

THE POWER OF GLOSSES: FRANCESCO FULVIO
FRUGONI'S SELF-COMMENTARY AND LITERARY
CRITICISM IN THE *TRIBUNAL DELLA CRITICA*

Andrea Baldan

Francesco Fulvio Frugoni (Genoa, 1620 – Venice, 1686) was a fellow of the religious Order of Minims. He came from a family of the new Genoese gentry and was educated in literature and philosophy. During the last twenty-five years of his life he wrote and refined his masterpiece *Del Cane di Diogene* or “About Diogenes’s Dog,” published right after his death between 1687 and 1689.¹ This four-thousand-page work consists of twelve tales split into seven books, which are called *Latrati*, “dog’s barks.” It is characterized by a programmatic self-commentary developed in synergy with the text, which Frugoni notates through thousands of glosses.

The title of the oeuvre immediately connects it to the cynical philosophy of Diogenes of Sinope, indeed called the “dog,” who professed the necessity of searching the truth through pursuing a life-style not ruled by passions. The protagonist is his dog Saetta, who narrates his philosophical journey from Athens to Corinth, crossing Asia and Egypt, visiting the mountain of Parnassus and the Underworld. Saetta represents Diogenes’s spirit during his conversion to cynicism and constitutes the necessary intermediary between the philosopher and the truth.² The shift of perspective from the philosopher to his dog, who faces all humanity’s vices and contradictions, is the literary expedient exploited by Frugoni in order to act out Diogenes’s detachment from material things, which is a fundamental precondition for the cynical way of being. He

¹ See Alberto Sana, “Il mappamondo dell’erudizione,” in Francesco Fulvio Frugoni, *Il Tribunale della Critica*, ed. Sergio Bozzola and Alberto Sana (Parma: Fondazione Pietro Bembo - Guarda, 2001), ix.

² See Lucia Rodler, *Una fabbrica barocca. Il “Cane di Diogene” di Francesco Fulvio Frugoni* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1996), 32–35.

represents the external point of view that the cynics shall internalize. At the end of the journey, during which Frugoni “anxiously exhibits every discovered data” creating an “enormous repertoire of collected information, mostly of second-hand origin,” Diogenes is found in Corinth living inside a barrel.³ After having reproached every material behavior and vice and having reached the truth through moral sincerity, his spirit has finally become cynical.

As stated by Ezio Raimondi, several literary genres of different cultures and periods, such as the picaresque novel, the dialogue, and the invective, are found “crossed and juxtaposed” in Frugoni’s work without totally fitting the peculiar characteristics of these genres.⁴ However, as claimed by Frugoni himself, the *Cane* can be considered a satirical work.⁵ Several satirical works inspired Frugoni: the *True Story* of Lucian, Petronius’s *Satyricon*, Quevedo and his whole literature, and Rabelais’s *Le Quart Livre* significantly influenced the Genoese author, who mocks an enormous amount of behaviors, writers, literary styles and philosophies. In order to accomplish such a purpose, he relies on a fictional narration, which needs to be fashioned as right and reliable in order to stigmatize the vices. His oeuvre must have the appearance of a stable and solid building. The connection between Frugoni’s work and architecture has already been pointed out by Lucia Rodler.⁶ The principle behind such work, *ut architectura poësis*, represents a physiognomic model for the representation of humanity and also a stylistic fundamental. As remarked by Rodler, Frugoni expresses his reservations concerning the genre of the novel in the fourth tale, *La Biblioteca dell’Atico*: novels are developed without good foundations and due to the lack of a solid rhetorical structure they are fragile compositions.⁷ This is what Frugoni tries to avoid in *Cane*. Therefore, after fifteen years of composition he decided to provide the reader with a useful tool for its comprehension and started to gloss his work. The use of the

³ Rodler, 41. Every translation of the *Tribunal* and of other Italian or Latin works is mine, along with all Italian and French scholars’ quotations. The translations of Dante’s *Inferno* and of his epitaph are referenced in the appropriate footnote.

⁴ Ezio Raimondi, introduction to *Trattatisti e narratori del Seicento*, ed. Ezio Raimondi (Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi 1960), xix.

⁵ See Sana, “Il mappamondo,” x.

⁶ See Rodler, *Una fabbrica barocca*, 50–59.

⁷ Rodler, 28.

glosses fulfills such a need of shoring up the *Cane*, giving useful information which can serve as an accessory assistance for its readers.⁸ In some sense the glosses constitute the props holding up the work, like the foundations of a building.

This essay is focused on the tenth tale, entitled *Il Tribunal della Critica* or “The Court of the Critic,” dedicated to literary theory and criticism. The second section discusses Frugoni’s practice of self-commenting through the use of glosses with different functions. In the third section of this essay I analyze two passages dedicated to Frugoni’s judgment of the Italian poets Dante Alighieri and Alessandro Tassoni. Their cases are paradigmatic in order to show how the use of the glosses can affect the interpretation of the commented text. Finally, the hypertextual features of Frugoni’s work and the potential of the gloss tool are taken into consideration.

FRUGONI COMMENTS SAETTA’S TALE

The main purpose of the *Cane* is the mockery of bad literary behaviors and the stigmatization of ignorance. Creating a canon represents the constructive part of Frugoni’s work, while moral and literary vices are reproached and condemned. In a gloss it is told that satire is the right medium in to scold immorality: “Satire needs to bite vices, then it is necessary that she has long and witty teeth.”⁹ The critic, whose allegory in the *Tribunal* represents right judgment, is closely related to the satire: “At Critic’s side there was Satire” (Frugoni, 151). Thus, satire is the first and necessary medium in order to criticize morality, behaviors, and literary styles with the aim of giving the right teaching. Saetta, in fact, appears to be its symbol, as stated by Frugoni in a gloss: “The Dog of Diogenes, symbol of Satire” (Frugoni, 339).

The narrator is Saetta while Frugoni comments his story. The text and the glosses represent two different informational spaces. The first one conveys Saetta’s narration, which is fictional and often allegorical, while the glosses normally submit direct authorial

⁸ Rodler, 149.

