CHAPTER IV

BARZIZZA'S COURSE ON GRAMMAR: *Recte Scribendi et Recte Loquendi Scientia*

In both the ancient Roman world and in the medieval schools and universities, the master of grammar was, generally speaking, expected to perform two functions, as we saw, for example, from the university *rotuli* at Pavia. First, he had to teach the technicalities of the Latin language and how it should be written and spoken. Barzizza's teaching of these fundamentals of grammar will be the subject of this chapter. The second and more advanced task of the *grammaticus* was the exposition of the authors, the *studia litterarum*, which will be examined in the next chapter.

There appears to be no surviving evidence of Barzizza's teaching of the central work on Latin construction which made up the 'ordinary' lecture course, Priscian's *Institutes,* although he must have lectured on this text as part of his terms of employment by the University of Padua. There is, however, a good deal of evidence for his teaching in his private grammar school, which was directed mainly at boys up to the age of about fourteen and, in some respects, was also intended to benefit those who were beginning the arts course at the University. The essence of this course on the fundamentals of grammar was stated by Barzizza himself: 'grammatica, ut a veteribus diffinitur, est recte loquendi recteque construendi scientia'. It could be further broken down into four parts: orthography, 'recte scribendi ars sive scientia'; prosody, 'scientia de accentu et quattuor syllaborum'; ethymology, 'scientia de vera dictionum significatione'; and syntax, 'scientia de constructione'.[1]

Written *c.*1420, this definition of grammar simply re-stated the traditional divisions of the subject which were given in the grammar schools of late antiquity and were perpetuated in their medieval counterparts.[2] One might almost say, therefore, that Barzizza's definition was commonplace; but, given the time in which he was writing and the kind of audience to whom he appealed, it was almost too straightforward. The very fact that his notion of grammar fell entirely within a literary tradition originating in antiquity implied, in the terms of the later medieval universities, that his conception of the subject was an exclusive one. As we shall see, he regarded the art of grammar in the same way as his model grammarians, Priscian and Donatus, had done; his pre-occupations, like theirs, were ultimately stylistic and literary, emphasizing that grammar was the ordered scheme of study by means of which one could best examine, appreciate, and imitate the ancient authors.[3] The

science of correct expression and construction was the foundation of the *studia litterarum*. The grammatical manuals led the student to the threshold of the literary sources, pointing to the need for an awareness of the complexity in linguistic usage, a need which was met by the student only if he constantly widened his knowledge of ancient writings. Grammar, as seen by Priscian, implicitly accepted a fixed standard in Latin usage, based on the practice of the best classical authors. It was, in other words, an historical and descriptive grammar, since it entailed a statement of one limited period of a language's development, a period which had passed. However, the set of rules or the standard laid down by the grammarian took on their full meaning only when accompanied by a reading of that literature on which they were founded; only then could it be seen how the rules were embodied, refined, and even, at times, properly transgressed.

This was Barzizza's view also, and in adopting it so wholeheartedly he ignored another and more recent tradition of grammatical studies: the science of speculative grammar which had been developed in the transalpine scholastic centres from the late twelfth century onwards and which, by the fourteenth century, had also attained a prominent place in the Italian universities. This speculative study of language applied the methods of logical analysis to the grammatical terms of Priscian. The speculative grammarians (*Modistae*) attempted to show how words had meaning. They asked what was the essential nature and purpose of speech. They argued, ultimately, that grammatical rules are founded on extra-linguistic premisses.[4] Barzizza, on the other hand, regarded grammatical rules as deriving completely from literary usage. He did not ask what sort of argument Priscian employed and whether it accorded with a logical system—at least, none of his surviving grammars suggest that he did—but set Priscian alongside other grammarians and, in turn, tested all grammatical tenets against the criterion of accumulated, respected uses by model writers. It was as if grammatical rules were legitimized by the prescriptive right of an ancient literary constitution, rather than by *a priori* reasoning.

Barzizza knew his *grammatica speculativa*. He had been trained in its methods at Pavia, under Giovanni Travesi, and he may have been required to employ this approach in his 'ordinary' lectures on Priscian at Padua. But in all his treatises on grammar he chose to exclude it from consideration. He choose to examine grammar as the ancients had done and, although he used eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth-century grammars, he used only those which he thought examined grammar similarly. Rather than linking grammar with logic, he made it the cornerstone of an extensive course on literature and rhetoric.

(a) *Orthography*

'Est autem orthographia scientia prime partis grammatice docens recte ordinare litteras in sillabis et sillabas in dictionibus secundum potestatem earum.'[5] To such an apparently straightforward subject Barzizza devoted a good deal of his attention; in

fact, he may have written as many as eleven works on various aspects of orthography and four summaries of the main precepts. These manuals, lexicons, notes, and short summaries appear occasional in their form, but to a student in Barzizza's school they were unified in purpose, each work relating, in an obvious way, to an overriding scheme which he devised for treating the whole question of Latin orthography. According to this scheme, the subject was to be approached in four ways:

Primum igitur eorum verborum ars tradetur, quorum usus frequenter est et in quibis saepius de recta scribendi via ab his disceditur, qui minus exercitati sunt, minusque hac una in parte eruditi. Secundus locus erit ut quaedam penes litterarum ordinem huic arti subiciam, tam composita, quam simplicia, ne quis in quaerendo aut falli possit aut aliqua inutili mora detineri. Tertio de quibusdam agetur, quae etsi nulla cum diphtongo scribenda esse, non solum ars a grammaticis tradita, sed etiam oratorum et poetarum usus comprobat. Ultimum erit de ratione punetandi, quantum ex usu veterum et modernorum elicere potui, praecepta aliqua tradentur.[6]

Orthography, therefore, most suitably falls into four sections for study: a treatise on the precepts; a lexicon of words which have caused difficulty in spelling; a study of diphthongs; and a study of punctuation. The statement of this scheme is found only in his treatise *De Orthographia*, but it most probably corresponded to the manner in which Barzizza had approached the subject in the classroom.

All four questions, in fact, were not covered in the one manual. The manuscript copies of the *De Orthographia*, of which there were two versions, all contain the first and second parts, the theory and the lexicon, but only a few include the section on diphthongs, which was usually circulated as a separate treatise, *De Diphthongis*. Several works on etymology and punctuation also circulated separately, as we will see later. However, the existence of individual works on certain aspects of orthography or of different combinations of works in different manuscript copies should not be muddling if we remember Barzizza's overall plan. We will consider these various works, then attempt to relate Barzizza's whole teaching of the subject to a Paduan-Veneto tradition of orthographical studies and, finally, we will view Barzizza's works in the light of more general humanist controversies on the nature of the Latin language.

