

XIV.—Gaspare Veronese, Humanist and Teacher

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE

The middle of the Quattrocento was a turning-point in the progress of classical scholarship. Up to that time the humanists had been engaged in the gradual revision of the mediaeval commentaries, which, through the dynamic influence of the twelfth century, had greatly increased in number, content, and sheer bulk. The work of the humanists of the latter half of the century, on the other hand, was more individual. Better-stocked libraries, greater mastery of Greek, and clearer grasp of orthography, grammar and classical antiquities soon made much of their immediate predecessors' work seem antiquated.¹ Thus Giambattista Cantalicio wrote in the preface to his commentary on Juvenal in 1488:

Very many men have written before our day on the satires of this sweetest poet of ours. . . . I pass over Lorenzo Valla, Tortelli, my own Gaspare Veronese, Porcelio, Filelfo, and the other notable men of that generation, who, albeit they rescued Roman letters from darkness and barbarism, did not really understand the most trenchant phrases of this very famous satirist. I would hazard the conjecture that the sole reason for this was that some glory might be reserved for our own age.²

Cantalicio's list of authorities includes two men, Lorenzo Valla and Porcelio, whose contributions to Juvenal scholarship were merely incidental to their major works. Tortelli, as I have shown elsewhere, incorporated the nucleus of a commentary in the article on *Prologus* in his *De orthographia* (see note 1). Filelfo certainly lectured on Juvenal, and MS Barberini lat. 134 contains (ff. 69–72) notes on the first three satires with the heading: "Haec omnia de mente Phylelphy in libris Juvenalis." For Gaspare Veronese we have a commentary on the sixth satire that he himself carefully copied from his lectures as a gift to Pope Nicholas V, the earliest

¹ This article is a by-product of a study of mediaeval and Renaissance commentaries on Juvenal for the *Latin Translations and Commentaries* project, to be published in the near future. Related studies are: "Renaissance Commentaries on Juvenal," *TAPA* 79 (1948) 92–112; "Giovanni Tortelli's Commentary on Juvenal," *TAPA* 82 (1951) 207–18; "Bread and Circuses," *CW* 45 (1951) 17–21; "Inaugural Lectures on the Classics," *CJ* 48 (1953) 263–69.

² MS Vat. Urb. lat. 662.

dated commentary on Juvenal by a known humanist that has come down to us. Another manuscript, more simply transcribed for Gaspare's own use, contains his commentaries on this and on several other satires.³ The whole work is significant not only as a "first" but as an unusual illustration of the methods of teaching the classics in this transitional period. In many respects it is more illuminating for this purpose than the better-known and more widely circulated commentaries of the next generation, whose authors were often bent on displaying their own erudition and belittling the efforts of their rivals in the bitter controversies that raged around Juvenal no less than other classical subjects, rather than on helping students comprehend his meaning. This is particularly true of the printed commentaries. Commentaries edited by their authors from their school lectures, but not printed, such as those of Ognibene da Lonigo, Gaspare's contemporary, and Cantalicio, Gaspare's pupil, preserve rather more of the personal element than the printed commentaries do, apart from their authors' controversial animus. Students' notes from their masters' lectures, of which the chief instances for Juvenal are those transcribed by students of Filetico, Guarino Veronese and his son Battista, for each of which several copies are extant, and by those of Landino and Politian, each apparently preserved in only one copy, give more clues to the actual methods of exposition, but generally omit the personal digressions and the more spontaneous portions of the lectures, as our own students' notes are wont to do. Like Gaspare's work, these less formal commentaries show how valuable contemporary allusions and vernacular terms were in making the classics really intelligible and interesting to fifteenth century students.

At the end of the commentary on Book IV (satires 10-12) Gaspare expressed the hope that Pope Nicholas would reward his heavy labors fittingly: "Oportet enim multa legisse, audisse, vidisse eum qui sit Iuvenalem interpretaturus." Certainly there were

³ MS Casanatensis 397 contains the commentary on *Sat.* 6 only; MS Vat. lat. 2710, a working copy, contains: ff. 2r-3r, a brief commentary, by Gaspare, on 14.1-137; ff. 4-9 are missing; ff. 10r-62r, Filetico's commentary on Persius, as in copies made by Filetico's students, with marginal notes by Gaspare; ff. 62r-146r, Gaspare's commentary on *Sat.* 13.6-7, 10-12 and 8.1-16, in this order; ff. 148r-198r, Ognibene da Lonigo's commentary on Juvenal, again with notes by Gaspare. Zippel's description of this MS is inaccurate, and does not identify the commentaries of Filetico and Ognibene, whose authorship is not indicated in the MS, presumably because Gaspare copied them for his own use only, as a working collection pending completion and editing of his commentary.

few major experiences in the first half-century of his life that did not contribute to his exposition of the text; Juvenal was a part of all that he met, and though, as his frequent apologies for digressions suggest, his students may sometimes have evinced boredom at his anecdotes, they must have been impressed by the extent to which modern life provided glosses for the satires, and the satires for life. His letters and his *Chronicon de gestis Pauli II*, whose death in 1471 preceded his own by only three years, add further details to those contained in the commentary.⁴

Little is known of Gaspare's early years. He was born at Verona about 1400, and his love for his native city survived long years of residence elsewhere. He proudly calls Catullus "Veronensis et conterraneus meus" (6.8), and repeatedly refers to Guarino Veronese as "compatriota" or "conterraneus meus." On 6.150: *pastores et ovem Canusinam*, he comments:

. . . *Canusinam* quasi optimam, nam oves illae praecipuae sunt, ut nostrae, hoc est Veronenses. Veronaei enim campi herbas mittunt ovibus aptas, sicut et Canusini. Canusium est in Apulia, quod ego vidi dum proficiscerer cum Stephano Porcaro, equite Romano, altissimi consilii viro Christiano et benevolo.⁵

Again, on 6.289: *vellere Tusco*, he says:

Meliores enim sunt lanæ Veronenses et Anglicanae quam Florentinae et Bononienses, licet Florentini lanas de longinquo allatas artificiose et mire componant, atque exercendo laborent; et cotidie plus filant, texunt, suunt.