⁹ Francesco Fulvio Frugoni, *Il Tribunal della Critica*, ed. Sergio Bozzola and Alberto Sana (Parma: Fondazione Pietro Bembo – Guarda, 2001), 153. All of the following in text citations from Frugoni’s *Il Tribunal della Critica* are taken from this edition. Frugoni’s other works or other sections of the *Cane di Diogene* are referenced in a footnote.

messages and quotations from other writers, which are used by the author in order to support the argumentation developed in the text. When Frugoni quotes his other works or when he reports events or facts taken from his life experience he calls himself “l'autore,” (the author) (e.g. cf. Frugoni, 23). Thus the glosses represent the first filter to interpret the allegorical narration given by the dog. In other words, the glosses are Frugoni's comments to a text which is fictionally attributed to another figure. They are full-fledged self-comments fashioned as glosses attached to anyone else's discourse.

The *Tribunal* is divided into three main sections. In the first one Saetta travels from the city of Memphis to the mountain of Parnassus. The purpose of this section is more theoretical and it explains what kind of literature should not reach Parnassus. The second section is staged in the Court of the Critic and is mainly devoted to literary criticism. Frugoni's judgments on literature and authors are to be found here. The arguments behind these judgments are expressed by the monologues of the Critic, who represents the supreme judge in the court, or during the fictional conversations among the great authors of every age. The Court finds itself, in fact, on Parnassus where only the great writers can be accepted as Apollo's courtiers at his palace on the top of the mountain. The third and last section of the *Tribunal* describes twelve dinners given by different sciences (Criticism, Theology, Jurisprudence, Philosophy, Medicine, Grammar, Oratory, Poetics, Astrology, Erudition, History, Politics) for the good authors.

The layout of the page foresees the positioning of the glosses in the right margin for rectos and in the left one for versos. Italic font serves different functions. It is used in order to mark the words or the sentences linked with a gloss. Italics also distinguish different kinds of speech: the quotations are printed in italics and regular font is used for the expression of opinions or for the bibliographical references. Furthermore, when the author switches from one language to another, e.g. Latin, Spanish or French, he normally marks such passages with italics.

Because of the number of glosses appearing in the *Tribunal* (2280 glosses) this paper only submits a brief overview on them and on the complexity of Frugoni's use. In order to fully describe the potential of the gloss tool in Frugoni's work, every tale constituting the *Cane di Diogene* should be taken into consideration. Apart from exceeding the physical limits of this paper, such analysis would not focus on the use of the glosses for the development of Frugoni's

literary theory and for the expression of his critics and judgments on past and contemporary literature. Therefore, in this section I am going to present only the most important functions of the glosses deployed by the author and some examples of their use: the bibliographical, theoretical, exegetical, and subjective functions. Taking into consideration the categorization given by Stefan Morawski and considered by Antoine Compagnon, the bibliographical function corresponds to the “external or intertextual” functions, i.e. the “erudition function” or the “invocation of authority;” while the theoretical, exegetical, and subjective functions correspond to the “internal or textual” functions, i.e. the “amplification function” or the “decorative function.”¹⁰

The most evident and frequent function is the bibliographical one (409 cases, of which 69 are not referenced by the author). More than a hundred different authors are quoted in the *Tribunal*. They normally represent literary or philosophical authorities. Excluding the self-quotations (Frugoni quotes himself fifty times) the most quoted authors and works are: Jan Fongers (29), Horace (20), the *Psalms* (19), Adriano Politi (18), Petronius (14), Pliny the Elder (11), Vergil (11), Erasmus of Rotterdam (10), Ovid (9), and Seneca (8). As noticed by Alberto Sana it is noteworthy to report that Frugoni’s quotations do not really consider the protagonists of the new sciences of the seventeenth century like Pascal, Descartes, Torricelli and Galilei. The editor of the *Tribunal* clarifies that Frugoni, thinking that rhetoric is superior to science, “appears to us in a culturally backward position.”¹¹

Some glosses just give the bibliographical reference: “Ovid. I, Trist. 2,” while the quotation is inscribed in the text: “[...] this can be sung about him: ‘The captain is in doubt and he does not know what [route] he should avoid or he should look for, the art itself is stunned by the ambiguous harms’” (Frugoni, 16). Describing the signboards of several bookshops, Saetta sees one of them depicting

¹⁰ Antoine Compagnon, *La seconde main ou le travail de la citation* (Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 1979), 99.

¹¹ Sergio Bozzola, “Teoria e morfologia del concetto,” in Francesco Fulvio Frugoni, *Il Tribunale della Critica*, ed. Sergio Bozzola and Alberto Sana (Parma: Fondazione Pietro Bembo - Guarda, 2001), lxxvi.

a boat. This sight triggers his thoughts and he starts to associate the authors with the captains of a ship. In order to reach the prefixed objectives the writers must not be uncertain. Having taken advantage of the same metaphor used by Frugoni, Ovid's quotation (*Tristia*, 1, 2, 31-32) represents the perfect synthesis of what a bad writer would be.

In other cases the quoted text is re-elaborated and only the bibliographical reference is given in the gloss in order to allow the possibility of comparing all the information: "Then I realized that he was Mercurius. I compared the etymology of his name with the business of that charge, and I noticed that he was a ware attendant, because he was taking care so much of those literary goods" (Frugoni, 22). During this episode Saetta sees Mercurius leading a wagon train loaded with books. The god is called "mercium curans," (ware attendant), and the related gloss refers to a contemporary work on etymology written by Jan Fongers and published in 1607: "Festus and Fulgentius in Fongers" (Frugoni, 22). The passage meant is found at the voice "Mercurius" and narrates: "Festus says that he gets the name from the goods because he was the god of business, Fulgentius says the same, as if Mercurius means 'care of the goods.'"¹² Fongers's quotation about the etymology of the name Mercurius, which means "mercium curam," (care of the goods), legitimates his business as described in the main narration. Frugoni's re-elaboration is based on the knowledge found in Fongers's work, which represents the starting point for the development of the figure of the god. Mercurius's role of attendant of literary goods and books of every sort is an invention but it relies on previous notions which constitute the secondary literature used by Frugoni.