Of Barzizza's major and most famous work on orthography, mentioned above, there were two versions. The first version was composed in Padua between 1417 and 1421 and exists in three manuscript copies which conveniently can be called 'N', 'F', and 'L'.[7] Each has both additions and omissions which are unique to itself: for instance, N contains mnemonic verses which are omitted in F and L; F has a summary of the orthographical rules at the end (fols. 23v–24r) which does not exist in the other two; and there are numerous textual variations between them.[8] They might have been students' notes dictated by Barzizza in his house at Padua, or perhaps they were copies made by schoolmasters who selected the parts they needed.[9] Unfortunately, the names of the copyists are not given. We do know,

however, that Barzizza wrote this first version for members of his private school, as he included, in the second version, an explanation of how the work had its beginnings. It was written at the request of two brothers, Domenico and Pietro Vettori, sons of Barzizza's patrician friend from Venice, Daniele Vettori, and boarders in his household school: 'Sed cum duobus Veturiis Dominico ac Pietro adolescentibus patriciis et adhuc praetextatis pollicitus essem me hac de re eos scripturum'.[10] Moreover, the first version, as the very few manuscripts of it suggest, had a local circulation, amongst Paduan pupils or those associated with the Paduan school, such as one Alfonso of Portugal to whom Barzizza wrote, while Alfonso was absent from Padua, that he was unable to send the 'Orthography'.[11]

The second version of the *De Orthographia* was written in Milan sometime during or after 1421, as we gather from two passages which are missing in the earlier work: the one referring to Duke Filippo Maria Visconti and the other to the discovery in 1421 of Cicero's rhetorical works at Lodi.[12] However, this version was essentially a product of Barzizza's teaching in Padua, being, indeed, merely an amplification of the first *De Orthographia* rather than a radical revision. Whereas the first version was a rudimentary work intended only for students beginning the arts course or boys at school, the second version was a more sophisticated work designed as much for other masters as for older students. The original treatment was filled out with a more extensive discussion of the controversies which surrounded certain spellings and a far wider selection of 'authorities' to illustrate and help explain a precept. Most notably, the second version embarked on a deeper discussion of the Greek roots of the Latin language.

The form of the *De Orthographia* was common to the medieval grammars which Barzizza used; a combination of the expository and the lexical, a treatise on the precepts, followed by an alphabetical word list showing their usage. The first part was based primarily on Priscian, dealing with those questions which he had considered and which later grammarians had elaborated, such as the mutation of consonants when prepositions are assimilated into composite words, the mutation of double vowels, the transliteration of Greek words and so on. The second part, the lexicon, was also firmly in the tradition of Roman and medieval grammars. In the first place, it was a word list which illustrated and frequently referred to the section on the precepts. At times, Barzizza would repeat a rule, reminding the student of the technical reasons for a particular spelling, or, when the suitable word came, he would elaborate on what he had said earlier. Secondly, the lexicon was a dictionary, intended to help the student to master an unfamiliar language by stretching his vocabulary further–some of the words were obscure–and defining words through Latin synonyms or their root meaning. For his content, Barzizza relied heavily on earlier etymologies, namely the *Lexicum* of Papias, the *Derivationes* of Uguccione (Hugutius) da Pisa, the lexical parts of Balbi's *Catholicon,* the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, and the word lists of Priscian. Like these earlier works, Barzizza's lexicon was intended to be a compendium of

knowledge, or at least a reference work on certain subjects: proper names from ancient mythology and history; geographical and cosmographical subjects; natural history, plants and bestiaries; medicine (parts of the body, diseases etc.); technical terms from rhetoric, dialectic, grammar, the *quadrivium*, and theology. One suspects that it was, above all, an aid to the student of ancient letters and linked to Barzizza's lectures on the authors.

Beneath this apparently simple and unoriginal form, Barzizza evolved a coherent and subtly presented set of principles for correct spelling, which marked him out both from his contemporary grammarians and from the line of grammarians from whom he acknowledged his descent. For Barzizza, orthography could not be subjected to any one universal principle suitable for every case, but many criteria had to be weighed up, almost pragmatically. Roughly speaking these criteria fell into three categories; grammatical doctrine, linguistic form and euphony, and to each of these there were many parts.

(1) Doctrine

Grammatical doctrine (*ratio doctrinae*), according to Barzizza, was compounded, first of all, from the traditional teaching of grammarians who, in respect of their authority and chronological sequence, belonged to one of three groups: the very ancient ('Vetustissimi' or 'Prisci'), principal among whom was Varro whose grammatical treatise, *De Lingua Latina Libri XXV*, survived in Books 5-10 (only 5 and 6 entirely); then, there were the later Roman grammarians, 'the moderators of that pristine antiquity (priscae illius antiquitatis moderatores)', who included Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, Victorinus, Servius, Nonius Marcellus, Asconius Pedianus, Nigidius Figulus, Donatus, and Priscian; finally came the 'Moderni', Isidore of Seville, Papias, Uguccione, Balbi, Alexander of Villa Dei, Parmenides, Brito, and, more recently, Manuel Chrysoloras and Guarino da Verona. Unlike some contemporary admirers of Antiquity who gave first place to the 'Vetustissimi', Barzizza held that the authority of the 'Moderatores' was generally to be preferred to that of the other two:

Moderni itaque nonnulli antiquitatis admiratores quibusdam locis vetustissimos illos in scribendo secuti sunt. Sed ut oratores hi magis sunt imitandi qui medii inter nos et illos vetustissimos fuerunt: ita in his quae de grammatica scripta reperiuntur nec antiquissimos semper nec novissimos sed eos qui priscae illius antiquitatis moderatores extiterunt imitandos esse censeo.[13]

Barzizza's reasons for preferring those who stood 'mid-way' between the very ancient and his own times can be evinced from the line of his argument throughout the treatise. They were in a position to have assimilated a whole stock of reading and, thereby, linguistic usage; thus, they were better fitted than the 'Vetustissimi' to pronounce judgement on what constituted an orthographical standard. What was more important, they knew Greek and so had a sound notion of the dimensions and

roots of the Latin language; in other words, they were more reliable than the 'Moderni' who were largely ignorant of Greek. Barzizza was remarkable in distinguishing between groups of grammarians according to a literary-historical division, in proposing that the development of language and changing historical circumstances were determining factors when considering the relative merits of particular scholars who had analysed that language. Indeed, his very notion of schools of grammarians represents an interesting facet of that development of proper historical consciousness which is generally attributed to the Italian Renaissance. Hardly less remarkable was the amount of research and discovery which seems to have lain behind Barzizza's references to authors. It appears that he knew, mostly at first hand, the grammatical works of all these 'moderatores', some of which were rare and, as far as I know, had not been used in medieval grammars. For example, he made use of the fourth-century grammarian, rhetor and philosopher, Victorinus, the preceptor of St Jerome and 'antiquitatis doctissimus'. Barzizza owned a fragment of Victorinus's *De Orthographia* which he tells us had been found, but he does not say where or how or by whom. Even in the early sixteenth century this work was rare enough to arouse comment.[14] Barzizza used another rare fourth-century grammar, the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus, in twenty books. Petrarch had a copy which eventually went to the library at Pavia and then, in 1409, Bartolomeo Capra passed it on to Bruni and Niccoli in Florence. In 1415 Francesco Barbaro brought it from Florence and it gained a limited circulation in Venice and Padua. Barbaro, a former pupil and close associate of Barzizza, might well have made the work known to him, or perhaps Barzizza had read it while he was in Pavia.[15] Nonius's work consisted of two parts, not unlike Barzizza's; one (Books 1-12) dealing with points of grammar and the second (Books 13-20) being a vast compendium of information, based on his own reading from a wide variety of authors, including a good number of republican poets whose works would not otherwise have been known at all. Thus, through Nonius's 'moderating' assimilation Barzizza had access to the 'Vetustissimi'. Even more obscure than the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* were the *Commentarii Grammatici* of Nigidius Figulus (fl. 50 B.C.) to which Barzizza referred twice. His knowledge of the work may have come at second hand, from Servius.[16]

