

LÁSZLÓ TAKÁCS

BARTOLOMEO FONZIO  
AND GREEK LITERATURE\*

*1. Fonzio's scholarship: a brief sketch*

After the Ottoman invasion of the territory of the Byzantine Empire and the fall of Constantinople in 1453, many excellent scholars migrated to Europe.<sup>1</sup> Their most important destinations became the Italian cities (Florence, Venice, Ferrara, etc.). During the heyday period of these cities, Humanism, the renaissance of ancient culture, and the cult of antiquity played an important role, and the Italian Renaissance spread to other parts of Europe. After centuries of oblivion in the Latin Middle Ages, the impact of Greek language and literature on the knowledge of humanists was indisputable.<sup>2</sup> Almost simultaneously with the decline of the Byzantine Empire, the interest in ancient Greek studies was rising. It was a symbolic act and also the beginning of the revival of Greek culture, when Boccaccio, as an aged man, started to learn Greek from a Byzantine scholar named Leontius Pilatus.<sup>3</sup> Following the increasing interest in Greek antiquity during the Quattrocento, the leading humanists of Italy and France became familiar with

\* This study was prepared with the support of the research project OTKA T 81297. I would like to thank Federica Ciccolella and Luigi Silvano for their comments and suggestion for corrections on this paper.

<sup>1</sup> On the importance of this event, see, e.g., Cammelli (1941); (Pertusi 1964); and Nuti (2012: 240): “The history of modern Western culture was substantially decided in 1397, when Manuel Chrysoloras started teaching Greek to Florentine humanists. In just three years, they would become not only confident with the structures of the ancient Greek language, but also be able to translate intensively the greatest Greek authors into good classical Latin.”

<sup>2</sup> See Ciccolella (2008: 97–102; 2010).

<sup>3</sup> See Ross (1927) and Lummus (2012), who writes (103): “Although Boccaccio tried to learn Greek late in life in order to read Homer, since his actual knowledge of the Greek language remained extremely limited, he engaged with Greek culture primarily through modern Greek scholars such as Leontius Pilatus, who provided him with an interlinear Latin translation of Homer’s two poems, and Barlaam of Seminara, whom he held as an expert on the Hellenic world, and through

ancient Greek culture, while the Byzantine scholars who migrated to Europe studied Latin and the vernacular languages.<sup>4</sup> But this interaction was gradually decreasing as classical Greek works were beginning to be translated into Latin.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, these translations made Greek literary, historical, and philosophical works accessible even to those who had a very limited or no knowledge of Greek.

In this paper, I would like to illustrate the complexity of this phenomenon using the example provided by Bartolomeo Fonzio (Fontius or della Fonte). Through his case, I would like to present how the knowledge of Greek became indispensable during the Quattrocento. Finally, I intend to prove that earlier views about Fonzio's Greek need reconsideration.

Bartolomeo Fonzio (Florence 1445/1446–Montemurlo 1514) was one of the well-known humanists of the second half of the fifteenth century.<sup>6</sup> He studied in the 1460s in Florence, where he was a student of Cristoforo Landino, Andronicus Callistus, John Argyropoulos,<sup>7</sup> and Bernardo Nuti. Thus, he can be said to have been educated by the leading humanists of his age.<sup>8</sup>

His life and works are well-documented, as he himself collected and edited all his letters in three volumes.<sup>9</sup> He wrote some poetic works as well: the collection of his poems sheds light on his friendships and intellectual connections.<sup>10</sup> Despite the fact that some of Fonzio's works have perished, we have a detailed description of them.<sup>11</sup> Also, there are even some manuscripts containing his notes, excerpts, fragments, and works. The investigation of his works can help us reconstruct the intellectual background and his progress from his youth until the end of the fifteenth century. Fonzio went to Buda in 1489,<sup>12</sup> to the court of the king of

---

other philhellenic Latins, such as Paolo da Perugia and Theodontius." See also Hankins (2007) and Wilson (1992).

<sup>4</sup> See Hankins (2002).

<sup>5</sup> See Pade (1998: esp. 109–111) and Pade (2007).

<sup>6</sup> About his life, see Marchesi (1900); Zaccaria (1988); and the recent study by Bausi (2011: esp. 197–368).

<sup>7</sup> Fonzio mentions him in his chronology in Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 1172, fol. 38<sup>r</sup> [ad annum 1456]: *Ioannes Argyropylos byzantius peripatheticus philosophus doctor egregius magno salario florentiam accitus summa omnium admiratione ad annos quindecim est professus.*

<sup>8</sup> Marchesi (1900: 11–31).

<sup>9</sup> Fontius' letters have been edited by Ladislaus Juhász in 1931. The first volume has been re-edited by Alessandro Daneloni in 2008. For an English translation, see the 2011 edition by Daneloni and Davies.

<sup>10</sup> *Carmina*, ed. Fögel and Juhász, 1932.

<sup>11</sup> See Trinkaus (1966).

<sup>12</sup> Marchesi (1900: 85–86); Daneloni (2014).

Hungary, Matthias Corvinus, but on his return to Italy he slowly abandoned the intellectual life of Florence. He became a priest and started writing works that were more ecclesiastical than humanist in nature. We can follow his intellectual career through more than three decades: from the mid-1460s to the mid-1490s.

Fonzio became an acclaimed scribe and scholar in the 1460s. He produced manuscripts, copying texts of classical and contemporary authors in Pietro Cenini's workshop.<sup>13</sup> It is worth mentioning that he copied the work of Livy and the commentary on Juvenal by Domizio Calderini.<sup>14</sup> At the beginning of the 1470s, he composed a commentary on Persius dedicated to Lorenzo de' Medici. In the *epistola dedicatoria*, he declared his literary program<sup>15</sup> and suggested that he would intend to write something voluminous.<sup>16</sup> However, as is known, he never accomplished this goal. When he visited King Matthias in Buda, he compiled a manuscript containing his earlier works written until 1489. This illuminated manuscript clearly proves that the most voluminous of Fonzio's works was his commentary on Persius. Although Fonzio gave lectures on Livy, Juvenal, Horace and Valerius Flaccus in the Florentine *Studium*, he did not finish or publish his commentaries. He had even written an *Ars poetica* at the beginning of the 1490s, but it remained unpublished during Fonzio's life. The manuscript was discovered and described by Oscar Kristeller and later published by Charles Trinkhaus.<sup>17</sup>

The importance of his commentary on Persius is confirmed by the fact that he revised his earlier work and, in a dialogue entitled *Tadeus vel de locis Persianis*, he corrected some points in his commentary when he was putting his works together for the king of Hungary. Considering that two decades passed between the writing of his commentary on Persius and the composition of *Tadeus*, we can come to two conclusions. Firstly, this commentary must have played an important role in Fonzio's career. Secondly, I am convinced that, by focusing on the interpretation and comparison of the *Explanatio in Persium* and the *Tadeus vel de locis Persianis* (and taking into account his other works and fragments), I will be able to trace his changing position towards the Greek language and culture.

<sup>13</sup> About his works as a scribe, see Caroti & Zamboni (1974).

<sup>14</sup> Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Acquisti e doni 233.

<sup>15</sup> Fonzio explains his choice of subject as satire offered many moral and rethorical values: *Quantquam, Laurenti, poetae omnes, uel ad bene dicendum, uel ad honeste vivendum plurimum conferunt, ii tamen in primis legendi sunt, qui non solum iocunda auribus, sed utilia quoque animis excolendis emoneant*. I quote the text of the commentary from Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 666.

<sup>16</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 4<sup>v</sup>: *Mox ut spero favente te, qui ut potes, ita etiam cupis adiuuare quam plurimos, et ad maiora animum excitabo, et cum primum facultas dabitur, ampliori te munere cumulabo*.

<sup>17</sup> Trinkhaus (1966: 40–122).

Fonzio composed his commentary on Persius in 1471. The original version or the autographic, second copy is preserved now in the Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence (Ms. Ricc. 666). This manuscript was used by Fonzio himself between 1471 and 1489.<sup>18</sup> The existence of an earlier version cannot be excluded, as the text of the commentary seems to be finished: we can only find some minor corrections, additions, and Greek comments as marginal remarks. The existence of an earlier version can also be confirmed by its comparison with the fragments of his commentaries on Livy and Juvenal.<sup>19</sup> The latter have more numerous and longer corrections: Fonzio sometimes deleted whole comments. We cannot find such extensive corrections in Ms. Ricc. 666.

Later, an illuminated and colourful codex, probably based on the earlier version, was copied by an unknown scribe and was presented to Lorenzo de' Medici. This codex (now Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 54.32) is less important, because it has many incorrect lectures and lacunas.

In 1477, Fonzio's commentary was published with minor corrections. The reception of the text changed radically. His interpretation became more and more widely accessible and the commentary, which earlier had been read only by few scholars (as actually there was only one exemplar of it in Lorenzo de' Medici's library), was widely read at that time. As Persius was an important classical author and his satires belonged to the *Trivium*,<sup>20</sup> students of Latin must have known his poetry. The many manuscripts containing his satires and the several medieval and Renaissance commentaries prove his popularity. However, the publication of Fonzio's commentary raised a controversy.

Fonzio's commentary was published several times in the 1480s. In 1490, in the first so-called *composed* edition, Fonzio's and John Britannicus' commentaries were published together in one volume.<sup>21</sup> These publications made Fonzio's work popular: during the period between 1477 and 1500, his *Explanatio* was one of the standard commentaries on Persius.<sup>22</sup> When Fonzio compiled his manuscript for King Matthias, his name was already well-known among scholars and he was an honored professor at the *Studium* of Florence.

<sup>18</sup> See Caroti & Zamponi (1974: 48–50).

<sup>19</sup> On his unfinished commentary on Juvenal, see Gellérfi (2014).

<sup>20</sup> See Noe (2008: 46). On the importance of Persius in the education of the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, see, e.g., Scarcia Piacentini (1973) and Black (2001: 252–254, and *passim*).

<sup>21</sup> On the history of the so-called composed editions, see Robathan & Cranz (1976: 265–267) and Takács (2009).

<sup>22</sup> On the number of the incunable editions, see Noe (2008: 86).

Between the two *termini*, Fonzio's commentary underwent several vicissitudes, paralleled by other works of his (poems, letters, and orations). Thus, this story can be interpreted as a document of Fonzio's changing attitude towards the Greek language and literature. In what follows, I will try to analyze this moderate and not exactly conspicuous change.

## 2. *Inconsistencies in Fonzio's Greek*

Ms. Ricc. 666 shows that he sometimes was uncertain about how Greek words should be written. For instance, he did not know what the correct form of the accusative of *Ilias* was. In Ms. Ricc. 666, he used the incorrect form *Iliadam* instead of the correct *Iliada*, which he used in the Wolfenbüttel-manuscript. This codex belonged to the library of king Matthias and is now held in the Herzog-August Bibliothek as Ms. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>.<sup>23</sup> The table below lists some of the inconsistencies we can collect by comparing the two manuscripts.

Ms. Ricc. 666	Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug., 2 <sup>o</sup>
<i>tribachum</i> (later corrected: <i>tribrachum</i> )	<i>tribrachum</i>
<i>Cirphin</i>	<i>Cirphim</i>
<i>Ptolaemeum</i>	<i>Ptolomaeum</i>
<i>a graecis pigi dicatur</i>	<i>a graecis πΗΥΗ dicatur</i>
<i>comoedia</i>	<i>comaedia</i>
<i>tragoedia</i>	<i>tragaedia</i>
<i>Lieus</i> (later corrected: <i>Lyeus</i> )	<i>Lyeus</i>
<i>Euius</i> (later corrected: <i>Euchius</i> )	<i>Euius</i>
<i>cinnamum</i> (later corrected: <i>Cynnammum</i> )	<i>Cynnammum</i>

These examples can raise doubts about the allegedly high level of Fonzio's command of Greek, as one can trace such uncertainties more frequently in his Greek than in his Latin. He once used the non-classical *faciliter* as the *adverbium* for *facilis*, but this was the only inaccuracy I could find in his otherwise very elegant and ornate Latin style. Although the incorrect spellings in Greek words could be interpreted as either the result of an uncertain orthography of Greek during this

<sup>23</sup> On this manuscript, see Milde (1995: 16–17) and Daneloni (2013).

period or as “*lapsus calami*”, the orthography was not radically changed between 1477 and 1488, and it seems obvious that at the beginning he used the forms based on contemporary Greek pronunciation, and later – when he started to study Greek systematically – he preferred the classical forms. And the wrong forms of Greek words were often written down (e.g. *tribrachum*). This event illustrates that Fonzio did not know originally the correct form of the above expression. We can hardly decide when certain corrections were made in the manuscript. Fonzio had actually corrected the whole manuscript, but usually only the *terminus post quem* seems certain. The Greek corrections belong to the corrections of the 80s.

