MHRA TEXTS AND DISSERTATIONS

VOLUME 10

The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza

With Special Reference to his Place in Paduan Humanism

R. G. G. MERCER

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

THE TEACHING OF GASPARINO BARZIZZA

With Special Reference to his Place in Paduan Humanism

R. G. G. MERCER

LONDON
THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
1979

TO CAROLINE

This PDF scan of this work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2024

ISBN 978-1-83954-647-1
doi:10.59860/td.b166b4a

Published by

The Modern Humanities Research Association

Honorary Treasurer, MHRA

KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND
LONDON WC2R 2LS
ENGLAND

ISBN 0 900547 51 0

© The Modern Humanities Research Association 1979

This publication is copyright under the Berne Convention and the International Copyright Convention. All rights reserved. Apart from any copying under the UK Copyright Act 1956, part I, section 7, whereby a single copy of an article may be supplied, under certain conditions, for the purpose of research or private study, by a library of a class prescribed by the UK Board of Trade Regulations (Statutory Instruments, 1957, No. 868), no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form without the prior permission of the copyright owners. Permission is not required to copy abstracts of papers or articles on condition that a full reference to the source is shown.

Multiple copying of the contents of the publication without permission is always illegal.

Printed in England by
W. S. MANEY & SON LIMITED
HUDSON ROAD LEEDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE vii

ABBREVIATIONS viii

INTRODUCTION 1

I THE FOUNDATIONS OF PADUAN HUMANISM 7

The Grammar Schools and the University *c.*1200-*c.*1360
(a) Literacy and Civic Demands
(b) Grammar, Rhetoric, and University Studies

Literary Developments in the Fourteenth Century
(a) The Emergence of Humanist Private Schools in the Later Fourteenth Century
(b) The Impact of Petrarchan Humanism in Padua
(c) Courtly Learning in Padua

II THE CAREER OF GASPARINO BARZIZZA UNTIL 1407 24

(a) Barzizza's Training at the University of Pavia
(b) Humanism in the Visconti Court

III THE FORMS OF BARZIZZA'S TEACHING IN PADUA 37

Barzizza's 'Official' Teaching
(a) 'Lectio'
(b) 'Disputatio' and 'Questiones Terminandi'

Barzizza's 'Unofficial' Teaching
(a) The 'Voluntary' Lectures
(b) Barzizza's Household

Contents (continued)

IV BARZIZZA'S COURSE ON GRAMMAR: 'RECTE SCRIBENDI ET RECTE LOQUENDI SCIENTIA' 47

- (a) Orthography
  - (1) Doctrine
  - (2) Linguistic Form
  - (3) Euphony; Diphthongs; Punctuation; Orthographical Studies in the Veneto and Florence
- (b) Prosody
- (c) Etymology
- (d) Syntax

V BARZIZZA'S COURSE ON GRAMMAR: 'STUDIA LITTERARUM 70

- (a) 'Emendatio'
- (b) 'Lectio'
- (c) 'Expositio'
- (d) 'Iudicium'

VI BARZIZZA'S COURSE ON RHETORIC 91

- (a) The Theory of Rhetoric
- (b) Imitation
- (c) The Practice of Rhetoric

VII BARZIZZA'S HOUSEHOLD SCHOOL IN PADUA 106

VIII THE PLACE OF BARZIZZA'S SCHOOL IN PADUA AND THE VENETO 118

- (a) Grammar, Rhetoric, and Other Disciplines
- (b) Grammar and Rhetoric in the Studium after Barzizza
- (c) Barzizza and the Veneto Schools

IX BARZIZZA'S LAST YEARS, 1421-1430 132

NOTES AND REFERENCES 138

BIBLIOGRAPHY 152

INDEX 163

PREFACE

Most of the literary sources for this work have not been used before by historians and thus it is not so much a re-interpretation of what is already known as an interpretation, for the first time, of fresh material. My major task has been to impose a pattern upon a large body of various documents which are scattered in numerous libraries. One or two of Barzizza's works have been published and even edited, but they have not been seen in relation to the rest of his teaching or to developments in the Italian schools. At the same time, I am obliged to acknowledge my enormous debt to Remigio Sabbadini, whose life-long researches into the textual discoveries of humanists are still, after two generations, a mine of information.

My attempt to assemble and make sense of the sources of Barzizza's teaching does bring with it three possible weaknesses. First, because I try to chart as much unknown territory as possible, extensive quotation from the sources has not been possible within the limits of the thesis, and, for the time being, I thought it better to interpret rather than edit some of the material, even though I often had access to numerous manuscript copies of a work. Secondly, the sources are mostly literary. which has meant that my investigations into university records in Padua and Pavia have been limited to published material, but, since this is fairly full for the period and since I am primarily concerned with Barzizza's teaching, I felt the limitation was justified. Thirdly, as this is largely an interpretation of what is new, it may have some of the weaknesses of the raw pioneer rather than the well established colonial.

Wherever possible, the names of persons have been rendered in Italian. Occasionally the obscurity of a name has dictated that it be left in the Latin form in which it is found. In reproducing selections from the sources no attempt has been made to change spelling, punctuation, or form, in the hope that ambiguity may be eliminated or, at least, left intact.

This work was presented in 1977 as a D.Phil. thesis to the Faculty of Modern History in the University of Oxford. In converting the thesis into a book only minor amendments, concerning form rather than substance, have been made.

I am especially grateful to Professor C. Grayson who has given me guidance and encouragement from the beginning of my research until the preparation of this book and who has been always unstintingly generous with his time and experience. I am indebted to Mr David Robey for his many helpful observations on Italian humanism. Dr George Holmes kindly gave me assistance in the early stages and I am fortunate to have had expert criticisms from Dr P. J. Jones and Dr J. K. Hyde. I wish to thank St John's College, Oxford, for their financial assistance and the many librarians in Italy for their kind co-operation and interest.

I owe a very great debt to my patient and understanding wife.

ABBREVIATIONS

Acta graduum	*Acta graduum academicorum gymnasii Patavini ab anno MCCCCVI ad annum MCCCCL*, curantibus C. Zonta et I. Brotto (Padua, 1922).
Bertalot	L. Bertalot, 'Die älteste Briefsammlung des Gasparino Barzizza', *Beiträge zur Forschung*, n.s. II (1929), 39-84 (the text of fifty-five letters is given on pp. 57-82).
Cod. dipl. Univ. Pavia	*Codice diplomatico dell' Università di Pavia*, ed. R. Maiocchi, 2 vols (Pavia, 1905-15).
Colombo	C. Colombo, 'Gasparino Barzizza a Padova: nuovi ragguagli da lettere inedite', *Quaderni per la storia dell' Università di Padova*, 2 (1969), 1-27 (the text of nine letters is given on pp. 17-27).
DBI	*Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana fondata da Giovanni Treccani, Rome), Vol. I (1960) and following.
Furietti	*Gasparini Barzizii Bergomatis et Guiniforti Filii Opera*, ed. J. A. Furietti, 2 parts (Rome, 1723).
Gloria I	*Monumenti della Università di Padova (1222-1318)*, ed. A. Gloria (Venice, 1884).
Gloria II, 1-2	*Monumenti della Università di Padova (1318-1405)*, ed. A. Gloria, 2 vols (Padua, 1888).
Iannellius	C. Iannellius, *Catalogus Bibliothecae Latinae veteris et classicae manuscriptae quae in Regio Neapolitano Museo Borbonico adservatur* (Naples, 1827).
Malagola	*Statuti delle Università e dei Collegi dello Studio Bolognese*, ed. C. Malagola (Bologna, 1888).

INTRODUCTION

Since the work of Jacob Burckhardt in the mid-nineteenth century the approach of scholars to the subject of the Italian Renaissance has undergone two broad modifications. First, Burckhardt's belief that the whole civilization of Italy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was conditioned by a spirit which was quite different from the spirit of the Middle Ages is no longer accepted generally. During the past forty years or so Burckhardt's assumption that the Renaissance in Italy, which he associated with the beginnings of 'modern' Europe, can be nicely cut off from the intellectual heritage of previous centuries has been questioned and largely abandoned. P. O. Kristeller, Helene Wieruszowski, and many others have come to regard the Renaissance as having evolved from the culture of earlier centuries in Italy, particularly that of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The second modification is a more recent one. It is the attempt to avoid supposing that the classic features of humanism are to be found in Florence in the late fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries. There has been a growing tendency, particularly among Italian historians, to examine closely the work of humanists outside Florence in order to add the widest geographical dimensions to the cultural history of this period and to show the various pursuits which all loosely come under the term humanism. Linked with this exploration out of Florence are the beginnings of an interest in the teaching of literary subjects in the Italian schools and universities, although important, but largely isolated work was done on this matter by G. Manacorda early this century. After all, humanists had to learn their literary skills. Schools not only reflect a society but also help to form it. It is curious, therefore, that historians have not spent more time looking at the educational foundations which supported for so long such an impressive literary, as well as an artistic and political superstructure.

In regard to these general questions, the teaching of Gasparino Barzizza has a considerable importance. First, it is a way into the Italian schools and universities of the period. Early in his career he was a member of the arts faculty in the University of Pavia, a master of grammar in an elementary school in Bergamo, and then a private tutor in Venice. Between 1407 and 1421 he stayed in Padua, where he lectured in the University as well as running a private grammar school, and it was in Padua that his teaching became fully developed and influential. From 1421 until his death in 1430 he taught in Milan and Pavia, and for a short time in Bologna. He takes us, as it were, through a good cross section of the educational system in northern Italy. Secondly, his teaching throws some light on the evolutionary theory of Renaissance culture, if we can call it that. The general curriculum which he followed in teaching grammar and rhetoric was essentially that which had been used in Italian schools throughout the medieval centuries. He did not change it; he added to it, adapted and modified it. He widened the range of

classical authors to be studied. He examined ancient texts with a new precision, depth and intensity. In grammar he emphasized the strict adherence to classical syntax and spelling. In rhetoric he encouraged a close attention to classical style in the composition of speeches and letters and he opened out the entire Ciceronian corpus of rhetorical works for study as well as looking at Quintilian and other ancient rhetoricians for comparison. In other words, while the form of his teaching was traditional, there was a great deal more substance than before, and this was largely because of Barzizza's contacts with humanists outside the schools. He adapted the results of humanist enquiries, particularly the recovery of classical texts, to a standard teaching pattern.

There are more particular reasons for examining Barzizza's teaching. From his school, as from the schools of his friends, Vittorino da Feltre and Guarino da Verona, came some of the gifted humanists of the middle decades of the fifteenth century and the three men share much of the responsibility for introducing a precise programme of humanist education into Western Europe. Barzizza had a special importance in Padua and the Veneto. His teaching and his household attracted considerable interest within the university. His school was favoured by the Venetian state and several important Venetian aristocrats were taught by him, thus reflecting the interest of the Venetian government in training good latinists for secretarial and administrative duties. His household became a centre for book-collecting, copying, and exchange in north-east Italy. There is evidence also that his teaching influenced the standard of literary instruction in grammar schools in many of the smaller towns in the Veneto. As probably the leading and most passionate Ciceronian scholar of the day, Barzizza helped to form the heavily rhetorical and Latin phase of Italian humanism, while he, perhaps more than anyone, may be said to have given that distinct bent towards linguistic scholarship which was to characterize the work of Paduan humanists during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Barzizza deserves to be placed on an equal footing with Vittorino and Guarino as one of the great schoolmasters of the early Renaissance. That this recognition has never quite been given him is largely due to the fact that his works have not yet been looked at as a whole and that some of his most important writings have been either ignored or only partly studied.

While I follow Barzizza through his life, the book is not so much a conventional biography as a study of the nature and development of his teaching and its place in the north Italian schools of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. I rely mainly on Barzizza's own works, but also on what is known of the practices in Italian schools and universities in general at that time.

Barzizza's long life affords us an unusually good insight into the world of early Italian humanism. His literary career spanned two generations: as a young man he explored antiquity in the shadow of Petrarch, along with other early humanists with whom he can be associated (Antonio Loschi, Uberto Decembrio, Coluccio Salutati, Niccolò Niccoli); in middle age and old age he taught and guided some of

the new generation of *literati* (Francesco Filelfo, Panormita, Pier Candido Decembrio, Francesco Barbaro, Leon Battista Alberti). He was familiar with every level and development of literary teaching in north Italy. A product of traditional instruction in grammar and rhetoric, he was to play an important part in the new movement to open out the course, to elevate the study of letters and to adapt a conventional curriculum to humanist pursuits. In short, he helped to create those conditions in which Italian schools were to be the foremost centres of classical education in the fifteenth century.

* * *

In examining the teaching of Barzizza we shall find a blending, for the first time, of two literary traditions in late medieval Italy. One was the instruction in grammar and rhetoric which had been given in the elementary schools and universities since at least the early thirteenth century, a tradition which, in a sense, could be called scholastic. The other tradition, which gained weight in the later fourteenth century, was what we can conveniently call humanist and involved a searching reappraisal of the language, literature, and culture of classical antiquity. Although these two traditions can usefully be kept separate for purposes of discussion, they did touch upon each other at certain vital points. First, the humanists had, of course, received their fundamental training in classical letters in the schools so that their literary activity presupposed, depended upon and, to some extent, was limited by what and how they had been taught, even though the direction and form of their work were shaped by the fashionable and more informal scholarship of the courts, chanceries, and aristocratic households. Secondly, the humanist could be described as merely the better classical scholar. His literary explorations might be far more thorough than the schoolmaster's and his use of classical learning more exciting, but, in essence, he was dealing with the same kind of material as the master of grammar and rhetoric. Humanist enquiries, therefore, could have an important bearing on the nature and range of school teaching. The schoolmaster who was also familiar with the new literary movement could shape his instruction in accordance with humanist tastes, giving a new depth and direction to his course. The relationship between the schools and humanism raises some teasing questions: can exact links be found between the two; did an improvement in literary instruction play an important part in the spread of humanist learning; did the type of instruction given mould the enquiries of the *literati* after they had left the schoolroom?

The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza provides some answers to the first question and throws some light on the other two. He was almost certainly the first schoolmaster to adapt humanist scholarship to the traditional education in letters. It is the first object of this study to show how he managed to do this and to suggest that the teaching framework of the medieval Italian schools and universities could easily accommodate the new intellectual horizons and the more thorough-going

appreciation of classical letters. My second and wider purpose is to modify the received picture of Italian humanism. Florentine humanism has received a good deal of attention from historians, but there is still a need to look more closely at humanism elsewhere in Italy, if only to help us form a more balanced assessment of Florentine achievements. Barzizza's career takes us into the world of the schools, which is not yet as fully explored as that of the Italian courts and civic chanceries. There might even be said to be a tendency to regard humanists and teaching masters as standing in very different and, perhaps, opposed camps. 'Universities, at least in Italy, were above all places of professional study, and their professors were long the enemies of humanism.' Thus Rashdall explained his almost total exclusion of humanism from his study of the medieval Italian universities.[1] More recently R. R. Bolgar saw humanism in the universities as, generally speaking, an unstable and uninfluential phenomenon in fifteenth-century Italy.[2] In many important respects it is hard to dispute the view that the universities did not encourage humanist activities, but the matter is far from closed.

It is true that the Italian universities were hardly associated either with the formative stages in the revival of antiquity or with its outstanding achievements. They did not encourage the discovery of classical manuscripts nor did they exhibit any of the other salient features which we tend to associate with the Italian Renaissance. The political and moral debates, cast in the language of ancient philosophies, were mainly conducted in private households and courtly circles. The splendid collections of ancient writings and the application of classical forms and motifs in architecture and the visual arts took place independently of the *studia generalia*. Moreover, it was precisely in those centres where the revival of antiquity, in all its aspects, found its richest expression that the universities were undistinguished. In Florence the *studium* was small, comparatively new (founded in 1349) and beset by administrative and financial difficulties. In Rome the *studium urbis*, founded in 1303, had died out by the second half of the century and was not re-opened until 1431, while the *studium generale* of the Roman *curia* concerned itself almost exclusively with canon law and theology. The universities in neither city affected the flowering of classical learning, at least until the latter part of the fifteenth century.

The apparent lack of interest of the universities in humanist activities can be attributed, partly, to the history and nature of these institutions.[3] Most of the seventeen, or so, Italian *studia* founded from the early thirteenth to the mid-fifteenth centuries had a troubled history, suffering from a weakness in numbers, periodic closures, or long gaps in their existence. Plagues, war, and local conditions at times imperilled the long continuity in one place of an academic body. The great exceptions were the ancient foundations at Bologna and Padua which had a long and (sometimes only just) uninterrupted existence. Secondly, almost all the universities were concerned primarily with teaching law and, to a lesser extent, medicine. For that purpose were they established and fostered by communes and

princes, and the scheme of studies was formed accordingly. In terms of university teaching as a whole, therefore, the liberal arts were regarded merely as an elementary training, a preparation for those 'higher' disciplines. Thirdly, it is hardly surprising that the universities did not share in the exploratory activity of the early Renaissance given the very nature of these corporations. The *universitas* was a guild, a body which dealt with rights, privileges, discipline, and administration. It laid down the syllabus for each faculty and the conditions and procedure for graduation. As official corporations, the universities were not concerned with research nor with the support of wider cultural enterprises, but with the teaching and examination of a minimum body of knowledge necessary for the student to serve his academic apprenticeship and to acquire a qualification which would be widely recognized.

In a strict sense, therefore, the universities could not be important in the humanist movement, but if one looks at them in a wider and looser sense, as living centres of teaching and study, a rather different picture emerges. The evidence of official university records is limited and deceptive. Statutes, salary specifications, graduation lists and administrative documents are dry monuments and can never tell us a great deal about the quality of intellectual pursuits. The formal syllabuses laid down in the statutes prescribed only a minimum of texts which masters were required to expound and students learn. This did not mean that the community of scholars who happened to be members of a *universitas* were impervious to new ideas or methods. The intellectual vitality of a university, then as now, depended upon how the official texts were taught and what was expounded, learned, and discussed around and outside the statutory curriculum. From a study of Barzizza's school in early fifteenth-century Padua we will see that there was ample evidence of masters and scholars taking an active interest in the revival and use of ancient literary texts. Moreover, this extra-curricular learning did touch the mainstream of university teaching in grammar and rhetoric. Barzizza brought to his teaching of the syllabus his intense interest in the new humanist discoveries and his refined appreciation of classical literature and the moral or philosophical notions which it presupposed.

The effects of humanist learning are not registered in the university records in Padua, at least in the first half of the fifteenth century. From reading these documents alone one would think that little had changed: law and medicine still remained dominant; logic was still regarded as the most important of the liberal arts; grammar and rhetoric continued to be the elementary tools of learning. But a silent reform had taken place in Padua. The humanists had re-built the very basis of the arts course – grammar and rhetoric – and the reformed teaching of these subjects, both inside and outside the schoolrooms, was attracting the interest of members of all faculties. Gradually, in the course of the fifteenth century, humanist activity in the *studium* may have helped to shape the way in which the 'higher' subjects of law and medicine were studied, although this is a question which lies

outside the scope of this study.