The Florentine *Arte di Lana* was given its due, as long as the natural superiority of Veronese wool was recognized.

Gaspare's references to Guarino among the few men who really understood Juvenal suggest not only that, as we might expect, he studied under his older compatriot, who was then teaching at Verona, but also that Guarino's lectures on the satires were the

⁴ G. Zippel has provided the chief accounts of Gaspare's life in: *Vite di Paolo II* ("Rerum Ital. Scr." 3.16 [Città di Castello 1904]) pp. xxi-xxxviii, and *Un Umanista in Villa* (Pistoia 1900). Briefer references are found in: Fabricius, ed. Mansi, 3.22; Maffei, *Verona Illustrata* (Milan 1825) 3.23 f.; Mancini, *Archivio Storico* 78 (1920) 219; Marini, *Degli Archiatri Pontifici* (Rome 1784) 1.178,354; P. Renazzi, *Storia d. Università di Roma* (Rome 1803) 1.234 f.; R. Sabbadini, *La Scuola e gli Studii di Guarino Veronese* (Catania 1894) 44 ff.; Tiraboschi, *Storia d. Letteratura Ital.* (Milan 1824) 6.1629.

⁵ In quotations from Gaspare, spelling, punctuation and capitalization have been standardized.

original source of his own interest in them. By 1426 he was studying at Bologna, and in his comment on 11.90 he rendered tribute to the notable group of scholars who were then lecturing there on various arts and sciences, as modern counterparts to the Roman Fabii. He describes himself at this period as still an immature student, attending the lectures on logic and philosophy of Giovanni dalle Fornaci and Gaspare Sighicelli, later bishop of Imola. But he never confined his range of interest to his chosen field alone. It must have been at Bologna that he became familiar with the writings of the juriconsults, whom he cites, for example, on 6.13, on the proper distinction between *parentes* and remoter *maiores*. The Bolognese government interested him, and the aedile of empty Ulubrae (10.102) reminded him of its magistrates: "Hodie Bononiae sunt aediles in magno et lato officio, qui extraordinarii seu notarii vulgo dicuntur."

From Bologna he went to Florence, where he studied under the Camaldolese scholar, Ambrogio Traversari, and became acquainted with numerous humanists to whom he paid tribute later. Here he made a connection that was to dominate his later life, for Stephano Porcari engaged him as tutor for his younger brother Mariano. He accompanied Porcari on his return to Rome, and in 1431 travelled through France and England with him, probably on a papal mission. Memories of the hazards of travel by sea and river colored his interpretation of several passages of Juvenal. He offered a remarkable series of etymologies for *mare* (6.284). Some commentators, he said, derived it from *amarus*, an erroneous idea, but one which recalled his bitter experience in a storm on the Thames near London.⁶ Others derived it from *mors*, a far-fetched etymology, and others still from *murus*, which he also rejected, preferring the theory that the sea was named from its ceaseless motion: "quia non desinit meare et in motu esse." But he characteristically concluded: "Dic, obsecro, sententiam tuam. Credo non adiiicies aliam." The same voyage lent vividness to his comments on the seasick matron (6.98-100), for he well remembered the stench of the bilge: "Cum autem verti videtur aer, tunc generatur nobis passio quae dicitur vertigo, quae velut quaedam epilepsia est seu comitalis morbus seu caducus, quocumque nomine vocetur." Many of Gaspare's students probably felt that they might well content

⁶ Zippel incorrectly quotes Gaspare as deriving *mare* from *amarus* because of his own tendency to *mal de mer*.

themselves with his description of the rich shrine of Saint Thomas at Canterbury rather than undergo such hazards themselves. But he had eaten excellent salmon in England, a fish unknown in Italian waters, for "no one recalls seeing fresh salmon in Rome," a bit of information rather gratuitously dragged in as a warning not to confuse *salmo*, the fish, with *Sulmo*, Ovid's birthplace. This warning does not seem valueless to anyone who has struggled with the open *a* characteristic of so many manuscripts. Juvenal's estimate of the size of British whales (10.14) gave Gaspare occasion to remind his students that Britain is the name of the entire island, including both Anglia and Scotia, which was subdued by Julius Caesar, though "the English, since they have not read histories, claim that they were never conquered by Rome."

This journey was made the more memorable by contrast with the quiet interlude that followed, for on his return to Bologna with Porcari, who was podestà there in 1432, Gaspare joined the Camaldolese order, following the example of his former teacher Traversari, for whom he did much scholarly research during his sojourn in houses of the order at Bologna, Florence and Siena in the next decade. His residence at Siena intensified his interest in the most famous preacher of the age, Bernardino of Siena, whose eloquent sermons, in which quotations from Juvenal and Virgil mingled congenially with those from Augustine and John Chrysostom, reflected his early training under Guarino.⁷ Bernardino died in 1444, and five years later preparations were already being made for his canonization in the Holy Year of 1450. It is no wonder, then, that Gaspare, dedicating his commentary on the sixth satire to Pope Nicholas in 1449, compared the ethical value of Juvenal and other classical satirists to that of the sermons of contemporary preachers, and primarily of Bernardino, whose especial sanctity had been proved by posthumous miracles. Like the satirists, Bernardino narrated the vilest incidents as effective warnings against sin; probably few men, Gaspare shrewdly remarked, actually learned anything new about sin from school-masters and preachers, but those who did would at least be better able to avoid the temptations they understood. The novelty in this familiar defence of Juvenal against the charge of obscenity is the analogy between ancient satires and contemporary preachers. In the preface to the tenth

⁷ Tiraboschi (above, note 4) 6.1660-68; G. Saitta, *Il Pensiero Italiano nell' Umanesimo* 1 (Bologna 1949) 290-307.

satire Gaspare, to support his claim that in the three satires of Book IV Juvenal was a true philosopher and moralist, chose an earlier parallel:

Atque haud scio an sanctissimus ille vir Franciscus Assisianus magis vitam, honores, facultates huius saeculi spreverit quam Iuvenalis in hoc libro. . . . In hoc quarto libro est aspectus contemptus divitiarum, maiestatum, pomparum, honorum, dignitatum.

