

VIII.—Renaissance Commentaries on Juvenal

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE

The chief Renaissance commentaries on Juvenal were composed in Italy in the latter half of the fifteenth century. Some of them made considerable use of the "Cornutus" scholia that formed the major part of mediaeval comments on the satires. The majority were highly individual and personal, reflecting the varied scholarly interests of the times, and were productive of heated controversy. In the sixteenth century, the few commentaries produced were brief works intended for school use, though individual passages of the satires engaged the interest of many notable scholars. This paper is based on printed editions of the commentaries and on secondary studies; it is preliminary to projected research in European libraries on the unprinted commentaries.

Juvenal was one of the classical authors most widely read throughout the Middle Ages. The satires were extensively quoted by mediaeval writers. Many manuscripts, and contemporary treatises on education, attest his popularity in the schools. The uninhibited language of his attacks on vice occasioned no prudish qualms in that lusty age. His diatribes against avarice, luxury and lust, and against women, who shared with gold the unenviable reputation of being major incentives to the commission of deadly sins, offered strong meat for schoolboys, convincing support for scriptural precepts, and models both for the Goliards and for more conventional poets.¹ Opposition to this most honored *auctor ethicus* was rare, and was usually motivated, not by the content of his works, but by the excessive devotion they inspired in some readers. In the eleventh century, a diabolical vision of Juvenal, Vergil, and Horace is said to have caused one Vilgardus, a grammarian at Ravenna, to exalt the authority of these pagan poets above that

¹ F. Gabotto, *Appunti sulla Fortuna di alcuni Autori Romani nel Medio Evo* (Verona, 1891) 40–54; J. A. Hild, "Juvenal dans le Moyen Age," *Bull. Mensuel de la Faculté de Lettres de Poitiers* (Paris, 1890–1891) 1.177–189, 2.39–54, 3.106–116, 4.116–122, 235–248; M. Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Dichter im Mittelalter," *Philologus* 1 (1891) 354–368; idem, "Philologisches aus alten Bibliothekskatalogen," *RhM, Ergänzungsheft* (1892) 66–68; Santi Consoli, "La Satira II del Giovenale nella Tradizione della Cultura sino alla Fine del Medio Evo," *RFIC* 42 (1914) 209–248; idem, "La Satira IX di Giovenale," *RFIC* 49 (1921) 79–97; F. A. Specht, *Geschichte des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1885) 100 f. It is regrettable that no one has yet studied the relative popularity of individual lines and passages of the *Satires*, as shown by citations and by marginal notes and underscorings in the MSS.

of the Scriptures, a heresy which was duplicated elsewhere in Italy, and spread to Sardinia and Spain before it could be suppressed.²

School texts call for commentaries, as Conrad of Hirschau said, "to draw copious deductions from brief statements, and to illuminate the obscure words of others."³ Though an eleventh century monk at Verona lamented the labor imposed on the clergy by inadequate comments on Juvenal,⁴ the majority were content with scholia culled from various versions of an ancient commentary, which appear as interlinear and marginal glosses in many of the manuscripts. The identity of the compiler of this commentary has eluded the research of modern scholars, and no copy in the original consecutive form has survived. It now seems certain that a single scholar, about A.D. 400, that is, in the generation after Servius, compiled the first substantial commentary on the *Satires*, incorporating in it various older glosses, and that the oldest portions of the mediaeval scholia are derived from this lost work. A notable group of manuscripts contain the *scholia vetera*, which are much closer to the original than those in other codices, in spite of many individual differences. This family is composed of the Bobbio and Aarau fragments, the *Glosula* and excerpts of St. Gall, George Valla's lost manuscript, with the old scholia which he published at Venice in 1486 as the work of the grammarian "Probus," and the scholia more accurately published at Paris by Pierre Pithou in 1585 from a Lorsch manuscript now at Montpellier. The provenience of these manuscripts, and internal evidence, suggest that the preservation of this older group is due, at least in part, to insular interest in Juvenal.⁵

² Radulfus Glaber, *Historiae*, ed. M. Prou (Paris, 1886) 2.12.23. Note also the attack by a 12th or 13th century satirist on those who "magis credunt Juvenali/ Quam doctrinae prophetali/ Vel Christi scientiae" (*Anzeiger f. Kunde d. deutschen Vorzeit* [1871] 232). The *Didascalon* of Conrad of Hirschau (c. 1140) and the *Registrum mul-torum auctorum* of Hugo of Trimberg, composed in 1280, show that the excessive devotion to Juvenal of some fanatics did not affect his continued use for ethical purposes.

³ *Dialogus super auctores, sive Didascalon*, ed. G. Schepss (Würzburg, 1889) 24.

⁴ Quoted by Gabotto, *op. cit.* 48.

⁵ *Scholia Bobiensia*, in *Vat. Lat. 5750*, saec. vi (text saec. iv); *Fragmenta Aroviensia*, Aarau, saec. x/xi; *Sangallensis 870*, saec. ix; *Montepessulanus 125*, saec. ix. For recent summaries and bibliography see P. Wessner, *Scholia in Iuvenalem Velustiora* (Leipzig, 1931) v-xlv; U. Knoche, *Die Überlieferung Juvenals* (Berlin, 1926); idem, rev. of Wessner, *Gnomon* 10 (1938) 590-603; B. Boyer, "Traces of an Insular Tradition in the Ancient Scholia of Juvenal," *CPh* 29 (1934) 240-250. The brief scholia in the Antinoe fragment of Juvenal, written about A.D. 500, are too inept to have any value except as evidence for the study of Juvenal by Greek-speaking students in Egypt; cf. C. H. Roberts, "The Antinoe Fragment of Juvenal," *JEA* 21 (1935) 199-209.