There are also glosses which contain the quotation and the reference, for example the following: "[You Tityos] feed the black birds with eviscerated bowels.' Senec. Trag. Lib. I," (Frugoni, 90) referring to the passage: "It is the envy allegorized in the vulture of Tityos, who feeds it with his bowels, corroded by the hungry beak, lacerated by the sharp claws" (Frugoni, 90). The quotation is taken from the tenth verse of Seneca's tragedy *Thyestes*, which recounts Tityos's punishment, condemned to feed the vultures with his own body, eaten during the day and restored during the night. Tantalus, who has been called by a Fury, opens the tragedy evoking the names

¹² Jan Fongers, *Etymologicum Trilingue* (Lyon: Antonii de Harsy, 1607), 474.

and the punishments of Sisyphus and Tityos. All of them have been condemned because of their haughtiness and envy. The story of Thyestis, king of Mycenae, and his envious and exiled brother Atreas finds its motive in Atreas's envy, who kills Thyestis's sons and lets him eat them for his revenge. In the gloss Frugoni quotes Seneca's exact words allowing the readers to prove the accuracy and the reliability of his words. By relying on an interpretation which associates Tityos and his punishment with different expressions of the envy drawing on a single quotation, Frugoni interprets Seneca's passage and takes advantage of it for his depiction of this mortal sin. Other glosses assume a theoretical function, such as the one about the "Bisticcio," which according to Frugoni's opinions on rhetoric must not be only a figure of sound: "The Bisticcio, if it has not at least a grain of salt, becomes insipid, as the many Bisticci which are senseless and without feeling" (Frugoni, 101). The "Alliterations, called Bisticci" by Emanuele Tesauro in his treatise on rhetoric *Il Cannocchiale Aristotelico* (1654),¹³ take on particular relevance according to both Tesauro and Frugoni, who considered such figures of sound not only complying with phonetic functions but capable of unveiling moral and cognitive functions too.¹⁴ However its use should be limited and pondered. In the gloss, in fact, Frugoni explains that: "The Bisticcio must be rare and wisely [created], but in the satirical genre it is more frequently admitted than in the heroic or serious ones" (Frugoni, 101). In serious or heroic poems the Bisticcio must be unusual or used with wisdom. Nevertheless, affirming that it is more suitable for the satirical genre, Frugoni authorizes the widespread use of this figure of sound in his *Cane di Diogene*.

Besides the glosses that comply with a bibliographical and theoretical function, Frugoni also takes advantage of the gloss tool to express exegetical comments. A sonnet written on a stone plate about the necessity of judging all criminals is initially interpreted by the gloss: "The rope is complaining because it is not married with the people who deserve it" (Frugoni, 41). Immediately the reader is told that there are criminals who are not condemned but they should be. After having read the sonnet Mercurius explains its full meaning

¹³ Emanuele Tesauro cit. in Sergio Bozzola, *La retorica dell'eccesso. Il "Tribunal della Critica" di Francesco Fulvio Frugoni* (Padova: Antenore, 1996), 12.

¹⁴ Tesauro, cit. in Bozzola, 13.

and the reader discovers who the criminals mentioned are: the rich magnates who exploit the poor should be condemned too (cf. Frugoni, 42-43). Another gloss that serves an exegetical function concerns the “big bronze statue” representing the man of letters placed in the middle of the Court’s hall (Frugoni, 164). Because of his critical behavior that brings him to tell the truth, the man of letters is persecuted by ignorance and calumny (cf. Frugoni, 164). The gloss explains why he is depicted like a bronze sculpture: “The man of letters has to be made of bronze, because of his assiduous study or because he is a target for envy and ignorance” (Frugoni, 164). The firmness before every difficulty, both those arising from study, and those coming from society make the man of letters great and strong like bronze.

Another considerable use of the glosses made by Frugoni concerns the expression of simple subjective opinions. They usually have critical or satirical purposes. In the following case the gloss states in sententious form that a court becomes a comedy if the prince behaves like a histrionic person: “When the prince behaves like a histrion, the court becomes a comedy” (Frugoni, 28). Here the author sarcastically expresses his own opinion of a behavior but the sententious form gives the impression of a generic statement as if it were an objective statement. This fake objectivity is also enhanced by the narration. Saetta, who should be the reliable and cynical character, sees and describes an Asian prince who loves to act in a ridiculous way:

He [the facetious prince] was often in the mood of transforming the palace into a theater and the throne chamber into a stage for a scene. His beloved role was being a histrion, transfiguring himself into different roles, but simple ones and rather than serious ones, ridiculous ones (Frugoni, 28).

The fictionally narrated situation represents evidence for the fake reliability of this *sententia*. In this case the main text, instead of being authorized by the gloss, legitimates it.

Even if Saetta should be a symbol of trustworthiness as a member of the cynical academy, every tale is just a “bark” written with the aim of expressing Frugoni’s ideas and subjective opinions filtered through Saetta’s perspective and narration. The fictional story told by the dog and his statements need to be reliable. The use

of the glosses constitutes the attempt of the author to present this literary play as worthy of confidence.

GLOSSES, TEXT, AND LITERARY CRITICISM

After having traveled through the Gatrimgari's island and having stated that people too much involved in material things cannot be good writers, Mercurius and Saetta reach Parnassus. When they arrive at the mountain they find an allegorical woman who represents the concept of critic. In charge as last judge of the Court, the Critic, named after her allegorical meaning, is responsible for allowing the authors to reach the top of the mountain. After having met her and the allegory of satire, the first two authors introduced to Saetta and the readers are Dante Alighieri and Alessandro Tassoni. This section aims to analyze their cases and Frugoni's opinion on their literary production.

As stated by the related gloss, above the door of the Court there is an inscription:

Inesorabile. Inappellabile.
Uscite di baldanza, voi ch'entrate!
Entrate nel Parnaso, o voi ch'uscite
(Frugoni, 163).

Inexorable. Irrevocable. Eject your boldness, oh you who get in! Enter in the Parnassus, oh you who get out!

It recalls and mocks the words written above the Hell's door in Dante's *Inferno*:

Dinanzi a me non fuor cose create
se non etterne, e io eterno duro.
Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch'intrate.

Before me nothing was created if not eternal, and eternal
I endure. Abandon every hope, you who enter.¹⁵

Although the Italian poet is left outside of the Court and therefore excluded from the group of the good writers, he gains the role of its

¹⁵ Dante Alighieri, *Inferno*, III 7-9, ed. Charles S. Singleton (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 24-25.

guardian, meaning that he is only partially banned from the mountain of Parnassus. The reasons for such a choice are explained through the interaction between the text and the glosses.