The name *Ambrosius* in 6.77 inspired memories of an Ambrosius who was general of the Camaldolese order, most learned in Latin and Greek, and dearly loved by Gaspare. Gaspare's scrupulous care to explain Juvenal's pagan theology without prejudice to Christian truth may well be attributed to his years of monastic life; he was careful, however, to leave to experts the last word on difficult theological questions. Hence in his comment on 6.551: *Et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri*, he wrote:

. . . Haec est pulchra quaestio atque honesta subtilisque concertatio . . . haec quaestio redundat ad illam nostrae prudentiae et praescientiae et praedestinationis divinae. Posset obiungi praeterea quod omnino indicentur contingentia. Scientia enim Dei infallibilis est, sic providentia, sic praedestinatio. Verum theologis relinquo hanc materiam, quam benedictus Deus voluit me pulchre intellegere. Et tamen quia non summam dici explanarique possit omitto. Praeterea haud ad me attinet.

Again, on *quantula nostra voluptas* (6.254), he recommends the Gospels as a better guide to Christian pleasures than Juvenal, on the authority of "very learned men, in whose judgment I have more confidence than in my own, for I do not claim to be a theologian."

Juvenal's account of primitive man (5.11-13) provoked the reminder that "our Catholic faith and the holy scriptures give the true account of human origins," and that it is impious and heretical to accept Aristotle's theory of the eternity of the world, which is contrary to sound doctrine: "Concedere autem potes omnia ab aeterno fuisse in mente divino." Gaspare did not hesitate, however, to speak *more gentiliū* of the gods and goddesses so often mentioned by Roman poets and historians. He suggested an alternative course for narrowly conscientious students: "Si vis, tu intellege res ipsas ex deorum nominibus, ut cum dicimus Bacchum pro vino, et certe hic est sensus satiri nostri" (6.1). Again, on *theatro* (6.67), speaking of the chronological absurdity of the tradi-

tion that the Temple of Peace would fall when a virgin should bear a child, he said: "Attamen sive credas sive non parvi facio, cum non sit articulus fidei." He had, however, been sufficiently interested in the question to consult Guarino and his learned friends from Arezzo, Leonardo, Carlo Marsuppini, and Tortelli, and to register their agreement that the date of the Flavian temple vitiated the legend.⁸

Thoroughly consistent with his monastic vocation, again, is his assignment of priority over all the rest to the sixth satire, on the ground that all who read it through would cancel any plans for marriage that they might have made. The man had already triumphed over the monk when Gaspare revised his lectures on this satire for presentation to Pope Nicholas in 1449, for by 1445 he had left the Camaldolese order and was teaching in Rome, where his lectures were attended by many Englishmen as well as by Italians. A letter to Tortelli written between March 1450 and 1452 shows that he soon forgot the warnings of this favorite satire, for he married a young wife, who apparently had nothing in common with the females excoriated by Juvenal; after her premature death he married a second time and had several children.⁹

His teaching at Rome won him both experience and reputation as a grammarian; its first-fruits were his *Regulae grammaticales*, to which he referred in his comment on 6.231, *desperanda*, as already in circulation, for he says: "Itaque ut brevissime dicam activa sunt *spero* et *despero*, quod in grammaticis meis edisserui." He continued to revise this textbook during his later years, as the successive versions preserved in the two manuscripts and the two printed editions indicate; it is of interest for the free use of vernacular terms to explain Latin words, though it never rivalled the grammars of Guarino, Perotti and Mancinelli in popularity.¹⁰ Many passages in the Juvenal commentaries show that his interest in grammar went far beyond the rudimentary requirements for exposition of the text.¹¹

⁸ Other comments of interest in this connection are that on 6.323, *virtus natalibus aequa*, in which he affirms his belief in the Virgin Birth, but adds: "at modum et rationem nescio naturalem," and quotes Dante on the limitations of human knowledge; on vows in connection with 10.6; on fate, 10.146; on 10.366, where he approves Juvenal's denial of divinity to Fortuna; also on 13, *init.*, on sin and absolution.

⁹ Zippel (above, note 4) xxviii.

¹⁰ MSS Casanatensis 285 and Ottobon. lat. 1347; editions, Brescia, 1475 and Milan, 1486. Sabbadini (above, note 4) 44 ff. dates the work between 1449 and 1455, overlooking this reference. The two printed editions show that it remained in circulation for a full generation.

¹¹ As in the note on *in trivio* (6.412): "Trivium a tribus viis sicut quadrivium a

He modestly called himself "pusillus grammaticus" (10.314), recognizing that grammar and the other studies of the *trivium* were the elementary crafts of scholarship, but he consciously sought to improve the level of instruction.

He thought that most grammarians were too prone to find excuses for vagueness on difficult points: "Grammaticus tamen potest se semper excusare: 'Illam esse congruam.' . . . De vere et flore non curat grammaticus" (6.39). Few, except Leonardo Bruni and Guarino, really understood such essential distinctions as that between *aliquis*, *quisquam*, *quispiam* and *quidam* (6.55). One of the rare cases of direct use of Gaspare's commentary is Pellegrino Allio's incorporation of this note, almost *verbatim*, in his own commentary in MS Ravenna 237. A good grammarian should at least have studied dialectics, as Gaspare suggests in an autobiographical comment on *nec non* (6.282):

Duae negationes affirmativum faciunt; ita didici in dialecticis, nam grammatici rationem huius nesciunt, quae negatio est indignantis, vere quicquid inveniens destruens. De hoc meliuscule novi quam de physicis. Et annos quattuor legi Romae in gymnasio publico tempore Eugenii Quarti et Nicolai Quinti, verissimorum et indubitatorum summorum pontificum. Nunc quiesco. . . .