### 3. Changing view of the importance of Greek

Fonzio, as the text of Ms. Ricc. 666 testifies, did not use Greek letters in the original version of his commentary on Persius. Sometimes he quoted Greek verbs, but only in Latin characters. For example, on *Sat.* 1. 12: *sed sum petulanti splene cachinno*, he gave a comment as follows: *Splen uero Graece, Latine lyenis et lyen dicitur*. There is no difference between the texts of Ms. Ricc. 666<sup>24</sup> and Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>.<sup>25</sup> But when he commented on line 1. 17: *Liquido cum plasmate*, he did not change the comment (*Ad fauces molliendas, vocemque suaviter emittendam nonnulli guttur emplastro colluebant, quod plasma a platto Graeco verbo, quod fingo, componoque significat, appellabant*),<sup>26</sup> but added the Greek equivalent on the margin: τὸ πλάσμα, ατος *figmentum*. Fonzio followed the same method during the revision of his commentary. Although he added to line 1. 101: *Menas: Menades a maenome Graeco verbo, quod furor significat, appellatae*,<sup>27</sup> he later added next to the text: μαίνομαι. It is very remarkable that he first used Latin letters only, but in the Wolfenbüttel codex he wrote in Greek also. It is possible that he heard the Greek original only from an oral source: for this reason, he could not transcribe it properly.

One of the most interesting changes can be found in *Satire* 4. To the expression *Nigrum theta* (4. 13), Fonzio originally added the comment: *Tau et theta Graecorum litterae sunt, sed tau absolutionis signum et salutaris nota est, ut in Ezechiele legitur: ‘Et signa Tau super frontes virorum gementium’* [Ezech. 9:4]. *Theta vero*

<sup>24</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 14<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> Ms. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, fol. 25<sup>r</sup>–25<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 16<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fols. 40<sup>r</sup>–40<sup>v</sup>.

*damnationis et mortis, Martialis: 'Nosti mortiferum quaestoris castrice signum, est opere precium discere theta novum'* [Mart. 7.37.1].<sup>28</sup> Later, he corrected the first version deleting the words *Tau & theta* and substituted them for the Greek letters T & Θ.<sup>29</sup> However, he was not consistent in the addition of Greek words. In Satire 6, he actually had not indicated the Greek original (καθίστημι) when he mentioned the word *catistao*.<sup>30</sup> These examples show that Fonzio presumably wanted to append the Greek forms of some words, but in the final revision he added only part of them.

#### 4. *The Greek sources in the Explanatio in Persium*

If we want to reconstruct how much Fonzio was devoted to Greek literature, we will have to first investigate whether he studied anything from Greek literary works. It is obvious that he used ancient commentaries on Virgil or Horace as well as the information relating to Greek literature he found in their texts.<sup>31</sup> However, examining the Greek authors he quoted and mentioned, we can discover that he only used Latin translations and did not consult Greek sources. For example, although he referred to Hesiod in the first comment on Satire 1, it is clear that he had Latin sources in mind.

The Greek authors Fonzio mentioned and quoted in the *Explanatio in Persium* are the following: Hesiod, Homer, Herodotus, Strabo, Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus, Aristotle, Plutarch, Diogenes Laertius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Lycophron, Flavius Philostratus, Appian, Aesop, and Ephorus.

The case of Homer is more complicated, because the parts of the *Iliad* he quoted could have been drawn either from secondary sources citing Homer's original text<sup>32</sup> or directly from Homer's Latin translations. As has been pointed

<sup>28</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 85<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 85<sup>r</sup> and Ms. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, fol. 80<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 130<sup>v</sup>: *Catasta autem locus erat, ubi servi venales exponebantur, a Graeco verbo catistao, quod expono significat, appellata.*

<sup>31</sup> For example, when commenting on Satire 1, he quotes the comment of Pseudo-Acro on Horace (102): *Ut Acron scribit: 'ex ev, quod bonum significat et υίος filium euchius componitur'* (Ms. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, fol. 47<sup>r</sup>). In this case, the Greek words come from Fonzio's Latin source.

<sup>32</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 10<sup>r</sup>: *Polydamas et Troades: Ex Homero assumptum est, qui secundo et vigesimo Iliados libro Hectorem, si se Achillis metu intra muros receperit, verentem inducit, ne a Polydamante Troianisque redarguatur. Quod et Aristoteles in ethicis de fortitudine scribens, et Cicero ad Atticum assumpserunt.* Aristotle really cites Homer's representation of Hector's thought (*Iliad* 22. 100 ff. and

out, Fonzio knew the Latin prose paraphrases of Homer's epic poems and corrected them.<sup>33</sup> The Latin translations of Homer's works were very popular in the period, as we can find fragments of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* among Fonzio's manuscripts held in the Biblioteca Riccardiana.

When Fonzio cites the Latin translations of his Greek sources, it is easy to establish whether or not he also consulted the Greek originals. One of his major sources was the work of Diodorus Siculus. He did not quote Diodorus *verbatim* every time, but when he did, it is clear that he used the Latin translation of Poggio Bracciolini. For example, Persius' expression *Brysei Acci* (1. 76) was commented by Fonzio specifying that: *Bryseum Bacchum cognominatum a byrsa pelle, quae in bellis induebatur, existimant. Nam apud Diodorum quinto uolumine Bacchum in proeliis pardalorum pellibus usum constat.*<sup>34</sup> The same word order can be found in the translation: *Armis pellicis in pugna utebatur et pardalorum pellibus etc.*<sup>35</sup> The Greek original (κεκοσμησθαι καὶ δοραῖς παρδάλεων)<sup>36</sup> has a different construction, so it is apparent that Fonzio knew the translated version only.

Another major source Fonzio used was Strabo's *Geography*. Although he quoted it many times, let us focus on one example only, a quotation from the ninth book in the commentary on *Sat.* 4. 16: *Helleborum enim, ut Strabo volumine nono scribit, quamvis in multis nascatur locis, tamen circa urbem Anticyram in Phocide optime praeparatur, quo frequentes olim advenae purgationi causa navigabant. Horatius 'naviget Anticyram.'* And when Fonzio mentioned, on *Sat.* 6. 9, that *Lunensis autem portus in quinto Strabo his versibus meminit: 'horum Luna quidem civitas et portus est. Graeci autem et portum et urbem Selenes, id est Lunae appellant'*,<sup>37</sup> he was repeating the *verbatim* translation of Guarino da Verona.<sup>38</sup> In addition, he used Guarino's translation for quoting a reference to the expression *mimaloneis* (*mimalloneis* eds.) *bombis* (*Sat.* 1. 99): *Mimalones Bacchae mulieres sunt cornua in orgiis ferentes eaque spiritu inflantes. Cognominantur vero, ut plures autumant, a Mima monte Ioniae, de quo Plinius libro quinto et*

7. 148–149) in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (3. 8), and Cicero quotes the Polydamas episode in his letter *Ad Att.* 2. 5. 1.

<sup>33</sup> See Silvano (2011). An earlier view on this question has been expressed by Ferri (1916).

<sup>34</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 30<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> See Diodorus Siculus (1476–1477: 154), a reprint of the Bologna edition of 1472.

<sup>36</sup> Diod. *Bibl.* 4. 4. 4.

<sup>37</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 119<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> See Strabo 1472 (a reprint of the 1469 Rome edition by Konrad Sweynheym and Arnold Panartz), fol. 61<sup>v</sup>.

*Strabo quartodecimo referunt: 'In Ionia enim iuxta Lebedum, quae urbs non procul a Mimante locata est, artificum Liberi conventus est, et Ionum habitatio usque in Hellespontum, in qua sollemnia et certamina Libero patri quotannis celebrabantur'.<sup>39</sup> In this case, Fonzio did not cite Guarino's translation word by word, but changed a few words in order not to obscure the original: *Postea est Lebedus quae centum et viginti stadiis abest a Colophone. Hoc in loco artificum liberi patris conventus est, et Ionum habitatio usque in Hellespontum, in qua sollemnia et certamina libero patri quotannis celebrantur.*<sup>40</sup>*

When quoting Diogenes Laertius, Fonzio also used a Latin translation of his major work, which had been prepared by Benedetto Brugnoli. In this case, he did not copy the entire translation but made a shorter version of it, using the words of the Latin text (*Sat.* 6. 10-11) '*Postquam destertuit esse Maeonides Quintus pavone ex Pythagoreo.*' *Refert Heraclides Ponticus, ut Laertius scribit, Pythagoram dicere solitum se aliquando Aethalidem Mercurii filium fuisse, qui longo post tempore in Euphorbum, deinde in Hermotimum, postea in Pyrrhum, novissime in Pythagoram commigravit.*<sup>41</sup> Fonzio's abridged version reads: *Refert Heraclides Ponticus, hunc de se dicere solitum quod fuisset aliquando Aethalides, Mercuriique filius putatus esset, etc.*<sup>42</sup> Fonzio changed and condensed Brugnoli's translation to form the comment.

Among the translations used by Fonzio, there is one more we have to mention, namely, the Latin translation of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. In his commentary on line 121 of *Satire* 1,<sup>43</sup> he used Filippo Beroaldo's translation: [...] *quod Philostratus libro sexto his verbis scribit: 'Ipse enim Mida satyrorum genus participavit, quod ipsius aures manifestant.' Satyrus igitur quidam propter affinitatem ipsi illudebant in Midae aures calumnias iactans, nec voce solum verum etiam tibiis in ipsum carmina decantabat.*<sup>44</sup>

The situation is almost the same in Herodotus' case. Fonzio quoted his work on *Sat.* 3. 53, but he used Galeotto Marzio's *De homine* (1477), a treatise on anatomy where those lines were included. Yet the translation Marzio cited is by Lorenzo Valla. Therefore, Fonzio quoted Valla's translation: *Galeottus Martius recte sen-*

<sup>39</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 39<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> Strabo 1472, fol. 167<sup>v</sup>. Fonzio probably used the earlier edition (see above, n. 38) or a manuscript of Guarino's translation.

<sup>41</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 120<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> Diogenes Laertius 1475, 279.

<sup>43</sup> Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 47<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>44</sup> See Flavius Philostratus 1502, 117.

*tit. Herodotus de Persis libro quinto* [Hdt. 5. 49. 3–4]. *Et genus pugnandi, eorum huiuscemodi est. Breves arcus ac brevia spicula, longas brachas, longasque in capitibus cristas, unde faciles captu sunt, gerentes in pugnam eunt.*

We could continue the list of examples, but the cases so far mentioned may be convincing enough to state that Fonzio did not use the original Greek sources when he composed his commentary on Persius. For Ptolemy, he took Jacopo Angeli da Scarperia's translation, for Aristotle that of Lorenzo Valla, for Plutarch that of Giovanni Calfurnio, for Eusebius obviously that of Jerome, for Appian that of Pier Candido Decembrio. He did not know directly other Greek authors such as Ephorus, Lycophron, and Aesop. In addition, we can also list Cornelius Celsus' name,<sup>45</sup> whose first modern editor was Fonzio himself: all the Greek medical vocabulary quoted by Fonzio in the commentary on Persius came from Celsus' *De medicina*.<sup>46</sup>

### 5. *Fonzio's method of compilation*

Although it is complicated to present Fonzio's scientific background knowledge and literary competences through a commentary, an analysis of a brief passage might enable us to characterize his working method and confirm our statement that he solely relied on Latin sources when composing his commentaries. Commenting on *Sat.* 1. 76 *Brysei Accii*, Fonzio provides a short treatise listing the epithets of the god Dionysus.

<sup>45</sup> Sabbadini (1900: 19–21).

<sup>46</sup> Fontius also used the late antique-early medieval *Commentum Cornuti* on Persius (on which see Zetzel 2005) and the ancient *Vita Persii de commentario Probi Valeri sublata*. See Takács & Tuhári (2015: 5). However, he does not mention them as sources of his commentary.