The scholia in most mediaeval manuscripts of Juvenal are classified in two groups of a younger type, with varying degrees of contamination between the two, and with endless differences in selection, accretion, and wording of the material. The active interest in Juvenal among Carolingian scholars is chiefly responsible for these comments. Since it is known that the learned Heiric lectured on the satirists at Auxerre in the middle of the ninth century, and references to "Magister Heiricus" occur among these scholia in some manuscripts, it seems probable that his comments were collected either by Heiric himself, or by his famous pupil, Remigius, whose commentary on Juvenal is listed in two mediaeval library catalogues. They were doubtless also circulated in various forms by other teachers who had been Heiric's pupils.⁶ Heiric did not know the older collection of glosses, which apparently did not circulate at this time in the western Frankish territory, but occasional items of demonstrably early origin, not included in these, appear among the later scholia, together with the Carolingian material and a mass of later accretions, which differ considerably in individual manuscripts. Occasionally entries from the old scholia also appear. Despite the conglomerate character of these glosses, they are often ascribed in late manuscripts to one Cornutus, by analogy with the earlier ascription of Persius-scholia to that satirist's famous teacher. References by Renaissance scholars to the prehumanistic commentaries, which they used far more freely than was consistent with their much-vaunted originality, under the name of "Cornutus," have at least given modern scholars a convenient name by which to identify the Juvenal-scholia of the later recensions.

Heiric and Remigius are the only mediaeval scholars whose names are associated with commentaries on Juvenal, with the possible exception of the English Dominican, Nicholas Trevet. No trace has been found of the "book on Juvenal" ascribed to him by what seems to be a "purely bibliographical tradition."⁷ Several

⁶ See, in addition to references in note 5: L. Traube, in *MGH, Poet. Lat. Aev. Car.* 3.424, and 441, note 3; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 1 (Munich, 1911) 502-513; idem, "Geschichtliches aus mittelalterliche Bibliothekskatalogen," *Neues Archiv*, 32 (1906-1907) 681-682, for the mss of Remigius' commentary in an unknown German library (Bamberg?), saec. xi, and at Glastonbury, saec. xiii; P. Wessner, *JAW* 113 (1902) 216-217, gives a valuable account of the compilation of mediaeval scholia, with special reference to Juvenal.

⁷ R. J. Dean, "Cultural Relations in the Middle Ages: Nicolas Trevet and Nicholas of Prato," *Studies in Philology*, 65 (1948) 553.

anonymous commentaries, however, have an individuality that distinguishes them from the general type, though their compilers naturally drew to some extent on the "Cornutus" material. *Coloniensis* 199 (saec. xi) was compiled in the borderland between France and Germany, perhaps at Liège; as a practical aid to teaching. It includes similar commentaries on Lucan, Macrobius, and Persius. *Dresdensis* Dc 153 (saec. xii), written in the Mathias Kloster at Trier, is another individual commentary by a man familiar both with "Cornutus" and with the *scholia vetera*, whose orthography suggests that he used a Carolingian manuscript, and who inserted a number of local references among his brief notes. The additional scholia in four later hands show that this compilation was still in use in the sixteenth century. *Bibl. Nat. Paris. lat.* 2904, written in the late twelfth century, includes a commentary on the first six satires, whose author cited Bernard of Chartres and William of Conches in his preliminary *accessus*.⁸ There may be more individual commentaries among the many mediaeval manuscripts of Juvenal, but their number is obviously very small by contrast with the popular "Cornutus" type.

From the middle of the fifteenth century the traditional anonymous scholia yielded chief place to consecutive commentaries whose authors proudly boasted of their own work, and often vilified that of their rivals with a flood of abuse far exceeding the bounds of scholarly dignity, and leading to counter-recriminations and sometimes to long-continued controversy. They pondered Juvenal's opening question, commented on it at great length, and evidently resolved that they would not remain long silent, or refrain from retribution against their enemies. The great access of interest in classical writers during the fourteenth century had given literature a prominent place in the universities and in the other schools supported by the north Italian cities, as well as in private schools. Petrarch's friend and admirer, Dionigi de' Roberti, is said to have been the first to lecture in humanistic fashion, at a university, on classical authors. He listed Juvenal both among the historians and the poets essential for a liberal education, though the satires

⁸ On these commentaries see, respectively, Jaffé and Wattenbach, *Eccl. Metr. Coloniensis Codices Manuscripti* (Berlin, 1874) 86-87, 142-150; M. Manitius, "Lesarten und Scholien zu Juvenal aus dem *Dresdensis* 153," *RhM* 68 (1905) 202-228; B. Hauréau, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 29 (1885) 572-573.

are not included among the works on which he composed commentaries.⁹

There was nothing new in Juvenal's satires to excite scholarly enthusiasm in those years when forgotten or neglected treasures of the past were being discovered in bewilderingly rapid succession. The most familiar lines of the satires had acquired a proverbial flavor such as quotations from Shakespeare now have. Some scholars scorned to waste their time on an author who was neither newly discovered, nor Greek, nor even classical in the strict interpretation of the term, on which extreme Ciceronians insisted. Despite these handicaps, Juvenal attracted more interest than one would infer from the scanty references to him in the standard works on Renaissance scholarship. We owe much to the spirit of rivalry that inspired individual scholars to pass judgment on their predecessors' and contemporaries' work in the introductions to their own commentaries, and in their correspondence and miscellanies. The information gained from these sources, and from catalogues of manuscripts and bibliographies of early printed books, adds substantially to the list of scholars who devoted a significant portion of their time and interest to Juvenal studies. It is unfortunate that modern monographs on some of these men fail to mention their work on the satires.

The prince of satirists was a congenial theme for the more irascible humanists, while men of milder temper sought in his satires effective remedies for the corruption of their age, and sometimes found consolation in reflection on the greater abuses mirrored in his attacks on Roman society. Ardent champions of Latin *versus* Greek, and of the Silver Age *versus* the Ciceronians, took Juvenal as their text. The satires also engaged the attention of editors of other works composed during the early Empire, which, unlike Juvenal's book, had been recently recovered from obscurity, and offered a fresh field for commentaries.