He attributed the prevalent confusion of spelling and syntax among Roman scribes and notaries to their reliance on poor textbooks. Eberardus of Béthune might be pardoned for his many ineptitudes because he died before he could correct his *Grecismus*, but there were fully as many errors in the popular works of Alexander de Villa Dei and Papias; the latter, however, was less faulty than that which Hugutio compiled from it. Hugutio was fairly competent in Latin, but his Greek etymologies were utterly ridiculous (6.562; 10.117).¹² The most serious source of error, he thought, was that grammar was studied chiefly by boys too young to grasp it thoroughly, and was not reenforced by reading in sound Latin authors:

quattuor viis. Grammatica, dialectica, rhetorica trivium sunt aut triviales, quae ubique legebantur in triviis. Quoque unde triviale dicimus fabrum, quia imperitum et vilem, mediocrem atque communem, nam singulares et excelsae res magis privatim et occulte traduntur. . . ."

¹² Mediaeval grammarians are rarely mentioned in 15th century commentaries on Juvenal. On their continued popularity in Renaissance schools see Manitius, *Gesch. d. lat. Literatur des M.A.* vol. 3. Papias' work was composed c. 1050, and Alexander's *Doctrinale* in 1199; Eberardus died about 1213, and Hugutio, who studied and taught at Bologna, where Gaspare must have known his reputation in canon law as well as in grammar, compiled his *Liber derivationum* from a copy of Papias which he found at Ferrara when he became bishop there in 1190,

Non enim probe didicerunt grammaticam, nec Priscianum lectitarunt. Nil enim aliud legerunt quam *Chartula nostra tibi mittit, Rainalde, salutes, et Tres leo naturas et tres habet unde figuras, et Eva columba fuit*, in quo debent scire grammaticam! Et quod peius est, habuerunt regulas artis in pueritia aut adulescentia, ubi nihil boni comprehenderunt. Nec mirum, cum magistri sint prorsus ignari, quaerunt modos significandi et speculationem et metaphysicam, et nesciunt loqui Latine, quorum multos monui amice ut legant auctores post Priscianum, vel etiam simul. Sed de his satis (6.421).

Gaspare's four years in the "public gymnasium" at Rome were followed by a journey through Apulia with his old patron Porcari, now a dangerous friend for a man dependent on papal favor for his livelihood. For Porcari, fired by enthusiasm for the republican liberties of ancient Rome, had attempted on Eugenius' death in 1447 to arouse the modern populace to overthrow the "signoria of the priests," and was therefore exiled from the city by Nicholas V, who preferred to utilize his undoubted diplomatic talents on missions at a safe distance from the Leonine City. Though Gaspare's inadequate Greek scholarship has been suggested as one reason for Nicholas' failure to give him the post he craved, his friendship with Porcari may well have figured also. While he praised the Greek language and literature repeatedly in his commentary, he gives little evidence of real competence in that field; as he taught Greek in the Roman Studio in later years, he may well have employed part of his enforced leisure in Hellenic studies. But the immediate task by which he hoped to gain both the Pope's favor and the salaried post that he needed for himself and his young wife, was the formal editing and presentation to Nicholas of his commentary on the sixth satire, in which he lost no opportunity to praise the Pope's wisdom and generosity, to call attention to his own arduous and useful labors, and to beg for a public appointment. As he wrote to Tortelli, who was now librarian of the new Vatican library and a leader in papal circles, life away from Rome was unthinkable; he would gladly be a scribe or *cancellarius*, but would much prefer to lecture on the poets; he was reluctant to impart the first elements of literature, "but who in these times will listen to lectures on dialectic or oratory or poetics?" A later letter shows that he gained the desired post, and gave early morning lectures on Terence and Virgil, the *Ethici* and *Aristotelici*, to "a hundred men, almost all bearded."¹³

¹³ Letters quoted by Zippel, *Un Umanista in Villa 9*, and *Vite di Paolo II*, xxviii (above, note 4), from MS Vat. lat. 3908.

Meanwhile he polished up his lecture notes on Book IV of the satires, and began work on some of the others, which, unfortunately, he never completed. References to Tortelli suggest that the bulk of this work was done before their long friendship ended in 1452, and before Porcari's fatal conspiracy in January 1453. His remaining years may be briefly summarized. The accession of Calixtus III, whose nephew Rodrigo Borgia he had tutored, restored him again to favor; he became a papal secretary, and under Pius II gained the coveted chair of Greek and Latin rhetoric in the Studio, a post which he probably kept under Paul II, whose biography he wrote. On his temporary retirement to Viterbo in 1473 he was succeeded by his brilliant pupil Martino Filetico, and the two men seem to have shared the chair when Gaspare returned for a few months before his death in the next year.

Though his hope that his commentary would serve future generations of students was not realized, and though the rapid progress in classical scholarship during the next generation might have doomed it to oblivion even if he had completed and published it, his skill and his deserved reputation as a teacher lend interest to the methods he used in expounding the text, apart from the many illustrations already given of the extent to which he utilized his personal experiences and his wide range of interests to make the study of Juvenal a vital part of his students' "general education."