Ms. Ricc. 666, fols. 30 <sup>r</sup> –31 <sup>v</sup>	Sources
<p><i>Brysei Accii</i>: Bryseus ex variis Bacchi cognominibus unum est. Quod aliqui a Brysea civitate Aoniae, in qua Bacchus colebatur. Quidam ab antiquo verbo bryo, quod emano scaturioque significat, dici volunt, quia vel ex alvearibus mella, vel ex uvis musta exprimere prius docuit. Qui cum novi scriptores sint veritasque in occulto lateat, ipse quoque eam opinionem subiiciam, in quam doctos plerosque ire prospicio. Hi quidem Byrseum potiusque Bryseum Bacchum cognominatum a byrsa pelle, quae in bellis induebatur, existimant. Nam apud Diodorum quinto volumine Bacchum in proeliis pardalorum pellibus usum constat. Byrsam autem corium ac tergus significare ostendit. Virgilius: ‘mercatique solum facti de nomine Byrsam / taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo.’ Postea vero qui huius cognominis causam reddidimus, non alienum a proposito nostro videbitur, qui ad utilitatem discentium haec scribimus, si cetera quoque Bacchi cognomina apud alios passim dispersa, nos hunc in locum breviter redegerimus. Bacchus ut Diodorus refert a mulieribus dictus est quae illum bacchantes, hoc est furentes sequebantur. Ab Iove autem parente urbeque Nysa, ubi educatus a nymphis fuit, Dionysius</p>	<p>Tortelli 1471, 165, s.v. <i>Bryseus: cum y Graeco et e absque diphthongo scribitur, unum est ex cognominibus Bacchi, dictum uel a brysea urbe, etc.</i></p> <p>Diod. Sic. 4. 4. 4 (1476–1477): <i>armis pellicis in pugna utebatur et pardalorum pellibus</i></p> <p>Serv. <i>ad Aen.</i> 1. 367: <i>quia byrsa Graece corium dicitur.</i></p> <p>Verg. <i>Aen.</i> 1. 367–368.</p> <p>Diod. Sic. 4. 5. 1: <i>Nam alii Bacchum a mulieribus, quae Bacchantes illum sequebantur dixere</i></p>

appellatur. Liber pater Lieusque dicitur, aut quod libertatem loquendi praestet, aut quod vinum, cuius inventor fuit, a curis homines liberet, aut quod exercitum apud Indos sua sapientia liberavit. A qua Lysii quoque cognomen a Graecis auctore Plutarcho meruit, et si quidam alii a lyein, quod solvere significat, dictum putant. Leneus vero a torculari, quo vinum exprimitur, dictus est. Bromius atque Pyrgenius a tonitru, qui eius in ortu contigit, dicitur. Mitrophoros, quod mitra caput ligabat si quando vini potu agitabatur, est appellatus. Dimitora quoque, hoc est bimaterem nuncupatum tradunt, quod ex uno patre duabusque matribus gemini Dionysii orti sunt. Antea enim Iuppiter ex Proserpina alium Dionysium procrearat. Triumphator etiam dicitur, quod ex Indis omnium primus in patriam rediens triumphavit. Bassareus a longae vestis habitu. Euchius ab Iouis laudatione, vel a voce bacchantium dictus fertur. Nyseus a Nysa urbe. Iacchus ab effusione vel vini, vel vocis laetitiae causa nominatur. Thyoneus a matris cognomine, quae Thyone dicitur, nuncupabatur.

Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 613c

Diod. Sic. 4.5.5: *alii a torculari, quo uinum exprimitur leneum...*

Diod. Sic. 5: *Quidam bromium a tonitru, qui in eius ortu contigit, pingenius insuper ex eadem appellatur causa...*

Diod. Sic. 5: *Si quando ex potu bibentis caput agitaretur, mitra caput aligabat. unde et mitriphoros dictus est.*

Diod. Sic. 5: *Aiunt insuper dimytora uocatum, quoniam ex uno patre duo sint orti dionysii et matribus duabus.*

Diod. Sic. 5: *Quem aiunt ex ioue et proserpina natum a nonnullis quae appallatum Saebasis.*

Diod. Sic. 5: *Quin etiam triumphator dicitur, quod primus omnium de indis multis cum spoliis in patriam reuersus triumpharit.*

---

The textual parallels illustrate that Fonizio compiled an essay using different Greek and Latin sources. This is actually the only passage in the whole commentary in which the author drew the reader's attention to the fact that the text was his own, because he composed the list of Bacchus' names: *Postea vero qui huius cognominis causam reddidimus, non alienum a proposito nostro videbitur, qui ad utilitatem discentium haec scribimus, si cetera quoque Bacchi cognomina apud alios passim*

*dispersa, nos hunc in locum breviter redegerimus*. However, this is not surprising, for Fonzio was interested in etymology; a sign of such interest can be found in one of his manuscripts. Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 837 contains an autograph piece with Dionysus' names: *varia Bacchi nomina: Dionysius, Bacchus, Liber pater, Lieus, Lysius, Leneus, Bromius, Pyrgenius, Mitrophorus, Dimitor, Triumphator, Bassareus, Euc(h)ius, Nyseus, Iachus, Thyoneus, Bryseus*.<sup>47</sup> The manuscript is entitled *Dictionarium ex variis auctoribus collectum*, and it seems to be the twin-manuscript of Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 153, another autograph manuscript by Fonzio. It is a very important document confirming the hypothesis that Fonzio used exclusively Latin translations of Greek texts from the 1470s. This manuscript contains excerpts from Homer (*Nomina Nereidum*), Diogenes Laertius, Ptolemy, Plutarch, Strabo,<sup>48</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Appian. All excerpts are written in Latin, and the first sentence of the Homeric quotation (*Undique concurrunt Nereides aequore ab imo*) is supposedly the translation of a line of *Iliad* 18. 38:  $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota\ \delta\sigma\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \beta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \text{N}\eta\rho\eta\iota\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ . The manuscript also contains a part of Jerome's commentary on the Gospel of Matthew: the date 1488 indicates that Fonzio used this abundant collection of Latin extracts during the revision of his commentary on Persius.

For his commentaries, Fonzio excerpted not only ancient authors, but also important works of his elder contemporaries. For instance, he knew and epitomized Domizio Calderini's commentary on Juvenal,<sup>49</sup> the Latin biography of Plato written by Guarino,<sup>50</sup> and Cristoforo Landino's *De anima*,<sup>51</sup> all quoted in the commentary on Persius.

To sum up, the lack of Greek excerpts (there are only some words in Greek) and the comparison of Fonzio's Latin text with the Latin translations of those authors available at the time confirm our assumption that the young scholar used merely Latin texts during the 1460s and 1470s. Yet the 1480s represent a turning point in Fonzio's scientific horizon.

<sup>47</sup> Ms. Ricc. 837, fol. 32<sup>v</sup>. On this codex, see Caroti & Zamponi (1974: 55).

<sup>48</sup> On fols. 77<sup>r</sup>–80<sup>r</sup>, Ms. Ricc. 153 contains Latin excerpts from Strabo, probably written down to be employed in the commentary on Persius. All of them return in the commentary on *Satire* 1 under the lemmata *Pirene, Pegasus equus, Caballinus fons, Helicon, Dirce, Potnia, Citheron, Helicon*, etc. On this codex, see Caroti & Zamponi (1974: 45–48).

<sup>49</sup> Ms. Ricc. 153, fol. 100<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> Ms. Ricc. 153, fol. 73<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> Ms. Ricc. 153, fol. 64<sup>r</sup>–64<sup>v</sup>. See also Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 53<sup>r</sup>–53<sup>v</sup>: *Acri bile: Bilis quae a Graecis cholera dicitur. Landino auctore secundo de anima libro, sanguis spuma videri potest, quae ita rubet, ut etiam in candorem ignis deflectat, corpusque optime nutrit.*

## 6. *An example of change in Fonzio's command of Greek*

The comment written on the expression *pappare minutim* (*minutum* eds.) in *Sat.* 3. 17 shows how Fonzio reworked his earlier incorrect explanation. The importance of this change should be underlined, because this was one of the very few corrections that had been made in the text of the commentary and that he had omitted from the corrections of *Tadeus*. In the left column, I have reproduced the version handed down by Ms. Ricc. 666, fols. 67<sup>r</sup>–67<sup>v</sup>; the middle column presents the revised text of Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, 67<sup>r</sup>–67<sup>v</sup>, while the right column contains the explanation from the *Tadeus*, included in the same manuscript.

In this case, Fonzio did not only change the comment but also quoted Persius' words differently, for he had checked the poet's text, as he himself reports.<sup>52</sup> Also, in the Latin version of Homer's *πάππα φίλε* (*Od.* 6. 57) that he used, he could find the word written with one *p*. But the original Greek word had two *π*'s, as the later manuscript shows. Consequently, Fontius was forced to face the fact that he had followed an incorrect translation. The problem had already been noticed by Poliziano, who had quoted a line from the *Iliad* in his commentary on Persius.<sup>53</sup> Homer's epic poem was published by Demetrius Chalcondyles in Florence between late 1488 and early 1489, and Fonzio may have consulted that edition.

## 7. *The turning point: Tadeus vel de locis Persianis*

By the end of the 1460s, in Ferrara, Fonzio made acquaintance with some Hungarians,<sup>54</sup> who belonged to the court of Vitéz János (Joannes Vitéz), the bishop of Várad. They invited the young Italian scholar to visit Hungary, especially the palace and library of King Matthias in Buda.<sup>55</sup> While Fonzio was planning his journey to Hungary, he heard that a conspiracy against the king had been detected. Thus, he decided that a journey to Hungary would be very dangerous under those circumstances.

<sup>52</sup> See Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 65<sup>v</sup>: *Et si quaedam exemplaria 'findor' habent, quia tamen in vetustioribus 'finditur' in tertia persona invenitur, antiquam scripturam tanquam sensui magis cohaerentem secutus sum.*

<sup>53</sup> Poliziano lectured on Persius between 1482 and 1485: see the 1985 edition of Poliziano's commentary on Persius by Cesarini Martinelli and Ricciardi, XIV. On Poliziano's interpretation, see *ibid.*: 76.

<sup>54</sup> On these friendships, see Daneloni (2001a and b).

<sup>55</sup> See *Epist.* 1. 16.

Ms. Ricc. 666, fol. 67 <sup>r</sup> –67 <sup>v</sup>	Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2 <sup>o</sup> , fol. 67 <sup>r</sup> –67 <sup>v</sup>	Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2 <sup>o</sup> , fols. 7 <sup>v</sup> –8 <sup>r</sup>
<p><i>Papare minutim: Minutis ac blandiusculis verbis patrem appellare, ut quidam sentiunt, quod si patrem vocare significat, per unicum p scribendum est. Papas enim pater est, et cum p unico scribitur. Quod patet apud Homerum in Odyssea, Nausicaam enim Alcinoi filiam inducit patrem suum vocantem, 'Papaphile' [6, 57], id est pater chare. Iuvenalis: 'Timidus praegustet pocula papas,' pro aliquo, qui te filii loco amet.</i></p> <p><i>Quidam uero papare per geminum p scribentes pappum, hoc est avum vocare dicunt. Pappus enim avus est, ut Festus scribit, quod et Ausonius ad nepotem suum ostendit: 'Pappos auiasque trementes, Ante ferunt patribus seri, nova cura nepotes.'</i></p>	<p><i>Pappare minutim: Minutis ac blandiusculis verbis patrem appellare, ut quidam sentiunt, quod si patrem vocare significat, per geminum p scribendum est. Papas enim pater est, et cum p gemino scribitur. Quod patet apud Homerum in Odyssea, Nausicaam enim Alcinoi filiam inducit patrem suum vocantem, Πάππα φίλε id est pater chare. Iuvenalis: 'Timidus praegustet pocula pappas,' pro aliquo, qui te filii loco amet.</i></p> <p><i>Quidam uero etiam pappare per geminum p scribentes pappum, hoc est avum vocare dicunt. Pappus enim avus est, ut Festus scribit, quod et Ausonius ad nepotem suum ostendit: 'Pappos auiasque trementes, Ante ferunt patribus seri, nova cura nepotes.'</i></p>	<p><i>Quanquam pappos significare avos apertum est: &amp; inde pappare deductum esse a delicati adolescentis moribus non abhor-ret: quem num puerorum instar loqui velit: interrogat: cum aut crassum humorem pendere de calamo: aut diluti atramenti guttas congeminari ea vocis mollitudine conqueratur: qua bimuli, aut trimuli indulgentioribus avis ac nutricibus blandiuntur: pappare tamen pro comedere magis convenit: cum praesertim apud Marcellum reperiatur: a Catone de liberis educandis scriptum esse. Cum cibus ac potionem buas ac pappas doceat. et apud Plautum Epidicum legamus ad Periphanem ita loquentem: 'At postea? Novo liberto opus est quod pappet'. Cui respondet Periphanes: 'Dabitur. Praebebo cibum' [Plaut. Epid. 727].</i></p>

He composed the commentary on Persius at that time, in the early 1470s<sup>56</sup> and had it copied by some other scribe, although Fonzio – as we stated earlier – was not only a devoted commentator of classical texts, but a scribe as well.