The universities, therefore, did not initiate the revival of antiquity nor participate in its more memorable achievements, but in Padua, at least, university scholars did play a considerable part in humanist learning in that they re-worked the new learning into the traditional structures of thought and education. To grade this scholastic humanism as less important than humanism in Florence or the princely courts would not be a wholly valid comparison. Humanism in the schools was, as we shall see, different and, perhaps, *sui generis*, combining elements of both traditional teaching and classical enquiries outside the schools in a way that suggests that this brand of humanism, at least, was only a more elaborate stage in a long medieval tradition of classical studies.

There were many schoolmasters in the fifteenth century who formed this link between the schools and the humanist circles outside, among the most celebrated of whom were Guarino da Verona (1374-1460) and Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446). Both men have received close study, though neither has a modern biographer.[4] Gasparino Barzizza is as interesting a figure for many of the same reasons. He was well placed to be conversant with literary activity both inside and outside the schools. Until 1407 he was a member of the university arts faculty in Pavia, a master of grammar in Bergamo and a private tutor to the Barbaro family in Venice, while also being associated with humanists in the Visconti court. Between 1407 and 1421 he stayed in Padua, where he taught in the *studium* as well as running an elementary school, and it was there that his teaching became fully developed and influential, so that his Paduan years are biographically the most important. From 1421 until his death in 1430 he taught in Milan and, for a short time, in Bologna. He takes us, as it were, through a good cross-section of the educational system in Italy at that time. From the schools of Barzizza, Guarino, and Vittorino came many of the gifted humanists of the middle and later *quattrocento* and together they share much of the responsibility for introducing a precise programme of humanist education into Western Europe, but it was a programme which extended and modified traditional teaching rather than creating something new. In many ways they merely added to and polished what was already available in grammar schools and in the university arts course. They were 'high-brow' schoolmasters who, trained in the traditional mould, wanted to widen their literary range and improve their classical style. Sabbadini presented Guarino in this light and Woodward did similarly with Vittorino; and it is essentially how I will interpret Barzizza's work. Although aspects of Barzizza's teaching have been examined, this study is intended to assess his importance more fully and to add further weight to the view that humanism had its roots in the medieval tradition of literary teaching in the schools while, at the same time, introducing to that tradition changes in scope and emphasis.[5]

CHAPTER I

THE FOUNDATIONS OF PADUAN HUMANISM

Before Barzizza's teaching of grammar and rhetoric is discussed in detail, it is necessary to know the resources on which he was able to draw during his early career in Lombardy (see Chapter II) and when he came as a teacher to Padua. It was in Padua that his teaching flourished, partly because of his personal qualities as a teacher, but partly, also, on account of developments in Padua and the Veneto during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: developments in the schools, in courtly culture, and in informal scholarship. I shall attempt in the following pages to outline what these developments were.

In the first part the main features of literary teaching in Padua between *c.*1200 and *c.*1360 will be described. In both the elementary schools and in the university arts course the common characteristic of that teaching was the subordination of grammar and rhetoric to other needs, either to the needs of civic professions or, in the university, to the needs of law and medicine. Grammar and rhetoric were seen almost entirely as elementary or ancillary disciplines, never as literary courses in their own right. However, gradual changes in the fourteenth century, gaining momentum after *c.*1360, allowed greater scope in the teaching of these subjects, in the university course at least, making possible a widely based course in literary studies for their own sake, freed from the rather narrow dependence on other demands. In the second part of the chapter I shall attempt to deal with those changes in the period from *c.*1360 until 1406, the year in which Padua came under Venetian rule.

THE GRAMMAR SCHOOLS AND THE UNIVERSITY *c.*1200–*c.*1360

(a) *Literacy and Civic Demands*

Urban changes in the Veneto from the late twelfth century onwards greatly altered the nature of primary education. Commercial expansion, the emergence of larger political units, and the need for more elaborate administrative and judicial expertise in civic government not only necessitated more grammar schools to train professional people, but also determined, to a large extent, the kind of instruction which these schools were to provide. From the late thirteenth century the number of grammar schools steadily increased. At first they were private enterprises in the

hands of a master, generally a layman, who received fees from parents. During the fourteenth and well into the fifteenth centuries, we find that, in addition to these private schools, many towns in north-east Italy were induced by social and economic reasons to invest in a communal school, paying a master from public funds. These arrangements existed in Treviso and in the Trevigiana towns of Oderzo, Asolo, Conegliano, and Ceneda; in Verona, Torri, Vicenza, and Rovigo; and further north in Belluno, Capodistria, Udine, Cividale del Friuli, and San Daniele del Friuli.[1] In the more prosperous cities of Venice and Padua, where professional families could afford fees, the only grammar schools were the private ones until the middle of the fifteenth century; and of these there were many. It has been calculated that in Venice between 1300 and 1450 there were between forty and fifty masters holding schools at any given time, and in Padua, with about one fifth of Venice's population, there were probably about ten grammar schools at any one time.[2]

These preparatory schools were regarded as fitting objects of communal patriotism, of the private benefactions of citizens, or of the almsgiving of guilds and corporations. For example, several confraternities or *scuole* in Treviso employed masters such as Feltro, a doctor of grammar and rhetoric, who was paid by the Scuola di San Liberale to teach in a house of twenty-five poor scholars.[3] In Padua during the fourteenth century, several *collegia* for poor scholars were founded, one by the rather successful notary and professor of grammar, Lazaro Malrotondi da Conegliano, who in his last years became friendly with Barzizza. In his will of 1400 Lazaro stated that, were he to die without sons, he would found a college for as many scholars as could be fed and clothed from his patrimony, 'usque quo pervenerint ad tempora pubertatis, hoc est ad quartum decimum annum et non ultra'.[4]

The purpose of these grammar schools was to take boys from the age of about seven to fourteen up to the threshold of a professional training: notarial work, a good position in one of the guilds, or a course in the university leading to a legal or medical degree. These close, practical links between the grammar schools and the lay professions steadily affected the fortunes of the older ecclesiastical schools. The two centuries after *c.*1150 saw the church schools in Padua slide from a position of dominance over primary education to one of marginal importance. The clerical *magistri* were probably not felt to be sufficiently in tune with the daily affairs of business, whereas the lay schools clearly shaped grammar and rhetoric towards business techniques, especially letter-writing and the rudimentary principles of 'paper-work'. By the mid-fourteenth century, lay grammar schools in Padua seem to have taken over almost entirely from church schools and we may assume that, in most cases, even prospective clerics attended the same classes as young prospective business men. Some elementary teaching may have continued in the mendicant and monastic houses. A library inventory of 1396-97 for the Franciscan convent of St Antony contained some of the basic texts for elementary teaching: two copies of

the *Derivationes* of Hugutius, one Priscian, the *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* of Papias, the *De Inventione* of Cicero, and the *Ad Herennium*.[5] The Austin Friars of the Arena possessed one copy of Giovanni Balbi's *Catholicon*.[6] However, these inventories do not prove the existence of grammar schools. Indeed, the convents may have co-operated with the urban authorities in lending library facilities or in providing accommodation for schools run by lay masters with whom they had special contact.[7] In the thirteenth century the cathedral school, for its part, had ceased to give elementary instruction and, with the founding of the *studium generale* in the 1200s, the liberal arts course had been taken out of its hands.[8]

The ecclesiastical corporations, therefore, seem to have used the lay schools at elementary and university levels. The grammar schools had virtually become a lay monopoly since they served so well the needs of lay professions. This subordination to civic needs also showed itself in the activities of the schoolmasters, as well as in the form and emphasis which they gave to their instruction.

It was common for the *grammaticus* to be also a 'part-time' notary or associated in some way with civic administration. This was not only to help him make ends meet but also because the occupations which he straddled were thought to be naturally allied. Paduan masters of *grammatica* (which usually meant rhetoric also) frequently attached themselves as notaries to one of the city chanceries. In the bishop's chancery we find, for example, Master Arsegnino in the early decades of the thirteenth century, Master Domenico in the 1260s and, in the later fourteenth century, Lazaro da Conegliano. Other *grammatici* can be found in the *officium sigilli*, the judicial office of the Palazzo Communale: the famous Rolandino was a notary there, certainly throughout the 1230s and probably for much longer; his pupil, the same Domenico, worked there for a time in the 1260s; long service, from *c.*1361 to 1397, was given by Carletto Galmarelli da Villatora. The Carraresi lords also employed *grammatici* as their secretaries, such as Bono da Lucca and Giovanni Conversino da Ravenna.[9]

Besides spending some of his time in notarial business, a *grammaticus* was sometimes appointed by the commune or the *signore* to act as an ambassador or help conduct great affairs of the city, since he was considered the most *letterato* of the chancery officials. Thus, in Treviso communal masters were, by their very office, eligible for any of the judicial or administrative magistracies in the March, being denoted, on that account, *homines legales literati*.[10] Giovanni da Spilimbergo twice served as ambassador for Belluno between 1401 and 1413.[11] The most renowned masters were sometimes accorded formal public recognition. For instance, Rolandino had a tomb built for him in Padua, and Pietro da Muglio, at a civic ceremony in 1365, was given a prominent position next to the *signore*, Francesco da Carrara, in front of the Palazzo del Signore.[12]

The *grammatici*, therefore, played, and were expected to play, an active part in public affairs and, correspondingly, they taught the literary arts in accordance with

the needs of the businessman, the notary, and the lawyer. This was most clearly the case, at least, in the period from *c.*1200 to *c.*1340 when the *dictamen* schools were at their height in Padua and Bologna. These schools taught the art of rhetoric – written and, to a much lesser extent, spoken Latin according to formal rules – in a way that would serve the practical needs of law, administration, and commerce. Although their teaching was far from uniform, as several modern studies have shown, the *dictatores* had at least one didactic principle in common; the trimming down of literary instruction to what they thought was strictly necessary for prospective notaries and lawyers.[13] This trimming down was effected in several ways. First, only a bare minimum of classical Latin literature was read and taught compared with the impressively wide range of authors studied in the fifteenth-century humanist schools. Secondly, those branches of the *ars rhetorica* which most closely served professional needs were given prominence, namely epistolary composition and the drafting of every kind of official document. The art of letter-writing was often equated, in treatises on the subject, with the whole *ars rhetorica* so central was the place it held. Oratory, on the other hand, that branch of rhetoric which occupied the ancients more, was much less valued by the *dictatores*.[14] Moreover, they often summarized the classical manuals on rhetoric–the *De Inventione* of Cicero and the *Ad Herennium*–in order to give the student the essential points, so that he need not read the text for himself. The *Candelabrum* of Bene da Firenze, for example, was designed to enable the student to acquaint himself quickly with the main classifications of the *Ad Herennium*. Alternatively, the classical manuals were made easier through vernacular translations, such as the widely used translation of the *Ad Herennium* by Guidotto da Bologna and Bono Giamboni in the mid-thirteenth century. Also, we find short treatises in the *volgare* on the art of rhetoric and numerous examples of vernacular letters drafted on the classical frame.[15]

What becomes clear from looking at those thirteenth and early fourteenth-century masters of the *ars dictandi* was that they did not appear to be interested in the niceties of classical Latin style–though they did have a sense of adapting style to purpose–nor in making their pupils read at first hand the classical authors who dealt with the art of rhetoric. Rather, the object seems to have been to ensure that the bare bones of the art were grasped so that the student could formulate letters and construct speeches according to some general specifications.

This is an over-simplified summary of the *dictamen* schools and is made with the later achievements of the humanist masters in mind, but it will help us to assess Barzizza's teaching. It is also a view of the *dictatores* which is based almost entirely on evidence taken from Bologna. However, it is not unlikely that the Paduan schools of rhetoric followed those of Bologna, at least until the early fourteenth century. The evidence for Padua is slight for this period but what there is does suggest this. In 1226 or 1227 the new *studium* in Padua invited the celebrated Bolognese *dictator*, Boncompagno da Signa, to read publicly his *Rhetorica Antiqua*,

an honour which surely showed the approval of the Paduan masters for Boncompagno's teaching. One of Boncompagno's pupils and admirers, Rolandino, shaped the teaching of rhetoric in Padua during the middle decades of the century, leaving his pupils to continue and further his work for another generation. Moreover, it would be surprising if Padua had departed from the Bolognese model in this area when, in almost all other respects, it followed the practices of its parent body until at least the early fourteenth century.

(b) *Grammar, Rhetoric, and University Studies*

If the elementary schools in the Veneto were the products of civic needs then so too was the University of Padua which was regarded as essentially a training ground for civil and canon lawyers and, to a lesser extent, for medical doctors. A degree in law or medicine was almost always the goal of the Paduan student and, consequently, the liberal arts were in various ways used as auxiliary or preparatory disciplines; the arts course was a necessary stage to be passed before students went on to study the higher disciplines.[16] Not surprisingly, therefore, the importance given to a particular subject in the arts course depended on its usefulness to law and medicine and in this respect the university records indicate that what was most expected from a student with a degree in arts was that he should have reached a satisfactory standard in logic and the three branches of philosophy. Most of the arts course, which generally lasted between three and five years, was taken up with the study of these subjects. Natural philosophy was clearly related to medicine. Moral philosophy and metaphysics most usefully exercised the student's speculative powers. Logic retained its place in the medieval curriculum as the tool for all further disciplines; the syllogistic method was used for studying and being examined in philosophy, medicine, and law.

Compared with logic and philosophy, grammar and rhetoric were skimped at university, partly because they were not of such immediate relevance to medicine and law and partly, one may suppose, because the university authorities judged that they had been covered more or less adequately in the grammar schools so that a student's knowledge needed only to be 'rounded-off' at university. Also, the pressures on the students of time, expenses, and 'careerism' may have led to the devaluing of grammar and rhetoric in the same way as they forced music, arithmetic, and geometry out of the statutory arts course altogether.[17]

The university masters of grammar and rhetoric appear to have been closely linked with the elementary schoolmasters, indeed, the same man sometimes combined both functions. No distinction was made between the two in the signorial decree of 1338 or 1339 (confirming a decree of 1259) which laid down that masters of grammar would enjoy immunities and exemptions from personal exactions and dues.[18] The frequent references to *magistri puerorum* in the university notarial records suggest that they may be affiliated in some way to the university arts faculty, a recognition, perhaps, by the university of the part played

by the elementary masters in preparing the ground for the arts course.

What grammar was studied at university seems to have been narrowly based. The branch of grammar which comprised a study of ancient Latin literature, the *studia litterarum*, seems to have been neglected. Which texts were to be read for the *studia litterarum* were never specified in the statutes of the university, which probably left this matter purposely to the taste of the individual master. But before the second half of the fourteenth century there is no evidence in Padua of *grammatici* covering a wide range of authors or thoroughly expounding even a few. In theory, this undefined course allowed a master a large degree of free choice in regard to the texts he used and the method he adopted for expounding them. Later, we shall see how Barzizza was quick to realize the possibilities which this opened to him.

For the teaching of grammar in Padua until Barzizza's time there is virtually no evidence, as Dr Siraisi also found in her study of the *studium* up to 1360: 'no grammatical work written by any Paduan master between 1200 and 1350 seems to have survived, and no documents mentioning the names of required texts have so far turned up'. Since the universities in Italy followed very similar courses, one can fairly safely assume that, as in Bologna, Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae* was studied, either as the *Maior* (Books 1-16) or as the *Minor* (Books 17-18).[19] There is also some slight evidence to suggest that, as in Pavia in the late fourteenth century, Priscian was studied speculatively or from the point of view of the logic of language.[20] The library inventory of a Paduan professor of grammar, Benvenuto di Castellano, who lectured in *c.*1370, included Kilwardby's commentary on the *Minor* and another anonymous scholastic commentary on the *Maior*.[21] Also, professors of grammar were sometimes praised for their proficiency in logic, which they may have taught, as we gather from an epitaph (1342) for Bendedio Lemniacensis and a description of Pietro da Muglio by one of his pupils.[22] Of course, the lack of evidence for the teaching of grammar may in itself be an indication of the comparatively minor place which the subject seems to have held in the *studium* during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and, if so, this may help to explain the impact which Barzizza's teaching was to make, particularly that part of his teaching which defined grammar as a critical study of the ancient authors.

LITERARY DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

During the course of the fourteenth century, especially in the second half, certain gradual changes can be observed which gave an increasingly wide scope to the university teaching of grammar and rhetoric. They helped to make rhetoric less strictly tied to the requirements of the legal and administrative professions and grammar freer of the influence of logic, giving to both subjects a higher standing in the university. In 1400 grammar and rhetoric could be studied for their own sake to a much greater extent than had been the case a century earlier. These changes were

brought about by two broad currents which converged in the early fifteenth century: first, developments, both institutional and intellectual, in the *studium* as a whole; secondly, influences on literary teaching in the arts faculty from intellectual forces in Padua which lay outside the university. We will consider each in turn.

The developments within the *studium* during the fourteenth century can be best summarized, perhaps, as the rise of the University of Arts and Medicine *vis-à-vis* the University of Jurists. Over the whole period, from *c*.1200 to *c*.1400, the University of Arts and Medicine rose from almost complete subjection to the University of Jurists to a point at which it had gained an independent footing and, perhaps, had become the strongest arts faculty among the Italian *studia*. This evolution, to a large extent, made possible the introduction of changes in the teaching approach to grammar and rhetoric. It opened the way for humanism to be established in the university.