As we have seen, Gaspare chose the sixth satire as most worthy of a full commentary, for presentation to Pope Nicholas. In his dedicatory letter he stated that he had copied his notes "precise velut meo in ludo literario lectitavi, nil fere adiiciens, nilque detrahens," in simple everyday language, "pro iuvenum adolescentiumque clariori enodatorique doctrina"; we may probably assume that he began his lectures with this satire, as a seminar topic for students who had been introduced to the satires at an earlier stage in their schooling. The extensive introduction, which includes much of the material commonly found in *praelectiones* or in the *accessus* to the first satire, supports this theory. Not only is the sixth the longest of the satires, with the widest range of material for study, but Gaspare considered it especially attractive for religious men and celibates. He offered, if Nicholas himself should insist, to complete his commentary, or if the Pope preferred, to edit his lectures on Cicero, *De officiis*, or on Suetonius. In a note on 6.187, he looked forward to editing Book I:

. . . *passiones et affectiones animi sunt ira et gaudium, de quibus pulchre, volente Deo, et aliis etiam dicemus in expositione primi libri, si quando dabitur locus interpretandi, quam rem lubens facerem, nam perpaucissimi librum Iuvenalis intellegunt.*

Again, on *historia* (6.450), he promised a brief explanation of the difference between *annales* and *historiae* in connection with Book I. In his concluding letter to Nicholas he repeated his resolution not to expound the remaining books except at Nicholas' request: "Neque enim facile est hoc opus interpretari, propter infinitas fabulas, historias, facultates et rerum plurimarum varietatem." Yet he was sure that if Nicholas imposed the task on him it would be of great service both to contemporary and later students. In spite of many requests he had not shown the work to any one as yet, but he obviously hoped that its presentation to Nicholas would be the prelude to a wider circulation. He concluded his final letter with renewed apologies for the simple style he had used, not indeed incongruous or barbarous, but still lowly and almost rustic: "Nam si locutus essem, ut potuissem, ornate, graviter, copiose et aliqua cum maiestate, intellexissent me perpauci. Nolo alios commentarios in meum, et qui me noluerit reiiciat. Nam nihilo minus sum cenaturus, summo Deo volente et Domino nostro Nicholao Quinto!"

This conclusion, with its defiance of the artificially "Ciceronian" style on which some of his contemporaries insisted, and its conscious echo of the old scribal subscriptions, is thoroughly characteristic. His purpose was to elucidate the text, not to display his scholarship; he made full but critical use of the mediaeval apparatus on Juvenal, which he assimilated and reworded instead of copying excerpts *verbatim* as some other commentators did, and which he supplemented with judiciously selected additions from his own experience and study.

Shortly after he presented the commentary on the sixth satire to the Pope, he edited his notes on Book IV, satires 10-12, which he chose as best suited to his own competence and understanding, and for their undoubted value to students. Again he promised commentaries on Books III, I and V, listing them in this order, provided that Nicholas should insist. Only part of the project was completed, however, and two references to his comments on other satires are doubtless based on his lectures.¹⁴ The commentary on

¹⁴ See note 3, above. The anonymous commentary in MS Corsini 43 F 13 cites a

Book IV is the only one that is worked out to a degree at all comparable with that on the sixth satire, which it was obviously intended to follow and supplement in his course of lectures. For in the introduction to this book he says:

. . . Nec est omnino niti atque minute pergere in hac expositione huius quarti libri. . . . Raro puerilia dicam, quod tamen in interpretamentis secundi libri non servavi. Illud erit satis si modo textus verba sensusque declaravero, cum historiis fabulisque necessariis. Ea enim taceri non possunt quae necessaria sunt cognitioneque dignissima.

For his introduction to the sixth satire he carefully revised the *accessus* that commonly preceded the anonymous mediaeval commentary most widely circulated in his day,¹⁵ supplementing it from his own wide reading:

Quae in libri primi initio quaerenda essent pleraque in huius secundi principio aperire decrevi, et ea quidem pernecessaria scitu, nam supervacanea missa faciam. Solent enim nonnulli hoc loco edissere quod a primordio voluminis inchoantes explicare deberent, ut puta Iuvenalem nostrum fuisse Aquinatem et beatissimi predicatoris Thomae, viri sanctissimi, theologi acutissimi, compatriotam . . . aliaque huiusmodi quae impraesentiarum mittenda esse censeo. Atque alia multa multo nobiliora et ea quidem quae scire peropus est narrare scribereque proposui.

He then summed up the usual account of the origins and nature of satire, adding references to Festus Pompeius and Diomedes, and recommending spelling *satyra* with the Greek *ypsilo*, on the authority of the most learned Greeks. To the customary history of Latin satire he added useful advice for those who wished to write as well as to study satire:

. . . meminerint etiam qui in hunc numerum referri volunt, id servare debere, ut quaecumque in satira agitantur, sive ad physicas artes aut historias aut quidvis aliud attineant, omnia ad unum principaleque propositum dirigantur atque referantur. . . .

His conviction of the importance of this precept is shown by its repetition in the introduction to Book IV: "Praecepimus alias et quidem praecipiemus crebro cupientibus intellegere Iuvenalem, ut cuique satirae ascribatur mens una primaria." The satirist must

note from "Gaspare praestantissimus grammaticus Veronensis" on 1.156; ms Laur. Edile 198, which belonged to G. A. Vespucci, has a note on the Roman hills (9.131) attributed to Gaspare.

¹⁵ Commentary 2 in my forthcoming study of Latin commentaries on Juvenal.

follow Horace's precepts on careful composition and avoidance of mixed metaphors. His revision of the customary survey of the history of Latin satire stresses the superiority of Juvenal, though Horace claims priority in time: "*Ceterum misso tempore credo anteponendum Aquinatem Venusino elegantia, maiestate, copia, scientia.*" This judgment was not unusual in mediaeval and Renaissance commentaries on Juvenal. The introduction concludes with the analogy between satirists and preachers, already mentioned, and with jibes at a contemporary grammarian whose life was no better than his scholarship, but who claimed to have written an original satire — "*atque uti emendatior esset grammaticus!*" For a satirist, like a preacher, must be a good man, and presumably a good grammarian also, if he is to justify his claims.