Barzizza's use of these rare grammarians shows his extensive scholarship and illustrates the way in which obscure works of antiquity were being brought to light in this period. Barzizza acquired and assimilated the results of the most recent textual discoveries, working fresh material into a traditional body of grammatical doctrine. In particular, two works which Poggio had discovered at St Gall in 1416 claimed Barzizza's attention; the *Commentaries* of Asconius Pedianus and the complete manuscript of the *Institutes* of Quintilian. The fragments of Asconius's historical commentaries on Cicero's orations fell into two parts; first, the rhetorical commentaries on six orations and, secondly, the fifth-century commentaries of the Pseudo-Asconius (which Barzizza thought genuine), including those on the Verrine

orations (I and II) which Barzizza used in his lexicon. These latter were of a strictly grammatical character. Three copies were made of the 'Codex Sangalliensis' by humanists at Constance in 1416-17, and Barzizza's familiarity with the work probably dates from his own presence among those scholars in 1417.[17] We know that Barzizza used the complete St Gall text of Quintilian's *Institutes* when, for example, he discusses the various spellings of 'con', taking this recently discovered codex as his main authority: '. . . prout in alio Quintiliano ex vetustissimo codice transcripto, qui repertus nuper est in Germania'. This text reached Padua in 1417.[18]

Although Barzizza's considered preference was generally given to the 'Moderatores', he was also eager to delve into the more obscure 'modern' grammarians, such as Brito and Parmenides, medieval lexicographers.[19] His intention was to know the complete corpus of grammatical writings from antiquity to modern times so that he would be able to make more balanced judgements on the relative merits of each within that tradition or to appreciate any general agreement, what he called 'communis grammaticorum schola' or 'omnium grammaticorum opinio'. These notions of a common tradition and schools of thought constituted a step forward in the application of historical thinking to literary criticism. For him, the 'moderns', just as much as the 'very old' and those in the 'middle', were 'authorities'. When it was still current in the schools to assume that a deep and vaguely divided gap existed between the ancients and the moderns, Barzizza's attempt to stand back from his own time and make a comparative assessment of it was an advance in historical consciousness.

Grammatical doctrine, however, was not merely the sum of grammatical teaching as it appeared in formal treatises on precepts, but also, and more vitally, the consideration of countless literary works, the linguistic usages of which were enshrined in those precepts, and, in turn, modified them. Again, Barzizza divided the authors into the three categories. Among the 'Vetustissimi', reference was made only to the *Annales* of Piso (fl. 130 B.C.), a work which he may not have read in the original, but knew only from the citations in Cicero, Varro, Livy, Pliny, and others. The 'Moderatores', on the other hand, were numerous: the poets Ovid, Virgil, Statius, Horace, Catullus, and Apuleius; the 'historians' Lucan, Aulus Gellius, Pliny, and Sallust; the playwrights Seneca and Terence; the orator Cicero; the Christian writers Eusebius, St Jerome, and Martianus Capella. However, it is impossible to say how many of these writers he had read at first hand or 'in toto' and how often he was 'lifting' well-known examples from other grammarians. Among 'modern' works he cited Petrarch's *De Viris Illustribus*, which he claimed to have seen (at Pavia?) in Petrarch's own hand, and Boccaccio's *Libellus de Montibus*.[20]

Barzizza made great use of these authors in his lexicon to illustrate a precept, bring forward an exception or to show how writers differed in their spelling, and, in so doing, he left the impression that language could only be properly studied as it was used; the ultimate concern of the grammarian was with literature. A good

knowledge of Latin literature, therefore, was important to the student of grammar, as well as an appreciation of a tradition of teaching. But there was a third element which was needed for a correct evaluation of grammatical doctrine; an understanding of Latin derivations from the Greek:

Inter multa vero ac varia in quibus nonnunquam latinitas in scribendo fallitur fere nullum vitium frequentius eo mihi visum est quam ignorantia litterarum graecarum accidit. Huic saepe magni auctores decepti, multa minus accurate scripserunt, multa praeterierunt in eorum libris, quae ad hanc unam partem de qua nunc agitur attinebant. Multa denique tanquam apud nos orta cum a graecis educta essent, non satis docte sciteque extulerunt.[21]

Barzizza found an ignorance of Greek a major criticism of most of the 'modern' grammarians (Uguccione, Balbi, Papias, et al.) and, throughout the treatise, he gave example after example of mistakes which had been perpetuated by Latin writers because they lacked an historical understanding of the Latin language.[22] Indeed, it often seems that he was going beyond the particular questions of this or that spelling and launching a more general attack on the intellectual impoverishment of his age, with a lot of Latin but little or no Greek. He thereby enrolled himself among the humanist 'avant-garde', the followers of the Byzantine pedagogue, Manuel Chrysoloras, and acknowledged, whenever suitable, his debt to Greeks or those Latins who knew Greek, such as Guarino, whom he mentions by name in the first version of the *De Orthographia*, and perhaps Vergerio, Barbaro, and the Decembrii.[23]

Paradoxically, Barzizza's own knowledge of Greek was slight. He probably had a basic knowledge of the Greek alphabet and elementary parts of speech, as explained in the elementary grammar of Chrysoloras, the *Erotemata*, with a Latin translation by Guarino. In general, however, he either reported the views of more erudite contemporaries or, more often, re-stated Greek etymological definitions from Priscian. As if to compensate for this lack of learning, he had the zeal of a neophyte with the awe of the unfamiliar, which comes from semi-comprehension, but his emphasis on the importance of Greek pointed to the need for educational reform as well as providing him with a line of criticism against several well known grammars.

(2) Linguistic Form

Grammatical doctrine in all its aspects–precepts, literary studies and Greek etymology–provided only one criterion for establishing correct orthography. Complementary to it, and part of it, was the question of linguistic form. Here, Barzizza gave most weight to the spelling which was found in ancient codices (or, rather, those codices which he believed had been copied in antiquity) and least weight to those codices copied in more recent times which, he claimed, were peppered with scribal errors and orthographical vagaries. It is important, therefore, to try to deduce what exactly Barzizza understood by 'codices antiqui'. First, he

had in mind those codices of classical texts being discovered in his own day, principally in monastic and cathedral chapter libraries (codices which he thought were written in antiquity, but which were actually copied in the 'Dark Ages').[24] He probably gave them the authority of antiquity because the orthography corresponded more or less to that proposed in the grammars of the 'moderatores' and this may have led him to assume that the codices themselves were contemporaneous with those grammars. He also described a codex as 'ancient' because of its punctuation and abbreviations, about which the moderns, he claimed, had been particularly careless: 'Moderni autem ignorantiae patrocinati sunt et potius voluerunt inertiae librariorum quam arti et antiquitati inservire'.[25] Finally, Barzizza claimed to have studied ancient monumental and numismatic inscriptions.[26] What we find is an aptitude for research and an almost 'scientific' piecing together of various kinds of evidence.