From the foundation of the *studium* until 1399, the *Universitas Artistarum et Medicorum* was under the administration and, to a large degree, the control of the *Universitas Juristarum*, which had the greater number of students, who were also, as a general rule, older than the Artists. Thus, the statutes of the Paduan Jurists in 1331 and the revised statutes of 1360 applied also to the Artists. In this, again, Padua was following the practice at Bologna. It was not until 1399, with the university reforms of Francesco da Carrara, that the Artists were freed from this dependence on the Jurists for their corporate regulations.[23] These reforms amounted to a formal recognition of demands from among the Artists themselves, who, for more than a century, had been moving towards independence. We find earlier, for example, signs of a corporate self-consciousness among the Artists, such as the literary occasions which they organized. In 1262 the Artists invited Rolandino to read publicly his *Cronica*. Like the earlier reading of Boncompagno's new work to the Jurists, Rolandino's reading was held in a church and surrounded by the same ceremonial forms.[24] The similarities are striking and at least tacit rivalry with the lawyers cannot be ruled out. The occasion demonstrated the Artists, as a group, supporting a literary enterprise, a chronicle of Padua for the years 1200 to 1262, which they felt came specially within their province. Such collective recognition of a literary work was seen again in 1315, when Albertino Mussato was solemnly crowned as poet, a ceremony which was almost certainly organized by the arts faculty.[25] Later in the century, the Paduan Artists again thought it fitting to honour officially, as a body, the most renowned *litteratus* of the day, Petrarch. At his death in 1374 his friend, the Austin friar Bonaventura da Perage, gave a funeral oration at Arquà in the presence of the rectors of the University, the students in arts and the *signore,* Francesco da Carrara.[26]

The self-consciousness of the arts faculty, which these occasions reflected and advanced, was deepened and made permanent, most of all, by another development within the Artists' University: the emergence in the fourteenth century of strong and renowned medical studies. The physicians had always been the senior Artists,

but the intellectual advances which they made, especially in the school of Pietro d'Abano in the early fourteenth century and in the schools of the Dondi family in the middle of the century, were to establish medicine as a powerful 'higher' discipline on equal terms with the Law Faculty. The rising reputation of the Paduan medical school probably carried the rest of the Arts Faculty with it.[27]

A third development within the *studium* as a whole affected the teaching of grammar and rhetoric more particularly. This was the change in the position of the *ars notaria*. Until well into the fourteenth century, as we saw earlier, notarial instruction came within the province of the schools of rhetoric. However, the emergence of a distinct notarial profession, reflecting, in turn, an increase in their work, demanded a more specialized training than could be covered by the *dictatores*. The art of epistolary composition did not embrace the whole range of official documents which needed to be drawn up; and the mastery of a complicated legal terminology, which the notary required, entailed a necessary alliance with the Law Faculty. Thus, by the middle years of the century, we find that the *ars notaria* had become a discipline in its own right, attached to the Law rather than to the Arts Faculty. From the statutes of 1331 we learn that there was a standard textbook on the subject, the *Summa* of Rolandino Passagieri, which all university booksellers (*stacionarii*) were obliged to stock. The first known master of notariate appears in 1341.[28]

Cumulatively, all these developments within the arts faculty either helped to shape the teaching of grammar and rhetoric or opened up further possibilities. The emergence of a specialized course in *ars notaria* gradually helped to correct the balance in the teaching of rhetoric which had been biased by the *dictatores* too much towards the needs of the notary. By the second half of the fourteenth century, rhetoric had been freed from the overriding need to teach the art of drafting official letters and documents. Certainly, the *dictamen* tradition and epistolary composition continued in the humanist schools, but it was balanced by the theory and practice of oratory and a new and painstaking attention to style. With medicine in the vanguard, the whole arts faculty rose in reputation and became more and more independent from the Jurists. As Dr Siraisi has suggested, this may well have helped the cause of classical studies. Once medicine had become the equal of law, the teaching of rhetoric no longer needed to be shaped principally to the needs of lawyers; the door was now opened for literary masters to provide 'a broad foundation of culture for lawyers and physicians alike'. Finally, the sponsorship by the Arts Faculty of 'creative' works of literature showed that, as a corporation, it valued highly literary pursuits which lay outside the formal curriculum. That there was a demand for literary pursuits is shown by developments in Padua outside the University; by changes in the private schools, by the impact of Petrarchan humanism and by learning in the Carrarese court. These developments, too, helped to give a wider and more advanced base for the teaching of grammar and rhetoric.

(a) *The Emergence of Humanist Private Schools in the Later Fourteenth Century*

The private schools in Padua, by their nature, could be media for educational change. Though subject to those social and commercial demands which we saw earlier, the absence of both communal regulations for teaching and ecclesiastical supervision gave to individual masters a considerable leeway in the practical organization of their schools and in the shaping of the syllabus.[29] These 'free' schools included the elementary grammar schools and the private households of university masters who, while also teaching elementary pupils, sometimes accommodated university students and instructed them over and above their formal curriculum. It was indeed from these institutions, under the direction of a talented master, that the far-reaching educational advances were made in the early Renaissance. These advances we will consider more fully when we examine Barzizza's household school and its influence on the more famous humanist schools of Vittorino da Feltre and Guarino da Verona, but the main directions of their changes can be found earlier, in some Paduan schools of the *trecento*, and, indeed, there was a direct continuity. In general terms, these changes took two forms: the remoulding of traditional institutional arrangements for teaching and, secondly, the expanding and renewing of the common syllabus of studies.

The most common practical arrangement adopted by *magistri liberi* at all levels, was the taking in of boarding students, mainly in order to pay the rent from private fees. Boys were sent from home, sometimes only for a few months, because of plague or war or because parents, who could afford to, wished to send their sons to a good master. Often, the master was a relative, compatriot, or family friend, and private arrangements were easily made. Thus we will find several Bergamaschi in the school of their compatriot, Barzizza. No doubt, the parents also assumed that the boy would be disciplined in his work and influenced for the good, under a watchful eye. This practice existed throughout university life also and professors similarly accommodated pupils to augment a public salary from boarding fees or from extra tuition.

Both the strength and weakness of this system was the close, unremitting contact between master and pupil. At worst, it merely satisfied a master's selfishness. Court records and literary references combine in giving the impression that physical maltreatment was not uncommon and, though perhaps these accounts were groundless or exaggerated, they indicate parental fears and perhaps the marred reputation which the schoolmaster's profession had earned itself. In most cases, boarding seems to have been a business contract which was strictly followed out. In a few cases (of great influence), the private school was regarded by the master as an opportunity to educate the boy according to his special disposition and to turn the institution to a moral purpose, based on the twin principles of Christian devotion and classical didactic theory. In fourteenth-century Padua, there were two outstanding schools of this nature, governed by Pietro da Muglio and Giovanni Conversino.

The high esteem in which Pietro was held by contemporaries derived from the moral direction of his teaching no less than from his classical learning. Salutati described his old master as 'unicuique virtutis specimen' and Pietro's intensely personal moulding of the school in Padua (*c.*1360-69) impressed Boccaccio.[30] By Petrarch he was regarded almost as a model teacher, presumably conforming closely to the latter's own ideal of Christian-classical pedagogy.[31] We do not know the details of Pietro's teaching and cannot therefore measure the grounds of his high reputation, except that he seems to have given much attention to classical or late antique moral philosophy, as in his lectures on the *De Quattuor Virtutibus* of the Pseudo-Seneca.

More evidence survives for the schools of Giovanni Conversino, who had himself been a boarder in Pietro's Paduan school.[32] Conversino set up a boarding school in Conegliano (1371-73), Padua (1392-1404), and in Venice (1404-06), and the evidence from all three suggests a consistency in teaching principles, which could be termed Christian humanism. First, he was concerned to reform disciplinary methods in school. Towards the end of his life, in his autobiographical work (*Rationarium Vite*), he recalled bitterly how, at ten years old, he had been a boarder under two cruel *ludi magistri* in Bologna. The various descriptions of his own teaching experiences show how he had consciously attempted to correct this moral deficiency in teaching others by constant reference to traditional Christian piety. Like Petrarch, whom he admired intensely, Conversino had a deep veneration for the Early Fathers, which we find explicitly in his work *Ad Augustinum philosophum de Christi conceptu*, in his frequent allusions to St Jerome and in his tour of Christian monuments in Rome in 1378 or 1379. He also maintained close relations with his uncle, Tommaso, who became Minister General of the Franciscans in 1367 and cardinal in 1387.

Like Petrarch again, he combined Christian piety with study and exposition of Stoic ethical principles, with a view to reformulating those priorities and values which were necessary for good living. At Belluno (*c.*1374-79) he composed his *De Fato* and, probably in the same period, his *De Miseria Humane Vite*, both of which treated common Stoic themes. More directly he applied the notions of that moral philosophy to the daily round of the household school. Again and again, he portrays his schools as the institutional embodiments of the classical ideal of the community of dining and debate from which springs benevolence and amity and in which all are literally educated. 'Vivere' was interpreted according to Cicero and Quintilian as 'convivere', an expression of 'humanitas' coupled with the notions of 'jocunditas', 'commoditas', 'tranquillitas', 'sodalitas' and the rest, the ideal setting in which intimacy or 'familiaritas' was bound.

What makes Conversino an important educator in the history of Paduan humanism was, first, his attempt to model his school on this ideal and to render it also a forum for debate, to which his own friends were invited from outside. Secondly, he related educational method to morality at large. He made the home,

the 'res familiaris', central to education in the school, which was, indeed, an extension of the 'familia', and underpinning this relationship was the need for a proper education of women in the domestic arts and good, simple morals. His awareness of both the good and harmful influences which parents could exercise on their children shows an appreciation of education in its widest and deepest senses. He re-examined thoroughly every aspect of educational method, leaning heavily on classical didactic principles, the Pythagorean instructions which characterized humanist education later: for example, the importance for the master of not amassing too much material for teaching and for the pupil of choosing from books the best parts, 'as a bee from flowers', and revising, in the evening, what one learnt in the day. Most important of all, perhaps, was Conversino's realization of the power which a master could exercise over pupils in the 'familia' of the school, a relationship of love and mutual development, not simply of monetary dealings. Among his own pupils in Padua were some of the prominent figures of the Paduan humanist circle of the early fifteenth century; Guarino da Verona, Pietro Marcello, Vittorino da Feltre, Ognibene della Scola, Vergerio, and others. It was Ognibene who felt that a master could be regarded by pupils with even greater reverence than their parents:

imo vereor quoque ne magistri ipsi in venerationibus preponendi sint parentibus; tribuunt enim genitores ipsi natis vitam atque esse, communia quidem omnibus animantibus: magistri vero disciplinas, mores atque bene esse, precipua quidem hominis.[33]

An active concern with educational methods and principles was striking in late fourteenth-century Padua. This was partly because private masters who were influenced by the revival of antiquity and Petrarchan ideals naturally examined those aspects of ancient literature which had a direct bearing on their own professions and partly because of various educational traditions which came together in Padua. Besides 'free' schools or private households, and the teaching within the *studium*, there was a distinctive courtly tradition of education in the household of the Carraresi lords. An anonymous chronicle of the mid-fourteenth century describes the education of the Carrara heir, Francesco Novello:

El qual nobelissimo zovene (Frencesco), come ave iiii ani, fuo sottoposto a la hobedientia de un maistro, el qual fuo un Simon di Maceri da Parma, el qual fuo versificator et nobile de gramaticha, el qual insegno al dito Francescho Novelo a lezer et scriver e anche a ditar nobelmente letere.[34]

Simone went on to instruct Francesco in the arts of war and gymnastics so that, by the age of seven, he was able to participate in a tournament at Padua in 1366, and he also trained him in swimming and hunting. Under another master, Michel Rosso, he learnt German, French, and Provençal, in addition to his Latin. Finally, we are told that five gentlemen, whose duties were not specified, remained constantly in his company, in order to inculcate in him the affable ways of courtesy. This

training was fairly representative of that in the Italian courts in general.[35]

Princely tuition pointed to the importance of breadth of studies, educating pupils physically, morally (in the manners befitting a gentleman), and intellectually. Designed for a leisured aristocracy, the programme had a comprehensiveness and flexibility removed from the rigidly narrow demands of the bourgeois professions. In two respects, it resembled the idea of university education. The traditional arts course and the higher subjects, if followed out completely, constituted a training of the all-rounder, intellectually versatile. Furthermore, as a juridical body, the university considered the moral welfare of its members, as well as their intellectual progress. The pedagogic reforms of the humanist schools, besides the inspiration of Christian-classical education, also drew on these various strands of educational practice and ideals: the private schools, courtly training and the ideal of the liberal arts course. Thus, the famous treatise of Pier Paolo Vergerio, *De Ingenuis Moribus et Liberalibus Studiis*, composed in the 1390s for another Carrarese princeling, Ubertino, bears the mark of the court and the university.[36] The passages on physical training and moral development belong firmly to the same tradition as the tuition of Francesco Novello, but a new, distinctly 'academic' content is introduced. Vergerio advises Ubertino to attend to the 'liberal studies' in turn: the *trivium* and *quadrivium* are discussed, though Ubertino is not expected to study the 'three great professional disciplines', law, medicine, and theology. Vergerio gives what will become a common humanist view of the liberal arts, first, by discussing subjects which were then unknown, or only partly taught in the formal university course: history, moral philosophy, poetry and music. The humanists were to advocate the full restoration of the liberal arts course, as they thought it had been, when bequeathed by antiquity. Secondly, Vergerio insists that, though a liberal education does not require a grasp of every subject, nevertheless, 'we cannot rightly understand one subject, unless we can perceive its relation to the rest'.[37] An awareness of how disciplines are interconnected by their common relation to philosophy was to be a fundamental tenet of Barzizza's school. These early Paduan humanists followed Cicero and Quintilian in their emphasis on grammar and rhetoric as the basic arts which opened the way to this all-roundedness and, in so doing, they accorded these subjects a status which they had never really enjoyed before. That a syllabus of studies was able to support this theoretical view of grammar and rhetoric was due largely to humanist advances made outside the schools, providing a fresh reservoir which could be channelled into a teaching curriculum.

(b) *The Impact of Petrarchan Humanism in Padua*

Both in the early and in the later fourteenth century literary studies in the arts faculty were influenced by humanist advances outside the schools. The relationship between the Paduan 'pre-humanists' and the arts faculty has been examined by Dr Siraisi (pp 43-57). A greater impetus to the study of grammar and rhetoric was

given by Petrarch, whose enthusiasm for classical letters suggested new methods of study and new teaching possibilities.

The Petrarchan heritage in Padua was a special one. Petrarch's connections with Padua date back to 1349, when Iacopo da Carrara gave him a canonry. From 1361 until his death in 1374, Petrarch's time was almost completely shared between Venice, Padua, and his country retreat in Arquà. It was Padua that was to be particularly associated with Petrarch's memory for about twenty years after his death, partly through his relations with the Carrarese house, partly through his disciples and partly through his library. His relations with Francesco 'Il Vecchio' da Carrara went beyond the usual ties between a scholar and patron. In 1368 Francesco endowed him with the Arquà estate. Moreover, Francesco showed more than a passing interest in Petrarch's writings on antiquity, commissioning Lombardo della Seta to copy the *De Viris Illustribus*, and these 'Lives', of Roman heroes provided the subject matter for the decoration of the great hall of the Carrarese Palazzo, executed by the northern followers of Giotto. Esteem seems to have been reciprocal, for in his will of 1370 Petrarch bequeathed to Francesco his treasured painted panel of the Madonna by Giotto.[38] These examples show why Petrarch and the Carrara house became associated in the minds of Paduan humanists in the 1390s. The patronage of literary pursuits had set an example which the Venetian authorities probably felt compelled to rival later and it had indirectly heightened the dignity of *studia litterarum* in the eyes of the University.

It is difficult to imagine the extent to which Petrarch fired the humanists of his own and the succeeding generation. This immediate influence partly derived from the fact that the Paduan friends guarded Petrarch's library after his death. Besides containing exemplars of Petrarch's own works, this was 'the most remarkable collection of books formed since classical times'.[39] On this account Padua became an important centre for early humanists. Scholars either came personally to transcribe works or an over-worked *scriptorium* did it for them. By the end of the century, however, the bulk of the library was dispersed. Between 1379 and 1388 it was partially sold, although it seems likely that Francesco da Carrara kept the lion's share for himself until his son was forced to give up most of the family treasures to the Visconti, when the Padovano was invaded in 1388. Even after that date, however, some works remained in Padua; for example, the autographs which later passed to the Bembo family and the *De Civitate Dei*, which probably went to the Augustinians of the Eremitani. Individual items returned to Padua by sale or chance, but the bulk went to the Visconti library at Pavia, where the collection played an important part in Lombard humanism and, probably, in the early part of Barzizza's career.

The model of Petrarch's life and work gradually affected the teaching of literary studies in the University. He had set a standard. He had shown that the *studia humanitatis* could not only be studied for their own sake, but could consume a lifetime of scholarship. By relating classical learning to the moral improvement and

inward state of the individual, he had expanded literary studies into a way of life and a philosophical expression. His scholarship was driven by an emotional and imaginative, as well as an intellectual commitment to know antiquity in all its aspects: its history, geography, monuments, no less than its literature. Among his Paduan followers this impetus produced a transformed approach to grammar and rhetoric. First, it produced the beginnings of a critical method in textual scholarship. The custodians of Petrarch's own works set about copying and editing several manuscripts—revising, amending, completing—an undertaking which presupposed a good deal of interpretation. Attempts were also made to give a reasonable interpretation of the meaning and to distinguish the authenticity of classical works. When we examine Barzizza's *Commentary on the Epistles of Seneca*, we will see how much he drew on earlier Paduan attempts to disentangle the knottiest problems. In order to clarify textual references, a painstakingly accurate knowledge of ancient history and other classical writings was realized as necessary. From Padua, Pietro da Muglio wrote to Petrarch with a set of precise questions about the ancient city of Durachium or Dyrachium: who was the founder; what did the name signify; did it have another name; who changed the name and why? Pietro had asked, we are told, because he had students interested in these finer points, which both amazed and delighted Petrarch, who proceeded to answer the queries point by point.[40]

This meticulous study of an original text, to which pupils were expected to refer continually, produced a gradual change in the schoolroom approach to ancient 'authorities'. They were regarded less and less as quarries of moral *dicta* to be hacked out in order to load an argument or give weight to a letter. Unlike the treatment of the classics in the *dictamen* schools, whereby authors were used for another purpose, now they were studied more on their own terms. Again, although summaries of rhetorical textbooks were still produced, they were not intended to be taken as substitutes for the original. Moreover, the traditional standard texts began to be studied with fresh eyes, with deeper understanding and wider learning. The influence of Petrarchan humanism assured the decline of teaching rhetorical principles at second hand, through Italian translations, and contributed towards the 'Latinization' of the middle and upper orders of the laity in the Veneto towns.[41] It contributed also to a revaluing of the approach to the whole art of rhetoric.

We saw that the *dictamen* schools of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries fell far short of a complete revival of classical rhetoric partly by their heavy emphasis on one branch of rhetoric, letter-writing, at the expense of oratory. This seems to have affected the study of law, which neglected forensic oratory, a fact which the early humanists bemoaned. Legal studies have declined since antiquity, Petrarch tells us, as a result of the separation of law and rhetoric; the two must be rejoined.[42] Vergerio complained of the more general decline of oratory in public life.[43] Barzizza and his followers answered these complaints in their attempt to bring classical oratory to the centre of university life and to relate it to other

university disciplines, especially law.

Secondly, the humanists revitalized the art of letter-writing. The business letter was given more polish in style and elegance. The familiar letter, also, was transformed by Petrarch and his correspondents. Petrarch's epistolary collection answered perfectly his innate sociability and volubility and suggested to his correspondents a sense of involvement in a shared enterprise. The epistle was made to express again those philosophical notions underlying Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*, which were used as a model; notions of friendship, sodality, 'humanitas'. The letter became the vehicle of a moral philosophy.

It would be wrong, however, to give the impression that humanism brought sweeping changes in the Paduan schools of the late *trecento*. It appealed to only a few masters. The rest continued to cater for a mainly utilitarian literacy, involving no new view of antiquity. But the humanists, such as Pietro da Muglio, Conversino, and Vergerio, set the pace in the *studium*. They attempted to translate the erudition of Petrarch and Salutati into terms of formal teaching in the schools, thereby registering the new perceptions of the antique world. One might set humanist teaching against conventional grammatical instruction in the same way that one can compare the advances of humanist historiography, such as Leonardo Bruni's, with the medieval tradition of Florentine chronicles: the one owed much to the other and, indeed, could not have surfaced without the long and deep undercurrent, but the whole spirit and orientation were different.