Since his first appearance it is told that the name “Dante” has been abolished during Frugoni’s age: “He was a strong old man, cool, clever and poor. He was called Dante: nowadays an abolished name, and suppressed by the avarice of the Asian satraps” (Frugoni, 163). Saetta’s statement about the name hides a theoretical statement about his literature, which is explained in the related gloss: “Nowadays Dante is an abolished author, because of ancient print and [because of] its obscure phrasing. What he gives, it is no longer comprehensible” (Frugoni, 163). Frugoni states that during the seventeenth century Dante gained little success because no one could understand his language and his poetry. In this case the gloss and the text have two different aims. While the gloss asserts a literary and linguistic judgment on Dante’s poetry, the text expresses a satirical thought about the princes. The fall into disuse of the name “Dante” is attributed to the bad princes because of their avarice, which affects the wise men:

But in the courts (I think I have already told it, but the truth shall always be said) philosophers are treated like dogs, because bones are thrown to them, and dogs are treated like philosophers since the fattest prebends are granted to them in order that they can squander more (Frugoni, 24–25).

The gloss explains the reason for such behavior against the philosophers. Wise men can identify the vices and reproach them: “In the courts they are treated like dogs because they bay at the moon of the context and bite the vice with the truth” (Frugoni, 25). Dante, who is able to scold immorality and vices through satire – the allegory of satire kisses the poet when Saetta meets him for the first time (cf. Frugoni, 64) – belongs to the same group of such philosophers. Therefore his name is abolished by the princes, who do not grant any importance to the wise men.

Although Dante is not counted among the cynical Court of Critic, he is associated with the cynical philosophy: “When the Satire saw that I was intent on considering him, she told me that I should lick his flap, because he was enrolled in the cynical sect; and such honor was owed by him, also because he was the eternal gatekeeper

of the Court of the Critic” (Frugoni, 164). In the gloss Frugoni tells the reader that the stoic school was born from the cynical one: “The cynical sect was the mother of the stoic one, because who tells the truth is condemned to suffer” (Frugoni, 164). This is the reason why the Florentine poet can be associated with the cynical philosophy. Dante, who is trusted as truthful by Frugoni, was perceived by the author as a stoic figure who had to suffer a lot of pain because of the truths he was telling, which are unveiled by the epitaph on Dante’s grave composed by Rinaldo Chivalchini da Villafranca:

The rights of monarchy, the heavens, the Phlegethon, the
cleansing waters
I sang while roaming, so far as destiny allowed,
But because the wandering part of me withdrew to better
citadels
And, happier, sought its creator among the stars,
Here I, Dante, am confined, an exile from my native
shores,
Born of Florence, a mother of little love.
(Frugoni, 163)¹⁶

Frugoni, believing that Dante himself wrote his epitaph on the brink of death in Ravenna, remarks in the related gloss that his literary behavior was trustworthy: “Epitaph written by Dante himself. The authors write their own epitaph when they are truthful, because the truth is buried” (Frugoni, 163). Dante’s virtue is his truthful and trustworthy literary attitude. This is the reason why the poet can be linked with the cynical court imagined by the author. This is also the reason why the Critic, who calls Dante “Diogenes’s portrait” (Frugoni, 164) pushes Saetta to revere him. In other words, despite the fact that his language is no longer understandable to everyone, Dante is a good poet and can be accepted in the court because of the trustworthy content of his works.

Although Dante’s language cannot be understood, his literature is not completely rejected by Frugoni. It is also quite important that Dante has been taken into consideration by the Genoese author. As already observed by Elvia Trincherio and Eva Gonnelli, except for Dante and Petrarch, almost every other poet from the Italian

¹⁶ Translation in Guy P. Raffa, *Dante’s Bones: How a Poet Invented Italy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2020), 43.

fourteenth century, including Boccaccio, is completely forgotten by Frugoni.¹⁷ Fifteenth-century authors are generally quoted but not critically examined.¹⁸ Boccaccio is actually cited once but only during the abjuration of the first and anonymous writer judged by the court, who says that he must forget his “fantasma,” (spirit) (Frugoni, 226). As Gonnelli remarks, the lyricist gains a better position in comparison with the other two Florentine authors.¹⁹ Because he represented a literary model, he sits inside the Court in the role of “praiseworthy Councilman of Letters” (Frugoni, 342). However the modern poets shall go beyond his style. If he had lived during the seventeenth century he would have embraced the same style of Frugoni’s age, which “does not love the compositions without embellishments” (Frugoni, 342).

Dante at least obtains the role of guardian thanks to his trustworthiness. Unlike the other Italian poets and writers of the fourteenth century he finds a place in Frugoni’s literary hierarchies. He deserves it because of the contents of his literary production. Nonetheless, he cannot be completely accepted among the great writers because of his language, which is too crude and no longer understandable to Frugoni’s contemporaries. Moreover, Frugoni never hides his predilection for the authors of his century and especially for those who deviate from the literary primitivism of the Italian fourteenth century and from the classicist style and principles.²⁰ Such an ambivalent opinion was not new. In the *Ritratti Critici* (1669) Frugoni in fact wrote: “And what should Dante say, who usually has the character of the pedant in his phrasing, as the character of the philosopher and theologian in the hidden meanings?”²¹ Immediately afterwards the author remarks that he cannot fully praise or disregard the Florentine poet. He admits, for example, that he reached a high quality style in his *Paradiso*. On the

¹⁷ See Eva Gonnelli, “*Il Tribunale della Critica* di Francesco Fulvio Frugoni: contributo alla definizione di un canone letterario” (Master Thesis, University of Pisa, 2013), 86–87; Trincherò Elvia, “Il ‘Parnaso’ di Francesco Fulvio Frugoni,” *Paragone. Rivista Mensile di Arte Figurativa e Letteratura* 12 (1961): 25–43 (29).

¹⁸ Sana, “Il mappamondo,” i.

¹⁹ Gonnelli, “*Il Tribunale della Critica*,” 83–86.

²⁰ Sana, “Il mappamondo,” l–lii.

²¹ Francesco Fulvio Frugoni, *De’ ritratti critici abbozzati e contornati* (Venice: presso Combi e La Noù, 1669), 370.

contrary, he judges his style in the *Inferno* as the lowest possible. However, he would never prefer the *Commedia* to the poetic works of any other contemporary author like Tasso or Chiabrera.²²

While Frugoni expresses such opinions in a linear way in the *Ritratti*, the *Tribunal* submits the same concept in an oblique way. Frugoni's true evaluation of Dante— positive because of the contents of his works, negative because of his language and style – is unveiled by the dialectic relationship between the glosses and the text which transform themselves in a synergistic way. In other words, neither the text nor the glosses alone submit such judgment.