(3) Euphony

Grammatical doctrine and linguistic form were, for Barzizza, two branches of one method, which he called 'ratio scribendi', and as such were distinct from a third principle of spelling, 'euphoniae ratio' or 'iudicium aurium'. The criteria of euphony were non-literary, being based on pronunciation or, as it were, on nature rather than art. That euphony was the fundamental component of grammar can be seen from the very terms used–'vocales', 'consonans', 'nota', etc.'–which were taken from the actions of the spoken voice. Euphony was also the prime link between written orthography and the spoken art of rhetoric, oratory. Following Priscian and Servius, Barzizza pointed out where a word was spelt one way and pronounced another and where the spoken arts of oratory and poetry differed.[27]

How did Barzizza relate these three principles of orthography to one another? He saw that all three tended towards a linguistic norm and when they agreed exactly then a spelling was indisputable. Sometimes, however, there were discrepancies, for example, between precept and euphony or between precept and usage, although he believed that usage had generally the stronger claim, or between the written and spoken art, when, for instance, poetic metre demanded its appropriate spelling, or discrepancies between usages themselves. It was in treating the latter that Barzizza was most subtle. Not infrequently, he preferred current usage to ancient rules, when the former was overwhelming and reasonable. Against the 'Moderatores' he sometimes preferred the 'Moderni' and the 'Vetustissimi' or, then again, he might opt for an ancient form which went in the face of a strong, but unfounded (usually 'un-Greek'), modern usage. There were no cast-iron principles for arriving at a fixed state of faultless spelling, because there was no universal and constant authority to which reference could invariably be made. Barzizza recognized that the ancients were often as much at variance amongst themselves as the moderns, as, for example, over the aspirated 'h'. Usage, by its very nature, was

continually changing: 'Orthographia tamen saepe (ut ait Quintilianus) mutata est'. Moreover, many words existed in his own times that had not done so in Priscian's, such as words containing 'z'. From time to time, Barzizza had to admit that the spelling of some words rested, ultimately, on arbitrary choice, or he agreed with Quintilian that some details of orthography were not worth bothering about ('frigidasque huiusmodi quaestiones ac velut inanes appeleat'). Often, he made no judgement at all, but just drew up the authorities 'pro et contra'. In effect, he moved from one case to the next, giving examples and counter-examples and contradictory precepts, giving the impression of the infinite complexity of language; but complexity within a fairly cohesive tradition. Also, while there could be more than one correct form of a word, each carrying equal justification, error was easy to ascertain: first, error resulting from ignorance of Greek; secondly, error deriving from false premisses, the error of the speculative grammarians.[28]

Barzizza ignored the tradition of speculative grammar, except for one passing reference to Petrus Helias and an oblique remark in the short discussion of 'Dialectica' in the lexicon:

Dialectica per i latinum et per c ante t scribi debet, usus tamen latinorum inscitia potius quam arte sine c ante t scribit. Dicitur autem dialectica a dialogomo quod est disputo, et non dia quod est duo et lexis ratio. Frustra ergo quaedam dialecticorum argumenta contra derivationem usitatam huius nominis sunt inventa.[29]

It is hard to know to which dialecticians Barzizza was referring. What is important, however, is not the very little that is mentioned but the great deal that is left unsaid. By reaching back to an older stream of grammatical doctrine, by concerning himself almost exclusively with the ancient sources and the medieval grammars which fed on those sources, Barzizza made a tacit criticism of a whole tradition of grammatical thought.

Besides the two versions of the *De Orthographia* there exists a collection of orthographical works which, in one way or another, are based on the teaching of Barzizza.

The Brescia Orthography

This is an orthographical lexicon, which has hitherto not been studied and now exists in the Querinian library in Brescia.[30] The work was put together and written by one Leonardo da Trento, but, as is clear from the text and is stated in the *explicit*, it drew heavily on Barzizza's teaching material: 'Explicit orthographia pulcherima egregij magistratus magistri gasparini pergamensis, quam ego de tridente leonardus summo deo favente caraxavi. Deo gratias agamus.' Leonardo was perhaps a schoolmaster in North Italy who had access to a lexicon of Barzizza from which he made selections and added his own material, but this explanation it not wholly satisfactory. In the first place, apart from examples in common, it is not a copy of the lexical section of the famous *De Orthographia*. It does, however, resemble,

often closely, an orthographical work in the Laurenziana library which gives Barzizza as its author in the title; but there are innumerable textual variations between the two works which make it impossible to accept that the one is a straight copy of the other or that both were straight copies of an examplar. Another possibility is that Leonardo da Trento was a pupil of Barzizza and the lexicon is a *reportatio*, a series of notes on Barzizza's lectures which may have been filled out later. While it is hard to believe that Barzizza dictated reams of word lists, as if reading out of a dictionary, it is conceivable that he gave a core of words to illustrate orthographical rules and that students added their own examples around his material. However, it is certain that, one way or another, the work is an extension of Barzizza's teaching.

Indeed, there are many echoes of the *De Orthographia* in Leonardo's compilation. Many of the words were the same and the comments on them were along similar lines, although Leonardo stated that he was interested in four questions in particular: 'scilicet, litterarum cognitione, mutatione, congrua aspiratione et rationabili significatione. Qua de re unaquaque littera et maxime geminata ex alphabeti ordine potero dicere conabor.'[31] Most of the authorities cited were the same, but there were the following additions: from the ancients we find Livy, Juvenal, Plautus, Lucretius, Macrobius, St Augustine, and Boethius; from the moderns, the *Grecismus* of Eberhard of Béthune. Moreover, certain authors found in both lexicons were given greater prominence here, such as Virgil, Terence, and Cicero. There was the same stress on the need to examine the Greek roots of Latin and the same concept of a grammatical tradition stretching from antiquity to the moderns,[32] although we do not find the distinction between the 'vetustissimi' and the 'moderatores'; indeed, there were no examples of the former and none of the rarer grammarians of the latter group were included. In both works Priscian was widely used when orthographical principles were stated, although there were less qualifications in the Brescia lexicon; 'ut prisciano placet', 'ut prisciani preceptis satisfiat' were sometimes the only explanations, without the reservations of other grammarians. On the whole, Leonardo's lexicon was less sophisticated than the *De Orthographia*.

The Laurenziana Orthography

Entitled *Orthographya Gasparini Pergamensis per alphabetum*, this work in the Laurenziana Library in Florence resembles fairly closely the orthography in Brescia, being an alphabetical lexicon in which the rules were explained, when words or letters provided apt illustrations, and with the same particular emphasis on geminations.[33] The stock of examples and the approach were broadly the same, giving the declension of rare words or proper names, providing a definition for most words and adding notes for less usual cases. The details, too, are often strikingly similar, such as the long section on the aspirant 'h', showing its various combinations with other letters.

However, the Laurenziana orthography is so far from identical to the one in Brescia as to suggest the possibility that either the latter was based, somehow, on the source of the former or even that the Laurenziana work, like the Brescian, was the product of a pupil or master who had copied and extended Barzizza's teaching material. Setting the two works side by side we would find that the same examples are treated in a slightly different way or that the one has numerous minor additions and omissions that the other does not have. Perhaps the obvious answer would be to accept the Laurenziana work as a simple copy of a lexicon of Barzizza, except that there is, to my knowledge, no surviving exemplar, no other copy of this work, and no reference to any such work in Barzizza's writings. It is tempting to suppose therefore, that the Laurenziana orthography was based on notes taken from Barzizza's lectures.