(c) *Courtly Learning in Padua*

So far, we have considered positive intellectual developments and educational trends in order to set Barzizza's humanist school firmly in a tradition of Paduan humanism. There were, however, changes in the intellectual life of Padua which exercised a negative and indirect effect on the nature and impact of his teaching. The second half of the fourteenth century saw a lively literary activity in the Paduan court. The defeat of the Carraresi lords by Venice in the years 1404-1406 brought this to an abrupt end. This literary activity in court had included both Latin, humanistic writings and works for entertainment in the *volgare*, the one providing a stimulus for the other, but the truncation of courtly life in Padua meant that the city never saw that ample courtly culture enjoyed by those lordships which remained intact during the fifteenth century, notably in Mantua and Ferrara. It also brought to an end a freer, more creative humanism, as well as removing political power from the city and, with it, the direct pressures for humanists to involve themselves in political writings and propaganda. Thereafter, humanism was to be almost exclusively centred on the University or the household schools, giving to the movement in Padua a peculiarly didactic and 'academic' character. Furthermore, the absence of a court contributed to that decline in the use of *volgare* writings, further ensuring a strong Latin literary culture in Padua for most of the fifteenth century.

Dependence on the Carraresi shaped the work of courtly *literati*. First, we find eulogies of princely rule in general and the Carrara dynasty in particular among the works of Petrarch, Conversino, and Vergerio.[44] Secondly, the needs of courtly entertainment stimulated literary creativeness in both Latin and the more relaxed vernacular. *Volgare* versifying seems to have been a popular pastime among the literary-minded familiars of the Carrarese court, such as Nicoletto d'Alessio, Zenone da Pistoia, Simone Mazeri da Parma, Giovanni de'Dondi, and Petrarch himself.[45] The same kind of easy interchange between Latin and *volgare* poetry can be seen, in the same period, in the Este court in Ferrara and among certain aristocratic circles in Venice.[46] There are examples of verses which were sung or given as accompaniments to music and, perhaps, dancing. Giovanni Conversino composed *volgare* verses, put them to music himself and then sang.[47] It was from Giovanni Conversino that Vittorino da Feltre learnt music in the 1390s and Sabbadini believes that Vittorino set some of his vernacular poetry to music, including perhaps, his love poetry: 'multos edidit versus de laudibus amantium non latina solum verum etiam etrusca'.[48] Earlier, Petrarch may also have helped in the music-making at the Paduan court, playing, perhaps, the 'good lute' which he left in his will to Tommaso Bombasi of Ferrara, the actor and musician. Works in Latin, too, were written in order to divert, such as Conversino's *Dolosi astus Narratio* (1396) and his *Violate Pudicicie Narratio*, while his *Rationarium Vite* (1400) combined bucolic themes with witty passages on local idiosyncrasies in Veneto towns and on his personal vicissitudes—the stuff of good story telling.

With the demise of the Carrarese *signoria* in 1406, there was no longer a court in Padua to make demands on the creative imaginations of *literati* and the troubadour strains appear to have died out. Literary activity in Padua in the early *quattrocento*, largely under the influence of Barzizza, became characterized by the drier, meticulous learning of the schools and the dominance of Latin scholarship.

* * *

The rise of the Paduan arts faculty, the influence of the revival of antiquity on the schools and the collapse of a courtly culture helped to place the university teaching of grammar and rhetoric on a more elevated level and to shape its content. From being closely allied to professional exigencies, these subjects were transformed into a widely based course in literary studies for their own sake. This was reflected in the term *studia humanitatis*, which was gradually coming into use in the late fourteenth century, and in the changing status of teachers, who, from being 'part-time' notaries or closely connected with legal studies, were expected, by the early fifteenth century, to be 'full-time' masters of the humanities. This was, perhaps, partly a self-conscious change.[49] Petrarch's avowed distaste for lucrative careers was to become a common stance among *quattrocento* humanists. It was probably no coincidence that the humanist masters, Barzizza, Vittorino, Guarino da Verona, and

their followers, were free from other occupations. The term *umanista*, which was coined in the universities in the early sixteenth century, represented a profession in itself and, like all new terms, described an existing practice.[50] When classical texts were given a new importance in themselves, the expositors of those texts correspondingly gained a more important footing in the university. Moreover, the professor of grammar and rhetoric probably had a freedom enjoyed by no other university master: only a few texts had to be taught according to the statutes. Beyond these he had an almost unlimited range and choice. It was Gasparino Barzizza who was the first to realize the full possibilities of this and to consolidate and further the intellectual changes within the *studium* which we have outlined.

CHAPTER II

THE CAREER OF GASPARINO BARZIZZA UNTIL 1407

For the first forty-seven years of Barzizza's life, until he took up his teaching post at Padua in 1407, we have only scanty evidence of his activities and no record of any literary works, whereas his life at Padua is comparatively well documented. However, some attempt will be made to sketch in this shadowy, earlier period, partly because what little evidence there is for this part of his life has never been fully pieced together, partly because Barzizza's social provenance and interests help to explain his later attractions, as a teacher, for the professional and noble families of the Veneto, and partly because we need to understand the nature of his training in the University of Pavia and his intellectual interests there, since they helped to shape his later work in Padua.

Gasparino was born in 1360 at Barzizza, a small country estate in the Val Gandino near Bergamo.[1] He himself described 'Barzizia' as follows:

proprium nomen oppidi non ignobilis galliae cisalpinae quod in finibus soli pergamensis positum sexdecim milibus passum ab urbe distat, a quo Barziziorum familia ex qua ortus sum deducta est.[2]

The date of Barzizza's birth used to puzzle historians because it would have made him exceptionally old both as a student and teacher but more recent examination has shown it to be correct.[3] The Barzizza family was old landowning stock on the fringes of the minor nobility, although Gasparino's father, Pietrobono, was perhaps asserting a fictitious heritage when he claimed that the estate had been owned by the family since the age of the Lombards.[4] No doubt Gasparino was realizing the social aspirations of his family when, in the late 1390s, he married into the Bergamasco nobility, taking as a wife Lucrezia Agliardi. The men in the family combined estate management with notarial skill in drafting letters and accounts, demonstrating that functional literacy which characterized the background of so many of the early Italian humanists. It is worth remembering, perhaps, that there was nothing unusual in members of the minor nobility in central and northern Italy following notarial careers.

There is no evidence for Barzizza's early schooling, although it seems likely that he attended the grammar school at Bergamo under a master salaried at public expense and from there he probably followed his father's profession and became a notary.[5] The provision of some business training in his Paduan course on rhetoric

and his work as an apostolic secretary to the council of Constance in 1417 suggest that, at some time, he had received training in the drafting of official documents. There is more concrete evidence of this if we assume that Barzizza was the notary, 'Gasparinus', who wrote some of the signorial documents at the Visconti *curia* during the years 1384 to 1392. 'Gasparinus' appears six times on official letters addressed from the court, both at Pavia and Milan, to the *studium* at Pavia and it is strongly tempting to suppose that this is the clue to Barzizza's activities for those years which have hitherto been a blank. On the face of it it seems convincing that, for four or five years before his *laurea* at Pavia in 1392, Barzizza combined (and paid for) his study of grammar and rhetoric at the University with practical, though related, work at the nearby court of Giangaleazzo Visconti.[6]

Between 1387 and 1392 Barzizza was taught grammar and rhetoric by Giovanni Travesi da Cremona, 'artium et rethorice doctor'. This we know from the fact that Travesi 'presented' Barzizza for his *laurea* in 1392, because the *presentor*, according to the statutes of the College of Doctors of the Arts Faculty (1409), had to be a master under whom the candidate had studied 'for a long time', which was defined as a minimum of three and a maximum of five years. The *laurea* ceremony took place on 13 July 1392 in the presence of the Bishop and the College of Doctors, according to the common practice. On 7 September we find the notary Gasparinus appearing for the last time in a letter of Giangaleazzo to the *studium*.[7]

Shortly after this Barzizza made a visit to Padua where his name appeared on a notarial deed which he witnessed in 1393: 'Mag. Gasparinus filius q.d. Petriboni filii q.d. Bonomi de Barziziis civis Pergami in gramatica et retoricha doctoratus'.[8]

It is not known why he came to Padua, what he did there or how long he stayed, but is is important to note that his connections with the city began at this date and not in 1407. He may have returned home by 21 June 1393 when he and his two older brothers divided up their patrimony between Jacopo and Antonio on the one side and Gasparino on the other.[9] The older brothers, who ran the estates, had involved themselves in local political and territorial feuds, lending their support to the Visconti faction among the Bergamaschi nobles, but this had led to the devastation of the patrimony through war. Guiniforte Barzizza, Gasparino's son, was later to recount this to Filippo Maria Visconti in passionate terms:

Ego ex ea familia ortus, in qua non modo nullus unquam tuae majestatis contemptor inventus est; sed plurimi quidem qui pro tui status instauratione, ac firmamento fortunas praedae, agros depopulationi, domos incendio, arces ruinae, liberos captivitati subjicere, suumque sanguinem effundere, atque ipsam animam exhalare non dubitaverunt.[10]

These political allegiances and family fortunes are probably vital ingredients in that marked predilection for Visconti rule which Barzizza held throughout his life.

By 1396 Barzizza was teaching in the elementary grammar school attached to the cathedral at Bergamo, assisted by a *repetitor*, Tonolo de Triviolo. G. Martellotti

thinks that this school was private, but it may have been partly private and partly public; mainly financed by one of the lay charitable societies in Bergamo with additional subsidies from communal funds.[11] For his teaching programme as a *magister puerorum* the eighteenth-century biographers, Furietti and Argelati, inflamed by their patriotic love of Bergamo and by their zeal for classical learning, assumed that Barzizza introduced a fully-fledged liberal, humanist education which transformed the minds and morals of Bergamo's youth; but there is no evidence for this.[12]

We next hear of Barzizza in Padua, again as a witness to a notarial deed, a donation made on 11 May 1400 by Margharita, the wife of Lazaro, professor of grammar in Padua. Lazaro da Conegliano first appears in notarial records as a professor of grammar in 1376 and thenceforth we find him assisting in public examinations, as a master in the Arts Faculty, as well as running a private elementary school. He was a friend of Giovanni Conversino and, during the 1390s, he taught the children of Francesco Novello da Carrara.[13] It is possible that Barzizza worked for a while as a *repetitor* in his grammar school, but it was probably not for more than a few months since Vergerio, who was also among Conversino's friends, was in Padua in 1400 but did not meet Barzizza then (their first contact was not until 1414).[14] Although, again, there is no firm evidence, G. Martellotti may be right in thinking that, between 1400 and 1403, Barzizza was able to obtain a position in the Visconti court, especially with the contacts he had gained after marrying the noble Lucrezia Agliardi.[15]

Barzizza's teaching career at university began in the academic year of 1403-04, as listed in the *rotulus* of lecturers and salaried officials at the *studium* of Pavia:

Ad lecturam Rethorice, Gramatice et Auctorum
M. Iohannes de Cremona Trivii et Philosophie doctor
Ad lecturam Gramatice et Auctorum
M. Gasparinus de Pergamo doctor Gramatice[16]

He was now an assistant to his old master and in the pay of the commune. In January 1404, the *signore* instructed the commune of Pavia on how they were to tax Barzizza's salary, making allowance for his clothing and maintenance. For the year 1404-05 Barzizza is listed as 'legens Gramaticam' and then for 1405-06 as '(electus) ad lecturam Gramatice, Rethorice et Auctorum'. During this period Travesi, for some reason which is not known, had been absent from Pavia, but he had been missed, for, as a lecturer in the University since 1374, he had earned himself admiration and popularity. In the August of 1406 the communal authorities sent a petition to Giovanni Maria Visconti that Travesi might be recalled, at the behest, it was claimed, of the entire city which revered this 'singulare gramatice sidus'. The appeal was made on the basis of Travesi's merits and long connections with Pavia and there is no reason to suppose that any slight was intended against the younger man, Barzizza. However, in professional terms, the

two men were rivals for the same position and this rivalry soon came to a head, when, in September 1406, Visconti asked the communal council how an *honorarium* could be set up for Travesi and how much salary the latter should receive. By February of 1407 the council came up with the idea that Barzizza would have to leave so that the funds for his salary could be given over to Travesi. A record was kept of this noisy council meeting:–

Item prefati Domini auditis hiis, que isto mane magister Gasparinus de Bergamo dixit, secum abducto illo magistro Iohanne de Cremona trivii philosophieque Doctore, quem aliis prestantiorem fore putant, incepit dicere ipse magister Gasparinus. 'Patienter! Fata me cogunt aliam patriam, alios querere honores etiam et utilitates impulit Comune. Cum conveniat volo recedere, sed non aliter quam licite'.

With the consent of Barzizza, the commune then appointed Travesi to a lectureship for four years, conditional upon signorial approval. The outburst 'Patienter!' suggests that Barzizza was trying to put a stop to rowdy wrangling in the council chamber and that he himself was no party to the dispute. With dignity he resigned himself to leaving. Indeed, since the question of his replacement had existed for several months, he had had time to make alternative arrangements; and this he had done through contacts with certain Venetian nobles.

Various reasons have been put forward why only one master could have held the post in grammar and rhetoric at Pavia and why Travesi was preferred: the loyalty of the commune towards the veteran Travesi; Travesi and his supporters in the council ousted Barzizza; the city's funds were exiguous and Barzizza's departure was purely a financial expedient.[17] All these factors may have come into play, but it is also possible that Barzizza already had the prospects of a teaching position in Venice and an appointment in Padua, prospects which made him amenable to the council's decision.[18] At any rate, on 12 March 1407 the *signore* approved the replacement and announced that Barzizza had sought a licence to go to Venice.[19]

He stayed in Venice as a private tutor to patrician families from March 1407 until the following October, when he took up his post at Padua. It may have been that Barzizza took over the position of Giovanni Conversino who, from 1404 to 1406, held a private school in Venice for aristocratic youths, among whom were Leonardo and Marco Giustiniani and Francesco Barbaro.[20] But it is not quite clear how Barzizza came by his new position; did these Venetian families hear of him through contacts in Pavia and learn that his tenure there was unsure; did Conversino recommend Barzizza whom he had perhaps met through Lazaro da Conegliano; did Paduan friends, whom Barzizza had met during his earlier visits to the city, mention his name to those Venetian families, such as the Trevisan, the Donati, and the Barbaro, who were interested in literary studies and who maintained close contacts with the Paduan *studium*? It is likely that he was already known in Padua, for example to those professors at Pavia in the 1380s and 1390s who subsequently took posts in Padua, such as the logician Antonio Cermisoni, and the physicians

Marsiglio and Daniele da Santa Sofia. Although it is impossible to pin down an exact connection, it is worth remembering that the world of the universities was, in some ways, both closed and open; closed, in that masters, because of their small numbers, were generally known to one another and to students, and open in that there was an easy circuit of exchange between the universities, on the one hand, and between the universities and the grammar schools, both private and communal, on the other.

In Venice, Barzizza was a tutor to the nine-year-old Francesco Barbaro and may have resided in the Casa Barbaro. Late in life, Barbaro was to recall Barzizza's companionable instruction in a letter to Panormita (1451):

Postquam nudius tertius de Martialis coqui facetiis jocose mentionem fecisti, incessit animum cupiditas, ut ita dicam, ferculorum suorum, quae adhuc pueris nobis apud eloquentissimum Gasparinum Bergomensem, hospitem nostrum, in symposio doctorum hominum apposita sunt. Sed illius epulas, quae lepore ac salibus conditae sunt, melius gustarem nunc in senectute, quam tunc per aetatem in pueritia potuissem.[21]

Barbaro's reading of Martial as a child was perhaps exceptional, but so also was the decision of Andrea Giuliano, at twenty-three, to begin elementary lessons in grammar with Barzizza's instruction in Donatus.[22] Because Giuliano and Barbaro happened to record their classes with Barzizza later, these are the only pupils in Venice of whom we have evidence, but there must have been others.

Venice in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, compared with Florence and the signorial courts at the same period, was not a centre of humanist learning. What literary activities there were seem to have been regarded as a 'side-line', as a diversion from politics and trade which did not bring honours and which interested only a few. Given these limitations, however, there was a perceptible change during this period; more noble families were showing an active interest in private schooling in grammar and rhetoric from good masters, perhaps in imitation of courts and chanceries elsewhere, and a greater practical concern was shown towards the need for good Latin in conducting public affairs.[23] Barzizza's own sojourn in the city both illustrated and contributed to this trend, initiating his friendship with those aristocratic families, such as the Dandolo, the Vettori, the Contarini, and others, who were to be patrons of humanism in Padua and the Veneto.

* * *

The biographical facts of Barzizza's career until 1407 have a bearing on his later teaching at Padua in several ways. First, we see how, like many of the early humanists, he came from a background of notaries and business people, taking his training in utilitarian literacy and chancery Latin a stage further, into the realm of literary scholarship. At the same time, he was to make use of his curial experience

in Padua by giving some instruction in the drafting of official letters and by advancing some of his pupils in their careers as secretaries. Secondly, his activities illustrate that easy movement to and fro between the elementary grammar school and the university arts faculty which seemed to characterize a teaching career in letters at that time. In Padua he was to teach at both levels, running a private elementary school as well as lecturing in the university, and some of his pupils left Padua to become themselves *magistri puerorum* at grammar schools in north Italy. Thirdly, we see a kind of protective interest being shown in the better Latin master by lay patrician families, which itself reflects one of the deepest changes brought about by the revival of classical learning. Barzizza's private school in Padua, as in Venice, had a strong aristocratic complexion, not only in terms of its social composition but also in the fact that it presupposed a membership from the leisured classes who were able to enjoy literary learning for its own sake, since the official university curriculum and professional qualifications were given only secondary importance in his course; of first importance was the moral, social, and intellectual improvement of the individual, which could be gained from a deep and wide study of the ancients. The ready acceptance of Barzizza's teaching by this class can be explained partly by the aspirations of the Veneto nobility itself, which recognized, more and more, the social glamour being attached to the practice and patronage of scholarship; and partly by the social and family connections of the Barzizza family. His wife's family, the Agliardi, allied themselves with the most powerful supporters of Visconti rule in Bergamo, the Suardi, one of the four major households in the city, around which were drawn the notable families in the area to form two broad groups; for and against the Visconti.[24] These factional wars were to reverberate in Barzizza's Paduan household; through the support which he had to give to his own relatives who had done badly out of the war; through his familiarity with the Suardi and other Bergamaschi; and through his loyalty to the Visconti which, if one can point to any political theory of Barzizza, led to *apologiae* for one-man rule, elevated by the persuasiveness of classical allusion. In short, from social and political experience, Barzizza breathed the same air as those families whose sons he taught.

Barzizza's visits to Padua in 1393 and 1400 may also have played a part in his later career there. It is hard to imagine that a man of his interests would not have established contacts with the small community of *literati* in the 1390s, led by Giovanni Conversino and including Francesco Zabarella, Zaccaria Trevisan, Vittorino da Feltre, and Guarino da Verona, scholars whom Barzizza was to know well later. By sharing, for a brief spell, the classical interests of this group, Barzizza would have perceived the strong Petrarchan heritage in Padua as well as some of the educational ideas which were emerging from the practice of courtly and private tuition.

Finally, his training in grammar and rhetoric at Pavia and his contacts with humanists in the Visconti court almost certainly shaped his work in Padua. These

influences we must examine in more detail.