Some ambitious scholars composed commentaries on Juvenal to display their own learning by elaborate and often absurd etymologies, extensive citations of parallel passages from Greek and Latin authors, mythological, antiquarian and historical disquisitions, and

⁹ G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums, oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus*³ (Berlin, 1893) 1.450; 2.387-393; for the preface of Dionigi's *Expositio in Valerium Maximum*, see Endlicher, *Catalogus Codd. Philologicorum Lat. Bibl. Pal. Vindobonensis* (Vienna, 1836) 85-86.

references to ancient inscriptions and to Roman law. Even in the commentaries whose compilers were most sincerely endeavoring to illuminate the poet's work, these categories often seem to the modern reader to have been given an emphasis disproportionate to their real value. The popularity of contemporary satires, both in Latin and in the vernacular, doubtless also contributed somewhat to interest in Juvenal. The fifth satire was especially useful for the popular theme of the courtiers' banquet, and the sixth for diatribes against women, whose baneful influence had not ceased with the waning of the Middle Ages. Porcelio and Filelfo, who aimed some of their most mordant shafts at one another, are listed by a late fifteenth-century commentator, Cantalicio, among recent contributors to Juvenal studies, together with those who had composed full commentaries on the satires.¹⁰

Discussions of Juvenal's suitability for use in the schools and for public lectures arose early in the Quattrocento. Vittorino da Feltre thought best, according to Platina, to assign the satires, with judicious excisions, to the last year of the curriculum at his famous school, on account of their frank obscenity.¹¹ His successor, Ognibene Leonicensi, however, encouraged the study of Juvenal by composing a commentary, obviously intended for use by teachers, of which several manuscripts are preserved, though it was not printed.¹² Ognibene's introduction follows the old pattern of the mediaeval *accessus*; his comments are brief, simple, and well-suited to oral delivery. The whole is in keeping with Ognibene's reputation as an industrious and well-informed teacher, who lacked the brilliance requisite for fame. Aeneas Silvius, in his treatise *De liberorum educatione*, published in 1450, included Juvenal among the authors to be studied by his royal pupil, Ladislav of Bohemia and

¹⁰ G. Manacorda, "Notizie intorno alle Fonti di alcuni Motivi satiriche . . . durante il Rinascimento," *Romanische Forschungen*, 22.4 (1907) 733-760; Voigt, *op. cit.* (above, note 9) 2.413; Gabotto, *op. cit.* (above, note 1) 54; G. Zannoni, "Il Cantalicio alle Corte di Urbino," *Rendiconti d. r. Accad. dei Lincei*, 5.3 (1895) 488.

¹¹ W. H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre* (Cambridge, 1897) 47, 214, note 1.

¹² Excerpts from *MS Malatestianus Cesenas xxii. ii*, saec. xv, are given by Muccioli, *Cat. Codd. MSS. Malatestianae Caesenatis Bibliothecae* (Cesena, 1780). The commentary also appears in *MS 89* of Sandanile del Friuli; in *MS 114.40* of the monastery of S. Salvatore, Bologna, taken to Paris by Napoleon, which is described by A. Achaintre, *Juvenalis Satirae* (Paris, 1815) 2.41; in *Brit. Mus. Addit. 22.158*, and in *Bodl. Arch. Selden B 50*. This volume was in the library of John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, who studied at Ferrara under Guarino Veronese. Tiptoft was a close friend of Ognibene, who dedicated his translation of Xenophon to him; cf. R. Weiss, *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1941) 112-115.

Hungary; but he also believed in judicious selection, to avoid lessening the moral value of the satires by passages unfit for youthful ears.¹³ Leonardo Aretino, who drew up an elaborate treatise on education for Baptista Malatesta, declared that women should neither read nor even glance at the satirists and comic poets.¹⁴ Ugolino Pisani of Parma wished to protect young students from corruption by barring Juvenal and Persius, with the amatory poets, from all public lectures, though he approved of their private study by serious individuals.¹⁵ These strictures, however, do not seem to have diminished Juvenal's popularity.

Manuscripts of the mediaeval type, with marginal scholia accompanying the text, continued to be produced, as numerous examples in the Laurentian and other libraries indicate. Other fifteenth-century commentaries, which follow the mediaeval tradition for the most part, bear clear traces of their humanistic origin. Some of these are presented in consecutive form, either without the text of the satires, or following it. *Dresdensis Dc 155*, written at Florence in August, 1452, by the notary Gerardus Johannes del Ciriago, shows its humanistic origin chiefly by comments on the variety, urbanity, and acumen of Juvenal's *sententiae*, and on the corruption of the age that inspired them. Some false readings have been eliminated, and there are considerable additions to the scholia.¹⁶ A manuscript now at Pisa, also copied in 1452, bears the title, *Lectura super satiras iuvenalis, ex commentariis cornuti copiosissime edita*. As the copyist was both ignorant and careless, this commentary contributes nothing to our understanding of the satires, but its title complicated the Cornutus problem for eighteenth-century scholars.¹⁷

One of the Laurentian manuscripts, *Ashburnham 187*, affords a good example of the fortunes of an anonymous commentary. The volume includes the text of the first fourteen satires, written by two

¹³ Woodward, *op. cit.* 150-151.

¹⁴ *De studiis et litteris ad illustrem dominam Baptistam de Malatesta tractatus*, in *Sammlung selten gewordenen pädagogischer Schriften*, 6.1 (Zschopau, 1880) 15.

¹⁵ Quoted in R. Sabbadini, "Classici e Umanisti da Codici Ambrosiani," *Fontes Ambrosiani*, 2 (Milan, 1933) 116, from *MS Ambros. F 141 sup.*

¹⁶ M. Manitius, *RhM* 66 (1905) 208-210. A similar example is the commentary in *Bernensis 223*, saec. xv, ff. 111r-117v, described by Marchesi, *RFIC* 39 (1911) 567.

¹⁷ *MS Pisanus*, in *tabulario Roncioniano 11*; cf. C. Vitelli, "De Codice Roncioniano Scholiorum in Iuvenalem," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 10 (1902) 29-39. Note also Mansi's description in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis* (Florence, 1858) 1.397.

copyists; this is followed by a commentary in a small cramped hand, which Gustarelli thought was copied about 1470 or 1480 by a rather ignorant scribe, from the compiler's original. The commentary uses the "Cornutus" scholia extensively, but sometimes gives alternative interpretations as preferable. The authors cited in the original comments include Aristophanes and Plautus. The phrase, *ut alii dicunt*, is sometimes used to introduce the opinions of other scholars; as Gustarelli was not able to trace the sources of these statements, or of other comments not derived from the vulgate, we may assume that the commentator worked from a glossed codex of the customary type, and supplemented it, according to his ideas of his students' needs, from his own reading and from contemporary discussions. His aim was to facilitate a literal understanding of the text; the notes are often elementary and pedestrian, but there are some flashes of insight and none of the long digressions and controversial rancor that characterize the more famous commentaries of the next generation. Gustarelli's description of the manuscript inclines me to conjecture that it may be a student's notes from his master's lectures, in which case the flagrant mistakes in spelling, and the occasional lacunae, would be quite understandable. Towards the end of the century, an unknown owner inserted in the margins his own glosses on the commentary, correcting obvious errors, suggesting alternative explanations, and expanding the briefer comments, in a careful and scholarly fashion.¹⁸

In 1444, Guarino Veronese asked his friend Costanza da Verano to send him a copy of Cornutus' commentary on Juvenal.¹⁹ If Costanza complied with this request, Guarino must have been disappointed to find in it only another example of the familiar mediaeval scholia. One of his students, in a letter written in 1437, had stated as an essential qualification for a good teacher the erudition gained through the study of many excellent and ancient books, not from "three petty commentaries stuffed with nonsense."²⁰ Guarino, whose lectures at Ferrara from 1436 to 1460 were attended

¹⁸ A. Gustarelli, "Un Commento umanistico inedito alle Satire di Giovenale," *Rendiconti della Tornate delle Classi, Reale Accademia Peloritana* (Messina, 1907) 14-21, and *Rivista Abruzzese*, 24 (1909) 196-212.