The Venetian and Paduan Orthographies

Equally puzzling are two orthographical works in the Museo Correr in Venice and the University Library in Padua, the latter being a fragment of the former, which has the title, *Viri excellentissimi gasparini pergamensis recte scribendi ratio*.[34] Parts of this work are not unlike the first version of the *De Orthographia*, but, again, are far from being identical. The first section presents the orthographical precepts in a simple way, using the same collection of mnemonic verses and rules as that found in the earlier version of the *De Orthographia*, which is now in Naples, but the order of treatment is slightly different and the preface, which states the quadripartite scheme, is omitted.[35] The second section is more like the alphabetical *vocabularium* in the Brescia and Laurenziana orthographies, except that it is concerned almost wholly, not just especially, with geminations; indeed, it is headed *de geminationibus*.

These various orthographical compilations tend to support one another in suggesting that they were *reportationes* of Barzizza's lectures or based on his teaching and it is perhaps in the same way that we should consider several summaries of various orthographical rules which are included with copies of other works of Barzizza. A manuscript book in Padua contains a collection of notes on orthography: a brief summary of the rules of orthography ending with a twenty-one-line verse on aspiration; a metrical summary of the main rules on the spelling of simple words (*Orthographia Metrica de Simplicibus*) and another set of rules in metre on the orthography of Greek words commonly used in Latin.[36] Appended to a copy of the *De Orthographia* in Florence are notes on vowels, semi-vowels, mutes, liquids, and diphthongs, while short notes on orthographical rules are also found in a manuscript in Naples.[37] These summaries may well have been related to Barzizza's elementary course on grammar.

So far, we have considered the first two parts of orthography as conceived by Barzizza—grammatical analysis ('ars') and lexical illustration—but he also wrote various short treatises on the third and fourth parts, diphthongs and punctuation.

Diphthongs

Although the general investigation of orthography by humanists was under way by the late fourteenth century, the work on diphthongs does not seem to have begun until the fifteenth century. Barzizza's contribution to the subject in *c.*1420 probably depended upon two slightly earlier treatises which had made a mark in humanist circles.[38] The first was the *Erotemata* of the Byzantine master Manuel Chrysoloras, an elementary Greek grammar written soon after his arrival in Florence (1414) and then given a parallel Latin translation by Guarino da Verona. The excited interest in Greek studies, which had been aroused by Chrysoloras more than anyone, sparked off comparative enquiries into the nature of certain aspects of Latin grammar. Among these questions was that of diphthongs which Chrysoloras had carefully distinguished from monophthongs. We know that Barzizza used the *Erotemata* for his *De Orthographia* and the work of Chrysoloras might have suggested to him the need for a fresh examination of diphthongs in Latin. The second treatise was Guarino's *De Diphthongis*, the first separate study of Latin diphthongs, probably written between 1415 and 1417.[39] Guarino composed the treatise at a time when his contacts with Barzizza were closest. For a few months in 1416 Guarino stayed in Padua and for the rest of the time, between 1414 and 1419, he stayed in Venice. The two men acknowledged their debts to each other. Barzizza, for example, was probably referring to Guarino, amongst others, when, in the introduction to the *De Diphthongo*, he recognized that the subject had already been broached 'a nonnullis ex nostris hominibus'. Guarino, in turn, was to use Barzizza's work in his grammatical controversy with Niccolò Niccoli.

Though Barzizza intended his work on diphthongs to be an integral part of his *De Orthographia*, the latter was usually copied separately; I know of only four copies of the *De Orthographia* which include it.[40] The treatise was divided into a theoretical discussion of the precepts and an alphabetical lexicon of words containing diphthongs. In the first part, he defined the term and discussed the number and form of diphthongs, how they differed from monophthongs and how and why they ought to be used. In the lexicon, he followed a fairly rigid method. First, he gave the word as it sounds, without the diphthong, then as it is written with the diphthong, since the written form does not always seem to correspond to the pronunciation.[41] Secondly, he examined any aspirants or other notable points of orthography. Thirdly, he discussed the diphthong in question and, finally, he gave the meaning of the word or, since most of them were proper names, he gave short biographical notes. Like the lexicon in the *De Orthographia*, the vocabulary was drawn from ancient poetry, history, and mythology, constituting, perhaps, as much a reference manual for the student of ancient letters as a detailed illustration of an aspect of grammar. Only Virgil, Seneca, and Papias were cited as authorities and the lexicon abruptly ended at the letter 'E', with 'Eneis.aeneis'.

The work reiterated some of the principles found in the *De Orthographia*. He discussed the seven Greek diphthongs, as opposed to the four in Latin, and frequently

referred to Greek principles, probably using the *Erotemata* as his guide. Among the Latins, he followed neither the 'prisci latini' nor 'nostra hec etas'; in other words, he followed the 'moderatores'.[42]

Punctuation

Barzizza wrote two short treatises on the rules of punctuation, both of which were also abridged, perhaps by others. They were not incorporated into the *De Orthographia*, although copyists occasionally added one of the treatises at the end of the larger work. More often they appear as separate works or appended to Barzizza's rhetorical work, *De Compositione*. The fact that they most often appear in collections of orthographical works or manuals on rhetorical composition, including sometimes Barzizza's own works on these subjects, is not surprising since punctuation was traditionally related to orthography in particular and to rhetoric in general.

The two works deal with punctuation in a complementary way: the first is a more elementary outline of the main rules and divisions; the second is a more abstract discussion of the nature and purpose of the 'ars punctandi'. The first treatise is divided into three main parts.[43] First, Barzizza deals, in a general way, with the three 'distinctiones'—'dependens', 'constans', and 'finitiva'—which help to break up and make sense of a written passage and are denoted by the comma, the colon, and the period respectively. Secondly, he defines and illustrates six principal forms of punctuation ('sex . . . species principales punctandi'): 'punctus copulativus, abreviativus, interrogativus, suspensivus, distinctivus, conclusivus'. The third part sets out the rules: 'sequuntur quedam breves et utiles regule de punctatione secundum modernos'. Here Barzizza follows the moderns' eightfold division of punctuation: 'virgula recta . . . virgula iacens . . . virgula connexa . . . punctum cum virgula sursum . . . punctus interrogativus . . . punctus planus . . . gemipunctus . . . peryodus . . .'. He then gives examples of how each can be used in speeches and letters, ending with a long example which incorporates them all. This third part seems to have been extracted by some copyists and abridged, and this shorter summary, the manuscripts of which tend to differ in their rendering, was published and examined by A. Roncaglia.[44]

In contrast to the descriptive method of the first treatise, the second was an analysis of the nature of punctuation: what is the punctuation mark; in how many ways is it made; what should be punctuated (and so on)?[45] He examines each proposition in turn, following his definition of the punctuation mark as the sign which divides up the meaning and recreates the spirit of the speaker's intention ('segregans intellectum, spiritum recreans prolatoris'). He then discusses three effects of punctuation: it gives the speaker a break ('recreatio loquentis'), helping him to commit to memory what he has to say and to keep his voice strong; secondly, it helps the listener ('utilitas auditoris'); since he perceives the tenor of the matter in due course ('seriatim') and has the time to understand it better ('et

habet spatium cogitandi et melius intelligendi'); thirdly, punctuation allows the subject matter itself to be presented in the best light. Punctuation, for Barzizza, was equally important for speeches as for written matter, particularly letters. It should be divided into 'puncta essentialia' which, according to Cicero, are fourfold ('virgula, coma, colum, periodus') and 'puncta accidentalia' which Cicero divided into 'interrogativum', 'gemipunctum', and 'semipunctum'. Each of these is discussed in terms of how it reflects the mind of the speaker ('dictatoris animus') and how it affects the mind of the listener ('auditoris animus'). Then Barzizza refers to Book I, Chapter XV of Cicero's *De Inventione*, where the man who intends to begin a speech is advised to understand first the subject matter on which he is basing his 'exordium'; likewise, he who wishes to punctuate should fully understand his material. Finally, the matter to be punctuated should be divided into 'subdistinctio', 'distinctio', and 'clausula'.