His commentary was published in 1477<sup>57</sup> and its several reimpressions<sup>58</sup> made his name well-known. In the early 1480s, he was invited to give lectures at the *Studium* of Florence, where he later became a professor.<sup>59</sup> Fonzio managed to find a good friend in Florence, in the person of Angelo Poliziano. Their close relationship is well documented by the poems that both humanists wrote in this period.<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless, the friendship was broken up before the middle of the 1480s; we do not have any information about the reasons for this rupture.<sup>61</sup>

After this bitter experience, Fonzio got probably surprised when he met Taddeo Ugoletto at the end of the 1480s, probably in 1487. At that time, the Italian Ugoletto was working as a book-agent<sup>62</sup> for King Matthias' famous library, the Corviniana Library. He invited Fonzio to Buda, Hungary. More than sixteen years passed since the earlier invitation: the memory of the defeated conspiracy and the death of some friends (the bishop Joannes Vitéz and the poet Janus Pannonius) seemed to have become appeased. Fonzio was very pleased with the invitation and, in the spring of the following year, he finally arrived in Buda.<sup>63</sup> There is no evidence about what Fonzio was actually doing during his stay in Buda, but he is supposed to have made corrections in some Latin manuscripts of the Corviniana Library.<sup>64</sup> He spent only few months in Buda.<sup>65</sup> Then, that summer, he returned to the village of Pelago, which is located ca. 15 miles eastwards from Florence.

Fonzio did not wish to arrive in Buda without a gift for the King. Therefore, he composed a manuscript containing all of his works written up until that time. This

<sup>56</sup> Robathan & Cranz (1976: 265–267).

<sup>57</sup> Fontius (1477).

<sup>58</sup> The *ISTC* mentions twenty reprints dating from the period 1480–1499.

<sup>59</sup> Marchesi (1900: 49–51) and Bausi (2011: 257ff).

<sup>60</sup> See Fontius: *Carmina: Et pariter nostras animo complectere flammis, / maxima pars animi, Politiane, mei*. See also Poliziano, *Eleg. 6 (in Fontium)*. 253–254: *Ergo vale, Fonti, et memori nos mente reconde / mutuaque alternus pectora servet amor*.

<sup>61</sup> Cesarini Martinelli and Ricciardi (see above, n. 53) quote two sharp expressions from Fonzio's letter 1. 24 referred to Poliziano: 4 *imprudētissimi hominis et parati semper ad lites*; 5 *tenebricorum ingenium*.

<sup>62</sup> Marchesi (1900: 80, 83).

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*: 86–87.

<sup>64</sup> See Csapodiné Gárdonyi (1977).

<sup>65</sup> Marchesi (1900: 87).

autograph codex, which later belonged to the Corviniana Library, is now being preserved as Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>.<sup>66</sup> The codex contains a dedicatory letter to King Matthias, followed by the commentary on Persius with its dedicatory letter to Lorenzo de' Medici, some of Fonizio's minor prose works, and a collection of poems, the so-called *Saxettus*, dedicated to the King's son, John Corvin. This Wolfenbüttel-manuscript includes only two new texts: the dedication to King Matthias and *Tadeus*, which he added to his previous works later.<sup>67</sup>

At the beginning of this writing, Fonizio described the reason for composing his *Tadeus* as follows: while he was working in his *studio*, Taddeo Ugoletto suddenly came in and interrupted him asking what he was doing. Fonizio replied that he was dealing with his *De poeticis locis*, which is probably his best-known work, and which was found and published only in 1960.<sup>68</sup> Whereupon Taddeo suggested to him that he should correct his own mistakes first: *Recte quidem Tadee mones priusquam aliorum errata ut mea corrigam*. And then he ceased writing *De poeticis locis* and began to write *De locis Persianis*. The short work *Tadeus* contains corrections to his commentary on Persius. As Fonizio writes: *Neque vero pudebit exemplo magnorum virorum quae olim adolescentulus in Persium non recte scripserim emendasse*. The number of corrections is not significant; there were only eighteen passages that Fonizio thought to be incorrect. One concerned Persius' poetic prologue, i.e., the *choliambus*; five were contained in the first satire and three in the second, the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth, respectively.<sup>69</sup>

*Tadeus* can be found in two manuscripts only: in the above-mentioned Wolfenbüttel-Corvina (Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>), on fols 3<sup>r</sup>-15<sup>r</sup>, and Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 1220, on fols. 106<sup>v</sup>-114<sup>r</sup>. The colophon informs the reader that the manuscript had been copied by a certain *Franciscus Thomas Fabrilignarius in Monte Ferrato*.<sup>70</sup>

There are differences between the two texts, which can be found mainly in the introduction, the explanation of some passages, and the conclusion. As a

<sup>66</sup> See above, n. 23.

<sup>67</sup> A brief remark: whereas Fonizio's commentary on Persius was published many times in the last decades of the fifteenth century the text of *Tadeus* had only one edition in 1621, when Georgius Rem published the whole Fontius-corvina (Fontius 1621).

<sup>68</sup> Trinkaus (1966). On the importance of this *Poetica*, see Greenfield (1981: 283-307).

<sup>69</sup> The corrected passages are *Chol.* 14; *Sat.* 1, 5-6; 17-18; 95; 108-109; 134; 2, 27; 40; 57; 3, 17; 50; 53-54; 32-33; 47-48; 186; 6, 18-19; 52; and 80.

<sup>70</sup> Fol. 106<sup>r</sup>: *Scriptum a me francisco thomasij fabrilignarij casalensis VI Kalendas iulij anno MoCCCCoLXXXVII*. (now Casale Monferrato in Piedmont). See De Robertis & Miriello (1999: 115) (12201 = N. I 35).

detailed and comprehensive analysis of all discrepancies would be unfeasible in this paper, only some peculiarities will be presented here. They will, however, be sufficient to clearly demonstrate that the text of Ms. Ricc. 1220 is an earlier version of the *Tadeus*. The first differences in the introductory section become apparent by juxtaposing the texts:

Ms. Ricc. 1220. fols. 106 <sup>v</sup> –107 <sup>f</sup>	Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2 <sup>o</sup> , fol. 3 <sup>f</sup> –3 <sup>v</sup>
<p>Dubitavi aliquantisper Mathia Corvine rex dicaremne maiestati tuae perbreuem perque humilem hunc sermonem habitum nuper cum Tadeo Ugholetto viro ad tuam bibliothecam perficiendam aptissimo. Maluissem enim donare aliquod opus insignius et regiae celsitudini tuae convenientius, cui non nisi multis lucubrationibus expolita et egregia decet dicari opera. Verum tui excellentiam animi mecum reputans non dona sed affectus donantium intuentis: decrevi eum tandem ad te transmittere, putans fore tibi non iniocundum, praesertim cum ad eum referendum sum adhortatus ab homine maiestatis tuae studiosissimo. Nam Tadeus me <i>nuper</i> domi scriptitantem cum invenisset ‘quid’ inquit ‘hoc est operis? Quod nunc habes in manibus?’ Cui ego: ‘<i>De locis Horatianis</i>’. Tunc ille quibusdam ex <i>his</i> percursis hoc ait: ‘utile erit opus et gratum <i>multis</i> [...]’.</p>	<p>Dubitavi aliquantisper Mathia Corvine rex <i>praeclarissime</i> dicaremne Maiestati tuae perbreuem perque humilem hunc sermonem habitum nuper cum Tadeo Vgholetto viro <i>doctissimo et</i> ad tuam bibliothecam perficiendam aptissimo. Maluissem enim <i>hoc initio meae erga te perpetuae observantiae declarandae, misisse</i> aliquod opus insignius et Regiae celsitudini tuae convenientius, cui non nisi multis lucubrationibus expolita et <i>ad amussum perfecta</i> decet dicari opera. Verum tui excellentiam animi mecum reputans non dona sed affectus donantium intuentis: decrevi eum tandem ad te transmittere, putans fore tibi non iniocundum: praesertim cum ad eum referendum sum adhortatus ab homine <i>amatissimo et</i> Maiestatis tuae studiosissimo. Nam Tadeus me <i>proximis diebus superioribus</i> domi scriptitantem cum invenisset: ‘Quid’ inquit ‘hoc est operis? Quod nunc habes in manibus?’ Cui ego: ‘<i>De poeticis locis</i>’. Tunc ille quibusdam ex iis percursis hoc ait: ‘<i>multis</i> utile erit opus et gratum <i>Regi</i> [...]’.</p>

*Nuper* is very likely an earlier version than the pleonastic *proximis diebus superioribus*. In comparison to the neutral address *Mathia Corvine rex*, the final version presents the more emphatic *Mathia Corvine rex praeclarissime*. Fonzio addressed Ugoletto with the adjectives *doctissimus* and *amatissimus* and later declared his attentiveness towards King Matthias as well: *Maluisse enim hoc initio meae erga te perpetuae observantiae declarandae, misisse aliquot opus insignius*, (i. e., a more illustrious work), which is obviously more courteous than *Maluisse enim dona aliquot opus insignius* in Ms. Ricc. 1220.

However, the formal, stylistic additions are complemented with remarkable textual differences as well. One of the most salient is undoubtedly the following: according to Ms. Ricc. 1220, Fonzio was working on *De locis Horatianis* when Ugoletto found him at work. Yet, according to Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, this work was *De poeticis locis*.

The last sentence of the quoted passage is equally remarkable. Ugoletto hastens Fonzio to write and offer something to the king, and – according to the earlier version – says to him: *utile erit opus et gratum multis*, while in the later one he adds *et gratum Regi*.

Feeling that a commentary on Persius is still quite a modest gift for the king, in the later version Fonzio added an anecdote, attributing it to Ugoletto. Fonzio commented on the expression *bracatis...Medis* on lines 53–54 of *Satire 3* (*Quaeque docet sapiens bracatis illita Medis / Porticus...*) using Galeotto Marzio's explanation of *Brachatis* (*braccatis* Ms. Ricc. 666) *medis: brachas femoralia non esse Galeottus Martius recte sentit*. He used *De homine* by Galeotto Marzio, who had quoted and explained these lines in his work.<sup>71</sup> Surprisingly enough, previously Fonzio had not mentioned the elder humanist at all; in the earlier version of *Tadeus*, in fact, he only stated: *Hoc loco bracas femoralia non esse, haud recte mihi videor posuisse*. Moreover, he confessed that he had misinterpreted a sentence by Diodorus Siculus, because he had not read it in Greek, but only in Latin:

*Nam cum bracae anaxyrides sint, anaxyrides vero feminum tegmina, sunt quidem certe bracae feminalia. Anaxyridas autem bracas esse. Diodorus ostendit libro in quinto [5, 30, 1], ubi de Galatis haec scribit. Me vero tunc scribentem decepit Latinus interpres, qui structuram et compositionem verborum non advertens tunicas simul cum anaxyridibus coniunxit, unumque membrum orationis, quae separata erant effecit, neque sensum neque verba ad fidem transferens. Ait enim: 'Vestes ad terrorem intonsas ac coloris varii ferunt: quas illi vocant bracas,' cum dicendum fuerit et tunicis eos versicoloribus atque etiam anaxyridibus uti.*

<sup>71</sup> I quote from the 1517 edition of Galeottus Martius' *De homine*, fol. 37<sup>r</sup>.

The words *decepit Latinus interpres* refer to Poggio Bracciolini, who translated the sixth book of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca*. Fonzio quoted Bracciolini's translation properly<sup>72</sup> but did not wish to blame the translator for the mistake.