¹⁹ R. Sabbadini, *Le Scoperte dei Codici Latini e Greci ne' Secoli xiv e xv* (Florence, 1905) 131; idem, *Il Metodo degli Umanisti* (Florence, 1922) ch. 4; "Vita di Guarino Veronese," *Giornale Ligustico*, 18 (1891) *passim*.

²⁰ Letter of Francesco Barbaro to Jacopo Foscaro, in K. Müllner, *Reden und Briefe italienischer Humanisten* (Vienna, 1899) 209.

by many students from all Italy and from other European countries, including England, amply met this requirement. He composed one of the first humanistic commentaries on Persius, and lectured with wisdom and eloquence on many other classical writers. The eulogy delivered at his funeral praised the charm of the lectures he gave on Juvenal, and quoted from the satirist to describe the moral influence of this modern Socrates.²¹ The library of the University of Bologna contains a copy of the satires, with glosses (*MS 500, olim 876*) which was copied by one Ludovico Lardo at Parma in 1432, and collated by him in the following year with an old manuscript at Modena. This book later came into the possession of Giovanni Garzoni, a noted professor and historian at Bologna, who wrote in it: "Audivi hunc librum a disertissimo omnium Veronensium Guarino praeceptore meo, sub anno domini 1449."²² Guarino composed arguments of one or two lines each for the satires, which were widely used until they were superseded by those of Mancinelli, but he probably did not compile a formal commentary. Procacci, however, has given convincing arguments for attributing to Guarino's son and successor, Battista Guarini, the anonymous commentary in Codex 3 of the Biblioteca Comunale at Ferrara, a diffuse display of the author's erudition, in which the verse arguments are quoted as the work of "my illustrious father Guarinus." *MS Estensis F.8.18*, dated 1497, eight years before Battista's death, contains a commentary similar in method and content to the Ferrara copy, but somewhat different in style and form, which is attributed to Battista Guarini by two notes in a single hand. The work appears, however, to be a reworking of Battista's commentary, or perhaps a student's notes from his lectures.²³ A later Ferrarese scholar, Lilio Gregorio Giraldi, who, in his youth, studied under the elderly Battista, wrote in his old age that the previous generation had rated Juvenal so highly that a man's learning was gauged by the number of verses of the satires he could recite from memory. Giraldi himself had come to the conclusion that Juvenal should not be read by any who had not

²¹ Ludovico Carbo, funeral oration for Guarino, in Müllner, *op. cit.* 89-107

²² L. Frati, "Indice dei Codici latini nella R. Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 16 (1908) 279.

²³ G. Procacci, "Scolii a Giovenale di Battista Guarini in un Codice Ferrarese," *Studi Italiani*, 20 (1913) 425-437.

first been well steeped in pure Latinity; he lamented that contemporary teachers did not agree with him.²⁴

Juvenal also attracted keen interest at Rome. Giovanni Tortelli, friend and librarian of Nicholas V, greatly admired the satires, and was said by Gaspare Veronese to have composed a commentary on them. Attempts to identify various anonymous commentaries as his work have thus far proved futile, and it is probable that references to his interpretations of Juvenal in the commentaries of Angelo Sabino, Calderini, and others, were actually based on his comprehensive treatise *De orthographia*, or on his oral statements.²⁵

Tortelli's contemporary, Gaspare Veronese, who occupied the chair of rhetoric at Rome for some years before his retirement in 1473, has left tangible evidence of his work on Juvenal in a commentary on the seventh satire. Juvenal's lamentation on the decay of learning was a congenial theme for the Roman professor, and one which he could use as a vehicle both for his erudition and for personal reminiscences, for he included an account of the towns he had seen in the Ciociaria district on his return from Naples. He has been censured for indulgence in absurd etymologies, a fault shared by many of his contemporaries and successors.²⁶ His pupil, Martino Filetico, who became professor of Greek at Rome about 1467, began to lecture on Latin authors before he succeeded to the chair of Latin rhetoric on Gaspare's retirement. The throngs of students whom Filetico attracted justified his double appointment, and his double salary. In the dedication of his commentary on Persius to Alexander Sforza, he boasted that more than two hundred copies of his extempore lectures on that poet had been made by his students, since they seemed no less useful and delightful than the poet's own works. Modesty was not an outstanding attribute of

²⁴ *De poetarum historia dialogus iv* (Giraldi Opera Omnia [Leyden, 1696] col. 243). This work was first printed at Basle in 1580. Giraldi died at Ferrara in 1550.

²⁵ G. Mancini, "Giovanni Tortelli Cooperatore di Niccolò V nel Fondare la Bibliotheca Vaticana," *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 78 (1920) 2.234. C. Beldame, "Scolies inédites de Juvenal," *RPh* N.S. 6 (1882) 76-103, describes the anonymous commentary in MS 85 of the public library at Nice, which he attributed to a mediaeval commentator, though, as L. Friedländer pointed out in his review of Beldame's study in *JAW* 47 (1886) 220, internal evidence precludes an earlier date than 1480. Since Tortelli died in 1466, Sabbadini's attribution of the commentary to him is also untenable. Sabbadini's suggestion was made in *Rivista Etnea*, 1 (1893), which I have not as yet been able to obtain; it is mentioned in Procacci, *op. cit.* (see note 23) 429.