(a) *Barzizza's Training at the University of Pavia*

In Pavia, as in Padua, the arts course was given little importance in itself; it provided an introductory, though necessary, training before the student proceeded to the higher and self-contained disciplines of law and medicine. Even if some students, such as Barzizza, never went on to take a degree in law or medicine, the way in which they were expected to approach the arts was, to a large extent, determined by the needs of the two major subjects. In practice, this meant that, because logic was the key to the current methods of teaching and studying law and medicine, logic stood at the head of the liberal arts; other arts were either dependent on it or were neglected by comparison.[25] Music is not known to have been taught and the *ars notaria*, astrology, and grammar were associated with the arts course only on the periphery. Rhetoric was a hurried course in which little attention seems to have been paid to stylistic exercises or strict imitation of the ancients.

As in Padua, the dominance of logic not only tended to diminish the importance of the other arts, but also tended to dictate how those subjects should be taught. This can be seen clearly in the case of grammar which was taught 'speculatively', as well as 'positively' (orthography, ethymology, prosody, and syntax). This was how grammar was taught by Travesi who spent most of the period from 1374 until 1418 in Pavia; significantly, he also taught logic and philosophy.[26] Francesco Maggi de Vigevano, who took Travesi's place for a few months in 1387, was also appointed 'ad lecturam Gramaticae positivae et speculativae Auctorum et Rhetoricae'.[27] The arts were thought to be essentially unified, with logic as a keystone, That the *trivium* was regarded as a cohesive training in the method of disquisition is suggested by the fact that, in their teaching assignments, masters were often expected to span the three subjects, and doctors in the College of Artists were expected to examine in all the arts, which was made easier by the fact that an identical procedure of study and examination was followed for every subject.

To be eligible for examination, the student had to meet three academic requirements.[28] First, during his course, he had to attend lectures and disputations regularly. Secondly, towards the end of his course, he was himself to take part in a disputation, answering one *quaestio generalis* and one *quodlibet* in the presence of all the doctors of the College. Thirdly, the scholar had to give at least ten lectures *in scolis publicis* on some well-known text on his subject. These lectures were to be given on exactly those lines which doctors followed ('prout a Doctoribus legi consueverunt'). To ensure this, the doctors attended the first part of the lecture. In other words, the student had to follow meticulously the lecturing methods of his master which, in turn, adhered to a rigidly uniform pattern. A valid analogy can be made with apprenticeship requirements in a guild. The need for standardized procedure in a teaching and examining body tended, by necessity, to make the

university a bedrock of conservatism.

In his examination, the candidate had to lecture on passages assigned to him (*puncta*), reading first what was written in the text, then dividing it into parts, linking a given passage to its context. Thus the candidate proceeded from one part to the next ('de parte ad partem procedendo'), leaving aside questions and further comments which might arise from the text. When the candidate finished reading, the doctors, beginning with the most junior, put up arguments. Each doctor was allowed two 'contradictions' and, if he wished, could propose one question unrelated to the lecture, but only in the subject being examined. Furthermore, a doctor might discuss some 'good point' at length ('super aliquo bono puncto decurrente'). On the following day, the College gave its *approbatio* or *reprobatio*.

Barzizza's *conventus* on 13 July 1392 was arrived at in exactly this way. After the public examination, which was almost a matter of going through the motions of the real test which had taken place in private, the Bishop, as Chancellor, addressed him thus:

publice in dictis scientiis gramatice et rethorice examinatus fuisti et examinibus ipsis lectiones in punctis vobis assignatis legendo solempniter dubia non pauca indagando subtiliter, oppositis et quesitis respondendo veraciter, sic vos exhibueritis quod ab omnibus ipsis doctoribus aprobatus fuistis ydoneus et sufficiens ad honores et dignitates doctoratus . . . vobis vestris meritis exigentibus cathedram magistralem ascendendi et in ea legendi, docendi, disputandi, questiones terminandi, ceterosque actus doctoreos exercendi et doctorum insignia defferendi in dictis scientiis . . . hic et ubique locorum . . .[29]

A notarial record, written in the vernacular, describes Barzizza's *laurea* ceremony:

Frate Guglielmo etc. concede le laurea in grammatica e rettorica a Gasparino de Barziziis civi pergamensi, presentato stamane all 'esame privato da Giovanni da Travesio di Cremona, dottore in grammatica, rettorica, logica e filosofia, al vicario Enrido Dina, ed esaminato parum hec ante, da Giacomini de Martignonibus, studente in arti e medicina vicerettore, da Arasmino de Curte, Priore del Collegio, e da Marsilio da S. Sofia, Guglielmo da Ponte Curone, Silano Negri, Cirstoforo da Piacenza. Martino da Voghera, Francesco Strazzapatti, Antonio da Gradi, Luchino de Beloculis, Stefano da Seregno . . .[30]

These notarial deeds and *acta graduum*, together with the statutes and what we know of Travesi's interests tell us a good deal about Barzizza's training in Pavia. Like all students, he was obliged to follow his master's teaching very closely and Travesi's teaching of grammar, as we learn from a list of doctoral stipends for 1391, was devoted to logical enquiry, leaving positive grammar to the elementary schools.[31] It seems likely, therefore, that Barzizza was examined, in grammar, on the logical implications of Priscian's terms and definitions, particularly as his examiners, listed above, were experienced and regular examiners in logic, some lecturing on logic and philosophy and some on medicine. Also, he would have been examined on his exposition of the authors, which might have included one of the

two standard texts on rhetoric, the *Ad Herennium* and the *De Inventione*, and this exercise would have been carried out according to the exact method discussed above.

It is worth considering Barzizza's training in Pavia as a reference point for his later teaching in Padua, which departed from some of the traditional methods and developed others. He was to 'drop' speculative grammar and concentrate entirely on positive grammar and the reading of the authors, which together were made to serve as a basis for literary criticism and rhetoric. He was to turn positive grammar into a deeper and more exacting science, while in his exposition of the authors he was to follow the scholastic scheme which he had learned in Pavia. Later we will compare one of Travesi's textual commentaries with Barzizza's to show that, essentially, they followed the same pattern; Barzizza differed from his master in that he paid more attention to historical questions, to textual readings, and to style, but these humanist enquiries were contained within the same scholastic framework.[32] Again, while he recognized the fundamental importance of grammar and rhetoric for the study of further disciplines, his main energies were spent in promoting them as separate and rewarding subjects in themselves.

In order to understand how Barzizza developed this teaching programme, we took into account, in the last chapter, certain intellectual changes in Padua in the second half of the fourteenth century. Here we must observe his debt to the courtly humanism which centred on the Castello Visconteo in Pavia.

(b) *Humanism in the Visconti Court*

Outside the tightly arranged university curriculum in grammar and rhetoric there was a literary movement, centred on the Visconti court, which strove for a freer, deeper, and more creative enquiry into classical literature. The participants were mainly courtiers and chancery officials: Pasquino Capelli, the secretary of Giangaleazzo Visconti until 1398; Antonio Loschi, probably a junior secretary from *c.*1390 to 1396 and then Capelli's successor from 1398 to 1404; Pietro Filargo of Candia, a Franciscan theologian, who was one of Giangaleazzo's close advisers, then successively an ambassador, Bishop of Novara (1389-1402), Archbishop of Milan (1402-05), cardinal and papal legate in Lombardy (1405-09) and, finally, elected as Pope Alexander V; Uberto Decembrio, a secretary to Filargo from 1391 and a chancery official in the Visconti court until his death in 1427; Giovanni Manzini, perhaps a court tutor (we know he taught the son of Capelli); Astolfino Marinoni; Alberto Mainanti and Bartolomeo Jacopo da Genova.[33]

This group of literary-minded civil servants was closely bound together by ties of friendship and shared interests. Their debates, the sources of ideas on which they drew and their public lives can be studied quite separately from the Arts Faculty in the University. Although it was to the schools and universities that Barzizza primarily belonged, there is considerable evidence of his connexions with this early humanist circle. If, as seems likely, Barzizza was the 'Gasparinus' who drafted

signorial dispositions to the *studium* between 1384 and 1392, he would have been in the chancery headed by Pasquino Capelli, whose name appears in similar documents.[34] It is also possible, as we mentioned, that Barzizza served in the Visconti court between 1400 and 1404, after his return from Padua and before his teaching appointment in the University. His later support for Pope Alexander V suggests, by its tone, that it was based on a long acquaintance with Pietro Filargo.[35] More important, however, were his relations with Antonio Loschi, the most influential of the courtly humanists. From 1388 to *c.*1390 Loschi was a *scholaris in artibus* at the University. Though there is no direct evidence that he and Barzizza knew each other or that Loschi was taught by Travesi, we can, from what we know of the nature of the Arts Faculty, assume that both were the case.[36] Moreover, Barzizza would have known Loschi if the two men worked in the *curia*. Loschi was a courtier and chancery official for his entire career and his talents were probably better suited than Barzizza's to celebrate the imperial nature of Visconti grandeur. Barzizza's literary interests, on the other hand, were not applied to political propaganda, but were to take a didactic, academic form. Yet the two had much in common. Both were in the service of the Visconti, though in different ways. Barzizza's family allegiances were to Giangaleazzo and, as a salaried master in the *studium*, he served an institution which came under the active supervision of the *signoria*. Secondly, Barzizza was impressed and influenced by the commentaries of Loschi on eleven of Cicero's orations; the *Inquisitio super XI orationes Ciceronis*, the outcome of *colloquia* in the castle at Pavia between Loschi and other humanists, particularly Astolfino Marinoni.[37] Barzizza was to incorporate the *Inquisitio* into his lectures on the orations at Padua.

The literary activities of these Lombard humanists had three vital mainsprings: the legacy of Petrarch, their contacts with Florentine humanism, and the outstanding library at the Visconti court. In Lombardy, as in Padua, Petrarch's connexions with the local court gave intellectual stimulus to humanists during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. He had been the courtly poet and scholar 'par excellence' who used his classical vision and rhetoric to glorify the ruling house. His republican hopes for Cola di Rienzo having been dashed, he looked to Galeazzo Visconti, for a while, as the most promising regenerative power in Italy.[38] Petrarch's interests were so extreme that subsequent humanists could select from them those particular aspects which served their own standpoints. Thus, for the chancery *literati* in Pavia during the 1390s. Petrarch seemed to set a pattern for their own positions in support of the *signoria.* A more precise literary influence came about when many of Petrarch's books were transferred to Pavia from Padua as a result of the Visconti victories over Padua in 1388 and 1392. These works were studied, copied and annotated by the Lombard humanists. For example, Pasquino Capelli possessed Petrarch's *Epistolae Familiares,* which were annotated by Giovanni Manzini, Marinoni copied the Petrarchan Virgil between 1393 and October 1394.[39] From a passage in Barzizza's *De Orthographia*, we know that he

read Petrarch's *De Viris Illustribus* in the Visconti library and, from a Neapolitan manuscript of the *Periochae Liviane* annotated by Barzizza, there is strong evidence that Petrarch's copy of the work (now lost) came into Barzizza's hands at about the same time.[40]

Petrarch's work was also selected and refined in the Florentine circle of Coluccio Salutati, which provided another impetus for the humanists at Pavia. Salutati corresponded with Capelli, Manzini and, most of all, with Loschi, who, after he left the Veronese chancery, worked in the Florentine chancery under Salutati in the 1380s.[41] The relations between the two men led to further contacts with Florentine humanists, notably Bruni.[42]

Finally, the *literati* in Pavia had access to the invaluable library of the Visconti, one of the largest collections of classical manuscripts in Italy at that time and a physical expression of signorial patronage and the predominant intellectual interests of the courtly officials. Besides the Petrarchan books many texts were collected from centres in North Italy, especially Vercelli, Verona, and Padua.[43]

More important than the sources which inspired these humanists were the attitudes which they assumed from their reading and discussion of classical texts and the forms in which these attitudes were expressed. They shared the belief that the moral content of the ancient texts was a matter of continuing debate and should be examined in the light of their own social and political conditions. This might take the form of using common arguments in antiquity to serve present political propaganda, panegyrics, or invectives. Loschi's polemics against the Florentine Republic are well known, with their subtle use of classical authorities in the defence of signorial rule. It might take the form of a heavy-handed imitation of a classical model, such as Giovanni Manzini's neo-Senecan tragedy on the fall of the Della Scala at the hand of Giangaleazzo. Taking as his theme Fortune and the fragility of human affairs, Manzini presents Visconti stewardship as inaugurating another golden age. The arguments of the ancients and the advantages of their rhetorical art might be exposed to a wider audience through the translation of classical works into the vernacular. Again, ancient debates on moral problems might be simply transposed to deal with contemporary affairs. Thus, we find Pietro Filargo and Bartolomeo Jacopo da Genova discussing the superiority of male to female education and, belonging to the same type of moral enquiry, the *Moralis Philosophie Dialogus* of Uberto Decembrio.[44]

This courtly humanism was various in its form, capable of adaptation and, at times, innovative in its approach towards antiquity. The inquisitive spirit of the humanists is seen in their eager interest in Greek, aroused by the presence in Lombardy, between 1400 and 1403, of the Byzantine master, Manuel Chrysoloras. This urge to examine and use ancient learning from various standpoints, while promoting a little virtuosity and amateurism, with its faults and virtues, also produced a greater and more exact textual scholarship, a search for manuscripts and a more precise copying of works.[45]

The literary movement in the court made no reference to the arts course in the University, but clearly it had a great potential bearing on the latter. The humanists were concerned with the same kind of subject matter which, in the University, would have fallen within the province of the schools of grammar and rhetoric. Though they did not openly challenge, at this stage, the rigid methods and restricted syllabus followed in the Arts Faculty at Pavia, nevertheless, the sum total of their interests contained considerable possibilities for the revision of the traditional curriculum in the schools.

In the first place, the humanists imitated the polished Latin of the best Roman authors and attempted to make it the language of learned intercourse and official communication. Through the efforts of Loschi in particular, the literary changes within the Florentine chancery made themselves felt in Pavia. The striving for elegant diction was thought to require also an examination of such technical questions as correct orthography and script. In other words, their proposals created, implicitly, an alternative stylistic model to that which was currently used in the schools. Moreover, the humanists were a self-conscious group, aware of their own literary ideals, and they felt themselves superior to those whose Latin style was peppered with barbarisms and neologisms. Salutati's correspondence, for example, has many references to writers of the 'avant-garde', compared with those who used the inelegant Latin of the schools. Only a step had to be taken before these stylistic questions were entertained in the schools themselves.

Secondly, the humanists, whether they intended to or not, suggested an important reassessment of those disciplines which were taught in the *trivium*. They attached a deeper value to rhetoric than that implied in the university course. For them, it was an exercise which went beyond the schoolroom; its continual cultivation benefited a man throughout his life and in every profession. Rhetoric was not simply a 'text-book' subject, but an intellectual approach and, if practised well, reflected one's moral disposition. Thus, they recaptured the categories of thought of Cicero and Quintilian, another of whose precepts was that the rhetor needed to be acquainted with all other disciplines, if only in a superficial way.[46] Thus, we find some evidence of courtly discussions on the whole range of disciplines, their interconnectedness as well as the separate purpose of each subject. Loschi, for example, in his preface to his *Inquisitio*, described how scholars around the court loved to argue 'de doctissimorum hominum studiis deque omni genere litterarum' and Uberto Decembrio, in the *De Re Publica*, defined the traditional scheme of the seven liberal arts.[47] This theme of the balance needed between all disciplines is found again and again in the letters and orations of Barzizza and, indeed, was a common one among humanists, who brought back to the fore that ideal of the liberal arts course which had undergone severe practical limitations since antiquity.[48] In denying the primacy to any one discipline, there was an implicit attack on the dominance of logic in the arts course. Each art, of course, assumed a different relation to the others, depending on the special interests of the individual,

but each art also had a method and a function peculiar to itself. Thus, the notion of studying grammar from logical premisses was false.

At another point, the humanists presented a challenge to the traditional syllabus. Aristotle, whose texts were the basis of learning in logic and in moral and natural philosophy, was denied his primacy. In moral philosophy, Cicero and Seneca were elevated and Aristotle, though never abandoned, was made to stand on a par with them. In logic Aristotle was left untouched, but the cumulative effect of humanism was to suggest that truth was arrived at not solely by logic; rhetoric was considered an equally valid channel of moral discussion, concerned with a particular aspect of truth. Eventually, and mainly by another route, the primacy of Aristotle in natural philosophy came to be questioned also.

Humanism at court seems to have influenced some scholars in the University. In the absence of letters and private library inventories, much is left to guesswork, but the interests of students outside their official curriculum probably constituted as much an avenue of change in Pavia as in Padua. Barzizza probably pursued such private interests in the University, along with Loschi and one Marciano da Tortona, for whom Barzizza wrote a funeral oration many years later, in which we are told that:

(Marciano) erat enim cum ceterarum omnium artium doctissimus cum poeticis studiis ac singulari eloquentia in primis preditus que humanitatis studia illum multo gratiorem apud tantum principem admirabilioremque reddebant.[49]

Allowing for the inflated language of the panegyric, there is the suggestion that, in Pavia, there was the opportunity, for those students who were interested, to develop and excel in their literary studies. One might include among these students Barzizza's only known pupil during his teaching career at Pavia, Paolo Maffei da Verona, who was to write a humanist dialogue later and became a friend of Guarino da Verona.[50] Also, surprisingly enough, certain lawyers felt a little of the impact of the humanist revival, even at this time.[51]

Barzizza, therefore, belonged to two intellectual traditions: the tradition of the Arts Faculty, as represented by Travesi, in which the selected ancient texts were studied according to a restricted and rigorous method, dictated by the formal needs of teaching and the prevailing modes of scholastic enquiry; and the early humanist tradition, as represented by the courtly circle at Pavia, in which classical authors were approached with new insights, for different purposes and in a more flexible manner. Owing as much to the one as he did to the other, we will see how Barzizza welded the two together.

CHAPTER III

THE FORMS OF BARZIZZA'S TEACHING IN PADUA

There is no evidence that Barzizza wrote anything while he was in Bergamo, Pavia, and Venice. His works seem to have been in one way or another the outcome of his teaching programme at Padua during the years 1407 to 1421. It seems also that he did not seek attention in the prominent literary circles of his day since, by working almost continuously in universities, he did not choose the means by which his ideas could make a quick impression or gain a wide currency; that is, he did not follow the path of most of his humanist contemporaries who entered the Italian courts and civic chanceries, the 'nuclei' of literary as well as political life. It is not surprising, therefore, that he adopted none of those literary forms–invectives, eulogies, princely advice-books, histories–which characterized the marriage of classical learning to statecraft; nor did he write satires, dialogues, or verse, all works of improvisation which flourished in an intellectual climate free from regularized scholarship and academic 'curricula'. He wrote nothing, in other words, which bristled with polemic, invited controversy, or demanded response.