This second treatise was also abridged in various ways by others.[46]

Barzizza's approach to punctuation, like his rendering of the other three parts of orthography, took into account both the old man and the new, the 'Antiqui' and the 'Moderni', welding into one what had been two distinct phases in the development of the 'ars punctandi'.[47] On the one hand, there was the classical system of punctuation which informed the well-known definitions of Isidore of Seville. This older tradition was outlined in the first of Barzizza's treatises. On the other hand, there was the *dictamen* tradition of punctuation, beginning in the thirteenth century, which represented almost a self-contained development, embracing the 'moderni' whom Barzizza cites. He does not dismiss the more recent tradition in preference for the ancients, but assimilates both into a more comprehensive pattern.[48]

The *ars punctandi* stood at the cross-roads of grammar and rhetoric. It was clearly indispensable to that part of grammar which comprised 'the science of correct expression and construction', since it helped to regulate the sense of an argument, while, equally, it served that part of the grammar which concerned itself with the textual study of authors; it was essential groundwork for the correct transcription and interpretation of ancient codices. Punctuation was also part and parcel of the art of rhetoric, as Barzizza demonstrated and explained in the second treatise. *Dictamen,* which Barzizza made synonymous with *ars rhetorica*, was divided into 'dictamen epistolarum' and 'dictamen orationum', the 'arenga' or 'alter dictamen'; and punctuation applied to both equally. He showed himself to be well versed in the current practice of epistolary composition and his works on punctuation probably reflect in the Paduan school of Barzizza an interest in those techniques of drafting letters which had been a major feature of Italian schools of rhetoric since the thirteenth century. Equally, using the rhetorical manuals of Antiquity, he stressed the importance of punctuation for oratory, the spoken rhetoric which the *dictatores* had tended to undervalue. Thus, he extended and refined the tradition of rhetorical instruction in Italy.

Orthographical Studies in the Veneto and Florence.

Barzizza's orthographical works were not isolated in their times, but should be seen as a contribution, perhaps the most important contribution, to a local school of pedagogic thought in Padua and the Veneto towns. We find, from the late fourteenth century, certain masters who showed an interest in the reform of Latin spelling and, generally, in correct literary expression.[49] They were few and exceptional, but a discernible pattern of interests emerges from their works.

The orthographical manual of an anonymous Veronese master (*c.*1400) was an early and more simplified rendering of the subject along the lines which Barzizza was to follow, both in its general form (Books 1 and 4 are expository, Books 2 and 3 are lexical) and in the detailed questions which the author chooses to alight upon, such as the 'mihi-michi' debate. There is no evidence that Barzizza read or knew of this work, but its existence does suggest the possibility that a fresh interest was being taken in the nature of the Latin language in certain grammar schools in the Veneto.

A work which may have reflected this fresh interest was an orthographical manual composed by Vittorino da Feltre, perhaps while he was in Padua, between 1396 and 1415. The small tract bears all the marks of being written for his own use in elementary instruction, either when he was a *repetitor* for another in Padua or when he held his own private school there. He presented his material in a way that would be most easily absorbed by a class of boys. The rules are given clearly, concisely and with as few exceptions as possible and driven home with the old mnemonic technique of jingle-jangle verses, which were probably chanted out aloud in chorus. He gave in digest form the precepts of the authorities, principal among whom was Priscian, who is repeatedly quoted, followed by the medieval grammarians, Isidore, Uguccione, Smaragdo, Alexander of Villa Dei, and Eberhard of Béthune. Vittorino may have appropriated some of these views at second hand, since his citations are not always accurate. The manual ends with a section on punctuation, demonstrating the importance of this aspect of orthography for spoken as well as written Latin. Throughout, there is no reference to Greek (which Vittorino learnt at Venice under Guarino from 1415).

Sabbadini believed that Vittorino imitated the work of the Veronese master, as regards the form of the manual, and he (Sabbadini) ingeniously (though not quite convincingly) detected an echo of Giovanni Conversino's teaching in the chapter on geminations. However, Sabbadini overlooked the similarity of the work to Barzizza's first version of *De Orthographia* for use by younger pupils. Both men were schoolmasters and knew each other in Padua; it would be surprising had they not discussed orthographical problems. Barzizza's approach, at least from the evidence of the two tracts, was more sophisticated being more systematic in its presentation, more subtle in its appraisal on conflicting authorities, and more far-reaching and thorough in its use of authorities.

Perhaps contemporaneous with Barzizza's first *De Orthographia* was the 'brief

and useful orthography' composed in Venice by another *grammaticus*, Cristoforo Scarpa da Parma,[50] who had close connexions with Padua and was a friend of Barzizza. The work adopted both the expository and the lexicographical approach and gave particular attention to the difficulties raised by aspirants, especially the classic battle of 'mihi', versus 'michi', in which he agreed with Barzizza in following the former. Cristoforo is today almost entirely forgotten, but to Guarino, who met him in Padua, he seemed an exceptionally able grammarian, 'alter aetatis nostrae Priscianus'.[51] Guarino himself, as we saw, made his contribution to this 'Paduan school' in his work on diphthongs, which influenced Barzizza's. During Guarino's stay in Padua in 1416, the two men must have discussed a variety of orthographical questions, since, from time to time, Barzizza acknowledged his debt to his friend, for example when dealing with Greek and Latin aspirants: 'de quibus certior factus fui a Guarino Veronensi Emanualis Chrisolae discupulo magni quidem ingenij ac in utroque lingua viro egregie docto'.[52]

Orthography received close attention from this group of masters which revolved around Padua and Venice in the second decade of the fifteenth century. Barzizza's own works on the subject were part of those wider investigations being undertaken by Guarino, Chrysoloras, Vittorino, Cristoforo Scarpa da Parma, the Veronese master, and perhaps others, as well as being the outcome of his teaching over several years and his own study of ancient and medieval grammars. Also, they belonged to a general current of humanist interest in the nature of the Latin language, a current which had its principal source in Florence. Coluccio Salutati's views on orthography may have been known to Barzizza while he was in Pavia and the latter would have been made familiar with the more recent Florentine debates through Guarino, who stayed in Florence from 1410 to 1414, and also, perhaps, through Francesco Barbaro, who stayed in Padua in 1416, not long after he had returned from Florence, where he had met humanist friends.[53]

Orthographical problems engaged the Florentine humanists from the late fourteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries, although different aspects were high-lighted at different times.[54] Their interest in the subject was, at times, almost intense. Their concern to establish an orthographical standard even became heated. First, there was the 'vos' versus 'tu' controversy which Salutati inherited from Petrarch. Then, there was the long struggle to revive the two diphthongs, 'ae' and 'oe', which the medieval centuries had lost. Salutati, again, was perhaps the first to draw attention to this, although the question was not fully examined until Niccoli composed his opuscule on orthography and Guarino and Barzizza produced their studies on diphthongs. Barzizza derived a good deal from Guarino's work, but the admiration was mutual; Guarino used his friend's conclusions as ammunition in his diatribe against Niccoli. Furthermore, the study of phonetics was brought to the fore: was not pronunciation closely related to 'eloquentia', and were they not both dependent upon correct spelling and prosody, especially geminations, mutations, aspirants, and accents? Above all, there were the celebrated debates over 'ch',

exemplified by 'mihi' versus 'michi' and 'nihil' versus 'nichil', and over 'quom' versus 'cum'. Sabbadini believed that Barzizza was the first to argue convincingly for 'mihi' and 'cum', spellings which were adopted by most humanists–but not all. Bruni put up fierce opposition.

