 115-120.

<sup>11</sup> The anonymous commentaries usually assign Juvenal to the reign of Nero, sometimes to that of a Claudius Nero who is a composite figure, more rarely to Domitian's reign, and occasionally to Trajan's.

<sup>12</sup> See G. Highet, "The Life of Juvenal," *TAPA* 68 (1937) 480-506.



in natural and moral philosophy. A quotation from "noster Carolus Aretinus" illustrates the interpretation of line 15, "et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus" as a general reference to the learning process.

At this point the consecutive commentary ends, with a significant statement:

. . . et hec dicta sufficient pro explanatione difficillimi loci et introductione ad primam satyram nobilis poete Iuvenalis. Cetera vero que difficilia videntur, diversis in dictionibus horum commentariorum pro nostra facultate explanare conabimur. Nec id sane formido quod nonnulli vaticinari videntur: futuros quosdam qui commentariola quedam ex his nostris commentariis diversos in poetas sine honore nostro traducere: ac que nostra sunt sibi arrogare non verebuntur: ego enim quosque similes parvipendo: suo enim illi mendatio et furto detecto erubescunt: modo amicis pro mea virtute satisfaciam. Hec hactenus. Verum et nonnulla in hac satyra restant et in aliis quibusdam deinceps satyris: que ex amissorum librorum defectu numquam plene intelligere valui: ut quis ille fuerit: de quo supra meminimus: qui pupillum expoliavit: et prostituit. Quis ille qui bona dedit presepibus: et caret omnium maiorum censu dum pervolat axe citato flaminiam. Et ille qui se lautum ac beatum exiguis tabulis et gemma fecerat uda: licet quidam fuisse Mathonem putant, quod mihi non constat. Quis etiam ille qui dedit tribus patruis aconita: et licet hec nonnullis forsitan parva esse videantur: nobis tamen si iocunditatem et lepiditatem ut decet: poete captare cupimus: necessaria prorsus apparent. Sed quod non valemus premittere libet et ad aliqua in secunda satyra transeamus: que obscure a poeta tractari videntur. . . .

Brief comments follow on passages from other satires.

The lines quoted above constitute an explicit statement that Tortelli's contribution to the editing of Juvenal, as of other poets, is contained in *De orthographia*, a contribution increased in Juvenal's case by this fragmentary commentary, introducing and supplementing the many comments scattered through the rest of the work.

One illustration of direct use of *De orthographia* occurs in MS Ambrosianus lat. A 121 inf., a commentary copied at Bologna in 1471, and apparently based, at least in part, like others of the same type, on the lectures of Guarino Veronese. Several marginal notes from Tortelli have been added, and the first two leaves, not a part of the original manuscript, contain Tortelli's notes on *Satire* 1.1-17 and 2.13 in the same hand as the marginalia, which are labelled *Io. Arret.*

The Nice manuscript mentioned previously, which Sabbadini concluded was Tortelli's commentary, was clearly written too late

in the fifteenth century to justify this attribution, as Friedländer's discussion of its date shows.<sup>13</sup> It is a glossed text rather than a commentary; the loss of the first leaf has destroyed any information about possible front matter or the glosses before line 36. There are even more borrowings from *De orthographia* than Sabbadini was able to identify from Beldame's selection of glosses, but the notes are almost all very short; few extend even to thirty words, and there is not much distinction between interlinear and marginal glosses. The compiler was apparently a fairly competent classicist without much claim to originality, who excerpted from Tortelli and other commentaries the notes he thought most useful, in the form of brief definitions and identifications, with occasional citations of parallel passages. The discussions of word order, the explanatory paraphrases, and the long accounts of myths and historical incidents so frequent in Renaissance commentaries are conspicuous by their absence. The one entry that has a personal flavor is that on *Phalaris* (*Sat.* 8.81) which was the primary basis for Sabbadini's attribution of the whole to Tortelli: "Phalaris tyrannus fuit agri-gentinus crudelissimus exquisitissimis poenis afficiens de quo late diximus in commentariis orthographie." But, as Mancini pointed out, the entry on Phalaris in Tortelli's book is too brief to justify the adverb *late*, though the gloss is obviously derived from it. Perhaps a manuscript used by this compiler had a marginal reference in which Tortelli was cited by the title of his book rather than by his name, and which was then expanded in this form without reference to the original. Or the compiler may possibly have been himself the author of some work on orthography, though the unoriginal character of his glosses offers no support for this conjecture.

The Augustinian friar Adam de Montaldo, in his preface to the first edition of *De orthographia* in 1471, defended Tortelli against criticism which he ascribed to the stifling of *ratio grammaticalis* by arrogant pedantry. In answer to those who charged that Tortelli was too often caught napping, he extolled the book as exceptional, useful, and essential for all who would write correctly. The rapidity with which other editions issued from presses in Vicenza, Treviso, and that chief of Italian printing centers, Venice, where five different printers published nine editions between 1471 and 1496, supported his claims.