²⁶ *MS Casanatensis B III.4*: cf. B. Pecci, "Contributo per la Storia degli Umanisti del Lazio," *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria*, 13 (1890) 451-453, 525.

university professors in the Quattrocento. A less effusive modern estimate gives him credit for being more correct, literal, and scientific than most commentators of his time, and for refraining from longwinded narratives and ridiculous etymologies. Two copies of his students' lecture notes have been preserved. *MS Ital. 1190* in the Riccardi Library at Florence contains the commentaries on Juvenal and Persius; the subscription at the end of the notes on Juvenal describes them as "collected by Martino's auditor, Piero Pacino da Pescia, at Rome, in the time of Paul Sixth, in the sixth year of his reign," that is, in 1470. *Ottobonianus lat. 1256* contains all three commentaries, in the hand of Marianus of Praeneste, with the dedication of the Persius added on a blank leaf at the end of the Juvenal commentary. The inscription for the Juvenal commentary, of which the first line was unfortunately cut off in the process of rebinding, reads: . . . obscuros Iuvenalis locos hac extemporaria oratione claros fecit; cuius interpretationem ego Marianus inter alios innumerabiles scholasticos collegi. Doubts whether the lectures were really extemporaneous need not lessen our sympathy for the students who "collected" them *precipiti calamo*, as Marianus says in the subscription to the commentary on Persius.²⁷

In 1467, the poet Angelo Sabino, who had fled from Rome to Corese to escape the plague, composed a commentary on the first two satires for a young Franciscan, who, though he had studied under Guarino Veronese, still put his chief reliance on "nescio quo Cornuti commentario," which he maintained was far superior to all other interpretations of the satires. Sabino succeeded, "by the authority of the chief historians and the divine poets," in so completely demolishing all Cornutus' opinions that the young man promised to burn his cherished book, provided that Sabino would write out his explanations to replace it. Actually, this book-burning would not have entailed any great loss, as Sabino, like other humanists, transferred many of the old glosses to his own commentary, usually without any acknowledgment of their source. On his return to Rome Sabino, at the urgent request of his students, began to lecture on Juvenal, and in seven years completed his commentary. He dedicated it to Niccolo Perotti, and published it

²⁷ Pecci, *op. cit.*, 468-526, gives an account of Filetico's career, but does not mention the commentary on Juvenal. On the Riccardi *MS* see S. Morpurgo, *MSS Italiani* (Rome, 1900) 1.252; on the Ottobonian, G. Mercati, "Tre Dettati Universitari dell' Umanista Martino Filetico," *Studies in Honor of E. K. Rand* (New York, 1938) 221-230.

at Rome in 1474, with the title *Paradoxa in Iuvenalem*.²⁸ At the beginning of the dialogue, Sabino charged that Cornutus' heirs made their hearers first insane, and then stupid. He pointed out that Persius' teacher could not have compiled the commentary, and suggested the theory of another man of the same name, "cuius nulla fama est." References to the errors of "Cornutus" are numerous at the beginning of the commentary; once his interlocutor, to whom he gave the name of Praxiteles, was convinced, Sabino was more interested in attacking the opinions of "alii," especially those of Domizio Calderini, to whom he usually referred as "amicus." He cited many Greek and Latin authors, in keeping with his initial characterization of the *Paradoxa* as based on the authority of poets and historians. He also expatiated at length on literary history, mythology, geography, and history, and liked to introduce historical notes by the phrase, "veritas historiae hoc habet." His letters to Perotti show that his revision of the commentary during the seven years before its publication was inspired chiefly by the rivalry of Calderini. The latter, after studying at Verona and Venice, became a professor of rhetoric at Rome in 1470, at the age of twenty-six. He soon entered into bitter controversy with Perotti and Sabino, bringing down on himself, in turn, the enmity of Politian and George Merula, and thus introducing a new and violent phase of the old humanistic controversy initiated by Poggio and Lorenzo Valla. Pope Paul II had suppressed the Roman Academy in 1468, as a subversive organization devoted to paganism; he was determined to protect Roman youth from the vicious influence of Juvenal, Ovid, and other ribald authors.²⁹ Yet one of the first dated editions of Juvenal was printed at Rome in 1470. In 1471 Paul's successor, Sixtus IV, a generous patron of arts and letters, made Calderini an apostolic secretary. Two years later Perotti published a text edition of Martial, for which he had promised to prepare a commentary. Before the publication date, however, he discarded the idea of a mere commentary in favor of a classical lexicon based on

²⁸ Descriptions of the *Paradoxa* and other printed commentaries are based on my study of editions at the Widener Library, Columbia University Library, and the Library of Congress. Sabino gave an account of the composition of the *Paradoxa* in his letters to Perotti, which are included in the printed edition and in the manuscripts. *MS Ottobonianus lat. 2850* is Sabino's autograph; another copy at Perugia, *MS 500*, is listed as anonymous in the inventory. See also G. Mercati, "Ultimi Contributi alla Storia degli Umanisti," *Studi e Testi*, 90.2 (Vatican City, 1939) 17-23.

²⁹ P. Monnier, *Il Quattrocento*¹⁰ (Paris, 1931) 193, note 2.

Martial's epigrams, on such a vast scale that only the first half was completed by 1478.³⁰ Calderini seized the opportunity for a direct challenge, by printing his own commentary on Martial in 1474, and thus inaugurated the long series of printed commentaries on classical authors. Meanwhile Sabino and Calderini continued their rival lectures on Juvenal, each accusing the other of stealing his comments, and their students took up the fight, bringing their masters reports from the camp of the enemy. Sabino therefore published his *Paradoxa* at Rome in August, to expose Calderini's plagiarism. Calderini took up the challenge on September first, with his commentary, dedicated to Julianio de' Medici. Apparently he could not get permission to have it printed at Rome, but it was published, with the text of the satires, at Venice in April, 1475, and in Brescia in September, without the text. The many editions of Calderini's commentary regularly bear the subscription: Editi Romae: Quom ibi Publice Profiteretur K. Septembris MCCCCLXXIIII, which led earlier bibliographers to assume a printed edition of that date.

Calderini incorporated specific charges against Sabino and Perotti, under the names of Fidentinus and Brotheus, in his dedicatory letter to Julianio. Throughout his commentary, while occasionally mentioning the *deliramenta* of other commentators, he aimed his sharpest shafts at Sabino, characterizing as inept and stupid such observations of "Fidentinus cum praeceptore suo" as he did not consider direct plagiarizations from his lectures. Occasionally he attacked an opinion that Sabino had adopted from Tortelli. A characteristic example of his mordant sarcasm is the comment on *faenum* in Satire 3.14:

Quid ariolatur praeceptor Fidentini hoc loco; qui discipulo stultissimo persuasit foenum hoc loco dici ex historia . . . dignus fortasse ipse qui foenum edat, cum alii ambrosia alendi sunt.