It might seem stretched and unconvincing to present such apparently pedantic debates in terms of impassioned conflict, but it was, indeed, in that way that leading humanists presented their arguments. Specific differences tend, perhaps, to arouse much heat among those who share a general ideal. These particular matters were hurdles to be crossed in the quest for the correct literary standards and forms of antiquity and, as Professor Gombrich has shown, these needling grammatical questions can throw valuable light on the history of early Renaissance architecture.[55] These debates also tell us something about Barzizza himself. He never entered the forum; he was not given to controversy or outspokenness. Rather, he treated the difficult questions in passing and, yet, it was the conclusions he had quietly and firmly reached which gained the widest and most lasting acceptance. In this, as in other respects, he was really a much larger figure in early humanism than is generally thought.

We will now turn to his treatment of the other three parts of grammar: prosody, etymology, and syntax.

(b) *Prosody*

Barzizza must have included prosody (the science of quantity, accent, and versification) in his ocurse on grammar, but more than that there is very little that one can say. It is possible that an anonymous, short work on poetic metre (*De Pedibus Carminum*), now in the Laurenziana Library in Florence, was by Barzizza, on the vague grounds that, in the manuscript book, it follows a copy of one of Barzizza's letters.[56] There is a slightly stronger case for accepting as Barzizza's a treatise on rhythm, since it is included in a codex which is made up of the first version of Barzizza's *De Orthographia* and one of his studies on punctuation. As the opening sentence suggests, the work on rhythm was in some way supplementary to another text, perhaps the popular section on the subject in Alexander of Villa Dei's *Doctrinale*, which was used as a major text on prosody by Guarino at Ferrara.[57]

(c) *Etymology:* 'scientia de vera dictionum significatione'

Barzizza seems to have understood 'the true meaning of words' at two levels; the elementary, direct translation into the *volgare*, and the higher science, involving a study of words through their derivations, their opposites, and their synonyms. He wrote several lexical works, which dealt with one or other of these approaches, but his most comprehensive study of etymology was, undoubtedly, the *Vocabularium Breve*.

Martellotti, without stating his reasons, tentatively gives 1417-18 as the date for the composition of the *Vocabularium Breve*, but I have found no internal or

external evidence for any dates.[58] The title is a little misleading:

Vocabularium breve . . . in quo continentur omnia genera vocabulorum quae in usu frequenti et quotidiana consuetudine versantur. Incipiens a rebus divinis ad res coelestes, aereas, maritimas, terrestres, inanimatas ac animatas.

In fact, the work is not quite 'brief', coming to sixty-two pages in the Venetian edition of 1545, and, although the words are said to be 'in common and daily use', only about half could be so called: the long lists of different types of buildings, farming implements, household articles and furniture, cooking utensils, riding equipment, clothes, shoes and parts of the human body. The other half contained rather technical and uncommon nouns: the names of over fifty species of birds, about forty kinds of trees, about thirty shrubs and herbs, thirty 'silvestrian animals' and so on. Divided into those categories which he gives in the title, the *Vocabularium* was both a dictionary for students learning Latin and a useful work of reference; the value of the words for the student of Latin poetry, Pliny's *Natural History*, or the letters of Cicero and Seneca is clear. The *Vocabularium* was, in fact, an early example of that note-book of categories which was to become so popular in later humanist pedagogy.[59]

The *Vocabularium*, however, was not just a dictionary, but a lengthy illustration of etymological principles. In his introduction, he lists eight categories of derivation:

quaedam ex causa sive ex officio nomina sunt sortita, ut seger a segregando. Quaedam ex origine, ut homo ab humo. Quaedam ex contrariis, ut lucus a luce. Quaedam ex formatione, ut ab dativo prudenti prudentia. Quaedam ex vocibus, ut turtur et taratantara. Quaedam a graecis orta, ut domus a domate greco, quod est tectum latine. Quaedam ex nominibus urbium vel locorum, ut a thebis thebanus, et a sylva sylvanus. Quaedam a fluminibus, ut a tyberi tyberius . . . .

For each word, Barzizza gave the gender, the *volgare* translation, the derivation and, usually, an example of its use. Where doubt or controversy existed over the derivation, he generally cited at least one authority, drawing on both the 'modern' lexicographers, such as Papias, and Balbi, and the ancients, especially Servius.

Some doubts have been raised as to whether the translations into the vernacular were Barzizza's or were added later. Azzoni has used internal evidence to show that Barzizza did write them, but perhaps corroboration of this can be found both in the teaching methods of the Italian grammar schools, in which explanation through the vernacular was probably not uncommon, and, more particularly, in other works by Barzizza.[60] Occasionally in his orthographical treatise, Barzizza used *volgare* definitions and there survive two separate Latin-*volgare* wordlists, one in Padua and the other in Naples.[61]

The first part of the Paduan dictionary (fols. 23r-30r) and the Naples dictionary can be considered together. They are simply vocabularies of Latin words with *volgare* translations, resembling the list of words in the *Vocabularium Breve* which

deals with words of everyday usage. Unlike the *Vocabularium*, however, there is no discussion of the derivation of words, which may suggest that the Latin-*volgare* dictionary was intended for beginners, who were attempting to master a reasonable, working knowledge of Latin nouns. The second part of the Paduan lexicon (fols. 35r-67r) is in the same hand as the first, but its intention is different. Here, Barzizza deals with those Latin words which sound alike or look alike, or words which are slightly different in meaning from one another or common words which cause difficulty. Again, Barzizza gives definitions in the vernacular, as well as mnemonic verses to aid the student; for example,

> Liber-bri codex et durus in arbore cortex
> Liber-eri bacus, nulloque ligamine natus
> factus de servo liber libertus habetur
> Libertinus erit liberto a patre creatus.

There are catchy lines to help the student to remember the four meanings of 'vir', the five different senses of 'consto', the differences between 'affinis', 'agnatus' and 'cognatus', and so on.