A similar case is represented by the judgment of the poetic style of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century author Alessandro Tassoni who wrote the mock-heroic poem *La Secchia Rapita* and ten books of *Pensieri*, dedicated to a series of reflections about literature, science and politics. In this episode, after having judged other minor poets, the court turns to examine a different genre of literature: the “*poesia giocosa*,” (ludic literature) (Frugoni, 330). From this first information the reader knows that the matter considered in this section of the *Tribunal* is comic literature.

As remarked by two glosses, Tassoni's works are praised by everyone inside the court. Against such commendations only Homer stands up and tries to club their author. The reason for this hostility lies in the *Pensieri*, in which Tassoni criticized Homer and denied his importance, judging his poems as “full of insipid things of all kind.”²³ Homer's poetry is also not sophisticated enough and according to his opinion he should not be taken as a model: “Imitating [his poems] nowadays would give the appearance of being humble. Tasso did it and abandoned the first story willing to imitate Homer in the second Gerusalemme, and he remained deadlocked.”²⁴

Immediately after Homer's attempt, the Critic stops him and Tassoni again undermines his poetry. Consequently, four major authors: Plato, Pliny, Quintilian and Velleius Paterculus raise their voices and defend the position of the Greek author. The information used by Frugoni is not from primary sources, but instead Frugoni finds whatever he needs in a contemporary work written by

²² Frugoni, *De' ritratt criticii*, 370–71.

²³ Alessandro Tassoni, *Dieci libri di pensieri diversi* (Carpi: Girolamo Vaschieri, 1620), 514.

²⁴ Tassoni, 514.

Baldassarre Bonifacio, the *Ludicra Historia*, published in Venice in 1652. The quoted chapter “De scriptoribus iterum” is a panegyric dedicated to ancient writers, which collects the praises addressed to them by other literary authorities.²⁵ Frugoni takes advantage of the passage dedicated to Homer, quoting the same reasons invoked by Bonifacio through the same four authors. To focus only on the section depicting Plato and Pliny, it states: “The first one was Plato, who called him with great emphasis “the very divine” [...] and “the very wise ” [...]. The second one was Pliny the Elder, who praised him because he was a source for the intellects, and among them he was the victorious one” (Frugoni, 330-331). The gloss, directly connected with Plato’s name but concerning all four authors, informs the reader on the bibliographical reference: “In Boni. Hist. Ludicr., B[ook.] 15, c. 5” (Frugoni, 330). A comparison with the related passage demonstrates Frugoni translated Baldassarre’s words: “Homer: the very divine and the very wise according to Plato; the source of intellects according to Pliny.”²⁶ Frugoni takes advantage of other authors’ words but he does not appropriate them. Instead, he inserts an indirect quotation and references the work of erudition in which he finds the information he needs. Although the quotations are not primary sources they are perfect to depict the controversy between Homer and Tassoni because they serve as the counterpart to the praising assembly. In order to achieve reliability and authority Frugoni gives his readers the bibliographical reference. Therefore, he demonstrates the application of a modern use of the sources in order to build up his argumentation, which relies on hypotexts with a high authoritative value.

In the second part of the discussion Tassoni defends himself, attacking Homer again and provoking a second fit of rage. Following that the Critic takes the stage and stops the different hostilities by giving her judgment, as the gloss explains: “The Critic resolves the controversy between Tassoni and Homer” (Frugoni, 332). Her speech represents a sort of synthesis of the various positions. On the one hand, she reaffirms the importance of the Greek author: “So did and taught Homer, chief laureate poet among all the Greek and Latin ones and of every other language” (Frugoni, 332). She actually states too, that Tassoni himself partially learned his comic style from

²⁵ Baldassarre Bonifacio, *Ludicra Historia* (Venice: Paulus Baleonius, 1652), 590.

²⁶ Bonifacio, 592.

Homer, although he recommended that authors avoid the Greek author as a literary model:

Although you do not want to confess it you learned from him your heroic style, mixed with the mocking one invented by you, and the comic style, when you imitated the war of frogs sung by him and with it you filled your *Secchia Rapita* in order to let laugh the Seriousness itself (Frugoni, 332).

On the other hand, she gives Tassoni his due and acknowledges the difference between him and Homer: “The great poets do not express a speech which is not mythological and consequently educative [...] Be glad of being the captain of the mock-heroic poets, while Homer is the captain of the heroic ones” (Frugoni, 332). The Critic implies that Tassoni’s poems are not “mythological” and “educative” like Homer’s. A gloss explains the meaning of the word “mythological”: “Without the allegories the heroic poetry becomes a buffoonery” (Frugoni, 332). Frugoni postulates that the absence of allegories and educational purposes distinguishes heroic poetry from the mock-heroic version. This is the reason why Homer writes epic and heroic poetry while Tassoni is a mock-heroic author. As stated by the Critic, Homer’s poetry conceals allegorical meanings. Simple images, such as the description of Minerva’s blue eyes that the Italian poet had accused of being too humble, should be interpreted as allegorical figures, not only as rhetorical constructions. On the contrary, the gloss lets the reader deduce that Tassoni’s poems do not unveil other meanings than the referential ones. The Italian poet is the best among the mock-heroic authors, but such poetry cannot reach the same importance as epic, which is educative, while the main aim of Tassoni’s poems is making the readers laugh. The gloss represents, then, the nucleus of the judgment of the two authors and Frugoni’s theoretical argument behind it.

These critical and theoretical statements constitute the synthesis of the episode but they are already anticipated during the previous controversy between Tassoni and the four major authors. Velleius explains that Homer was the greatest poet among the Greeks: “And, because of the sovereignty of the verse, and just because of the subject, [Homer] deserves by definition the title of Poet (among the Greeks)” (Frugoni, 332). Frugoni attaches a gloss: “Homer among the Greeks, Vergil among the Latins, and Tasso

among the Italians [are] poets par excellence” (Frugoni, 332), which affirms that Homer, Vergil and Tasso are the most important poets for their own languages. But what do they have in common and why are they the greatest poets for the corresponding literature? All of them wrote epic works with possible allegorical interpretations. Critic’s entire speech and the following gloss about the necessity of deploying allegories in order to write heroic poetry allow for Frugoni’s judgment. They are poets par excellence because they wrote epic-heroic works, which are heroic and not mock-heroic because they are also allegorical. Only the crossed reading of the glosses and the text allows an understanding of Frugoni’s opinion about contemporary or past writers. At the same time, such a relationship lets the aware readers determine how he expresses his assumptions by exploiting other people’s statements or his own theoretical theses authorized by his own text.