That Barzizza did not claim the widest possible attention in his own time partly explains why he has not claimed enough attention in ours; the noisiest humanists have generally come first, now as then. At all times, Barzizza was the methodical, careful schoolmaster, whose works were the occasional by-products of a life-time of teaching: commentaries and glosses; short treatises on particular aspects of grammar and rhetoric; model letters and orations. The nature of a man's writings, of course, reflects the personality of their author. Barzizza was modest, uncontentious, and shy of the public eye. The comparative neglect of Barzizza by modern historians of Italian humanism, it must be said, is probably also due to the uninspiring character of his writings. Seen individually, as literary pieces in their own right, they offer us very little; indeed, they suggest that he was as unimaginative as he was unoriginal. Even his private correspondence and speeches, which one would hope were stylistically varied and informative of 'the times', are rendered dry and wooden by their painstaking imitation of classical models, while the content of the letters sheds little light beyond the routine and local matters for which they were written.[1]

However, for the historian of the late medieval schools, the 'corpus Barizizianum' is a treasure. The various works, since they can barely be examined singly, have to be considered as a whole, and along thematic rather than chronological lines (indeed, precise dating is generally impossible). Above all, we

must remember that they were intended as supplementary aids to a main body of instruction, as works fitting neatly into a regulated scheme of studies, as manuals for teaching, guides for students, summaries, and handbooks. In subsequent chapters we will examine the exact nature of this scheme of studies, but that can come alive only when, first, we understand both the forms of teaching which Barzizza was able to adopt in Padua and the structure of teaching in the *studium* as a whole.

Barzizza's teaching can be divided roughly into the 'official' and the 'unofficial'. His 'official' teaching corresponded to his public lectures, both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary', and the disputations which he was expected to conduct. These were the obligations which derived from his post as a university *lector* and for which he received a salary from the Venetian authorities.[2] Because of its official status, this form of teaching, as well as its content, was strictly regulated. His 'unofficial' teaching included the 'voluntary' lectures, given under the auspices of the University, but for which he received fees from his audience, and the private instruction in his household. In both of the latter he was quite at liberty to choose his material and the method by which he expounded it. We will consider each form in more detail.

BARZIZZA'S 'OFFICIAL' TEACHING

Barzizza's 'official' teaching career in the Paduan *studium* began in October 1407. The previous month, the *sapientes consilii* in Venice sent a list of 'doctores famosi' to the *podestà* and *capitano* of Padua, publishing the names of those masters to be employed for the new academic year. Among those was 'Magister Gaspar de Pergamo', appointed as a lecturer 'in Rhetoricis et Moralibus (Auctoribus)', at a salary of 120 ducats a year.[3] Barzizza had thereby entered into a contract of service with the Venetian state which was to last until the end of the academic year in 1421.

Barzizza's appointment reflected Venetian policy towards the *studium*. Six weeks after Venice had defeated the Carrara and had taken over the city state of Padua in November 1405, the Senate not only confirmed that the *studium* would continue in Padua but determined, as the Visconti had done in the case of Pavia, that all higher learning in the Venetian dominions would thenceforth be concentrated in Padua and thus forestalled any further attempts by Treviso, Verona, and Vicenza to establish their own *studia generalia*. A year and a half later, the Senate set out to attract the finest masters of the time to Padua by allocating the enormous sum of 4,000 ducats for academic salaries.[4] Besides Barzizza, the list of masters compiled in the following September included Francesco Zabarella and Raffaelo Fulgosi in law and Jacopo da Forlì, Blasio da Parma, and Daniele da Santa Sofia in medicine and natural philosophy, all celebrated professors in their day. It is difficult to know why Cessi and Cestaro thought Barzizza was obscure in his early

years in Padua since he was accorded high recognition from the start.[5] That Barzizza was included in the list of 'famous doctors' confirms this, since we are told that there were many other doctors who were not mentioned at all.[6]

Those particularly responsible for the appointment of Barzizza were the Venetian patricians Niccolò Vettori, a member of that family with which Barzizza was to have close connexions in Padua, and Zaccaria Trevisan, a familiar of the Barbaro household in which Barzizza taught in 1407 and the *capitano* of Padua for that year. Barzizza thanked them for their help in a letter of 1408; 'Vestra auctoritate in hunc me locum honorificum et egregium propris, ut ita dicam, manibus, collocastis.[7]

Barzizza was appointed to lecture on rhetoric and the 'moral' authors, which as we shall see, included Seneca, Cicero, Valerius Maximus, Virgil, Terence, and other major writers of Latin prose and poetry. The lectures on 'the authors' were common in the Italian *studia*, being regarded as a branch of grammar. In Pavia they were carried out, as we saw, by Travesi. There is no evidence to support the view of Facciolati that, from 1407, Barzizza taught moral philosophy on the basis of Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*.[8] Aristotle was the only authority for this course and would hardly have been referred to as 'morales'. Moreover, moral philosophy, at this stage, was taught by a logician, whereas in all the deeds which record Barzizza's presence at an examination he is described as 'gramatice et retorice professor' or 'artium doctor et retorice professor'.[9] Although we lack evidence for the teaching of the *Ethics* in Padua at this period (it was generally regarded as a minor subject), it is extremely doubtful that it was assigned to Barzizza. The strongest reason for departing from Facciolati is the fact that Barzizza had had no training in moral philosophy or even in logic (except in its relation to grammar) before he came to Padua. Only after he came to Padua, between 1407 and 1413, did he study logic and philosophy (natural philosophy, metaphysics and, probably, some moral philosophy), while he was also lecturing on grammar and rhetoric. His doctorate in 'arts', which meant logic and philosophy, is recorded for 16 September 1413:

Licentia privati examinis cum publica doctoratus in scientia art. mag. Gasparini de Pergamo sub rev. sacre theol. mag. d. fr. Paulo de Venetiis acutiss. art. doct. famosissimoque art. et med. doct. mag. Iacobo da la Turre de Furlivio promotoribus suis, presente art. doct. mag. Batista de Neapoli rect. artistarum.[10]

The *promotores* were chosen from among those who had taught the candidate, so it is reasonable to suppose that Paulo Veneto had taught him logic, metaphysics, and moral philosophy and Jacopo da Forlì had taught him natural philosophy.[11]

Although Barzizza did not lecture in these subjects, he seems to have had an interest in them. In his commentaries on Seneca's letters he frequently used Aristotle's *Ethics* as a point of reference and showed himself to be knowledgeable in contemporary logic.[12] In his funeral oration for Jacopo da Forlì (1414) Barzizza

recalls their discussions on the immortality of the soul in which both attacked 'quosdam minutos philophos, qui putarunt animas hominum simul cum corporibus interire'. Barzizza also lists Jacopo's works in a way which suggests he was familiar with them.[13]

By an indirect route, therefore, what we know of Barzizza's study of the other arts helps us to establish more clearly the nature of his teaching, but there are still many gaps in the evidence. We know that he taught rhetoric and the *auctores*, as well as the grammatical doctrines of Priscian, but it is still impossible to know for certain which texts were specified by the terms of his 'official' appointment and which texts he lectured on privately. Even the precise terms of his appointment are unknown, though we can infer a good deal from graduation records in general and the rubrics of university statutes: the statutes of the Paduan Arts Faculty (1465), which registered many traditional practices, the statutes of the Arts Faculty in Pavia (1409); and the 1405 statutes of the Arts Faculty in Bologna, which directly influenced the Paduan Artists. We will make considerable use of these records to give more substance to Barzizza's career in Padua.[14]

The duties of a doctor in the Italian *studia* are conveniently summarized in the report of a *laurea* ceremony at Pavia: teaching activities in the form of *lectio, disputatio*, and *questiones terminandi*; administrative stewardship ('scollas regendi'); and, thirdly, performing duties attached to the authority and privileges of the doctor, such as examining, 'promoting' scholars in examinations, and participating in university ceremonies.[15] Barzizza carried out the first two duties throughout his stay at Padua, but the third he performed only from 1413, when he acquired the doctorate in arts. Thenceforth, he appears five times among the promoters in university examinations and frequently gives orations for university ceremonies.[16] Barzizza became increasingly involved in the official side of university life, if we accept the evidence for his entry into the College of Doctors of Arts, the select body of doctors who governed the teaching in the University of Artists. The rolls for the College, like so many other university records, are missing for this period, though there is a hint from another source that Barzizza was elected to the College during his last four or five years at Padua. During the early years of Venetian rule, citizenship of the Venetian state, through origin, adoption, or honorary conferment, was being demanded more and more as a qualification for entry into the College of Jurists.[17] If a similar tendency prevailed in the College of Artists, this may be the clue to Barzizza's request for citizenship in 1416, which was granted by the Venetian authorities on 6 June 1417.[18]

The evidence of Barzizza's teaching activities, the first duty of the doctor, must now be examined.

(a) *Lectio*

In all disciplines the reading matter for the 'ordinary' lecture course was precisely demarcated, since it covered what was strictly necessary for examinations.

For the course on grammar and rhetoric, Barzizza, like his counterparts in Bologna and Pavia, would have been obliged to lecture on Priscian, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and the *De Inventione* during all 'non-festive' days in term. The Bolognese practice of holding lectures on grammar in the early morning ('in missa Sancti Petri') and again in the afternoon ('in vesperis parvis') was probably followed in Padua.[19] Lectures in rhetoric were held in the evenings, unless the lecturer found another time of the day more convenient to him.[20] To ensure that these arrangements were adhered to, Barzizza, like other lecturers *in scholis publicis*, came under the surveillance of university officials.[21]

Although there is only one example of a doctorate in grammar and rhetoric between 1407 and 1421, some knowledge of Priscian and the two rhetorical texts was expected of all students in the *studium*. Yet, considering the importance of the 'ordinary' lectures, the intellectual backbone of the university, there is very little evidence of Barzizza's lectures in this form. Of his lectures on Priscian we know nothing. For his course on rhetoric some evidence survives, but it amounts to only a very small part of his teaching. There is no record of his lectures on Cicero's *De Inventione*, but we have his commentary on Book IV of the *Ad Herennium*, also an anonymous fifteenth-century commentary on the same text, which Barzizza owned and probably used in this course, and some notes, probably made by a pupil from Barzizza's lectures.[22]

The 'extraordinary' lectures were less formal and regularized than the 'ordinary', as is suggested by the fact that they were held on 'festive' days, on certain afternoons, or even in the vacations. They were ancillary to the 'ordinary' lectures, dealing with those sections of the main texts which had been omitted in the 'ordinary' course, or with less important texts by major authors, or with marginal disciplines which were excluded from the 'ordinary' course altogether.[23] Barzizza's lectures on the authors were probably 'extraordinary' and also his lectures on rhetorical writings other than the two standard texts, such as the orations and letters of Cicero and Quintilian's *Institutes*. It should be added that some of these lectures may not have been 'extraordinary' but 'voluntary', another form which we will see shortly.

(b) *Disputatio* and *Questiones Terminandi*

Barzizza was obliged to hold 'at least' two public disputations a year. This was primarily for the benefit of the scholars, whether they were participating or merely listening: 'Quotidiana experientia docet quantum fructum pariat exercitatio quantumque valeat ad scholarium audaciam informandam frequens disputatio.[24] He either disputed with a scholar or with a master, as an example for his students, or he arranged disputations among his older scholars prior to their *licentia*, presiding at these as a kind of adjudicator, summing up and, where necessary, making criticisms (*questiones terminandi*). The disputation played a central role in all faculties and in all medieval universities since it demanded that scholars should use the material

they had learnt in the sharp formulation of their ideas and it also provided a ready means of assessing a student's ability and progress.

The statutory evidence which we have used to outline Barzizza's 'official' teaching is limited by the fact that it gives the essence of an ideal programme. Doubtless, this was often modified in practice, since it had to be interpreted according to the actual complexity and complications of university instruction; but the broad outlines hold good. We know that Barzizza's university teaching hinged on the *lectio* and *disputatio* and that these 'public studies' took up a good deal of his time—too much he tought.[25]

BARRZIZZA'S 'UNOFFICIAL' TEACHING

In comparison with his specified university instruction, Barzizza's private pedagogy had greater vitality. This is apparent not so much because there is very little evidence for the former and much evidence for the latter, but because, as we will see more clearly in later chapters, Barzizza devoted more energy to his 'voluntary' lectures, to household tuition and to informal instruction in general.

(a) *The 'Voluntary' Lectures*

The Italian universities made provision for both masters and students to offer lectures on whatever subject they wanted. The conditions were set down in the statutes: permission must first be obtained from the Rector of the University and the lecturer must announce to his audience beforehand what the attendance fee would be. Similar provisions were made for 'voluntary' disputations.[26] In a more general way the university authorities sponsored these voluntary pursuits. It was recognized that an older scholar, aspiring to an academic career, could use the voluntary lecture to gain practice. A master, on the other hand, could use it to generate greater interest in his subject or to present unconventional views, or simply to supplement his income. In an indefinable way, the prestige of a university as a learned community could be heightened by the quality and amount of intellectual activity outside the bounds of the main curriculum. The 'voluntary' lecture took the 'extraordinary' lecture one stage further removed from the 'ordinary' course, the first two resembling each other in that they both dealt with material over and above the required minimum and both depended on a 'voluntary' audience. Since they were essentially similar and since the evidence for Barzizza's lectures does not allow us to distinguish between them, we will henceforth consider them in conjunction.

The enormous importance of these forms of lectures for the full and systematic introduction of *studia humanitatis* into the University of Padua becomes clearer when we recall the low position which grammar and rhetoric held in the *studium*. In institutional arrangements, the masters and scholars of grammar and rhetoric had the least weight and in intellectual terms it was thought that these subjects could be

studied as an introductory basis to the main material of the arts course and to the study of law.[27] The university statutes, therefore, gave them only scant attention; only three texts were specified and nothing is said on how they should be expounded, in contrast to the meticulously precise stipulations for lecturing on other disciplines.[28] Paradoxically, grammar and rhetoric gained a peculiar strength from this neglect. Since they were not cramped by heavy and rigid statutory provisions, they could be the most pliable disciplines. Under a master inspired by humanist studies and debates outside the universities, the fragmentary teaching of classical letters in the arts course could be infinitely extended and shaped. These 'open-ended' arrangements gave the humanist master the opportunity to create a scheme of studies almost anew and to formulate his own methods. Almost a whole course could be established outside the 'ordinary' curriculum, whereas in other disciplines the teaching load within the official course was so packed as to allow little development outside it.

The success of the voluntary lecture depended, almost entirely, on the ability of the master giving it. The audience had to pay him and, in crude terms, they naturally wanted their money's worth. Secondly, the voluntary lectures were 'open'; by stepping outside the narrow path of prescribed courses, the humanist could appeal to the entire *studium*, cutting right across faculty divisions. In this respect, the lectures resembled the inaugural addresses given to the whole University for each academic year.[29] Both forms were used to great effect by humanists—Barzizza in Padua, Guarino in Ferrara, and even Valla in Pavia—and it was partly in this way that students and doctors in other faculties were attracted by humanism. Thirdly, the voluntary lectures were sometimes used as platforms from which masters could propound new ideas, publicly answer their critics, or attempt to generate a wide interest in some area of their work which did not fit into the main curriculum. Sometimes the lectures were given to meet the demands of scholars whose views the master knew privately.

Barzizza's lectures on the *Epistolae Morales* of Seneca illustrate many of those aspects of the voluntary lecture, while showing how it often led into the entanglement of academic controversy in a way that the conventional, 'ordinary' lectures did not. In his introduction to his commentaries on the letters, he tells us that they were originally given as lectures and how these lectures came about.[30] He had a high regard for stoic philosophy in general and for Seneca's in particular. He felt that the *Epistolae Morales ad Lucilium* were the product of the greatest moral philosopher in antiquity. Besides studying Seneca privately he had discussed his tenets with friends: 'quotiens otium mihi esset et cum amicis meis et sine pisis aliquam eius sententiam legerem'. The results of these meditations and discussions were two series of public lectures on the letters. The first had aroused hostile criticism in certain quarters, which he put down to jealousy or ignorance, and so, at the instigation of learned friends ('hortatu doctissimorum hominum'), he decided to tackle his opponents in another set of lectures ('sententias huius pulcerrimi operis

iterum in publico exponere'). This, however, was only a half considered plan which he was tempted to abandon since he was unsure of his abilities and family affairs were draining his time and energy. But his friends badgered him, offered assistance and debated among themselves which method should be adopted in the lectures. The comprehensive and disorderly commentary on the first letter, Barzizza explains, was due partly to the variety of these opinions, which he wished to incorporate, and partly to the hurried and strained conditions under which he had to work. Eventually, however, he and his friends had come to agree on two major purposes: to set out and discuss all the important opinions so far expressed about the first letter and then to unravel the knottiest passage by reference to Seneca's whole moral philosophy. The latter purpose led him to expound in detail all the letters, in order to understand properly Seneca's philosophical language, his intentions and the conditions in which he lived.[31]

The circumstances of Barzizza's lectures on Seneca illustrate how private discussions, academic hostilities, and a search for a new approach all came into play in voluntary lectures. The same conditions prevailed with the rhetorical lectures of another humanist in Padua, Vittorino da Feltre. He was not employed as a publicly salaried master until 1422, but, as a voluntary lecturer, he was able to gain a wide hearing for his new methods of interpretation and his attacks on diehard traditional teaching. Platina has left a beautiful description of Vittorino's lectures in Padua, which he gave between *c*.1410 and *c*.1415:

Patavii publice aliquot annis rhetoricam docuit, nullo nisi publico praemio accepto; satis sibi a discipulis fieri dictitans, si et eleganter loqui, et bene vivere didicissent. Auditores, qui plurimi ad eum confluebant cum bona spe dimittens, alacriores semper ad perseverandum reddebat, lectione utens urbana, simplici, ac pudica, omni pompa ac fastu verborum, quo concitari invidia, atque odium solet, procul amota; pertaesus vero scholasticorum arrogantiam, et flagitia, in quae adolescentes ob petulantiam et licentiam in publicis maxime gymnasiis incurrunt.[32]

Platina's account was written a generation later and was probably idealized, but it does attest the memorable impression left by Vittorino's lectures. His hold over an audience was partly due, no doubt, to the attractive personality of the man, but also to his readiness to criticize current practices in the schools. For airing slightly unconventional views the ideal forum was provided by the voluntary arrangements.

(b) *Barzizza's Household*

Following a common practice among university masters and private teachers of grammar at that time, Barzizza took the lease of a large tenement in Padua in which he provided board, lodging, and tuition for perhaps up to fifteen or twenty pupils at standard prices. This hospice and school, which he called a *collegium* or *gymnasium*, was situated in the Via Pozzo Campione in the district which is still called the Prato. We know that he gradually enlarged it by acquiring adjacent houses.[33]

We will describe Barzizza's *collegium* more fully in Chapter VII, but it must be

mentioned here in order to give a balanced picture of his teaching activities as a whole. At any given time, there would have been two kinds of teaching. First, he held an elementary grammar course for boys between seven and fifteen years old, probably delegating to a *repetitor* much of the teaching of the youngest group of *non latinantes*. Secondly, he gave extra tuition to older students who had entered the university arts course. It was for the benefit of these two groups that Barzizza wrote the many short manuals on grammar and rhetoric. In addition to his school, Barzizza seems to have turned the *collegium* into a meeting-place for his literary friends and former students who happened to be in Padua. For these and for his older students he organized readings of classical authors, debates and discussions of literary matters, which were informal renderings of the *lecturae* and *disputationes*. Thirdly, the household was a *scriptorium* and a centre for textual scholarship, providing the essential preliminary work on those texts which Barzizza was to expound in his public lectures.