After praising Nicholas V, the second year of whose pontificate was now almost at an end, Gaspare called on God to silence those who objected to Juvenal on the ground of obscenity. For, he said, even if some men do learn of a hitherto unrecognized evil by reading the satires, they will be the better for their knowledge: "*Scire certe malum non puto malum. Malum certe est male vivere*" — a sentiment that is not without its current application.

In the commentary itself, Gaspare regularly copied several consecutive lines of the text, as he must have read them aloud in his lectures, and then summarized their general purport, after which he took up the passage line by line, commenting in detail on significant grammatical points, figures of speech, orthography, and historical allusions, with briefer summaries of the fables alluded to in the text. He often used the words "*Dicit Iuvenalis*" or "*Inquit Iuvenalis*," to keep the author before his students' minds. He paraphrased only such passages as seemed to present real difficulties of interpretation. On others he commented: "*Textus est sole clarior*"; "*Nec hic textus difficilis est*"; "*Etiam hi decem versus nulla difficultate tenentur*"; "*Fere totus textus clarissimus est. Satis est ordinem litterae explicare*" (i.e., to explain the word-order); or, with more explicit instructions to the student: "*Connecte hos versus cum superioribus, et construe simul, quia ex se textus est clarior sole.*" But his comments are often very extensive, sometimes running to a column or more on a single line that presented difficulties or included words, topics or sentiments of special interest.

His habit of using the second person singular as if addressing his hearers individually is consistent with his obvious intention that

the students should use their own minds and not merely follow his dictation. So on 10.81, where the reading *Pan* for *panem* caused so many difficulties,¹⁶ he wrote: "Sequere hanc expositionem ut meliorem. Elige quae tibi potior videbit."

He was less devoted to elaborate etymologizing than were most commentators; as he said in his comment on *ferula* (6.479): "Tenebatur olim in manu preceptoris et diverberabat manus discipuli, ideo multi volunt a feriendo dictum. Sed parvi facio tot varietatem etymologiarum." He liked to repeat comments on general characteristics of the satires, as on 6.130, where he said: "Vide tu quod, ut saepe dictum est, Iuvenalis scripsit quae videbat, quaeque sciebat esse vera." His interest in improving the students' own Latin style is well illustrated by two comments. On 6.176: *Dum sibi nobilior Latonae gente videtur*, he remarked:

Et nota elegantem sermonem linguae Latinae. Niobe videtur sibi nobilior. Non dixit: "videtur sibi quod sit nobilior," ut si dicas: "videor mihi esse egregius grammaticus," potius quam "videtur mihi quod sim egregius grammaticus." Id eleganter et pulchre, hoc rusticane.

Again on 6.254: *Vir nollet fieri*, he used a contemporary parallel that reverses the familiar phrase "Nolo episcopari":

Dicimus "volo fieri episcopus," et "volo esse diaconus," sed dicimus quoque "volo me fieri episcopum" et "volo me esse diaconum." Breviares sunt primi et politioris sermonis sine accentu, quibus magis utuntur auctores. Quisquis enim sive rhetoricus sive grammaticus sive dialecticus dici de nostris vult, debet si Latine vult loqui, Latinitatem complecti, id est ut fugiat barbarismum et soloecismos, ut videtur velle Cicero, *Ad Herennium*, cum dicit elocutionis oratoriae esse partes quinque. . . .

He was always alert to refresh and extend his students' knowledge of other Latin authors also, and to recommend further reading in them. Explaining *Madidis cantat quae Sostratus alis* (10.178), he said:

. . . Sed quaeso dic quamobrem gallus quatit alas cum cantaturus est? respondeo quia strictum pectus suapte natura nititur dilatare passis agitatisque alis. Tu solve melius. *Felix qui potuit rerum dinoscere causas*, dicit poeta Latinus; et quae diximus de poeta tu sis memor.

He gave them a convenient list of standard authors to use as models, in his comment on 6.13: *nullos habuere parentes*:

¹⁶ See "Bread and Circuses" (note 1, above).

Quod autem nonnulli dicunt parentem pro propinquo vel affine, in hoc ii somniant, nam frater meus aut filius fratris non potest parens dici, nec in bonis umquam compertum est, dico in bonis veteribus, ex quibus linguam Latinam didicimus, ut Virgilius, Statius, Horatius, Iuvenalis, Persius, Terentius, Plautus atque alii illiuscemodi.

He recommended reading Cicero's letters for the distinction between compounds of *testari* (6.216), Ovid's *Metamorphoses* on *varia natura malorum* (13.236), Quintilian on the Gracchi (6.161), and the life of Cicero, either in Plutarch's Greek or in the work compiled by Leonardo Bruni from many historians, to explain the reference to Clodius in 6.345. Priscian was recommended on many passages, and Cicero, *De natura deorum* on 6.512, and the *Tusculans* on 10.4, while 6.8 gave opportunity for praise of his fellow-Veronese Catullus. This last comment reflects his reading of several of Catullus' poems, though he could not refrain from giving the mediaeval interpretation of the sparrow as a libidinous lover of Lesbia's, which, however, he describes as merely an allegorical interpretation of the poem. A mediaeval holdover appears also in his use of the name *Martialis Cocus* for Martial. One useful work whose lack he lamented is still among the undiscovered classical texts. On 10.102 he refrained from discussing the names and origins of Gabii, Fidenae, Ulubrae and other ancient towns, though his travels had familiarized him with their remains, ". . . praesertim cum non legerem Hyginum, quem saepe mire suspiravi, quod scripsit de nominibus urbium et conditionibus, quem quidem amisimus. Laus Deo." Sometimes his recommendations for further reading are left vague, as on Crassus (10.108), where he merely says that he will give a brief account: "nam alibi leges copiosius." His recommendations are not confined to classical authors, but include a few contemporaries also, as in the case of Leonardo's life of Cicero, mentioned above, and his translation of the life of Demosthenes (10.114).