Yet Galeotto Marzio is mentioned again in the *Tadeus* of Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>. While Fonzio is interpreting the text, Ugoletto bursts out into laughter, and when Fonzio asks him why he is laughing, Ugoletto tells him an anecdote concerning Giorgio Merula trying to defend the interpretation of a line of Persius as it was explained by Fonzio himself:

*'Sed quid rides? An haec tibi parum idonea sunt visa?' Hic Tadeus: 'Non quidem subrisi, quia non ea probem, quae rettulisti, sed quoniam venit in mentem Galeotti Martii adversus praeceptorem meum Georgium Merulam eruditissimum hominem se tuentis. Volens enim ostendere bracas non esse feminalia, pro se dictum illud in triumpho Caesaris. In curia 'Galli bracas deposuerunt, latum clavum sumpserunt' [Suet. Iul. 80, 2], addens facete ait: 'Ostenderuntne quaeso, Georgi, culum in senatu depositione bracarum?' Hoc nanque ridiculum dictum mihi quoque excussit risum. Nam quod aegre ferebat romanus populus in senatum allectos esse quosdam bracatos Gallos et ad rei maiorem indignitatem demonstrandum in curia eos bracas deposuisse et latum clavum sumpsisse decantabat, ille in suam defensionem iocose traxit. Itaque memor Galeotti amici et docti viri et perurbani cum huius tum aliorum in Pannonia facete coram Mathia Corvino Rege dictorum, non potui risum continuisse. Verum quando non ioco res est: sed serio peragenda: equidem paucis explicabo quod sentio.'*<sup>73</sup>

This is a short comment by Ugoletto in *Tadeus*, after which the Florentine scholar goes on with his explanations.

Taddeo Ugoletto was Giorgio Merula's student in Milan.<sup>74</sup> A sharp controversy broke out between Merula and Marzio, when Marzio republished his work *De homine* mentioned above. Although Ugoletto implies that Marzio's little book of collected jokes and anecdotes about King Matthias (*De egregie, sapienter et iocose dictis ac factis Mathiae regis*)<sup>75</sup> was written around 1485, the dialogue between Merula and Marzio seems to be fictitious rather than real, and it can be considered

<sup>72</sup> See Fig. 1 (Diodorus Siculus *Bibliotheca*, translated by Poggio Bracciolini, Venice, 1472, 217; the passage belongs to Book 6 in Poggio Bracciolini's edition).

<sup>73</sup> Ms. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, fol. 9v.

<sup>74</sup> Affò (1781: 6) and Bolonyai (2011: 119, n. 1).

<sup>75</sup> Galeottus Martius, *De egregie* etc., ed. Juhász.

part of the polemics around *De homine*. In his *Adnotationes*,<sup>76</sup> Merula criticized Marzio's interpretation, which was also accepted by Fonzio. Marzio did not leave it without a response: *Refutatio obiectorum in librum de homine a Georgio Merula*.<sup>77</sup> Galeotto Marzio did not moderate himself when addressing Merula:

*Ecce iterum ac saepius Merula balbutit. Non enim videtur id esse verum quod de braccis ponitur in libro nostro. Diximus namque braccas vestimenta longa ex pellibus facta: et Merulae quae allegavimus ad hanc rem non videntur satis idonea: nosque conviciis ut consuevit incussit: quae mihi qui occalui duce philosophia: sunt ut dicta histrionum et scurrarum. His omissis dico Georgi bracas esse pelliceas vestes.*

And then the quotation serving as climax for the anecdote follows:

*In curia Galli braccas deposuerunt latum clavum sumpserunt, ostenderuntne quaeso Georgi culum in senatu depositione braccarum?*

It is obvious that Fonzio made use of Marzio's satirical reply to Merula. Thus, a literary polemic was transformed into a real, personal dispute.

It is very interesting to follow the transformation of Fonzio's first version of *Tadeus* into the version King Matthias was presented with. The table (next page) clarifies the similarities and differences between the earlier and the final versions.

However, the interpretation of *Sat.* 3. 53–54 provides other important elements and can illustrate quite well how Fonzio's point of view changed over the years between the composition of the commentary and its final supplement, *Tadeus*.

The position of *Tadeus* within the texts of the Wolfenbüttel-Corvina is also worthy of note: at the beginning of the manuscript, there is the dialogue with the corrections, followed by the commentary with the original, uncorrected text. This composition shows the eminent importance of self-correction.

<sup>76</sup> Merula (1474).

<sup>77</sup> Martius (1476).

Ms. Ricc. 1220, fols. 110<sup>r</sup>–111<sup>r</sup>.

Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, fols. 8<sup>v</sup>–10<sup>v</sup>

*Quaeque docet sapiens bracatis illita medis Porticus*

Hoc loco brachas femoralia non esse, haud recte mihi videor posuisse.

Nam cum bracae, anaxyrides sint: anaxyrides vero feminum tegmina, sunt quidem ceree bracae feminalia. Anaxyridas autem brachas esse. Diodorus ostendit libro v, ubi de Galatis haec scribit: Ἐσθῆσι δὲ χρώνται καταπληκτικαῖς, χιτῶσι μὲν βαπτοῖς χρώμασι παντοδαποῖς διηνηθισμένοις καὶ ἀναξυρίσιν, ἃς ἐκεῖνοι βράκας προσαγορεύουσιν [Diod. Sic. 5. 30. 1].

Me vero tunc scribentem decipit Latinus interpres, qui structuram et compositionem Graecorum verborum non advertens tunicas simul cum anaxyridibus coniunxit, unumque membrum orationis, quae separata erant effecit, neque sensum neque verba ad fidem transferens. Ait enim: ‘Vestes ad terrorem intonsas ac coloris varii ferunt: quas illi vocant brachas,’ cum dicendum fuerit ‘vestibus utuntur terrorem incutientibus, tunicis quidem versicoloribus atque etiam anaxyridibus, quas illi brachas vocant.’

Hoc loco bracas femoralia non esse, haud recte mihi videor posuisse.

Nam cum bracae, anaxyrides sint: anaxyrides vero feminum tegmina: sunt quidem certe bracae feminalia. Anaxyridas autem bracas esse. Diodorus ostendit libro in quinto ubi de Galatis haec scribit: Ἐσθῆσι δὲ χρώνται καταπληκτικαῖς, χιτῶσι μὲν βαπτοῖς χρώμασι παντοδαποῖς διηνηθισμένοις καὶ ἀναξυρίσιν, ἃς ἐκεῖνοι βράκας προσαγορεύουσιν [Diod. Sic. 5.30. 1].

Me uero tunc scribentem decipit Latinus interpres, qui structuram et compositionem verborum non advertens tunicas simul cum anaxyridibus coniunxit: unumque membrum orationis, quae separata erant effecit, neque sensum neque verba ad fidem transferens. Ait enim: ‘Vestes ad terrorem intonsas ac coloris varii ferunt: quas illi vocant bracas,’ cum dicendum fuerit et tunicis eos versicoloribus atque etiam anaxyridibus uti. Ita vero ei fuisse tunicas ab anaxyridibus distinguendas, quando minus Diodori verba percepisset: Strabo eum potuit in quarto volumine de Belgis haec referens admonere: σαγηφοροῦσι δὲ καὶ κομοτροφοῦσι καὶ ἀναξυρίσιν χρώνται περιτεταμέναις, ἀντι δὲ χιτῶνων σχιστοὺς χειριδωτοὺς

Anaxyridas autem feminalia esse et Hieronymus docet ad Fabiolam scribens de sacerdotalibus vestibus. [cf. Hier. *Ep.* 64. 10] Qua in epistola ostendit, quod genus tegimenti Hebrei vocant maschinasse, a Graecis anaxyridas, a nostris feminalia nuncupari.

φέρουσι μέχρις αἰδοίων καὶ γλουτῶν. [Strabo 4. 4. 3] hoc est 'saga ferunt autem et comas nutriunt et laxis utuntur anaxyridibus. Pro tunicis autem scissos amictus cum manicis ferunt usque ad pudenda et nates.'

Anaxyridas autem feminalia esse et Hieronymus docet ad Fabiolam scribens de sacerdotalibus vestibus. Qua in epistola ostendit, quod genus tegimenti Hebrei vocant maschinasse, a Graecis anaxyridas, a nostris feminalia nuncupari.

Sed quid rides? An haec tibi parum idonea sunt visa? Hic Tadeus: 'Non quidem subrisi: quia non ea probem, quae rettulisti: sed quoniam venit in mentem Galeotti Martii adversus praeceptorem meum Georgium Merulam eruditissimum hominem se tuentis. Volens enim ostendere bracas non esse feminalia pro se dictum illud in triumpho Caesaris: "In curia Galli bracas deposuerunt: latum clavum sumpserunt" [Suet. *Iul.* 80. 2], addens facete ait: "Ostenderuntne quaeso Georgi culum in senatu depositione bracarum?" Hoc nanque ridiculum dictum mihi quoque excussit risum. Nam quod aegre ferebat Romanus populus in senatum allectos esse quosdam bracatos Gallos et ad rei maiorem indignitatem demonstrandum in curia eos bracas deposuisse et latum clavum sumpsisse decantabat: ille in suam defensionem iocose traxit.

Vestium autem quibus corpora conteguntur pro locorum ac regionum diversitate fuerunt quoque diversae formae. Sed Gallicarum gentium bracae semper peculiare sunt habitae. A quibus eas et aliae quaedam nationes barbaricae assumpserunt. Has Graeci anaxyridas et periscelidas: Romani vero appellavere campestris: qui amictus eiusmodi pudenda tegens ad exercitationem campi repertus esset, cum caeterae partes corporis nudarentur. At quam hae vere ac proprie brachae sunt: nihil tamen obstat arctos gentes oblongis adeo brachis interdum usas, ut maximam corporis partem eis contegerent. Nam Pomponius Melas elegantissimus vir, summaeque auctoritatis ubi de Sartis (i.e. Satarchis) loquitur, haec rescribit: 'Atque ob saevitiam hyemis admodum assiduae demersis in humum sedibus, specus aut suffossa habitant totum brachati corpus: et nisi qua vident, etiam ora vestiti.'

Itaque memor Galeotti amici et docti viri et perurbani cum huius tum aliorum in Pannonia facete coram Mathia Corvino Rege dictorum, non potui risum continuisse. Verum quando non ioco res est, sed serio peragenda, equidem paucis explicabo quod sentio.

Vestium, quibus corpora conteguntur pro locorum ac regionum diversitate fuerunt quoque diversae formae. Sed Gallicarum gentium bracae semper peculiare sunt habitae. A quibus eas et aliae quaedam nationes barbaricae assumpserunt. Has Graeci anaxyridas et periscelidas: Romani vero appellavere campestris: qui amictus eiusmodi pudenda tegens ad exercitationem campi repertus esset: cum caeterae partes corporis nudarentur. At quam hae vere ac proprie brachae sunt: nihil tamen obstat arctos gentes oblongis adeo brachis interdum usas, ut maximam corporis partem eis contegerent. Nam Pomponius Melas elegantissimus vir summaeque auctoritatis ubi de sartis (i.e. Satarchis) loquitur, haec scribit: 'Atque ob saevitiam [saeva Mela edd.] hyemis admodum assiduae demersis in humum sedibus, specus aut suffossa habitant totum brachati corpus: et nisi qua vident, etiam ora vestiti' [Mela 2. 1. 10]. Esse vero bracas non Graecorum aut Romanorum tegmen sed barbarorum ex nostris quoque Cornelius Tacitus attestatur

Cecinnae vitellianarum partium ducis habitum sic describens: 'At Cecina, velut relicta post Alpes saevitia ac licentia, modesto agmine per Italiam incessit. Ornatum ipsius municipia et coloniae in superbiam trahebant, qui [quod Tac. edd.] versicolori sagulo, bracas, barbarum tegmen indutus togatos alloqueretur' [Tac. *Hist.* 2. 10. 1]. Qua sin hanc usque diem nomen servasse, maximum quoque argumentum est, succinctoria et feminalia eas esse. Sed haec hactenus. Tu modo ad inchoata locos regrediare.

A new question arises immediately: what persuaded Fonzio to make corrections on his commentary? It was probably the critical reception of his work. In the early 1480s, Poliziano became a professor at the *Studium* of Florence, just like Fonzio.<sup>78</sup> Both of them taught classical literature and gave lectures on Persius. Fonzio's commentary on Persius had been written some years earlier and was published in book-form. Poliziano, who was a very talented scholar (probably more talented than Fonzio),<sup>79</sup> criticized his friend's commentary and shared his criticism with his students, who told Fonzio about it. Poliziano had also written his own commentary on Persius, but his work remained unpublished during his lifetime (in fact, it was not meant to be published, and survives in a single autograph copy).<sup>80</sup>

As a matter of fact, a comparison of Fonzio's *Expositio* and *Tadeus* to Poliziano's commentary (ca. 1484–1485) enables us to reveal a clear connection between the three works.