<sup>13</sup> L. Friedländer, *JB* 47 (1886) 220.

The commentators' estimates of Tortelli's competence varied considerably. Yet his detractors made very nearly as much use of his work as his eulogizers did. Angelo Sabino, whose *Paradoxa in Iuvenalem* appeared in 1474, cited him often, and usually with full agreement. When his pupil "Praxiteles" quoted a comment on *Satire* 1.49 from his reading "in hortographia Tortellii," however, Sabino expressed surprise that Tortelli had so grossly mistaken the character of the republican Marius as to identify him with Juvenal's bibulous exile, and had not profited by the Younger Pliny's account of Marius Priscus (*Ep.* 2.11). Domizio Calderini, on the other hand, Sabino's bitter and successful rival in the exposition of Juvenal, attacked Tortelli and his followers for preferring a consensus of opinion to the *ingenuitas* of the Latin language, and accused Sabino of merely following Tortelli's lead.<sup>14</sup> Calderini's violent jealousy of other scholars detracts from the weight of his criticism.

Some others cite Tortelli occasionally without comment. Pierfilippo Pandolfini's *Commentariolus* in MS Riccardianus latinus 663 gives page references to *De orthographia* in connection with place-names mentioned in *Satire* 6.187. Among the notes in MS Laurentianus latinus 34.34, a glossed text whose relatively few marginal comments seem to be the work of a thoughtful scholar, is Tortelli's conjecture of *cocche*, "quod mali et corrupti vini genus est," in place of *conche* in *Satire* 3.293, an ingenious suggestion, though not endorsed by modern editors.

Giorgio Merula cited Tortelli once to disagree with his recommendation of an aspirate in *Alcyonem*, the usual reading in his day for *Alcithoen* in *Satire* 7.12, but adopted other comments from him without question: for instance, that on *Phalaris* (8.81) and that on *gobio* (11.37), without stating his source. Cornelio Vitelli, in his oft-quoted letter to Ermolao Barbaro the Younger "In defensione Plinii et Domitii Calderini contra Georgium Merulam"<sup>15</sup> included Tortelli's *Commentarii* among the sources from which Merula pilfered material for his commentary on Pliny, though he failed to list them among Merula's sources for that on Juvenal. Antonio Mancinelli, who copied Tortelli's note on *phucus* (*sic*!) in his own note on *pingit* (*Satire* 2.94) compiled a work listing and

<sup>14</sup> Calderini's comments on *repono* (*Sat.* 1.1), which is actually inserted, out of place, in his note on *togatas* (line 3), and on *Sat.* 4.133.

<sup>15</sup> Printed in J. Gruter, *Thesaurus Criticus* I (Frankfurt 1602) 584-585.

correcting Tortelli's errors, which was printed at Venice in 1493. I have not seen this *Lima*, but the occasion for it is not difficult to discover. As the examples of Tortelli's Latinity that I have quoted indicate, his personal orthography fell somewhat short of the best classical standards, and his efforts to establish sound principles for Latin spelling had contributed, with the work of Guarino Veronese and others, to such rapid progress during the next generation that many details of his book became obsolete, though the *Commentarii* were still widely circulated and used. As Bartolommeo Fonzio pointed out in his *Adnotationes in Iuvenalem*, Merula followed Tortelli "in dictione prologus" in his interpretation of *reponam* (*Satire* 1.1), and Mancinelli followed Merula.<sup>16</sup> Fonzio himself found several occasions to criticize Tortelli's interpretations of Juvenal.

Giambattista Cantalicio, who cherished throughout his long and checkered career as teacher, poet, and hanger-on of princes, many grateful memories of his master, Gaspare Veronese, introduced his *Interpretatio in Iuvenalis Satiras* by a survey of previous commentators. This critique assumed a greater improvement in standards of classical scholarship than his own commentary exemplifies, but enabled him to give due credit to his illustrious predecessors while maintaining the superiority of the best modern work to theirs. After censuring the ineptitude of the vast majority, he wrote:

. . . De Laurentio: Tortellio: Gaspare meo Veronensi: Porcello: Philelpho: ceterisque eius etatis clarissimis viris verba non facio. Qui sicut romanas litteras a tenebris deque barbarie eripuerunt: ita huius preclarissimi sätÿri argutissimas sententias ignorant. Quod nulla alia ratione evenisse putaverim, quam ut huic nostre etati aliquid glorie reservaretur. In qua procul dubio bona studia omni ex parte in se rediisse manifestissime cernitur.<sup>17</sup>

But Cantalicio and his contemporaries, in spite of their pride in their own age and its scholarly achievements, still depended to a considerable degree on the contributions of Tortelli to the elucidation of Juvenal, and rarely surpassed the quality of his introduction to the study of his favorite Latin poet, however effectively they might supplant his individual comments.

<sup>16</sup> MS Riccard. lat. 1172.

<sup>17</sup> MS Vat. Urb. lat. 662.