Calderini's commentary is regularly concluded in the manuscripts and printed editions by an account of the trouble Fidentinus and Brotheus had caused him during its compilation, together with a list of the most ridiculous errors in the *Paradoxa*. This is followed by the *Defensio adversus Brotheum grammaticum Commentariorum*

³⁰ Cf. R. P. Oliver, "'New Fragments' of Latin Authors in Perotti's *Cornucopiae*," *TAPhA* 78 (1947) 376-424.

meorum calumniatorem, in which Calderini asserted that his readings of Juvenal were derived from a very ancient manuscript brought from Gaul. He also specifically attacked Perotti's corruptions of Pliny.³¹

Calderini died prematurely in 1478, but his commentary, with the introductory accounts of Juvenal's life and of satire in general, and with its wealth of parallel passages and etymological, historical, mythological, and antiquarian comments, held the field for two centuries against all competitors. Its popularity was probably aided at first, and certainly was not limited thereafter, by his violent slander of his rivals. Sabino's *Paradoxa*, on the other hand, seems to have had a very restricted circulation. Two manuscripts are preserved, but I have not been able to find adequate evidence for any printed editions after that of 1474.^{31a}

In 1478, George Merula, who had sided with Politian against Calderini, published his *Enarrationes satyrarum Juvenalis* at Venice, where he was then lecturing. He dedicated it to Federigo of Montefeltro, a notable patron of arts and letters. Though Merula was deservedly famous for his discovery and editing of classical works, his commentaries aroused much criticism, which was not diminished by his violent quarrels with his teacher Filelfo, with Calderini, especially over their interpretations of Martial, and later with his former ally, Politian, over Juvenal. This last was the first great quarrel between humanists of the same school. Merula's comments are rather shorter than Calderini's, except for some long disquisitions on mythological and antiquarian points. His range of literary allusions is considerable, especially among Latin authors. His interpretations are often far-fetched and distorted, for his critical scholarship fell short of his ambitious vanity. Cornelio Vitellio, a staunch friend and supporter of Calderini, said that Merula's commentary on Juvenal was based entirely on his diligent study of Guarini, Ognibene, Sabino and Calderini, and that, though his public lectures were mere babblings, of no profit to his auditors, he

³¹ A convenient summary of the controversy, with bibliography, is given in V. Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*³ (vol. 5 of *Storia Letteraria d'Italia*, Milan, 1933) 319, 381-383.

^{31a} Achaintre, *op. cit.* (above, note 12) 53, lists an edition at Venice in 1493; *Juvenalis cum commentariis Sabini, Merulae et aliorum*. Ruperti copied this entry from Achaintre in his edition of Juvenal, vol. 1 (Glasgow, 1825) cviii. H. C. Henninius, *D. Junii Juvenalis Satyrae* (Utrecht, 1685) prologue, section 4, mentions a quarto edition of Sabino's and Merula's commentaries on Juvenal as published at Lyons, 1498. I have not found any other mention of either of these editions.

viciously attacked the scholars from whom all his scanty knowledge was derived.³²

Rivalry between interpreters of Juvenal also raged at Florence. Cristoforo Landino, who became professor in the Studio Fiorentino about 1458, lectured on Juvenal and Persius. Commentaries based on his lectures are preserved in the Ambrosian Library, in a manuscript (*J 26 inf.*) dated 1462.³³ One of his audience, Bartolomeo Fonzio, perhaps also a student of Guarino, in 1471 published the first printed commentary on Persius. Fonzio became a bitter enemy of Politian. In 1485 Politian delivered a public lecture at Florence on Juvenal, which is not preserved; this provoked Fonzio, who in the next year also lectured on Juvenal, violently attacking Politian and Merula, among others. In 1489 or 1490, Fonzio collected his *Observationes in Juvenalem*, and dedicated them to Lorenzo Strozzi (*MS Riccardianus 1172*). His work is chiefly notable for his vituperation of his rivals; it has not been printed, and is not mentioned by later commentators.³⁴

Meanwhile, Politian had completed his *Miscellanies*, which, on its publication in 1489, became the book of the year, greeted with extravagant praise for its erudition and scope, and with vehement criticism for its over-meticulous discussion of small points, and for its eclectic style and vocabulary, which made it anathema to extreme Ciceronians. Politian overlooked no opportunity to attack Calderini. The difficult passages of Juvenal's satires that he discussed promptly gained him a place among authorities on Juvenal, and were cited by later commentators. They were printed, with excerpts from the elder Beroaldo, and from the *Racemationes* of Battista Egnazio (printed in 1502), and with Britannicus' commentary. in an edition of the satires published at Milan in 1514. Beroaldo had chosen Juvenal as the subject of his inaugural lecture at Bologna

³² *In defensionem Plinii et Domitii Calderini contra Georgium Merulam Alexandrinum ad Hermolaum Barbarum*, in J. Gruter, *Thesaurus Criticus*, 1 (Frankfurt, 1602) 584-585. Note also the comment of Jacopo Antiquario, in a letter to Politian (*Politiani Opera* [Basel, 1553] 161) . . . commentarios in Iuvenalem vix illius fuisse crediderim, nisi ipse suos edendo affirmavisset. There are two mss of the *Enarrationes*, *Vat. Urb.* 348 and 663; the former also has Calderini's commentary, and the latter is the copy presented to Federigo. There are also excerpts in the Ferrara manuscript of Battista Guarini's commentary. Printed editions usually combine Merula's work with those of Calderini, Mancinelli, and Valla. Britannicus incorporated the best of Merula's material in his own commentary, which therefore superseded Merula's.

³³ C. Marchesi, *RFIC* 40 (1912) 199.