His desire to round out his students' information as far as possible led him to list the Greek names of the seven liberal arts in his comment on 6.254, with the remark:

Quamquam geometria et astrologia non ad propositum, sed eas adieci ut ordine omnes artes liberales explicarem. Libenter evagor ac digredior, modo usum auditoribus lectoribusque fore intellegam. Nihil liberalius nota Latinitate, Latinitas enim pars rhetoricae et poeseos.

Yet he could on occasion resist the temptation to digress, as when he reluctantly refrained (11.120) from discussing the many articles

made in his own time from the "bones of elephants' teeth," for fear of boring his readers, or when he concluded a fairly long digression in his note on 10.158 by saying: "Taceo alia permulta, ne mediocritatem nimia prolixitate excedam. Non possum me continere ab extasi et digressionem; attamen cuncta utilissima sunt."

Spelling was a real problem to Gaspare's generation, and his autograph manuscripts show how difficult it was to follow the correct form, even when one knew what it was. Aspirates were one of the chief stumbling-blocks to correct Latinity; in the lemma on 14.17 he wrote *elementa* correctly, but in his comment wavered between *helementa* and the unaspirated form. Explaining that *moechos* (6.24) required the *c aspiratum*, he listed the parallel cases of *monachus*, *patriarcha*, *eunuchus* and *monarchus* for his students' instruction, but on 6.24 and elsewhere he absentmindedly used the aspirate for *pecchata*. Correct spelling was as difficult to exact from fifteenth century as from twentieth century students, even if the teacher had always been sure of his ground; on 6.160, explaining that *cycnus* required *ypselon* and *c* before the last syllable, he added: "verum nostri corrumpunt omnia, posueruntque *g* pro *c* et dixerunt *cygnus*." On 6.224, using Priscian for the correct spelling of *haec* and *hi*, indignation at the carelessness of his fellow grammarians overcame him, somewhat to the prejudice of his own Latin style, which was usually clear:

Sed ignoscant me quotquot sunt, errant, licet nonnulli sunt qui licet scribant, sciunt se tamen prorsus errare, sed parvi pendunt hunc errorem, quod non est nisi unius litterae, praeterea multitudo peccantium videtur excusare illos. Praeterea non videtur error ex quo argentum affertur domum.

He has heard that the "Transalpini" are better than the Italians in their treatment of these words, but is not sure whether this is true or not.

Even the spelling of so usual a word as *cunctus* was a matter for consultation with other scholars, and in his comment on 6.190 he adds to Guarino's testimony the evidence of an inscription which he quotes at length, doubtless feeling that his students should share his pleasure in all four lines of the poem, and not merely that in which the word in question appeared:

Cuncta: cunctus, cta, ctum. Ego scribere (*sic*) per *u* et *n* cum *c*. Sic exarat conterraneus meus Guarinus Veronensis, et ego legi huiusmodi orthographiam in ara quadam quae est in templo seu ecclesia Sancti

Angeli prope Sanctum Spiritum trans Tiberim, prope Sanctum Petrum, ubi sunt quidam versus et epitaphion Homonoie et viri sui Atimeti. Est enim ibi tale carmen descriptum:

Illa ego quae claris fueram praelata puellis,
Cui formam Paphiae Charites tribuere decorem,
Hoc Homonoie brevi condita sum tumulo,
Quam Pallas cunctis artibus erudiit.

He often referred to Greek usage in discussing orthography and etymologies, as indeed Juvenal's liberal use of Greek derivatives required. His own knowledge of the language, at least at this time, was only moderate, as we have seen, but he was anxious to impress the importance of Greek on his students, and gave generous praise to his own Greek teacher, Abbot Peter of Grotta Ferrata, for whom he besought Nicholas' generosity, in his comment on 10.158, in which he took up the pronunciation of *belua*, with reference to the length of syllables in Greek words:

. . . Utinam dominus noster praemio digno afficeret dominum Petrum Cryptae Ferratae abbatem, multo dignissimum, et quotannis trecentos florentinos more Romano, id est centum et L aureos impenderet, qui legeret atque doceret linguam Graecam, sine cuius cognitione male scimus Latinam. Omnes enim libri nostri sunt tincti litteratura Graeca verbisque Graecis. Immo si credimus Prisciano omnem eloquentiae doctrinam et omne studiorum genus sapientiae luce praefulgens a Graecorum fontibus derivari constat.

Memories of Sappho's reputation aroused his indignation at Juvenal's attack on women who write books (6.24 f.), again with praise of Abbot Peter's Hellenism:

Quid dices de Sappho poetissa seu vati seu poetride? Quocumque nomine dicas, omnia haec recte dicuntur. Non placuit certe Iuvenali mulieres componere libros; fortasse dixisset quod Sappho non fuit pudica? Aut certe dicendum quod *Una hirundo non facit ver*, ut dixit Philosophus in primo *Ethicorum*. . . . Ita enim Graece me docuit pronuntiare et scribere linguam Graecam vir doctissimus Petrus abbas Cryptae Ferratae, Graecus Calaber, vir integerrimae vitae, licet sit pro Sanctae Mariae monasterio suo litigiosus.

He also praises Gaspare of Volaterra, who spoke Latin like Greek, and Greek like Latin, and both excellently (6.512). His references to Greek literature, however, are not such as required any intimate knowledge of the works themselves, but they are adequate to arouse the students' interest, and accurate enough not to mislead them, aside from such slips as making Socrates the teacher of both Plato

and Aristotle (13.185–87). On *Graecia* (6.16) he lists the five forms of the Greek language, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic, Attic, and *communis* (i.e. *koinê*), and describes briefly the areas in which each was spoken. The word *elementis* in 14.17 gave him an opportunity to explain that *alfabetum* (*sic*) “componitur ab *alfa* et *vita*, id est ab *a* et *b*,” and to urge his students to learn the Greek alphabet.