Barzizza's household activities were to inform every branch of his teaching. There he prepared the work for his public lectures, through textual research or through the literary criticisms which he received from friends, as we saw in the case of his lectures on Seneca. There his public teaching was extended and refined in the tuition which he gave to students and in the literary discussions which he promoted. There he exercised a continual and pervasive influence over the minds of his pupils and it was in his private school that he was given the unlimited opportunity to devise that scheme of studies which will be examined in the following three chapters.

* * *

A very clear pattern emerges from a study of Barzizza's teaching; the less formal and 'official' the teaching the more evidence there is. For his 'ordinary' lectures and disputations, there is least evidence. The university was not prepared to add to the statutory three texts for study in grammar and rhetoric and this was evidently still the case in 1465 when the Statutes for Artists were revised. An extensive course on letters had to be held outside the central curriculum, through the less formal and less regulated means of the 'extraordinary' and 'voluntary' lectures. For Barzizza's use of these there is a great deal of evidence, as we shall see. Even more evidence, however, survives for Barzizza's private teaching, that area which lay right on the periphery of university teaching. The work for which Barzizza was to be remembered by later humanists, his textual scholarship and his various didactic manuals, was derived from his household instruction.

Barzizza's Paduan teaching seems to bear out the principle, generally a reliable one, that intellectual change comes about outside a rigid academic curriculum which, because it is embedded in the heavy structure of institutional teaching, is inclined more to self-perpetuation than to quick change, even in questions of

emphasis only. Broadly speaking, the principle is valid for humanist studies in Padua, but it could be misleading. In general, Barzizza did not oppose the *studia humanitatis* to the traditional course in the University, but saw these studies as filling out and refining the statutory instruction. He took the latter as his starting point and, indeed, the techniques and assumptions of university teaching, with which he was deeply familiar, were to penetrate and, to a certain extent, shape his private teaching. His school produced changes in emphasis rather than any new, fundamental reckonings.

In the next three chapters we will systematically set out Barzizza's teaching in grammar, which is divided into two branches, and rhetoric, in an attempt to present his scheme of studies more clearly. However, there is no evidence that he taught exactly according to these divisions. Indeed, he seems to have regarded disciplines as interconnected and his teaching had a unity, an inner coherence which cut across the formal divisions between subjects. Thus, he interpreted classical authors both from the point of view of style and of moral content, while also using the texts to substantiate grammatical precepts. Grammar and rhetoric, with their various divisions, were made to merge into one course on letters, the *studia humanitatis*. In a letter to the grammarian Enrico Veronese, he appealed to the interdependence of rhetoric, poetry, and grammar:

Lege etiam oro Ciceronem in suo Oratore, et videbis dilucide, quam necessaria, atque utilis sit Rhetori poetica facultas. Adde praeterea, quod illi ipsi Auctores unum, et eundem finem respiciunt; nam habent propemodum similitudinem, quam si mente concipere volueris, illum ipsum recte factum confiteberis, quod ego facio. Proponas tibi hominem, qui se optet bonum esse artificem, sed pauperrimum, qui prorsus careat instrumentis ad illam ipsam artem necessariis: quid tunc proderit ei ars? Certe nihil. Itidem mihi: quid mihi prodesset Cicero sine Prisciano, et Terentio, et caeteris Poetis? Quid Priscianus sine Cicerone et Terentio? Quid denique Terentius sine Cicerone et Prisciano? Sane nihil.[34]

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.

CHAPTER V

BARZIZZA'S COURSE ON GRAMMAR: *'Studia Litterarum'*

We have seen how Barzizza presented the first stages of grammar as an ordered investigation into Latin diction; its origins, its evolution, its complex usages, and its construction. It was, however, a programme of study which was entirely unoriginal. The fourfold division of grammar was followed in all the elementary schools in Italy at that time, a course which continued, in shadowy outline, the grammatical teaching of late antiquity. Yet, the Paduan school achieved a reputation among humanists and exercised an influence which set it apart from the ordinary grammar school. While the framework of teaching was a standard form, Barzizza managed, within those limits, to further the scope of grammar, alter its emphasis and, to a certain extent, change its purpose. He went beyond the notion that grammar was merely a necessary and useful art which prepared students for professional studies, and attempted to instil in his pupils an interest in the classical Latin language for its own sake. He showed, furthermore, that all grammatical precepts were derived from the literary usage of the classical authors rather than from logical premisses and his approach demanded an elementary understanding of literary development, as well as an awareness that rules are often tempered by sensitive and creative improvisation. In every way, this notion of grammar was related to the disciplined and resourceful reading of classical literature, the *studia litterarum*.

Before we examine the particular way in which Barzizza approached the authors, it is important to understand the impetus behind his literary studies and their cumulative effect. The medieval schools and universities were principally designed to train their members for a professional career in the church or the state. Within these institutions all disciplines were, in some measure, interdependent and all presupposed some initial grounding in the *trivium*, those linguistic sciences which were regarded as 'media' through which the higher studies of law, medicine, and theology could be formally conducted. Grammar, rhetoric, and logic, therefore, were given importance because they were fundamental and useful skills, not because they were regarded as of sufficient value in themselves. However, the course on grammar (and rhetoric) was, in some respects, unique among disciplines. As we saw in Chapter I, since grammar in the university, at least in Padua, tended to be regarded as an extension of what had been taught in the elementary schools, the provisions for its teaching were comparatively neglected by the statute-making bodies. The course on grammar, therefore, could be extended or contracted,

according to the intentions of the master teaching it. In the hands of a master whose interest in the classics was unusually deep, grammar could be made to include the study of a wide field of classical literature; the *lecturae auctorum*, which was traditionally regarded as one of the functions of the grammarian, could be considerably extended and refined. Barzizza, because of his interest in the wider humanist learning of the times, was able to turn the 'reading of the authors' into a full-scale course of literary studies, a course, moreover, which was valuable in itself and was not linked to practical considerations. Pure erudition and moral propositions are the only treasures which he seems to have sought from the ancients. As a result, Barzizza's house in Padua was not only a school, but also became a centre of scholarship which attracted notable members of the University and some men of affairs, whose interest in the classics was informal. If the humanists were the first since antiquity to introduce into the pedagogic tradition of Western Europe the notion and practice of pure scholarship and research, serving only the cultivation of the inner man, then Barzizza holds an important place in their ranks.

Barzizza developed, therefore, the 'reading of the authors', which was practised in the higher classes of the elementary schools and in the university arts course. This he accomplished by dividing the *studia litterarum* into four branches:

(a) 'emendatio', the attempt to establish a correct textual reading;
(b) 'lectio', the correct reading out aloud of the text;
(c) 'expositio', the clarification and explanation of particular points in the text (this generally accompanied the 'lectio');
(d) 'iudicium', the interpretation of the content, usually from a moral aspect.

These categories were never actually set down in this way in any of Barzizza's writings, but his literary criticism fits so precisely into this ancient scheme that it is hard to believe that he was not trying to reproduce it, especially as he knew so well those treatises in which it was set out.[1] At any rate, whether or not he was aware of this ancient pedagogic model, his teaching of the *studia litterarum* did, in effect, correspond to it and this he managed to achieve by drawing together into an ordered syllabus two strands of literary pursuit which were already in existence in his time, but which had existed separately from each other.

The emendation of classical texts, involving the collation of diverse manuscript copies of a work and the quest for new or unmutilated codices, had been the growing concern of humanists since about the mid-fourteenth century.[2] While these scholars, such as Petrarch, Salutati, and Poggio, were concerned, also, with the moral content and style of classical writings, their interests did not take a systematic form nor did they engage in any pedagogic exposition of their favourite authors. On the other hand, the formal teaching of classical literature, the province of the grammar schools and universities, had been almost completely out of touch with the work of the humanists; or, at least, the schoolmasters had not made any notable attempt to incorporate the new textual enquiries and interpretative insights

of the humanists into their teaching programme. There was a gap between the teaching of the Latin language and literature, on the one hand, and the new research and literary criticism on the other. In other words, 'lectio' and 'expositio' were not in line with 'emendatio' and 'iudicium'. Barzizza bridged this gap and created an 'up-to-date' course on grammar. Through his contacts with informal humanist groups, he was able to draw on new textual discoveries, to exchange books, and to share in the infectious enthusiasm for antiquity. Through his private school and public teaching, he was able to adapt his literary erudition to the progression of an academic curriculum. It was strictly a progression, since each stage arose out of the preceding one and depended on the next, but since each stage or branch of the *studia litterarum* required particular techniques, it is convenient to examine each one separately.

(a) *Emendatio*

The emendation of texts was made the foundation of the *studia litterarum* in the Paduan school. The reading, exposition, and criticism of an author could proceed properly only when the textual groundwork had been laid as firmly as possible. An attempt, however inadequate or unsuccessful in its outcome, was always made to establish a correct textual reading.

From Barzizza's letters we know that, whenever he decided to produce a commentary or a lecture-course on an author, there was generally a flurry of activity among his pupils and friends to collect as many manuscript copies of the work as possible for purposes of collation; or Barzizza used his contacts in the Veneto to obtain what was thought to be a particularly good copy. There was much borrowing, transcribing, checking, and correcting. Sometimes this process proved frustratingly lengthy and Barzizza would begin a commentary while still seeking better texts from which to work, making appropriate adjustments later, if they were necessary. Sometime after 1411, for example, Barzizza proposed to write a commentary on Pliny's *Natural History*. He had had an imperfect copy of the work sent to him by his former pupil, Giovanni Corner (Cornaro), a Venetian patrician. For lack of any other copy Barzizza had this transcribed, but he claimed it contained more errors than correct parts; indeed, he added, he had never seen a 'correct' Pliny. He asked Corner to inform him of any better copy of which he might hear and, if others were found, then he wanted Corner's judgement on their quality. In fact, not long after, Barzizza's medical friend in Venice, Pietro Tommasi, came across a Pliny 'perrarum et singularem' and arrangements were quickly made for its purchase. Unfortunately, the commentary of Barzizza on this text has not come to light.[3]

Far more protracted and complicated was Barzizza's textual work on Cicero. He seems to have planned to emend the entire Ciceronian corpus—'ad effingendum Ciceronem', as he called his task—and the surviving works of this vast project provide the most complete examples of his method of emendation. It was his years

of study on the Ciceronian texts which earned for Barzizza the recognition of his humanist contemporaries as the finest Ciceronian scholar of the day. This work on the mutilated rhetorical works of Cicero, which occupied most of his period in Padua, has been examined thoroughly by R. Sabbadini, who also published all the relevant documentary evidence. Much of what is said here is drawn from Sabbadini's findings.[4]

Because of thirteenth-century scribal arrangements of the mutilated codices of the *De Oratore* and *Orator*, Barzizza thought, initially, that the two works were a single treatise, the latter being a fourth section of the former. He possessed this 'single treatise' in 1407, or even earlier, although it passed from his hands for five years until it was returned to him through his Venetian friend, Zaccaria Trevisan. In *c.*1412 two former pupils, Andrea Giuliano and Daniele Vettori, sent Barzizza a hitherto unknown fragment of the work and, at about the same time, he learned of a fragment discovered at Florence, though he doubted Cicero's authorship of this latter piece. Barzizza gathered as many manuscripts of the *De Oratore* as he could and then set about emending the mutilated text as far as this was possible. We know the methods which he adopted from a letter he wrote to Giovanni Corner.[5] First, he divided up the text into chapters and sections, giving marginal summaries of the material ('sententiam'). He had collected as many codices of the text as he could find and chose those readings which he thought were most accurate (although he does not state what his criteria were). Where there was ambiguity due to scribal negligence or to a faded script he made conjectures ('quae ambigua erant, aut propter librariorum incuriam aut propter vetustatem, interpretatus fui'). Perhaps by 'interpretation' Barzizza meant the correction of scribal errors brought about by a shaky grasp of orthography, careless transcription or a mistaken reading of abbreviatory signs. Finally, he met the problem of textual *lacunae* by giving his suggestions in the margin. Thus, he showed a scrupulous respect for the given text, resisting the temptation to insert what he thought might be a plausible bridge; by his marginal *supplementa*, he merely reconnected the thread of the discourse in a tentative way. He was also at pains to give alternative readings from other codices in his glosses.[6]

Similarly Barzizza examined the corrupt texts of the *Orator*, in a way that suggests that he gradually realized that it was a separate work from the *De Oratore*, and he also studied texts of the *Epistulae ad Atticum* and the *Tusculan Disputations*. From a letter by a pupil of Barzizza we know that the master thoroughly corrected the *Epistulae* ('ad unguem . . . correcte') and it was perhaps this corrected copy which he sent to Giuliano in Venice in *c.*1408. Much later, in 1418, Barzizza announced to Lorenzo Bonzio, the Venetian grammarian, that he had finished emending the *Tusculan Disputations*, a most difficult undertaking on account of the number of earlier scribal errors. Sometime before 1417 he also attempted to correct the mutilated text of Quintilian's *Institutes* and to write *supplementa* for the missing parts.[7]

Broadly speaking, the collation and emendation of texts fell into two parts. The first was the collection of manuscript copies of known works and the attempt to arrive at a correct reading, while giving cautious recognition to possible alternatives. The critical techniques, or lack of them, at Barzizza's disposal will be examined shortly. He did not, of course, work alone, although he was the guiding figure and his Paduan school was his *studio*. He was given much assistance in buying and borrowing books, as well as scholarly advice, by his friends in the Veneto, particularly those Venetian aristocrats who were associated with his household school: Daniele Vettori, Marco Dandolo, Giovanni Corner, Andrea Giuliano, Francesco Barbaro, and others. This activity was a mainly local affair. The second and more exciting part of textual emendation involved the search for unknown classical works and for complete copies of works which were only known in fragments. Here Barzizza was drawn into a far wider network of scholarship.

He did not participate personally or directly in the search for ancient codices, tied as he was to his teaching duties and hampered by financial straits, but he remained in touch with the discoveries through his colleagues and correspondents, particularly through Guarino, whose circle in Venice was closely connected with members of the humanist group who served as secretaries and *curiales* at the Council of Constance.[8] Barzizza's exposition of texts in their mutilated condition made him acutely aware of their inadequacy and his excitement at the disinterment of complete or new texts was in proportion to his earlier dissatisfaction. For at least two months in 1417, however, Barzizza was himself at Constance as an apostolic secretary. He moved out from the schools into a wider and livelier literary circle. It is impossible to say to what extent Barzizza familiarized himself with the St Gall discoveries of Poggio. Certainly he knew the Asconius Pedianus, since he was to use it in his *De Orthographia*, and certainly, through contacts he made at Constance, he later received a copy of the complete Quintilian, which, he tells us, he used 'daily' in Padua.[9] Perhaps it was in Constance, when Barzizza mingled with some of the prominent humanists of the day, that his reputation as a foremost textual scholar and an authority on Cicero was firmly established. The high esteem in which he was held was borne out by the part he was invited to play in the major discovery of Cicero's rhetorical works at Lodi in 1421. The circumstances of the Lodi episode have been fully examined.[10] Here it is only necessary to show how it related to Barzizza's teaching.

That Bishop Landriani had the *De Oratore, Orator*, and *Brutus* sent immediately to Barzizza in Milan (1421-22) attests to the impressive mark which the latter had made as a textual scholar and Ciceronian expert. It was, in this respect, the culmination of his years of textual emendation at Padua. Although he probably played little part in the technical work of deciphering the codices–that was mainly the achievement of his pupil Cosma Raimondi–he supervised the undertaking and put his experience at the disposal of those scholars involved. However much credit he in fact deserves for the operation, it is significant that contemporary humanists

believed his contribution to have been central and this estimation was continued in the literary histories of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.[11] Moreover, although Barzizza's most active teaching years were over (he was now in his sixties) it seems that he might have revised his teaching, where necessary, in the light of the recent manuscript discoveries. We know for example, that he used the unmutilated *De Oratore* in his recension of the *De Orthographia*.[12]

As a textual scholar Barzizza was regarded as an 'authority' by fifteenth-century Italian humanists, but they tended self-consciously to cut themselves off from a 'medieval' textual tradition with the result that they misrepresented their own achievements and limitations in this field. Barzizza has an important place in the history of textual scholarship because of his awareness of the problems involved, not so much because he made any real technical advances towards their solution.

A recent and important article by E. J. Kenney has analysed the character and limits of 'medieval' textual scholarship, as exemplified in the monastic *scriptorium*.[13] 'Copyists saw their task to reproduce the transmitted text, that of their exemplar.' The correction of the text was limited to setting it in order and searching for good or better readings. 'Criticism' was limited to choice between variants, a choice determined by the quality of textual forms rather than by any reasoned principles. What was lacking was any attempt to devise 'scientific' criteria or plausible conjecture for preferring one reading to another; straightforward transmission was the overriding concern. Kenney sees in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries 'the secularisation of the copying of texts' marked by the gradual decline of the monastic *scriptorium* and the simultaneous rise of the professional (often lay) scribe and the advent of the 'scholar', exemplified most fully in the person of Petrarch. These gradual changes were to bring about conditions which were conducive to a re-evaluation of textual tradition. It was this urge towards a more reasoned scholarship, as Kenney presents it, which Barzizza represented and, indeed, stimulated.

Yet, while he perceived some of the difficulties which needed to be resolved in order to establish a correct edition of a text, Barzizza lacked the techniques to answer those needs and, in practice, he generally had to fall back on the 'medieval' and unsophisticated methods of textual activity. In a few respects, however, he advanced beyond the *scriptorium* tradition (although how he stood in relation to his humanist contemporaries, in regard to textual enquiries, would require a full study in itself). First, he appreciated, in a vague way, the importance of a textual tradition as such when he devised a rough method of separating older and more recent manuscript copies on the grounds of script, orthography, and punctuation. He was aware that the older copy was probably the more reliable, though, of course, he lacked the critical apparatus for tracing a *stemma*. Secondly, by stressing the importance of orthography (in all its parts) he perceived where and how scribal errors had come about and, thereby, how misreadings of a text could be perpetuated. Thirdly, he attached importance to reasoned conjecture. He

demonstrated an elementary appreciation of context, the attempt to elicit the correct reading of a particular passage by referring to the general sense of the argument in which it is located and by understanding the meaning which an author gives to terms in all his writings. We see this in his *supplementa* to missing passages, in his glosses and, more fully, in his commentaries. Finally, he recognized the problems of forgery and authenticity. For example, in his copy of the *Declamationes* of Quintilian, he doubted Quintilian's authorship of the twentieth declamation on stylistic grounds: 'sed non putatur Quintilianai quia stilus non satis congruit'.[14] Barzizza also figured in a debate over the authorship of the *Gallic Wars*, as we learn from one of P. C. Decembrio's *Epistolae Juveniles* in which the latter summarized the problem for Archbishop Bartolomeo of Milan: some attribute the work to Suetonius, others to Celsus Julius, rather than to Julius Caesar, while others debate over the former two, thus removing Caesar from all consideration. Among these last, apparently, was Barzizza, since a marginal note gives: 'error Gasparini Barzizij'.[15]

Barzizza's emendation of texts was carried out in his household school, in which he must have discussed with his pupils and friends those difficulties which he saw were intricately related to the task of reading texts correctly. This textual study had a fundamental bearing on his teaching programme since he regarded *emendatio* as both a prerequisite and an integral part of his lectures on the authors. He embraced the methods and findings of the humanists into his teaching and, thereby, developed and made more complex an existing branch of the grammatical syllabus.