HYPERTEXTUAL GLOSSES

In the *Tribunal*, just as in the whole *Cane di Diogene*, the glosses represent a section of the work which does not follow the same linearity as the text. In other words they build up a hypertextual structure, a “non-sequential writing” according to Jakob Nielsen’s definition, where the glosses constitute the “nodes” containing “some amount of text or other information.”²⁷ Moreover, some glosses evince strong hypertextual features that can be interpreted by taking into account First-Wave Hypertext Theorists, who tried to bring theories prepared for printed texts closer to the new forms of hypertextual fiction, whose physical support is the computer.²⁸ This section aims to show how Frugoni’s glosses can “transcend the linear, bounded and fixed qualities of traditional text,” which is a characteristic of the digital hypertextuality as stated by Paul Delany and George P. Landow.²⁹ At the same time they can produce ambiguity which, according to Landow’s theories, could activate

²⁷ Jakob Nielsen cit. in Astrid Ensslin, *Canonizing Hypertext: Explorations and Constructions* (London: Continuum, 2007), 12.

²⁸ See, for example, Alice Bell, *The Possible Worlds of Hypertext Fiction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 10–15.

²⁹ Paul Delany and George P. Landow cit. in Bell, *The Possible Worlds*, 12.

readers' curiosity or, like in an informational hypertext, they can be clarifying tools for the reader.³⁰

The following passage constitutes an example of every element emphasized by Alice Bell regarding First-Wave Hypertext Theorists. After having seen a comedy about the folly, Saetta describes a dance where even the lazy people attending the performance took part: "At the end a Spanish Muxiganga was danced and everyone started to dance, even those who had no envy for it, even some [men with] lead beards who seemed to be people who cannot move" (Frugoni, 100). The gloss related to this passage tells the reader: "Muxiganga is a sort of ball, during which also the dead people dance. See tale three" (Frugoni, 100). Right after describing the old men, Saetta says that: "The mythology of this carol is very sententious; Mercurius explained it but I am going to talk about it another time because I am afraid of saying far too much truth" (Frugoni, 100). The related gloss clarifies: "All the truths shall not be said, a lot of them shall be left to speculation" (Frugoni, 100). The preterition deployed by Frugoni in the text and in the gloss has the effect of increasing the curiosity of the readers. In this way he encourages the unveiling of the hidden allegory by relying on an artificially created ambiguity and on the possibility of interpreting the passage.

The author informs the reader about an extract in the third tale, *La Moda Smoderata*, of the *Cane di Diogene*, in which the word "Muxiganga" appears thrice. In the first case the word is explained by the gloss: "Muxiganga is the life, during which everybody dances," which represents an explanation of the behavior of the lazy people dancing in the *Tribunal*.³¹ Moreover the word comes from the German "Müßiggang," which means "sloth" or "laziness." Symbolically, this dance represents the life of the lazy ones, the people spending their life dancing. The second occurrence states that the people attending a funeral are dancing and playing a Muxiganga, which triggers the resurrection of the dead man: "In addition to the curious and informative addendum, the dead man awakens [...] and gets married with the dance."³² Because Saetta sees

³⁰ Bell, *The Possible Worlds*, 12–13.

³¹ Francesco Fulvio Frugoni, *Del Cane di Diogene opera massima del P. Francesco Fulvio Frugoni Minimo, I Primi Latrati, cioè La Scuola d'Antistene, La Fontana di Bacco, & La Moda Smoderata* (Venice: per Antonio Bosio, 1689), 411.

³² Frugoni, *Del Cane [...] La Moda Smoderata*, 413.

a corpse which starts to dance during a funeral, the gloss in the *Tribunal* can state that the Muxiganga is able to lead everyone to dance: the lazy people with heavy beards and even the dead. In this way the episode authorizes the content of the gloss in the *Tribunal*, which enhances such an authorizing relationship by taking advantage of the link between the two passages. Furthermore, both episodes share the presence of people with heavy beards dancing the Muxiganga: the lazy old men in the *Tribunal* and the doctors in the *Moda*. Their similarity allows an interpretation which lets the old men take on the same characteristics attributed to the ignorant doctors, who are, in their turn, associated with the infamous gravediggers and the libidinous adulterers.³³ Thus the old men gain the same connotation and the connection through the Muxiganga implies that they are ignorant and infamous because of their lazy lifestyle.

The possibility of interpreting the figures of the old men from this negative point of view is allowed only by the non-linear relationship between the passage in the *Tribunal*, the one in the *Moda* and their related glosses. This negative interpretation is authorized also by the first section of the *Tribunal* in which Saetta and Frugoni attack all the people who are lazy several times. People who live without working while they exploit the poor people and the workers are particular targets of their satire and hostility. Paradigmatic of such ideas is Saetta's description of the rich people living in the palaces of Memphis: "oh big leeches of the poor, oh werewolves of the orphans, oh raptors of the common people [...]" (Frugoni, 6-7). Several other epithets continue his accusation. The related gloss which is also interesting because it encourages the reader to autonomously continue the explication, clearly refers to aristocracy's and rich classes' behaviors towards the lower classes: "Leeches of the poor are those ones who blow their blood; werewolves of the orphans are those ones who eat them as they were lambs; etc. The wise reader shall add the rest of the erudite annotation" (Frugoni, 7). The connection between the old men, the Muxiganga and the upper classes is assured by the description of their lifestyle: they do not work and they always sleep: "rich people usually sleep longer than the poor" (Frugoni, 12). Indeed the attacks against the lazy people are not new in Frugoni's literature. In his work *Ritratti Critici* (1669), Frugoni already stigmatized the lazy type

³³ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 412-13.

and several quotations used for the composition of such portrait show up in *Cane di Diogene* too, as reported by Cutri.³⁴ This sort of dance is therefore a symbol for the life-style of the lazy people who are moved only by vicious activities.