The method used in this part of the Paduan lexicon, the learning of Latin vocabulary through 'differentiae' and 'sinonima', seems to have been an important feature of Barzizza's teaching of both grammar and rhetoric. In the manuscript book containing the *Brescia Orthography* there is a lexicon, also in the hand of Leonardo da Trento, which is an extensive list of the differences between words of similar meanings.[62] This, too, may represent notes taken from Barzizza's classes. Very probably Barzizza made a collection of synonyms taken from the works of Cicero (*Sinonima Ciceronis*). The authorship of the *Sinonima Ciceronis* is not certain, but copyists have nearly always included it with grammatical or rhetorical works by Barzizza. Sonkowsky stated categorically that Barzizza 'made a collection of the "Sinonima Ciceronis"' and Martellotti, though more cautious, was inclined to accept that Barzizza was the author of this particular collection.[63] Later fifteenth-century humanists, at any rate, were in no doubt; Albrecht von Eyb, for example, used this list of synonyms, together with a similar work by Stefano Fieschi, for his collection 'ex auctoribus Gasparino Barzizio Pergamensi et Stephano Flisco Soncinensi'.[64]

The *Sinonima Ciceronis* is designed, from the outset, to assist the student of rhetoric to increase his vocabulary and to improve his powers of expression: 'collegi ea que pluribus modis dicerentur quo uberior promptiorque esset oratio'.[65] This alphabetical reference manual was both an aid to the student's memory and a means of seeing quickly which words were best suited to nuances in meaning. Usually five or six synonyms are grouped together and, sometimes, up to ten or twelve. References to particular works of Cicero, however, are not given.

In one manuscript book (Padua B.U., 534) the *Sinonima Ciceronis* (fols. 1-21r) are followed by a short lexicon of words (fols. 21r-22r), half of which praise and

half vituperate someone ('aurea dicta ad laudem vel ad vituperationem alicuius'). Here, Barzizza (?) was reviving the popular exercises in the ancient schools of rhetoric, in which eulogy and vituperation were standard forms to be used in the 'causa demonstrativa'.

Belonging both to etymology and to the second aspect of grammar, the *studia litterarum*, were various short lexicons by Barzizza explaining technical terms found in Roman antiquity. First, there was a glossary on the meaning of ancient abbreviations (*Significatio Literarum Antiquarum et Breviature Antique*). Four known manuscripts exist of this work, the fullest of which is in Naples.[66] In the Neapolitan manuscript, the purpose of the glossary is stated: 'studium necessarium quod partim pro voluntate cuiusque fit partim pro usu publico et observatione communi'. The ancient notaries in the Senate, Barzizza continued, used abbreviations so that they could understand words quickly and, by general consensus, certain words and names were noted by their first letters only and one or two single letters were used in signifying first names, public laws, records of *pontifices* and books of civil law. Then there follows a list of abbreviations with their meanings (the order differs in the Neapolitan manuscript from that in the other three), which include proper names (L. for Lucius, M. for Marius, etc.), public offices ('Eq.R.' for 'eques romanus'; 'p.c.' for 'patres conscripti', etc.), dating, money, and well-known phrases ('ab u.c.' for 'ab urbe condita'; 'D.M.' for dijs manibus', etc.).

Barzizza may have been able to take these abbreviations from an earlier glossary, although I have not been able to find one of this exact type which he could have used. Alternatively, he could have made the compilation from his own reading and there is a hint that this might have been the case when he remarks that such abbreviations are to be found in various ancient writings: 'monumentis plurimis et in historiarum libris sacrisque publicis reperiuntur'. The 'monuments' may have been epigraphical as well as literary. We saw in his *De Orthographia* that he studied the linguistic usage of the ancients partly from epigraphs and coins. It is difficult to know which epigraphs he could have seen; perhaps they included the pseudo-Livy epitaph discovered in Padua in the early fourteenth century. If so, Barzizza has a place in that early humanist movement to use the archaeological remains of Roman antiquity.[67]

Clearly linked in purpose to the above work was a glossary on the thirty-two different magistracies found in Roman histories, which was edited by A. Azzoni. This *Epilogus de Magistratibus Romanis* was both a work of etymology, giving the derivations of a specialized vocabulary, and an historical handbook, a reference work for the student. His concise, technical definitions may indicate that he had worked through the Roman histories, especially Livy, compiling a comprehensive list of magistracies. Also, Barzizza may have known the glossary on Roman magistracies by Sicco Polenton which appears at the end of Book 3 of the *Scriptorium Illustrium Latinae Linguae Libri 18*, composed in Padua in the early

fifteenth century.[68]

Like his Latin-*volgare* dictionaries, Barzizza's glossaries, and those other humanist works mentioned, were rather makeshift manuals; fuller treatment of the subject came a generation later, when humanists were becoming more specialized in their interests and methods, in the form of the *De Magistratibus Sacerdotiisque Romanorum* by Lucio Fenestella (Andrea Fiocco).[69] Also, later copyists often included two or more of the early glossaries together.[70]

Barzizza's interest in the history, geography, and social customs of the ancient world is further attested by two remnants of what must have been fuller notes. The first is a list of the provinces of 'Italia', with brief geographical descriptions of the main towns in each, and survives in two manuscripts, one of which, the Ambrosian, has the title: 'Excerpta ex quodam libro domino olim Gasparini de pergamo viri doctissimi atque clarissimi de finibus Italiae'.[71] This is ambiguous in that the 'de finibus Italiae' could have been owned and not written by Barzizza, but, if that is so, I have been unable to find its author. The Ambrosian manuscript is part of a codex written in the hand of Michele Pizolpasso, the Milanese humanist, in 1438, containing his work, *De Situ Mediolani*. Again, this is part of the humanist, Petrarchan tradition of studying the historical geography of the ancient world and reconstructing its setting (see, for example, the *Africa* VI. 839-80; VIII. 856-953), a tradition which includes the *Italia illustrata* of Flavio Biondo. Similarly, the attempt to know Greek and Roman antiquity in all its aspects is suggested by a short list of ancient wines, painters, clothes, and games, notes which probably came from the Paduan school of Barzizza.[72]

All these various lexicographical studies have certain features in common. Each represented a means, or a combination of means, for establishing 'the true meaning of words'. Sometimes this involved an elementary translation of Latin words into the vernacular or, at a more advanced level, the study of the roots of those words. Again, 'etimologia' might deal with the clarification of the meaning of words by reference to synonyms or by defining the differences between words of nearly identical meaning or by showing the differences between homonyms. Sometimes, it involved the straightforward definition of uncommon words, technical terms and abbreviations.

One part of Barzizza's course of studies, however, was usually connected with the other parts. So it was with etymology. The *vocabularia* were almost certainly intended as aids to understanding Roman literature, as well as helping grammar. Also, they were, at times, quite clearly intended for students of rhetoric, particularly the works on synonyms and 'differences'. They were the mechanical tools which had to be mastered in the craft of *dictamen*; they were part of that groundwork on which good expression would eventually flourish. The etymological works also provide early evidence of the attempts made by humanists to supply specialized notes for reference; they represent the beginnings of that spate of

'excerpta', 'epilogi', and 'collecta', which were to become so popular in the schools.[73] Finally, the lexicons add up to evidence of Barzizza's whole approach to the ancient world, which was to get inside it, to master its terminology—political, social, geographical, historical—to make it come alive, literally to 'revive' antiquity.

(d) *Syntax*

This fourth part of grammar, 'scientia de constructione', was in many ways the measure of a student's firm comprehension of the Latin language, since it involved both a knowledge of its structure and an ability to adapt that knowledge to the practice of prose composition. It required two techniques: analysis and expression. Strictly speaking, the first appertained to grammar and the second to rhetoric.

For Barzizza's teaching of the rules of syntax no evidence survives, although we may assume that he followed the standard practice in the schools in using at least Books 16-18 of Priscian's *Institutes*, which were given over to the question of how to employ a proper word order. In contrast, there is a good deal of evidence for the methods which Barzizza used to exercise his pupils in prose composition. These techniques will be examined later, in the chapter on rhetoric.