Gaspare made less use of vernacular terms to explain Latin words in his commentary than he had in his Latin grammar, but on 14.4–5, *Bullatus heres*, he said: “ut etiam hodie ponuntur bullae argenteae in vestibus puerorum. *Bulla*, id est *le copette* et *li sconagli*.” Again, on 14.8, *Boletum condire et eodem iure*, he forestalls possible confusion between the two varieties of *ius* in Latin, by translating *ius* into Italian: “id est *brodo*.” He made more use, as we have seen, of contemporary life, and especially of his own experiences, than of contemporary language to illustrate the text. On 6.582–84, he describes in some detail how Cardinal Fumanus (Domenico Capranica) ordered a woman accused of witchcraft *in agro Perusino* to be burned for her detestable art, a reminder that Juvenal’s witches were not without modern parallels, and shortly after, commenting on the same passage, he tells of old countrymen at Verona who could find by divination the whereabouts of a lost ass or horse, using magic spells to make stars appear to fall where the lost property was to be found. One of them, a man of eighty years, illiterate though he was, could predict the exact place where lightning would strike. This contemporary instance gave grounds for opposing those who claimed that *fulgura condere* meant merely *conferre* and *abscindere*. The word *saeculum* in 6.24 gave occasion for a detailed account of the preparations for the Holy Year of 1450, which, to imitate Gaspare’s fondness for personal reminiscence, I found most timely when I read it in the Vatican Library in the spring of 1950, when another *Anno Santo* was in full sway:

. . . et potest dici saeculum maius L annorum, in cuius fine fit celebratio Iubilei, qualem celebrationem seu celebritatem ad annum unum omnes Christiani opperiantur. Sunt et fuerunt ipso anno mirabiles indulgentiae a pontificibus et, ut paulum digrediar a proposito meo, in fine huius saeculi, id est quinquaginta annorum, qui finis erit ad annum, apparebit prudentia et scientia et sapientia Nicolai Quinti. . . . Cuius quidem constitutiones in dies magis atque magis placent, placituraeque sunt, tanto sensu, prudentia tanta sunt confectae; et si Deus nos illuc usque salvos produxerit, mira videbimus in hoc ipso summo pontifice. . . . Eo ipso anno benedictiae advenient Polloni, Pannoni, Germani, quos alii

Alemannos appellant, sed Alemannia pars est Germaniae assistens undique flumini Lemando. Nec non Galli; Gallia nunc multas habet partes, de quibus alias. Hispani pariter, qui Christiani sunt. Nam et Hispania complures itidem habet partes, in quibus alicubi non sunt Christiani. Itidem Itali, Illirici, Dalmati, Siculi confluent. Denique omnes reges Christiani suos Romam dimittunt populos, sinentque venire, tum videndi gratia novi summi pontificis adeo sapientis, de quo potest dici, ut de Tydeo dicit Statius: *Maiores in exiguo regnabat corpore virtus*, tum Romae quoque visendae causa et habendae peccatorum veniae, quam amplificabit ipse pontifex maximus confessis vereque contritis.

A parallel reference, though much briefer, is found in ms lat. 40 in the Houghton Library of Harvard University, dated 1462, in a note on 16.42: *qui lites inchoet annus*. It must have been a great disappointment to Gaspare when the plague, and the Pope's flight from the plague-stricken city, prevented the actual celebration of 1450 from realizing his high hopes for it.

This very human teacher showed his concern for his students' digestion as well as for their scholarship. He warned them to shun vinegar as they would fire, at least in their daily eating and drinking, for it was a deadly enemy to all who suffered from catarrh, though it had its medicinal value for those who had indulged overmuch in alcoholic beverages; for these, however, it was to be applied externally, as the doctors' books advise (10.153). They are, however, to drink the best wine possible, "ad claritatem cordis et corporis sanitatem" (10.178). Juvenal's reference to cabbages in 6.18 provoked a comment as useful for the diet as for orthography:

Qui sunt caules quis ignorat? Hi non incongrue *coles* dicuntur a quibusdam, ut *saurex*, *sorex*; *plastrum*, *plostrum*; *cauda*, *coda*; *caudex*, *codex*. Quatenus vero sint cocendi caules reticero, ne videar plus sapere quam oporteat, et ea dicere quae nihil aut parum attinent ad rem. Quidnam valeant corpori humano an callidi an frigidi aut temperantes optime calleo, silentio tamen praeteribo, sicut et de multis herbis quibus hactenus ingerendis sum oblectatus magnopere. *Pomum* quid sit in genere et in specie dixi superius. Nolo repetere, ne tam puerilia decies repetita sint taedio, et nullo pacto placeant.

It seems a pity that a teacher who showed such a genuine interest in the scholarly, moral and physical welfare of his students should have been denied the immortality for which he hoped. His commentary on Juvenal, incomplete though he left it, was in many respects his major work, but it failed to gain circulation either in manuscript or in printed copies. He had written in his comment on 10.314, addressing Pope Nicholas:

Sum enim pusillus grammaticus, et iniunctis mihi a tua Sanctitate laboribus lubens do operam, tum ut parens beatitudini tuae, tum ut pluribus prosim. . . . Antea enim lego auditoribus ea quae post monumentis et scripturae trado. Posteris enim pro virili planto et sero, quibus meum opusculum erit usui et utilitati.

We can only hope that the students who flocked to his lectures transmitted enough of what he taught them to their pupils in turn, as Martino Filetico and Cantalicio assuredly did, so that his hopes of being useful to future generations of scholars were not entirely vain. Modern scholars, who like to dismiss mediaeval and Renaissance commentaries on classical authors as "banal and trivial," would do well to reflect on Gaspare's comment on the word *trivium*, cited earlier in this paper,¹⁷ for it is to the *Trivium* that we owe the continuous study of classical authors which preserved them for us; it is a pity that such a worthy word should have come to such a trivial end.

¹⁷ See note 11, above.