Moreover, in the third passage in the *Moda* mentioning the Muxiganga the dance is associated with the world and with the game of chess: “On this big board of the world, where a lot of checkmates occur, the pawn faces the knight, the king faces the rook, the bishop faces the queen. Everybody is involved in dancing this Muxiganga.”³⁵ The related gloss explains: “The world is a chess game: the little pieces are moved forward more than the big ones.”³⁶ This statement is in complete harmony with the first part of the *Tribunal*, in which Frugoni denounces the exploitation of the poor people, the little pieces, identifying this phenomenon as the source of the wealth of the upper classes, the big pieces. However such an interpretation is allowed only by the non-linear relationship of the sections of text relating to the idea of Muxiganga. A linear reading would otherwise lead to a different interpretation. Piero Camporesi, for example, interpreted the passage about the game of chess as a moralistic judgement which criticizes the carnivalesque reversal of social roles.³⁷

The interpretation of the passage is based on the crossed reading between the text and glosses, and between this section of the *Tribunal* and the related section in the *Moda*. The link between them is activated by a gloss which lets the reader transcend the linearity of the text just as in hypertextual fiction.³⁸ In order to understand the “truth” left to the “speculation” (Frugoni, 100), a jump between two different points of Frugoni’s work is necessary and suggested by the author himself. On one hand the ambiguity created by the text is similar to the one created by hypertextual fiction. On the other hand Frugoni provides the reader with every tool necessary to clarify

³⁴ See Maicol Cutri, “Il ritratto dell’ozioso. Le citazioni morali di Francesco Fulvio Frugoni,” *Parole Rubate. Rivista internazionale di studi sulla citazione*, 17 (2018): 105–19 (117).

³⁵ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 415.

³⁶ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 415.

³⁷ See Piero Camporesi, *La maschera di Bertoldo. G. C. Croce e la letteratura carnevalesca* (Torino: Giulio Einaudi, 1976), 50–51.

³⁸ Paul Delany and George P. Landow cit. in Bell, *The Possible Worlds*, 12–13.

ambiguous passages. Thus, he allows the possibility of unraveling the different meanings of the word “Muxiganga,” whose interpretation depends upon the hypertextual structure of the information. The Muxiganga can be a dance that leads everybody to take part, even a corpse, because it is amusing. It can also be a symbol of the lazy lifestyle of the upper classes, constituting a synthesis of Frugoni’s criticisms and the ideas deployed in the first section of the *Tribunal*. Lastly, it can be interpreted as an allegory of the social dynamics which affect the world according to the vision of the author.

A very simple case of hypertextuality appears in the passage about the description of Clivo, a doctor more concerned with the money of his patients than interested in their health. His characterization is not given in the *Tribunal*, but instead he is only mentioned and his nature briefly outlined. However, a related gloss informs the reader that his exhaustive description can be found in the eighth tale, *I Padroni Svariati*, (cf. Frugoni, 616), in which Clivo is described as an ignorant, a slimy figure, a superb narcissist, and a leech.³⁹ It must be reported that the text in the *Tribunal* already states that he is ignorant and greedy but in order to fully understand the negativity of such character the reader must remember the passage in the eighth tale. The gloss therefore provides an informational function. The link between the two parts of Frugoni’s oeuvre does not comply with an exegetic function. Indeed the crossed reading of the two passages does not actually change the meaning of the text. This reference just represents a support for the reader to help recall the information given two tales before.

A more complex hypertextual relation is found in a passage concerning the status of the poetry written by the poets who pursue “Ikarian flights” with “feathers full of wax” without the expertise of Daedalus (Frugoni, 308). They are the incapable poets whose poems are judged by Horace who ironically refers to a censored work: “[they] end up in the alley where frankincense, perfumes, and pepper, and whatever is wrapped in redundant paper is sold” (Frugoni, 308–9). As stated by the gloss, the quotation is actually taken from Horace’s *Epistle to Augustus* (*Epistulae* 2, 1, 269–70) and it is used in order to reject the poetry defined as “dozzinale” (Frugoni,

³⁹ Francesco Fulvio Frugoni, *Del Cane di Diogene opera massima del P. Francesco Fulvio Frugoni Minimo, I Quarti Latrati cioè I Padroni Variati e Gl’Incontri Diversi* (Venice: per Antonio Bosio, 1687), 115–19.

310), which means “second-rate poetry,” or “low quality poetry.” The interesting fact here is not the quality of the judgment, which appears quite banal. In fact, bad poetry is characterized as ignorant and unimportant. In other words, poetry that does not develop concepts and intellectual matters is second-rate poetry. Therefore, its authors are called: “orbi” (blind), and “scervellati” (brainless) (Frugoni, 309). But why are they incapable of writing good poems? What is interesting here is the lack of an explicit statement both in the text and in the glosses. In order to understand why the poetry judged here is bad and why such poets do not write well the reader must take into consideration a passage written almost three hundred pages earlier:

Lastly the eagle lets me understand that the good writers shall emulate it trying to bring their chapters under the more clarifying beams of the solar judgment. They must fly above the steamy exhalations with their magnanimous flying. They have to eat heart, which is the most selected and consequently the most intellectual food. Their feathers shall be similar to the eagle’s feathers, which are never clipped by time and thanks to the contact with them, like an infallible comparison, they shall consume the parrot’s, the pygmy owl’s, the owl’s, the magpie’s, the tawny owl’s, and the lark’s feathers, which, indeed, are the second-rate writers (Frugoni, 16).

Here Saetta is thinking about how to be a good writer. Good authors should behave like an eagle, which was believed to be capable of flying above the clouds and to be incapable of eating during its old age. Ravisius attests to the notion of the ability of the eagles to fly above the clouds in his *Officina*, as it is reported by the editors (see Ravisius in Frugoni, 765). The belief in their inability to eat in their old age was transmitted by Pliny the Elder, who stated that they could only drink the blood of their prey because of the size of their beak (see Pliny the Elder in Frugoni, 765). Saetta develops his thought starting from these arguments. Because the eagles can fly above the clouds, they can fly nearer the “more clarifying beams of the solar judgment,” which means closer to Apollo. Because eagles cannot eat, they are supposed to feed off only intellectual and spiritual food. All the authors who do not follow the same way of behaving are called “dozzinali scrittori,” (second-rate writers), who

in the related gloss are explained to be: “those who are sold in bundles and sheaves; and they are destined for the alley ‘where it is sold the frankincense and perfumes and pepper’ etc.” (Frugoni, 16).