³⁴ *Idem, Bartolomeo della Fonte* (Catania, 1900) 122-128.

in 1472, on the ground that the satirist had been "distorted rather than illuminated by the commentaries of learned men."³⁵ The aged Merula, despite his former friendship with Politian, exercised all his *canina facundia*, as Beroaldo said, in attacks on the *Miscellanies*, and especially on the Juvenal items. He threatened to publish a work that would utterly destroy Politian's scholarly reputation. Merula's death in 1494 ended the controversy, but later commentators showed its influence by their attitudes toward the interpretations of crucial passages in the satires, proposed by the protagonists.³⁶

George Valla, professor of classical literature at Venice, came in for his full share of Fonizio's vituperation. He is usually listed as the fourth humanistic commentator on Juvenal, in testimony of the power that the printing-press already exerted over scholarly fame. Unprinted works were soon forgotten. Valla's *Commentaries* were first published at Venice in 1486, and were reprinted with those of Calderini and others during the rest of the century. They are chiefly notable as the first to include the ancient scholia, from a manuscript since lost. As we have seen, he attributed these scholia to the ancient grammarian Probus. It is scarcely surprising that his contemporaries did not recognize the value of these remnants of the ancient commentary. Valla's edition is most uncritical; he selected, emended, and interpolated the scholia according to his own taste. His old codex lacked some of the scholia preserved in the *Montepessulanus* and *Sangallensis* collections, and ended with verse 198 of the eighth satire, but it included some valuable additions to the corpus. Valla himself was especially interested in mythology, and in citations from Greek authors.³⁷

Not all commentators of this period achieved the immortality granted by the printing-press. Giovanni Battista Cantalicio, a prolific court poet, who taught school when he could not find a generous patron, completed his commentary on Juvenal in July, 1488, while he was teaching at Perugia, and revised it at Viterbo

³⁵ Beroaldo's lecture is printed in Müllner, *op. cit.* (cf. note 20, above) 60-63.

³⁶ See the letters of Politian, Merula and others in Politian's *Epistolae*, 11 (*Opera*, 147-162); Rossi, *op. cit.* (cf. note 31, above) 379-388. For Politian's estimate of Calderini and Merula see his discussion of Juvenal 14.196, in *Miscellanea*, ch. 9 (ibid. 232-234). *MS Laurentianus LIII.ii*, the presentation volume of Calderini's commentary, is described as containing marginal notes by Politian.

³⁷ See Ch. Stephan, *De Pithoeanis in Juvenalem Scholiis* (Bern, 1882) 26-76, and the references given in note 5 above.

in 1492, in the hope that Guido, son and heir of the late Duke Federigo, to whom he had planned to dedicate it, would insure its preservation, despite the barking of the critics. His patron did at least keep the book, though he did not enable Cantalicio to print it. In his introduction, Cantalicio listed his predecessors in the task of elucidating the satires. Among earlier scholars, he noted Lorenzo Valla, Tortelli, Gaspare Veronese, Porcelio and Filelfo. The more recent commentators named include Calderini, whom he took as his especial model; Merula, who did not seem to him to understand Juvenal's true spirit; George Valla, whom he ranked somewhat above Merula; and Sabino, who "was utterly wild, and wrote monstrous nonsense." For himself, Cantalicio knew that he would be accused of aping his predecessors, but he modestly felt that he had at least composed a useful work, like those of Servius on Vergil and Porphyrio on Horace, though he could not aspire to the heights of Landino!³⁸

In 1492, Antonio Mancinelli of Velitrae, a successful teacher, published his *Familiare commentum* at Venice. His lavish promises of a commentary which would leave no difficult point unsolved and no textual crux unemended far outran the value of his prolix and pedestrian paraphrases, and his boasted discovery of the true Juvenal was one of the least worthy claims put forth in that year of great discoveries. For all his pride, his works appealed more to untrained students than to scholars. His verse arguments for the individual satires were popular, and the commentary itself was often reprinted in the next thirty years, in combination with those of Calderini, Valla and Badius Ascensius.

The *Familiarissima Explanatio* of Josse Badius Ascensius was printed in 1498 at Lyons, where Calderini's commentary had been published a dozen years earlier. Unfortunately it continued the trend towards banal and superficial treatment of the satires, in notes intended primarily for young students. Ascensius was a Fleming, who studied at Louvain before he came to Italy to study under Battista Guarini at Ferrara, and under the elder Beroaldo at Mantua. He had probably heard lectures on Juvenal at Louvain, for John of Westphalia, who established the first printing-press there, copied a commentary on Juvenal, of the "Cornutus" type,

³⁸ *MS Vat. Urb. 662*; G. Zannoni, *op. cit.* (cf. note 10 above) 485-507; B. Croce, "Sulla Vita e le Opere del Cantalicio," *Archivio Storico per le Province Napoletane*, 49 (1924) 155-191.

in 1473, "in felici studio Lovaniensi." John's edition of the satires of Juvenal and Persius, published in 1475 "arte quadam characterisandi modernissima," was one of the earliest products of this press, which was primarily devoted to books needed at the university.³⁹ Ascensius gained a considerable reputation as a rhetorician and poet at Lyons, where he was appointed professor of Latin. In 1503 he established his own press at Paris. His commentary on Juvenal was composed in the hope that it would not only help students to understand the poet, but would also inculcate in them sound moral standards. He used the commentaries of Calderini and Valla, but chose Mancinelli's work rather than theirs to accompany his own, for such readers as preferred a fuller and more erudite commentary. His work was frequently reprinted for half a century, at Lyons, Venice, Milan, and at his own press in Paris, either alone, or with those of Mancinelli and Britannicus.⁴⁰

The work of Britannicus, teacher and publisher at Brescia, marked a partial return to earlier standards of scholarship. Britannicus dedicated his *Commentaria in satyras Iuvenalis*, in 1501, to the senate and people of Brescia, in the belief that no other work was more profitable for study than Juvenal's. Like his predecessors from Calderini's time on, he prefaced the commentary with a life of the poet and an essay on satire. He had studied under Merula, and was loyal to his teacher, but selected judiciously from the *Enarrationes*, and wisely omitted Merula's poorest comments. He also used Politian's notes on Juvenal, and the readings of various manuscripts. Unfortunately, his original additions to the work of his predecessors are more often ingenious than penetrating. He was convinced that he had solved most of the problems that other illustrious scholars had overlooked. Although his confidence in his own acumen was decidedly exaggerated, he was still far less arrogant about his own achievements than earlier humanists had been about theirs.

With Britannicus, the scholastic succession of major commentaries on Juvenal ends. The evidence for the study of the poet during the Quattrocento is naturally much more extensive in Italy

³⁹ *MS Brit. Mus. Addit. 33,795* has the commentary copied by Johannes. The British Museum also has a copy of the edition of 1475 (832 m. 16) with manuscript notes. John and Ascensius were just in time to benefit from Louvain's activity in the liberal arts, which declined after 1578.