<sup>78</sup> See Marchesi (1900: 49ff).

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *ibid.*: 50, "Il Fontius non era un genio; era un erudito, un maestro anzitutto."

<sup>80</sup> See the introduction to Poliziano (1985).

Fontius, <i>Expositio</i>	Politianus, <i>Commentarium</i>	Fontius, <i>Tadeus</i>
de vita Persii: [...] ut ipse de se scribit, Lunae potius natus est	Hic autem non Ligur, ut quidam somniant, sed Hetruscus Volaterrisque natus	
ad <i>Chol.</i> , 14 <i>perpegaseum melos</i> : valde pegaseum, poeticum persuavem et dulcem cantum. Melos autem sicut et sophos genere neutro indeclinabiliter ponitur.	Pegaseium, non perpegaseum. Nectar, non melos: nam praeterquam quod versus non stat, etiam fide antiquissimi commentarii refellitur. Ausonius: Paganum e Medulis iubeo salvere Theonem [Auson. 27. 13. 2 Green].	Non enim perpegaseum, ut in plurimis etiam pervetustis codicibus reperiuntur, sed quinque syllabam pegaseium, ut in quarta sede iambum hic versus habeat scribi debet. Melos quoque etsi a multis indeclinabile ponitur, per casus tamen Lucretius et Capella et Diomedes et Severinus Boetius inflexerunt. <sup>81</sup>
ad <i>Sat.</i> 1. 17-18 <i>liquido cum plasmate</i> : ad fauces molliendas vocemque suaviter emittendam nonnulli guttur emplastro coluebant, quod plasma a platto graeco verbo, quod figo componoque significat, appellabant. Ex pluribus enim liquidioribus	Plasmate: Ausonius...: nec plasma semper allinunt [Auson. 18. 6. 2 Peiper]	Equidem vulgatam opinionem secutus in plasmate describendo in alium sensum Quintilianum Persiumque adduxi, qui sint legendi. Non enim apud hos auctores pro liquamento ad molliendas capi debet [...] Ausonius quoque ad Paulum scribens pro

<sup>81</sup> Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, 2. 412: *ac musaea mele*; Martianus Capella 35. 23: *melo favente rhythmico*; Diomedes [Terentianus Maurus, v. 1377:], *spondeo melo...*; Boethius, *De inst. mus.*, 1. 8: *aptus melo*.

rebus commixtis vocemque adiuvantibus miscebatur. Quam sane prononciationem his verbis Quintilianus libro primo institutum redarguit. [Quint. *Inst.* 1. 8. 2]

figmento ac sono vocis accepit, cum ait: Siqua fides falsis unquam est adhibenda poetis: nec plasma semper allinunt.

ad *Sat.* 3. 53 *Bracatis Medis*: brachas femoralia non esse Galeottus Marcius recte sentit. Herodotus de Persis libro quinto: Et genus pugnandi eorum huiusce modi est. Breves arcus ac brevia spicula, longas brachas longasque in capitibus cristas, unde faciles capti sunt, gerentes in pugnam eunt...

*Bracatis*. Pollux libro 7o de vestibus: Καὶ Περσῶν μὲν ἴδια κἀνδύς ἀναξυρίς. Et mox: τὰς δὲ ἀναξυρίδας καὶ σκελέας καλοῦσι [Poll. 7. 58–59]. Suidas quoque ἀναξυρίδας feminalia esse ostendit et bracas ἢ τὰ βαθέα καὶ ἄβατα ὑποδήματα et proprie δερμάτινον ὑπόδημα, quod a Persis est inventum; βράκια [i.e. βρακία] dicuntur ἐρράκια: Eolis enim solent ‘β’ στοιχεῖον apponere. [cf. Suid. Adler α 1993; Etym. Magn. 98, 1–5 Gaisford]

Hoc loco bracas femoralia non esse haud recte mihi videor posuisse. Nam cum bracae anaxyrides sint, anaxyrides vero feminum tegmina: sunt quidem certe bracae feminalia...

ad *Sat.* 6. 8o *Depinge ubi sistam inventus Chryssippe tui finitor acervi*: nescius avaritiae suae finem imponere, Chrysippum rogat, quo tandem in numero divitiarum consistat. [...] undecim et trecenta

*Acervi*. Libro 2o De divinatione: ‘Quomodo autem mentientem dissolvas. quem pseudomenon vocant, aut quemadmodum soriti resistas (quem, si necesse sit Latino verbo liceat acervalem)’

[...] Verum enimvero praestat acervum hunc ad soritam referre. Quem constat Tullium secundo divinationum volumine Latino verbo acervalem appellasse.

volumina in logycis  
 scripsit, in quibus omnia  
 ad eam artem spec-  
 tantia et coacervavit  
 et diligenter absolvit.  
 Ob quod ait sui acervi:  
 hoc est dialectico-  
 rum librorum cumuli  
 finitorem Chrysippum  
 repertum est.

appellare; sed nihil opus  
 est; ut enim ipsa philo-  
 sophia et multa verba  
 Graecorum, sic sorites  
 satis Latino sermone  
 tritus est.' [Cic. *De div.*  
 2. 11] Quaere in Zenonis  
 vita libro 7o Laertii [cf.  
 Diog. Laert. 7. 44].

It is unclear why Fonzio did not want to correct his comments, and why he chose this strange form of revision. Furthermore, being a student of the elder school of commentators like Giovanni Tortelli or Domizio Calderini, Fonzio did not use to quote Greek texts. Poliziano, on the other hand, belonged to another school. He tended to cite Greek authors extensively and many times used sources that were considered unique. When we read the comments of *Tadeus*, it becomes remarkable that Fonzio inserted several Greek quotations and neglected their Latin translations. It is very likely that he intended to show that he was able to use original Greek texts. This decision may have been determined by external pressure. It was probably not his own initiative to study Greek, expand his knowledge in this field, review his earlier method of interpretation, and become more attentive to Greek texts. The source of this external pressure may probably be identified with Angelo Poliziano.

### 8. *Fonzio and Demosthenes'* On the false embassy

In the *Appendix* to his article on Fonzio's *Poetics*, Charles Trinkaus quotes the list of Fonzio's works from Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Palatino Capponi 77, fol. II<sup>v</sup>.<sup>82</sup> The list contains his works written in Latin and, in a separate section, his translations and original Italian writings.<sup>83</sup> Among other works, in this section one can find the Italian translations of Greek works such as Phalaris'

<sup>82</sup> Another list of his works has been edited and commented on by Daneloni (2006).

<sup>83</sup> See Trinkaus (1960: 126–127).

epistles, which were very popular during the fifteenth century.<sup>84</sup> Later, Fonzio also translated Lucian's *On Slander* and Pseudo-Demosthenes' *Oratio ad Alexandrum* into the Italian vernacular.<sup>85</sup> However, the most important fact we must note about these works is that both (like other translations by him from that period) were translated from Latin versions and not from the original Greek texts.<sup>86</sup>

To sum up, only two translations exist, for which Fonzio presumably used the original Greek sources. While nothing certain is known about Fonzio's *Phocylides*,<sup>87</sup> which is probably lost, the only known translation is *Demosthenis oratio de mala legatione*, which can be found in Ms. Pal. Capponi 77, fols. 37<sup>r</sup>–71<sup>r</sup>. Moreover, Ms. Ricc. 62 contains Fonzio's commentaries on this oration.<sup>88</sup>

The above-mentioned Ms. Ricc. 62 contains numerous Greek and Latin texts, but we should note that it is a factitious manuscript: only a small part of it was written or just copied by Fonzio himself, while most parts were composed by someone else or by many others. The first section (1<sup>r</sup>–21<sup>v</sup>) of the codex is a bilingual booklet containing Greek sentences and their Latin equivalents. Constantine Manasses' *Chronicle* begins on fol. 23<sup>r</sup>.<sup>89</sup> It is uncertain whether Fonzio copied the text; however, the marginal comments are very likely to have been written by him. He adds short titles to sections of the first book: for example, *Chrysaë uerba ad Atrides et Achiuos alios* (85<sup>v</sup>) and *Achillis uerba ad exercitum* (86<sup>v</sup>). This method is

<sup>84</sup> One of Fonzio's manuscripts (Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 907, fols. 154<sup>r</sup>–169<sup>r</sup>) contains the Latin translation of Francesco Aretino's *Epistles of Phalaris*. Della Fonte's translation was first published in 1471 ([Pseudo]-Phalaris 1471). On this translation, see Vaccar (1952: 10–16).

<sup>85</sup> See Trinkaus (1983: 42). On humanist translations of Lucian's *De calumnia*, see Deligiannis (2006).

<sup>86</sup> Zaccaria (1988: 811) mentions, among the translations into Italian vernacular "mostly dating from the earliest years of Della Fonte's literary activity," that of Aristeas' letter *De LXXII interpretibus*, completed around 1467–1468; that of Lucian's *On Slander*, based on Guarino Guarini's Latin version; that of the *Epistles* falsely attributed to Phalaris, based on Griffolini's Latin translation; some pages from Apuleius' *On the God of Socrates*; and Pseudo-Demosthenes' oration *Ad Alexandrum* (the latter is published by Silvano 2015).

<sup>87</sup> As Trinkaus (1940: 114) mentions, "although this translation into Latin is unlocated, it was sufficiently popular at the time of its rendition, for three copies were included in the fifteenth-century catalogue of the Pandolfini family library" (see Alvisi 1884: nos. 7, 22–23; 23, 45). Trinkaus' assumption that it was a Latin translation does not seem very persuasive. Another translation appeared at the end of the fifteenth century in an edition of Lascaris' *Erotemata* printed by Aldus Manutius (Venice 1495). The hexametric maxims the so-called Pseudo-Phocylides were very popular. If Fonzio actually translated them, he probably did it from Latin into Italian.

<sup>88</sup> For the description of the manuscript, see Caroti & Zamponi (1974: 39–41).

<sup>89</sup> On the content of the manuscript, see Caroti & Zamponi's description, (1974: 39–41). See also Silvano (2011: 244–245) on the fragment of the *Odyssey*.

very similar to the one he used in his commentary on Persius, where he indicated the speaking character at the beginning of a speech

On fol. 105<sup>r</sup>, Demosthenes' speech against Philip of Macedon begins. The text with the Latin and Greek marginal comments can be attributed to another scribe. Then another part of the codex follows, which was certainly copied or written by Fonzio himself. Fol. 175<sup>r</sup> includes the title *In Orationem Demosthenis contra Aeschinem de mala legatione*, but its text begins only three pages later, where Fonzio repeated the title with a minor modification: *Ad orationem Demosthenis contra Aeschinem de falsa legatione*. The commentary is not continuous but is divided into lemmata. All Greek lemmata are underlined with red and, in the margins, etimologies are introduced with *a verbo*. On top of fol. 105<sup>r</sup>, we find the most important piece of information: the date 1489. It signals the year when the glosses to Demosthenes' speech were copied.

Some additional information quoted by Trinkaus confirms the belief that Fonzio was interested in translating Greek originals into Latin. Trinkaus mentions a short comment by Fonzio stating that, after his return from Buda, he translated Demosthenes' speech in Pelago.<sup>90</sup> Trinkaus states, quoting the colophon of a codex copied by an anonymous hand from Fonzio's original:

On 30 May, he was in Pelago, presumably staying at the Ghiacceto family villa, as his translation of Demosthenes' oration *De mala legatione* states at the end (Florence, Bibl. Naz. Ms. Palatino Capponi 77, f. 71r, 'Pelagi iii Cal. Junia 1490 Copiato dallo originale di mano delfontio adi 10 digennaio 1513 per me Francesco baroncini et finito ditto di').<sup>91</sup>

This colophon, therefore, confirms the assumption that the preparation of Demosthenes' text – as Ms. Ricc. 62 shows – was the first step to the translation of the Greek rhetor's work. However, the interpretations and marginal comments in Ms. Ricc. 62 make it clear that Fonzio only had a basic command of the Greek language at that time.<sup>92</sup> If he had had a deeper knowledge, he would not have annotated elementary observations in the margins, such as, e.g., “*ἔργον* *i.e. ver-*

<sup>90</sup> As Trinkaus (1983: 124 n. 12) says: “Paolo Cattani da Ghiaccetto (or Diacetto as it is spelled today), a grandson of the Florentine statesman of the same name whose life Fonzio wrote about. [...] The Cattani family had a villa in the village of Pelago nearby, but took its name from Ghiaccetto, where Fonzio was living in the summer of 1490.” Pelago is a little village not far from Florence.