Besides the semantic interactions established by the references to Icarus and Daedalus’ myth and the eagle which flies near the Apollonian sun without melting, the quotation from Horace builds up a connection between the two passages that resembles a hypertextual link created inside the same informational space. The reader must read both paragraphs together in order to understand why second-rate poets are censored and who they are. Jumping from the first passage to the second the reader can discover what end the second-rate poets deserve and the judgment on their writings. From the second point of the work to the first one the reader can understand why these writers are second-rate and what an author needs to do in order to be good at their craft. An interesting facet of this hypertextual connection concerns the fact that it can be triggered only by the reader’s memory, who must remember that the quotation has already been attached by the author to the passage which gives the theoretical principles behind the judgment of the second-rate poets.

Taking advantage of the glosses, Frugoni lets the communication of information and messages transcend the text. This tool gives the possibility of presenting and creating an informational web which leads the reader to understand the message in its entirety only by taking into account both the glosses and the text. However, the glosses and the text do not share the same space. Although they are both situated on the same page, so that the reader can easily cross-reference them, the glosses and the text do not follow the same textual linearity. Moreover the glosses, as stated by Frugoni himself, can “connect the passages characterized by undetectable transitions.”⁴⁰ Taking advantage of them he can link portions of text with passages narrated in other parts of the *Cane di Diogene* and even with other works. Such use of the glosses, which builds up a system of different texts (glosses, primary text, other authors’ works), manifests hypertextual features like the parceling of the information that the reader should recompose following the links given by the author. The choice to read the glosses and the decision to follow the suggestions of the author are left to the reader, whose interpretations depend upon their choices. However the only

⁴⁰ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 241.

possible narrative path is the one given by the author and the necessity of reading the glosses does not let the reader “move freely through the information according to their own needs.”⁴¹ The glosses do not construct the narration, they build up its interpretation and they serve as props for it. The reader of the *Tribunal* can choose to interpret the text but they are not co-constructors of the fiction like the readers conjectured by Marie-Laure Ryan,⁴² or by Second Waves Hypertext Theorists.⁴³ Although Frugoni’s work does not totally meet the characteristics of hypertextual fiction, it exhibits a non-linear organization of the information typical of informational hypertexts, which usually evince “structural clarity,” and “allow the reader a choice of reading routes,” and in which “the linked term is more often than not suggestive of what the reader will find at the destination.”⁴⁴

Frugoni’s use of the glosses does more than fulfill an authoritative need. Taking advantage of this tool, Frugoni can support his argumentation with quotations from other authors, he can add more information, or he can give more strength to his *sententiae*, fashioning them as theoretical statements. In this way, as stated by the author himself, he can “legitimate the narration.”⁴⁵ Such use of the glosses meets the definition of the most important function of a commentary according to Glenn Most who suggests that “what a commentary does most essentially is to empower.”⁴⁶ Moreover, Frugoni’s self-commentary forces the reader to pay great attention to the glosses. They convey an authorial point of view while the text transmits the perspective of the narrator: Saetta’s, which must be filtered. The self-commentary submits an authorial reading key that leads to the actual message behind Frugoni’s work, modeled by the synergistic

⁴¹ Nielsen cit. in Ensslin, *Canonizing Hypertext*, 12.

⁴² See Marie-Laure Ryan cit. in Ensslin, *Canonizing Hypertext*, 12.

⁴³ See Bell, *The Possible Worlds*, 16.

⁴⁴ Alice Bell, “Ontological Boundaries and Methodological Leaps: The Importance of Possible Worlds Theory for Hypertext Fiction (and Beyond),” in *New Narratives. Stories and Storytelling in the Digital Age*, ed. Ruth Page and Bronwen Thomas (Lincoln-London: University of Nebraska Press 2011), 65.

⁴⁵ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 241.

⁴⁶ Glenn W. Most, Preface to *Commentaries – Kommentare*, ed. Glenn W. Most (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), x.

and non-hierarchical interdependence between the narration, the comments, the sources, and the philosophical schools of Cynicism and Aristotelian Rhetoric. In this way Frugoni's commentary does not just represent a paratext or an exegetical section of the work that just clarifies the text as if it were its paraphrase. Constituting a programmatic interpretive intervention on the narration, Frugoni's self-comments do not only clarify or strengthen the commented text but constantly remodel it too. Although the *Tribunal* is not a poetic self-commentary, such use of the comments can "create a new poetic vision" of the commented text, just as in the poetic self-commentaries studied by Shelly Roush.⁴⁷ Actually, Frugoni's self-commentary is a part of the text written in form of glosses positioned outside of its physical layout. Like in a hypertext, such a relationship disrupts the textual linearity during the reading. At the same time both text and glosses cannot be understood without knowing or having read the amount of literature quoted or referred to by Frugoni, which constitutes the web of texts behind the *Tribunal*. In some sense it can be called a "proto-hypertext," just like the ones that "can be traced as far back as the Middle Ages" according to Ensslin's studies on Hypertext Fiction.⁴⁸

Although the use of the gloss as paratextual apparatus in printed texts is already attested in previous authors, for example Teofilo Folengo, Emanuele Tesauro and Baldassarre Bonifacio, such systematical use represents an innovation in comparison with them. Earlier, glosses were used especially for the compliance with the bibliographical function. In other cases, they were applied in order to summarize or explain the argument of the paragraph. Frugoni exploits the versatility of this tool and widely enlarges the range of its utilization. Such "creative" dialogical relationship between the glosses and the commented text is unlocked by the gloss tool used in the form of self-comment, which can refine, explain, strengthen, or even transform the linked text. In this way the information is conveyed by different communicative levels that have the double purpose of authorizing or interpreting each other. On one hand Frugoni's glosses submit the reading keys for the interpretation of the text, which can shape, connote and transform the commented

⁴⁷ Sherry Roush, *Hermes' Lyre: Italian Poetic Self-Commentary from Dante to Tommaso Campanella* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), 5.

⁴⁸ Ensslin, *Canonizing Hypertext*, 24.

passages. On the other hand the comments in the glosses can validate the argumentation developed in the text, providing the necessary arguments which substantiate the commented narration. Frugoni himself states that “the annotations, where the text must be clarified” differ from the “resentful ones [...] of the malicious commentator” and from the “allusions” characterized by the “connoting industry,” which leave the reader the possibility of generating “inferences” through their “conjectures.”⁴⁹ This kind of utilization of the glosses, defined by Frugoni as an “accessory, likewise [the comments] attached by the modern commentators to the ancient authors,” represents a sort of foot note *ante notam*.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 239–40.

⁵⁰ Frugoni, *Del Cane* [...] *La Moda Smoderata*, 240.