⁴⁰ Ph. Renouard, *Bibliographie des Impressions et des Oeuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius* (Paris, 1908).

than elsewhere, but a few significant instances in other countries may be noted here. Gregory of Sanok, a Polish scholar and ecclesiastic who was keenly interested in Italian humanism, lectured on Juvenal and other Latin poets at the University of Cracow during the middle years of the century.⁴¹ The Dominican Tommaso Schifaldio, the first notable humanist in Sicily, is said to have composed a commentary on Juvenal.⁴² Among the scholars, trained in Italy, who enjoyed a great reputation in Spain in this period, were several who took a special interest in the satires. Pietro Martyre chose Juvenal as the subject for his *praelectio*, or inaugural lecture at Salamanca, a festival occasion attended by members of the court as well as by the faculty and students of the university.⁴³ During the last years of the century, the presses of Lyons, Paris and Nürnberg brought out a few editions of Juvenal, with one or more commentaries. The number of annotated texts published by the printers of Lyons during the sixteenth century shows that there continued to be a widespread demand for the satires, especially in an inexpensive small format convenient for use in schools.

The most popular notes on Juvenal in the sixteenth century were those of Celio Secundo Curio, a Piedmontese scholar. Curio's chief interest, apart from the Protestantism which forced him to spend much of his life beyond the Alps, was in Latin grammar, on which he wrote several treatises. His commentary on Juvenal is well described in the title of the first edition, published at Paris in 1528: *Junii Juvenalis Aquinatis Satyrae decem et sex, cum annotationiunculis in margine adjectis, quae brevis commentarii vice esse possunt*. Brief as they were, these notes obviously satisfied the Latin teachers for whose use they were compiled, for many editions appeared, chiefly at Paris, Lyons, and Antwerp; one edition was printed at Cracow in 1529. The format is unpretentious, and the size usually duodecimo or smaller. Later in his career, Curio compiled new scholia, as a supplement and correction to Britannicus' commentary, for the edition of Juvenal and Persius published by Froben at Basle in 1551. In his preface, addressed to Abraham

⁴¹ Voigt, *op. cit.* (above, note 9) 2.329.

⁴² Quetif-Echard, *Scriptores Ordinis Predicatorum* (Paris, 1719) 2.882.

⁴³ D. Rubio, *Classical Scholarship in Spain* (Washington, 1934) 39; C. Lynn, "The *Repetitio* and a *Repetitio*," *Speculum* 6 (1931) 123-131, on the prominence of Juvenal in the work of Lucio Marineo Siculo. The noted Spanish humanist, Nebrissensis, is said to have written a commentary on Juvenal (cf. Antonius, *Bibliotheca Hispanica Nova*, 1 [Madrid, 1783] 137), but I have not been able to find any definite trace of it.

Sbaski of Poland, Curio expressed his admiration of Juvenal, and his wish to contribute to a better understanding of the satires on the part of his contemporaries. He lamented that for many years they had been published only in Italy, and so carelessly that a fresh interpretation was needed. The only commentary he considered really useful was that of Britannicus, who, he said, though a most erudite man for his age, did not always grasp the poet's meaning; this was not strange, as he had no one to follow! This cavalier disregard of Britannicus' predecessors is the more surprising, since Britannicus' own preface clearly mentioned them. Curio's scholia in the Basle edition are few and comparatively brief, though somewhat fuller and less elementary than his earlier *adnotatiunculae*. They consist of corrections and additions to Britannicus' individual comments, and are interspersed among them, identified by the initials C and S at the beginning and end of each.

The great sixteenth-century scholars in the Low Countries and in France were attracted to Juvenal by his interest for students of Roman law and antiquities, though the religious tenor of the age led to increased strictures against his obscenity. This opposition to the study of the satires naturally inspired ardent and vocal support of their moral value as deterrents to vice. At the end of the century, the first of a series of expurgated editions was published, in the interest of those who wished to profit by Juvenal's moral precepts without danger of contamination from the freedom of his vocabulary.

Sixteenth-century scholars, however, generally limited their work on the poet to their scholarly correspondence and conversation, and to passages incorporated in bulky volumes of *Variae lectiones*, *Animadversiones*, and the like, in which they discussed many of the problems of textual criticism and explanation that had vexed their predecessors, and often quoted the latter's opinions. The revered Adrian Turnebus, at the very mention of whose name lesser scholars respectfully doffed their caps, devoted considerable attention to the emendation and explanation of critical passages in the satires, as numerous chapters of his *Adversaria* show. When the French scholar Muretus was forbidden to lecture at Rome on law, and then on Plato, since he was under suspicion of immorality and heresy, he turned to Juvenal and other Latin authors instead.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 2.148-152.

His *Variae lectiones* discuss a number of passages in the satires, and show that he was well acquainted with earlier commentaries. Justus Lipsius devoted a considerable part of his correspondence to the text and interpretation of Juvenal, and defended his value for the elevation of moral standards in an age when a satirist's services were so much needed.⁴⁵

In 1586, Theodor Poelmann published at Antwerp a small volume in which Curio's *Adnotatiunculae* were reprinted in the margin of the text. The text was followed by a cento of citations from contemporary scholars, with some additions from Poelmann's study of various manuscripts. Poelmann drew especially on the opinions of Turnebus, Hadrianus Junius, Scoppa, Willem Canter, and Muretus, with a couple of citations from Calderini and Britannicus. In his preface, he declared that Juvenal used modest language in his denunciation of the most obscene crimes, and expressed his conviction that God had inspired this heathen poet to lead mortals towards an honorable and blessed life.

This survey of Renaissance commentaries on Juvenal may well close with the edition issued by Pierre Pithou in 1585, at Paris. Pithou laid the basis for modern scholarship by his careful editing of the text of the satires and of the *scholia vetera* on the basis of the ninth century *codex Pithoeanus*, now at Montpellier. We have already noted the honored position of this manuscript among the representatives of the ancient commentary. Pithou's critical edition, and his explicit recognition of the composite nature of the scholia in his manuscript, are in marked contrast with George Valla's uncritical publication in 1486 of the "Probus" scholia, lavishly "emended" and almost inextricably intermixed with his own comments.

⁴⁵ See especially *Epistolariae Quaestiones* (*Opera*, Antwerp, 1585) 4.15, a letter to Muretus.