<sup>91</sup> Trinkaus (1983: 125, n. 22).

<sup>92</sup> As Marchesi (1900: 116) said, “Pare ad ogni modo che Bartolomeo ignorasse allora il greco o almeno lo conoscesse ben poco, dacchè era costretto a servirsi delle traduzioni latine.”

*bum praeteritum perfectum a* Γίνομαι καὶ γίγνομαι” or “ὄτε (sic) *quando*,” which shows some uncertainties in orthography.<sup>93</sup> Even his Greek writing appears to be quite uncertain: Fonizio sometimes inserts capital letters, in the middle of words written in minuscule (e.g., ἐκλΗροῦσθε *a uerbo* κληρόομαι). This peculiarity can also be observed in Ms. Guelf. 43 Aug. 2<sup>o</sup>, written in 1488, where one can find πηγῆ written πΗγΗ (fol. 21<sup>r</sup>).

An examination of Fonizio’s comments on the Greek text of Demosthenes’ speech leads us to conclude that he started to learn Greek intensively only in the second half of the 1480s. Style and contents of these comments show that he needed to collect information even about the most elementary notions. However, such efforts demonstrate that he was committed to learn Greek. His efforts resulted in the Latin translation of *On the false embassy*, which he finished in Pelago.

### 9. *The problems of the translation of Apollonius Rhodius’ Argonautica*

Earlier we came to the conclusion that Fonizio might have started to learn and study the Greek language and read original Greek texts in the middle of the 1480s. Accordingly, we have now to ask the question whether young Fonizio had been able to translate the whole epic poem by Apollonius almost twenty years earlier, that is, in the middle of his twenties. This is one of the most controversial points in the scholarly literature relating to Fonizio.

The list published by Trinkaus mentions a translation of Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica* among Fonizio’s works. Ms. Ricc. 539<sup>94</sup> contains the Latin prose translation of Apollonius’ epic poem, and the main part of the manuscript as well as the corrections within the text were written by Fonizio himself. After evaluating the standard of Latin used in the translation and making a comparison between the original and the Latin version, Gianvito Resta<sup>95</sup> stated that it was not Fonizio himself, but one of his masters, Andronicus Callistus, who made the translation. The name Andronicus was immediately linked to Fonizio because, in another occasion, the Florentine humanist mentions and quotes the translation by Andronicus, i.e., in Ms. Ricc. 153, fols. 90<sup>r</sup>–90<sup>v</sup>. Some pages of this manuscript (90<sup>r</sup>–95<sup>v</sup>) probably preserve an earlier version of this prose translation:

<sup>93</sup> Ms. Ricc. 62, fol. 177<sup>r</sup>. See more in Marchesi (1900: 107).

<sup>94</sup> See Caroti & Zamponi (1974: 48).

<sup>95</sup> Resta (1978).

Ms. Ricc. 153	Ms. Ricc. 539
Incipiens a te Phoebō antiquorum res gestas virorum commemorabo, qui per hostium ponti et per lapides cyandos...	Incipiens a te Phoebe antiquorum glorias virorum memorabo. qui ponti per hostium et per petras Cyaneas...

Resta's argument has been challenged by Nikolaus Thurn. Rejecting Resta's conclusion, Thurn tried to demonstrate that the translation of the *Argonautica* was Fonzio's work. His findings were first published in 1999; he has recently restated this hypothesis when editing Fonzio's comments on Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*. That commentary is basically a collection of remarks, which had not been published earlier: the humanist did not prepare a comprehensive commentary but only added some marginal comments to the copy of the *editio princeps* of Valerius' text.<sup>96</sup> Focusing on this incunabular edition, Thurn tried to prove that Fonzio made the translation based on Andronicus Callistus' lectures.<sup>97</sup>

Other researchers have highlighted Fonzio's usage of his master's Latin translation in a different way. Luigi Silvano published a remarkable study in 2011 about the Latin version of Homer's *Iliad* copied and corrected by Fonzio. Silvano noticed that it cannot be ascertained whether Della Fonte did actually read the Greek text of the *Iliad*, as some corrections might suggest, or instead he worked on Callistus' Latin text only.<sup>98</sup> Indeed, Fontius repeats some mistakes that are already to be found in Leontius Pilatus' version.<sup>99</sup> This case is quite similar to the one concerning the Latin translation of Apollonius of Rhodes' work. Fonzio's corrections insist on the Latin phrasing; he seemingly did not delete inaccurate translations of Greek passages (which he had done in his other manuscript when correcting his own text), but tried to give a more suitable Latin style to the text. For example, instead of *regis monitione* (*Arg.* 1.3: ἐφημοσύνη), he proposed two options: *iussu* or *praecepto regis*.<sup>100</sup> When the formulation was uncertain, as was the

<sup>96</sup> Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Rari 431.

<sup>97</sup> Thurn (1999); on page 148: "Es zeigt sich, daß Bartholomaeus Fonzio die Übersetzung im Ricc. 153 wohl nach dem mündlichen Referat von Andronicus Callisto niederschrieb, dem dort findet sich eine von der derzeitigen Aussprache der Griechischen beeinflusste Orthographie..." See Thurn in Fonzio (2009: ix–xxviii).

<sup>98</sup> Silvano (2011: 236).

<sup>99</sup> On Pilatus' translation, see the bibliography quoted in Silvano (2011: 225, n. 1).

<sup>100</sup> Ms. Ricc. 539, fol. 5<sup>r</sup>.

case with *et ei certamen / paravit nauigationis insignis* (Arg.1.15–16: καὶ οἱ ἄεθλον / ἔντυε ναυτιλῆς πολυκηδέος), he corrected *insignis* into *multae gloriae*. Also, he replaced *convivio* (Arg. 1.13: εἰλαπίνης) with *sacrificio, tuam ob famam* (Arg. 1.8: (ἐ)τεῖν κατὰ βάζιν) with *tuum secundum oraculum*, and *simul sole* (Arg. 1.1362: ἄμ' ἡελίῳ)<sup>101</sup> with *cum [sole]*.<sup>102</sup> Fonzio's corrections show that Callistus was not an eminent Latinist and his command of Latin was insufficient. Considering the quality of Latin prose translations and the obvious fact that Fonzio could not read Greek authors in the original with his very basic knowledge of Greek, Resta's view seems to be much more acceptable.

Although Fonzio did not mention Apollonius in his commentary on Persius, he quoted a Greek line from the *Argonautica* in his *Tadeus*:

*Post prandia calliroen do.* [Pers. Sat. 1. 134] *Hunc ego, quem scripsi, in Paphlagonia fontem apud Valerium Flaccum esse, eius poetae explanationem professus pro Calliroa, ut etiam in vetustis codicibus scriptum est, Callichorum posui, ut quinti voluminis legatur versus: 'Et festa vulgatum nocte Lyei Callichorum.'* [5. 74–75] *Quod ut facerem Apollonius eadem loca secundo in libro enumerans me admonuit, ubi sic ait: ὦκα δὲ καλλιχόροιο παρὰ προχοῶς ποταμοῖο ἦλυθον* [2. 904–905], *hoc est: 'Callichori celeres venere ad fluminis undas.'*<sup>103</sup>

The correction was probably added to the commentary at a later stage, and it is very interesting that Fonzio quoted a poetic translation of Apollonius' verse. These words could be found in a prose translation (*Cito autem Callichori iuxta per fluxus fluvii / venerunt...*) in Ms. Ricc. 539,<sup>104</sup> and Fonzio repeated them in his commentary on Valerius Flaccus.<sup>105</sup> Nikolaus Thurn supposed that Fonzio had planned to complete a poetic translation of the *Argonautica*,<sup>106</sup> but the only quotation in *Tadeus* would rather suggest that Fonzio did not wish to pursue this project. The translation is almost a *cento* of some lines from Virgil's *Aeneid*:

<sup>101</sup> Ms. Ricc. 539, fol. 51<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Resta (1978: 1064).

<sup>103</sup> Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 12201 (first part), fol. 109<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>104</sup> Ms. Ricc. 539, fol. 82<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> See Thurn (2009: 162) *ad loc.* There is *vero* instead of *autem*. See also *ibid.*: xxvii.

<sup>106</sup> Thurn (2009: xxvii): "Zum druckfreien Zitieren also hätte Fontius erst einmal fast den halben Apollonios Rhodios neudichten müssen." Thurn talks about Fonzio's wide knowledge of Greek: "Gerade seine profunde Kenntnis auch der griechischen Literatur..." and "zu einer Zeit, wo andere nicht selbstverständlicherweise um dieselben Griechisch-Kenntnisse verfügten." This "profunde Kenntnis" (i.e., deep knowledge) cannot be observed either in his speeches (on which see Mercuri 2006) or in his poetry.

*inde ubi venere ad fauces grave olentis Averni (Aen. 6.201)*  
*tollunt se celeres liquidumque per aera lapsae (Aen. 6.202)*  
*corpora debentur, Lethaei ad fluminis undam (Aen. 6.714).*

This is the only existing fragment of a poetic translation. But where are the other fragments supposed to be, if Fonzio's plan was to translate Apollonius of Rhodes' complete epic poem in verse?

But there is another interesting problem as far as this passage is concerned. As it was mentioned in an exemplar of the *editio princeps* of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* Fonzio composed a commentary: he wrote the comments into the book on the blank parts of the pages. In his edition – mentioned above – Thurn describes precisely where the comments can be found on the page. But the physical order of the comments (Thurn takes first the comment on the top of the page, thereafter at the right or left side, and finally at the bottom of it) does not correspond with the chronological order of their creation. As the four dates at the end of the text show Fonzio lectured about Valerius Flaccus' epic poem four times to his pupils: first in the academic year of 1475/1476, then in 1478/1479 and 1481/1482, and finally in 1503/1504.<sup>107</sup> It seems very likely that the different positions of the comments on the page (and the different ink colours used) make certain that they were written at a later point of time. The first comments were written under the text or as interlinear glosses, the next ones either on the right or left side of the pages, the later ones either on the top or at the bottom of the pages. The above quoted passage is interesting, while we can reconstruct its chronological order.<sup>108</sup> First he wrote an interpretation based on the expression *Calliroe*. In this long passage there is not any Greek expression. Thereafter he deleted that comment and the *terminus ante quem* is the time of composition of *Tadeus*. The deleted comment was changed into a shorter comment which is a mixture of Greek and Latin words: ὁ Καλλιῖρος *pulchre fluens*. On the same part of the page he later added: Καλλιχῶρος *flumen dictus quasi pulcher chorus*. Fonzio later copied the Latin translation of the verses of Apollonius' *Argonautica* by Andronicus Callistus: this translation was written at the bottom of the page, and finally – as it was usual in the case of Fonzio – he wrote the Greek text on top of the page. It is also very important that Fonzio quotes long passages from Apollonius Rhodius' epic poem only in books I and II. The only long Greek passage can be found in the book V, which appears to correspond with the revision of his commentary on

<sup>107</sup> Thurn (2009: 267).

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*: 162.

Persius. The Greek quotations never appear in the main parts of the pages: they are always written at the top or at the bottom of the pages. This phenomenon confirms our hypothesis that Fonzio later, during the 80s became familiar with the Greek language. The fact that Fonzio generally quotes the form of Greek words used in vocabularies can also be interpreted as a sign of his elementary command of Greek.<sup>109</sup>

## 10. Conclusions

As we have seen, initially Fonzio could have had some basic knowledge of Greek, as he probably learnt some expressions, words or phrases. However, he must have been unable to read or translate Greek texts into Latin. After the seventh decade of the Quattrocento, the knowledge of the Greek language was becoming more and more important to humanists, and leading scholars of humanism such as Angelo Poliziano already possessed an equally perfect command of Greek as well of Latin. Obviously, while some of them were able to read and interpret Greek texts, Fonzio read his main sources – Strabo, Diodorus Siculus or Plutarch – only in Latin translations. The critical remarks on his commentary on Persius expressed by a friend, Poliziano, clarified to him that he had to study Greek and read the original Greek texts. The Greek quotations in *Tadeus* and the translation of Demosthenes' speech from Greek can already be considered pieces of evidence of Fonzio's fundamental change in his attitude toward Greek sources.

### *Manuscripts*

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 62.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 152.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 153.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 539.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 666.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 646.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 673.

Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 837.

<sup>109</sup> Using the physical order of comments as the basis for reconstruction seems to be very misleading in Thurn's edition.

- Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 907.  
 Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 1172 (vol. 1)  
 Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Cod. 12201.  
 Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ed. rare 431.  
 Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 54, 23.  
 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek, Cod. Aug. 43. Guelferbytanus.

### *Incunables*

- Appianus (1477): *Historia Romana*. Translated by Petrus Candidus Decembrius. Venice.  
 Aristoteles (1492): *Ethica ad Nicomachum*. Translated by Johnnes Argyropulus. Roma.  
 Bartholomaei Fontii (1487): *Orationes*. Florence: Antonio di Francesco.  
 Claudius Ptolomaeus (1462?): *Cosmographia*. Translated by Nicolaus Germanus. Bologna.  
 Cornelius Celsus (1478): *De medicina*. Florentiae: a Nicolao impressus.  
 Diodorus Siculus (1476/1477): *Bibliotheca, Libri I–V*. Translated by Gian Francesco Poggio Bracciolini Venice.  
 Diogenes Laertius (1475): *Vitae et sententiae philosophorum*. Translated by Benedetto Brugnoli. Venice.  
 Flavius Philostratus (1502): *De vita Apollonii Tyani*. Translated by Philippo Beroaldo. Venice.  
 Galeottus Martius (1475?): *Liber de homine*.  
 Galeottus Martius (1476): *Refutatio obiectorum in librum de homine a Georgio Merula*. Bologna: Dominicus de Lapis.  
 Georgius Merula(1475?): *In librum de homine Martii Galeotti opus*. Venice: Johannes de Colonia and Johannes Manthen.  
 Herodotus (1474): *Historiae*. Translated by Lorenzo Valla. Venice.  
 Plutarchus (1477): *Problemata*. Translated by Johannes Petrus Lucensis.  
 Strabo (1472): *Geographica*. Translated by Guarino da Verona.

### *Editions*

- Opera exquisitissima Barth[olomaei]. Fontii Florent[ini]. V[iri]. Cl[arissimi]. Familiaris Matthiae Regis Pannoniarum. Ad Illustriss[imum] et Celsiss[imum]. Principem D[ominum] Augustum Brunsvic et Lunaeburg Ducem. Cum Praefatione Georgii Remii et Noricae Reipubl[icae] Consiliarii et Adcessit de Pudicitia et Coniugio Dialogus etc.* Francofurti. Sumptibus Joannis Caroli Unckelii. Anno MDCXXI.
- Fontius, B. Fontius (1932): *Carmina*. Edd. Iosephus Fögel et Ladislaus Juhász. Leipzig: Teubner.  
 Fontius, B. (1931): *Epistolarum libri III*. Ed. Ladislaus Juhász. Bibliotheca scriptorum medii recentisque aevorum Saec. XV–XVI. Szeged.  
 Fontii, B. (1997): *Epistolarum liber 1*. Ed. Daneloni, A. Messina: Università di Messina.

- Daneloni, A. (2008): *Bartholomaei Fontii Epistolarum libri*. Università di Messina: Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Centro interdipartimentale di studi umanistici.
- Martin, D. (2011): *Bartolomeo Fonzio: Letters to friends*, (Prefazione di Alessandro Daneloni, Testo critico latino a cura di Alessandro Daneloni, Traduzione inglese di Martin Davies, Note filologiche e di commento a cura di Alessandro Daneloni e Martin Davies). Harvard University Press: "The I Tatti Renaissance Library".

### References

- Affò, I. (1781): *Memorie di Taddeo Ugoletto Parmigiano, Bibliotecario di Mattia Corvino, rè di Ungheria*. Parma: Stamperia reale.
- Alvisi, E. (1884): *Catalogo della libreria Pandolfini*. Firenze: Libreria Dante.
- Bausi, F. (2011): *Umanesimo a Firenze nell'età di Lorenzo e Poliziano, Jacopo Bracciolini, Bartolomeo Fonzio, Francesco da Castiglione*. Roma: Studi e testi del Rinascimento europeo.
- Black, R. (2001): *Humanism and education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolonyai, G. (2011) Taddeo Ugoletto's marginal notes on his brand-new Crastonus dictionary. In: Ch. Gastgeber, E. Mitsiou, I.-A. Pop, M. Popovic & J. Preiser-Kapeller (eds.) *Matthias Corvinus und seine Zeit. Europa am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit zwischen Wien und Konstantinopel. Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung*. Wien: Akademie Verlag. 119–154.
- Cammelli, G. (1941): *Manuele Crisolora, i dotti bizantini e le origini dell'Umanesimo*. Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Caroti, S. & S. Zamboni (eds.) (1974): *Lo scrittoio di Bartolomeo Fonzio umanista fiorentino*. Milano: Il polifilo.
- Ciapponi, L. A. (1980): B. Fonzio e la prima centuria dei Miscellanea "del Poliziano". *Italia medievale e umanistica* 23: 166–177.
- Ciccolella, F. (2008): *Donati Graeci: Learning Greek in the Renaissance*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ciccolella, F. (2010): Greek grammars and elementary readings in the Italian Renaissance. In: O. Pecere & L. Del Corso (eds.) *Libri di scuola e pratiche didattiche dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*. Cassino: Univ. di Cassino.
- Csapodiné Gárdonyi, K. (1977) *Humanista kódexek nyomában*. Budapest: Magvető.
- Daneloni, A. (2001a): Nota sul soggiorno a Firenze dell'umanista ungherese Peter Garazda. *Rinascimento* 41: 259–264.
- Daneloni, A. (2001b): Sui rapporti tra Bartolomeo della Fonte, Janos Vitez e Peter Garazda. In: A. Di Francesco & S. Graciotti (eds.) *L'eredità classica in Italia e Ungheria fra tardo Medioevo e primo Rinascimento*. Roma: Il Calamo. 293–309.
- Deligiannis, I. (2006): *Fifteenth-century Latin translations of Lucian's essay on slander*. Pisa & Roma: Studia Erudita I.
- Daneloni, A. (2003): Bartholomaeus Fontius. In: *Compendium Auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevi*, I. 6. Firenze: Edizioni del Galluzzo: 747–750.

- Daneloni, A. (2006): Note sulla biblioteca di Bartolomeo Fonzio e sulla sua organizzazione. *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 20: 299–335.
- De Robertis, T. & R. Miriello (1997, 1999): *I manoscritti datati della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*. Firenze: SISMEL/Edizioni del Galluzzo.
- Fera, V. (1979): Il primo “testo critico” di Valerio Flacco. *Giorn. ital. di filologia* 10: 230–254.
- Ferri, F. (1916): Per una supposta traduzione di Omero del Fonzio. *Athenaeum* 4: 312–320.
- Gellérfi, G. (2013): Scholarly polemic: Bartolomeo Fonzio’s forgotten commentary on Juvenal. In: K. A. E. Enenkel (ed.) *Transformations of the classics via early modern commentaries*. Leiden: Brill. 111–123.
- Greenfield, C. C. (1981): *Humanist and scholastic poetics 1250-1500*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- Hankins, J. (2002): Chrysoloras and the Greek studies of Leonardo Bruni. In: R. Maisano & A. Rollo (eds.) *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in occidente*. Napoli. 181–209.
- Hankins, J. (2007): Greek studies in Italy, from Petrarch to Bruni. In: M. Feo, V. Fera, P. Megna & A. Rollo (eds.) *Petrarca e il mondo greco Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Reggio Calabria, 26–30 nov. 2001)*, in the series *Quaderni Petrarqueschi*, vols. XII–XIII (2002–2003). 329–339.
- Marchesi, C. (1900): *Bartolomeo della Fonte (Bartholomaeus Fontius), Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici in Firenze nella seconda metà del Quattrocento*. Catania: Univ. di Catania.
- Mercuri, S. (2006): *Le ‘Orationes’ di Bartolomeo Della Fonte*. Testo critico e commento. Tesi di dottorato. Università della Calabria.
- Milde, W. (1995): *Die Wolfenbüttele Corvinen*. Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek.
- Noe, A. (2008): Das Buch in der Gesellschaft der Renaissance. In: A. Noe (ed.) *Geschichte der Buchkultur, Renaissance*, Band 6. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt. 11–91.
- Nuti, E. (2012): Reconsidering Renaissance Greek grammars through the case of Chrysoloras’ *Erotemata*. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 52: 240–268.
- Pade, M. (1998): Sulla fortuna delle «Vite» di Plutarco nell’umanesimo italiano del Quattrocento. *Fontes: Rivista di filologia, iconografia, e storia della tradizione classica* 1: 101–116.
- Poliziano, A. (1985): *Commento inedito alle Satire di Persio*, a cura di L. Cesarini Martinelli e R. Ricciardi, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki editore.
- Resta, G. (1978): Andronico Callisto, Bartolomeo Fonzio e la prima tradizione umanistica di Apollonio Rodio. In: A. Ardizzoni, E. Livrea & G. A. Privitera (eds.) *Studi in onore di A. Ardizzoni*. Roma: Edizioni dell’Ateneo & Bizzarri. 1057–1131.
- Robathan, D. M. & F. E. Cranz (1976): A. Persius Flaccus. In: P. O. Kristeller & F. E. Cranz (eds.) *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin translation and commentaries*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 265–267.
- Sabbadini, R. (1900): Sui codici della Medicina di Cornelio Celso. *Studi ital. di filol. classica* 8: 8, 18–21 (poi in *Storia e critica di testi latini*, Padova: 221, 231–234).
- Scarcia Piacentini, P. (1973): *Saggio di un censimento dei manoscritti contenenti il testo di Persio e gli scolii e i commenti al testo*. Roma: Istituto di lingua e letteratura latina.

- Silvano, L. (2011): Un esperimento di traduzione di Bartolomeo Fonzio: la *retractatio* della versione *Illiade* I 1–525 di Leonzio Pilato. *Medioevo greco, Rivista di storia e filologia bizantina* 11: 225–268.
- Silvano, L. (2015): Bartolomeo Della Fonte: un inedito volgarizzamento dell'orazione pseudo-demostenica Ad Alexandrum. *Interpres* 33: 249–260.
- Takács, L. (2009): Bartholomaeus Fontius and his works in the Bibliotheca Corviniana of King Matthias. In: P. E. Kovács & K. Szovák (eds.) *Infima Aetas Pannonica: Studies in late medieval Hungarian history*. Budapest: Corvina. 294–308.
- Takács, L. & A. Tuhári (eds.) (2015): *Two Renaissance commentaries on Persius: Bartholomaeus Fontius' and Ioannes Britannicus' commentaries on Persius*. Budapest & Piliscsaba: Szent István Társulat.
- Thurn, N. (1998–1999): Bartholomeo della Fontes Übersetzung der *Argonautica*. *Acta Classica Univ. Scient. Debrecen.* 34–35: 139–156.
- Thurn, N. (2009): *Adnotationes Bartholomei Fontii in Valerii Flacci Argonautica*. Kommentar des Valerius Flaccus. Rahden/Westfalia: Leidorf.
- Trinkaus, Ch. (1960): A humanist's image of humanism: The inaugural orationes of Bartolommeo della Fonte. *Studies in the Renaissance* 7: 90–147.
- Trinkaus, Ch. (1966): The unknown Quattrocento poetics of Bartolommeo della Fonte. *Studies in the Renaissance* 13: 40–122.
- Vaccari, A. (1930): La lettera d'Aristea sui settanta interpreti nella letteratura italiana. *La Civiltà cattolica* 81: 308–326.
- Vaccari, A. (1952): La traduzione italiana di Bartolomeo Fonzio. In: *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, volume primo. Roma: Filologia Biblica et Patristica. 10–16.
- Wilson, N. G. (1992): *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek studies in the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore: Duckworth.
- Zaccaria, R. (1988): Fonzio (Fonzio) Bartolomeo. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 36: 808–814.
- Zetzel, J. E. G. (2005): *Marginal scholarship and textual deviance. The commentum cornuti and the early scholia on Persius*. BICS, Supplement 84. London: Institute of Classical Studies.