(b) *Lectio*

In the ancient and medieval schools *lectio* involved the reading through of a text line by line, either amongst a group in a classroom or privately by the individual. We know that Barzizza held informal readings with his friends, such as the reading of Macrobius's *Saturnalia*, which he recounted in a letter to Vettori.[16] He spoke of the pleasure and amusement to be derived from such gatherings, citing Cicero, Socrates, Laelius, and Scipio who said many things jokingly to release tension. Valerius Maximus he read to his small son and we know he also read Martial to the young Francesco Barbaro. These leisured and purposeful pursuits, like the discussion of moral problems among friends, were the highest occupation of *otium*, with its contrived reproduction of a classical setting. Such ideals illustrate the extent to which Barzizza believed the *studia litterarum* to be of life-long value for their own sake.

For formal readings in Barzizza's school there is no evidence, but there is no reason to suppose that he did not follow the traditional practice of the grammar schools. Traditionally, *lectio* was an exercise for the *latinantes*, those boys aged from about eleven to fourteen. It allowed the pupil to acquaint himself with passages from major Latin authors, which naturally increased his comprehension of the Latin language. In the ancient schools, reading authors out loud formed part of the training for spoken rhetoric since, by sharpening the student's ear for the flow

and rhythm of language, it contributed to his training in the art of persuasion. However, we do not know whether Barzizza taught along these lines.[17]

(c) *Expositio*

Whether texts were read in school or privately, the more difficult or obscurer passages needed elucidation by the master and certain aids were adopted to make the work as a whole more intelligible. The means by which Barzizza gave an elucidation or *expositio* of the text can be divided up as follows:

(i) The explanatory gloss on the language and argument.

These were conventional interlinear glosses giving synonyms or short definitions for words and phrases or marginal glosses which might paraphrase or summarize the parts of an argument.[18]

(ii) The formal division and ordering of the work.

The *tractatus* was divided into *partes* and each *pars* into *particula*. Generally, at the beginning of the *tractatus* a summary of the argument was given and, throughout, the divisions were given marginal headings. In a philosophical work, such as Cicero's *De Senectute*, Barzizza's divisions generally corresponded to the ordering of the *quaestiones*. Besides helping to make a text more manageable and, therefore, more comprehensible, these divisions may have served as marking points, facilitating reference and revision.[19]

(iii) Glosses giving alternative readings from other manuscript copies of the text.

This was the most obvious way in which Barzizza related his work of textual emendation to the business of expounding the literal meaning of a work. The best example is the fourteenth-century copy of Quintilian's *Declamationes* to which Barzizza added, in the margin, alternative readings which he had found 'in a certain very old codex'.[20]

(iv) Occasional notes.

These generally consisted of precise references for quotations or allusions in the text and notes on biographical or historical details. Several of the annotated texts owned by Barzizza are remarkable for the thoroughness which he showed in citing and comparing historical sources. Ugo Lepore has compiled a list of his references to Valerius Maximus and Cicero's works in his glosses on the *Periochae Livianae*.[21] In his glosses on Cicero's *De Oratore* he cross-refers to Livy, Maximus, Aulus Gellius, Plutarch, and Suetonius. The historical notes on Claudian are based on Sallust, Statius, and Orosius.[22]

Sometimes the references are of a more general nature, such as those which point to a similar argument used elsewhere. Some notes he seems to have made for his own use, perhaps as 'reminders' or references which he could incorporate in his glosses or commentaries on other texts.

(v) Notes on rhetorical techniques.

Not surprisingly, these make up some of the glosses on Barzizza's copies of the *De Oratore* and the *Orator*. They might pinpoint the rhetorical method

which the author is discussing ('captatio benivolentiae' etc.) or refer to other rhetorical texts which are relevant to the matter in hand.[23] Notes on style are rare: in fact, I have found them only in the glosses on Claudian (Book I, *De Nuptiis*), where Barzizza indicates Claudian's changes (four 'diversitates') in the metre.[24]

(vi) The extended gloss

This is found, for example, in Barzizza's same copy of the mutilated *De Oratore* which is so heavily annotated as to fall midway between the textual gloss and the separate commentary; indeed, the glosses amount to almost a continuous commentary on the text. He gives a prefatory summary on the lines of the traditional *accessus ad auctores,*[25] discussing *libri titulus, materia, auctoris intentio,* and *modus tractandi.* The glosses then paraphrase the text so as to highlight the main stages of the *argumentatio*. More penetrating were his glosses on the *Declamationes* of Quintilian and Seneca, which were almost exclusively concerned with illuminating the various legal arguments presented by the prosecutors and defence and summarizing the specific laws which are at stake. At the beginning of each *declamatio* he presents briefly the issues. Thus, Seneca's seventh *declamatio* concerns a poor father who seeks food from his son who refuses it: what is the law on the duty of children to feed their parents and does it apply here? Extensive notes are then made on each stage of the case as it unfolds. Barzizza seemed to be primarily interested in the questions of moral philosophy which inform jurisprudence, though he probably also appealed to the student of rhetoric in so far as the *Declamationes* illustrated the material and form of forensic oratory.

Barzizza's marginal glosses on Seneca's *Tragedies* are a continuous summary of the plot in each, while incorporating abundant information on the mythological background, using Virgil and Ovid as his main sources. One can well visualize here the reading through of the text from the *cathedra*: often, for example, he gives a prose version for the poetic forms, reminds the students what has happened, or points out to whom or to what reference is being made.

In general, there is nothing new about the techniques and characteristics of Barzizza's glosses. One need look no further than the manuscript copies in thirteenth and fourteenth hands which he possessed. Sometimes he adds the same kind of gloss to those already made, which appears to be a superfluous exercise. In two important ways, however, certain glosses reveal a humanistic interest in literary studies as opposed to the conventional approach to classical texts in the schools, though the differences are really in degree not in kind. First, he gives methodical attention to alternative readings from other texts. Secondly, there is a greater depth in his explanation of references, which serve as more than aids to elucidating the text, as they reveal an interest in the history and composition of the ancient world. There are frequent and often detailed discussions of the historical background,

which partly show the interests of the antiquarian and encyclopedist. He is quick to elaborate on a geographical reference or add to a legend.[26] These glosses also show the questioning mind which combed through the ancient sources. Thus, Barzizza compiled a genealogical tree from references in Claudian, but notes that the results from Claudian differ from the facts as presented by Orosius: 'hec genealogia videtur contra narrationem horosij'.[27] This is one of the innumerable examples where he juxtaposes authorities, especially where they are at odds. Sabbadini believed the postils on the *Periochae Livianae* were Petrarch's because they seemed to bear his stamp in the frequency of the comparisons with other sources, in the questioning of traditional opinion by noting divergencies in the authors and in the emphasis given to the morality of the action. In fact, the postils have been shown to be Barzizza's, but Sabbadini's mistake does suggest how firmly Barzizza sensed and worked within the Petrarchan textual tradition.[28] This humanist scholarship differed from the traditional grammatical exposition in degree; a deeper awareness that one classical text cannot be studied in isolation from the corpus of classical literature, a greater erudition, and a more thorough investigation of the sources. These qualities appear more fully in Barzizza's separate commentaries on authors, the final branch of the *studia litterarum*, which we will now examine.

(d) *Iudicium*

In teaching literary texts the connexion between *expositio* and *iudicium* was a natural one. Indeed, the development of the textual gloss into the full commentary, separate from the text, was a feature of medieval school instruction held in common by at least the schools of grammar, law, and biblical exegesis from the twelfth century onwards.[29] As we saw, Barzizza's glosses served several functions: (1) to comment on particular words and phrases; (2) to divide up a text; (3) to elucidate the subject matter and (4) to summarize or draw attention to stages in the argument or to particular *sententiae*. Their common purpose was to facilitate the reading of the text; *expositio* was essentially auxiliary to *lectio*. The commentary contains all four functions, though giving prominence to (3) and (4); but the simple process of reading through the text is presupposed so that the grammarian could proceed to the more elaborate task of giving a continuous critical interpretation of the text as a whole, expounding and interrelating the arguments employed therein. This appraisal or evaluation was what the Roman grammarians would have called *iudicium*.

The various commentaries were, for Barzizza, his most important contribution to teaching humane letters. From his letters we know that they were his most ambitious projects and to produce them he worked immensely hard over his entire period at Padua. Yet, the commentaries have never been included in any study of Barzizza and it may be largely because of this that there is such a wide discrepancy between the high esteem which was accorded to him as a master by his own contemporaries and the comparative neglect which he has suffered from modern

historians of Italian humanism. A few of the commentaries are included in library catalogues but have not been studied. Others have been catalogued but never ascribed to Barzizza. Still others, which we know he wrote, do not survive or have not yet come to light. Therefore, before we discuss how he approached the classical authors, it is first necessary just to list the range of his works, giving the evidence for their composition.

(1) The Commentaries on Seneca's Letters to Lucilius and to St Paul

This is the largest of the commentaries and, in itself, is a vast work.[30] It was written between *c.*1408 and *c.*1412 to serve a lecture course which he was asked to give by his friends at Padua. In 1411-12 Barzizza sent the final *quaternus* to Andrea Giuliano in Venice and made arrangements to pay the latter for his work of transcription. It is possible that Barzizza wrote the first version, added corrections and supplements and then asked Giuliano to transcribe the whole, putting it in order. With the planned lectures approaching, Barzizza insisted that Giuliano have the commentary ready for when he (Barzizza) next came to Venice. A little later, he arranged, through two other pupils in Venice, Antonio Fantasello and Damiano da Pola, to have his *Summa* on the Senecan-Pauline correspondence sent to him, since they were to be treated in public lectures. Elsewhere, he explained how the insistence of his Paduan friends that he should lecture on Seneca had interrupted his commentaries on Cicero's *De Officiis*.[31]

Barzizza certainly gave the lectures, as he recalled them in his introduction to the commentaries, but they were probably given in a shorter form than the final commentaries.[32] We possess the introduction as it was given in the lectures, a shorter version, being the traditional *praelectio* to the exposition of an author.[33] It seems likely, therefore, that the full-scale commentary was a recension of the lectures and it circulated privately. Barzizza tells us that he devoted enormous energy to composing the final version, and that having written it quickly and under pressure, he hoped to have time later to revise it.[34]

(2) The Commentaries on Cicero's *De Officiis*

Having completed the Senecan Commentaries, Barzizza resumed his commentary on the *De Officiis*, a task which he had been commissioned to perform by the Marquess of Ferrara, Niccolò d'Este. It seems that he went to Ferrara to discuss the matter with the Secretary of the Marquess, Lodovico Bonifazio. While engaged on the work, Barzizza heard from Antonio Fantasello of 'certain old commentaries on the *Offices* of Cicero', in the hands of a *grammaticus* at Verona. There ensued a series of letters in which Barzizza asked Fantasello, with increasing urgency, to send the anonymous commentaries and arrangements were made for their purchase in Verona. Barzizza felt the work might prove useful for his own commentary.[35]

Although Barzizza's commentary has not come to light, we do know he wrote it since he mentioned the work in his *De Orthographia* and, a century later, Simler

claimed to know of it.[36]

(3) The Commentaries on Cicero's *De Amicitia* and *De Senectute*

These come together in a Naples codex (MS. N. B. Naz. V. C. II, fols 23r-41v) and are undated. Both are short and rigidly schematized, perhaps indicating that they were given as lectures.

While arranging to acquire the Veronese commentaries on the *De Officiis*, Barzizza also wrote to Fantasello that he wanted this to be sent 'cum aliis commentariis in Laelium disputantem de Amicitia et Catonem de Senectute', no doubt in order to assist his own work on the same material.[37]

(4) The Commentaries on the *De Oratore* and *Philippics*

Mazzuchelli recorded that the commentary on the *De Oratore* existed in the former 'Libreria de' Camaldoli' and in the sixteenth century Simler mentioned its existence.[38] I have been unable to trace either this work or the Commentary on the *Philippics* which Mazzuchelli also mentioned.

(5) The Commentary on Cicero's *Epistolae ad Familiares*

Simler also ascribed this work to Barzizza, but it has not come to light.[39]

Mazzuchelli believed that Barzizza undertook to examine the entire *corpus Ciceronianum*. From what we know of the above commentary and his lectures on Cicero it does appear that he may have decided on a systematic and complete textual study and exposition of Cicero's works. There is further evidence, however, that he wrote—or at least planned to write—commentaries on other classical writers, poets and historians and on Dante.

(6) The Commentary on Terence's Comedies

Terence was one of Barzizza's favourite authors whose moral *dicta* he was fond of citing in letters and orations. He studied all the Comedies, as he compiled excerpts from each.[40] In an undated letter to Daniele Vettori he asked that 'my commentaries on Terence' be passed on to his medical friend in Venice, Tommaso Dandolo. Of course, the phrase 'commentarios meos' is ambiguous: it could mean commentaries written by Barzizza or commentaries owned by Barzizza. Mazzuchelli assumed the former, although he does not state that he had seen the work nor where it could be found. In either case, Barzizza drew on or contributed to a long tradition of interest in Terence in the Italian grammar schools.[41]

(7) The Commentary on Seneca's Tragedies

This is mentioned by Barzizza in a letter to his nephew, Niccolò in 1412.[42]

(8) The Commentary on Valerius Maximus

Barzizza wrote to Giovanni Corner between 1411 and 1415 that he was engaged in a commentary on Valerius Maximus, a work so bulky that he was afraid that it

would put people off or that he would be unable to finish and have to leave the thing in mid-course. He thanked Corner for lending books and for helping him with the work and informed him that he (Barzizza) would send him the first parts of the commentary for him to look over and criticize.[43] It seems, therefore, that part of the work, at least, was written, but there appears to be no further evidence of the commentary.

(9) The Commentary on Pliny's *Natural History*

Barzizza received a copy of Pliny's text from Facino Ventraria which he needed for a commentary which he proposed to write on the *sententiae* of 'great men' ('pernecessarius est sententiis summorum virorum a me commentandis').[44] However, we hear nothing more either of a commentary specifically on Pliny or of any great general commentary on classical writers.

(10) The Commentary on Dante's *Divine Comedy*

After he had written his Commentary on Seneca's Letters, Barzizza proposed to write one on the *Divine Comedy* and to give a *lectura Dantis* in Padua. We know that he used the Commentary of Benvenuto da Imola on the *Inferno*. Later, in Milan, we hear, from a letter to his son, Guiniforte, that he had glossed Dante 'digitis meis'. It is reasonable to suppose that Gasparino's work influenced Guiniforte's later commentary on the *Inferno* (*c*.1440). Again, the sum of the evidence consists of only a few passing references in letters.[45]

The evidence for Barzizza's commentaries does not allow us to reconstruct in detail the curriculum of his Paduan school. First, we cannot date precisely any of the commentaries so that it is not possible to study the development of Barzizza's course during his period at Padua. Secondly, most of the commentaries have not survived, a fact which, in itself, may indicate that they were written for specific lectures or for local circulation. Thirdly, we cannot be sure how much of his teaching was 'official' and how much 'unofficial'. Barzizza's official appointment in 1407 was as 'lector in rethoricis et moralibus (auctoribus)', but how much did he read the authors 'ordinarily', how much 'extraordinarily' (on the periphery of the main curriculum), and how much 'voluntarily' (outside the curriculum altogether)? His lectures on Seneca were voluntary, given at the request of friends, but what of the others? The commentary on the *De Officiis* seems to have been intended for private circulation, since it was specially commissioned by the Este family. The commentaries on Seneca and, Barzizza suggests, on Valerius Maximus were enormous works, parts of which may have been given in lecture form and the rest intended for private readings. Again, when there is strong evidence that Barzizza gave public lectures on particular authors, it is usually the case that the lectures themselves do not survive. Thus, we have three *Lives* of Virgil, Terence, and Cicero which were probably *praelectiones* or introductory lectures to a course of reading

of the authors in question, but nothing remains of the lectures.[46] Similarly, we know that in 1412-13 Barzizza used Loschi's commentary on Cicero's orations and, from the notes of a student, we know that Barzizza added to them.[47]

However, enough material has survived to reveal Barzizza's methods when expounding the authors and to point to the scope of his teaching. Moreover, our understanding of his teaching methods is not substantially affected by the circumstances in which he taught; whether he taught publicly or privately, the nature of his work was essentially the product of a scholastic background. His approach in his commentaries was moulded by the traditional forms of literary exposition in the schools. He adopted that schematic exposition of a text which had long been a convention in the medieval schools of grammar, as well as in the teaching of legal, scriptural, and philosophical texts.

First, he employed the standard *accessus ad auctores*, an introductory summary or plan dealing with a set of general questions about the work, such as: *vita auctoris, titulus operis, intentio scribentis, materia operis*, and *cui parti philosophiae supponatur*. The *accessus* might also mention the number of books or chapters, their order and the authenticity of the work. Though customarily found in thirteenth and fourteenth-century commentaries on classical authors, the *accessus* probably derived from the late antique grammatical commentaries, such as that of Servius and Donatus on Virgil and Boethius's commentary on the *Isagoge* of Porphyry.[48] Barzizza was clearly well schooled in the tradition of the *accessus* as his approach to the *De Amicitia* of Cicero illustrates:

Circa hunc auctorem VIJ sunt consideranda: intentio auctoris, utilitas operis, ad quem scribit, qua de causa scribit, quo genere sermonis utatur, cui parti philosophie supponatur, quis sit libri titulus.[49]

Barzizza's more particular debt to the thirteenth-century scholastic commentary, informed by Aristotelian concepts, is exemplified in his commentaries on Seneca's letters. This is a bulky and, at times, a digressive and rambling work, but it is constructed in accordance with a scholastic framework. He employs a general *accessus* for the whole commentary and then a shorter *accessus* for each letter as he comes to it. The general *accessus* follows the practice of the schoolmen, who reduced a work to the four Aristotelian causes. The *causa efficiens* is twofold: the *causa principalis* or what Aristotle called the 'prima causa, quam nostri deum asserunt . . . hec est proprie et principaliter efficiens causa huius libri'; and the *causa secondaria*, namely the life and work of Seneca, which Barzizza then relates. The *causa materialis* is moral philosophy, which Barzizza defines as a discourse on virtues and vices; this is further separated, along Aristotelian lines into, *ethica, yconomica*, and *politica* (the latter being then sub-divided into monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy). The *causa formalis* is twofold; the *divisio tractatus*, being the number and order of the letters, and the *modus tractandi* which, in Seneca's case, is the use of *adhortationes* and *dehortationes*. The *causa finalis* is

summarized simply as 'perfectus vite status et ea felicitas quam stoyci in sola virtute posuerunt'.[50]

Within this general scheme each letter has a short *accessus* discussing: (1) the *continuatio*, how the letter relates to that of Lucilius (which, of course, we do not possess), how it relates to the preceding letter and to the other letters in regard to general arguments; (2) the *materia* or contents of the letter, and (3) the intentions of the author. Besides the *accessus* Barzizza adopted the conventional divisions of the *argumentatio*, the stock distinctions of the schools ('primo generaliter . . . secundo specialiter' etc.).

It is not necessary to point only to general traditions of scholastic exposition to show how closely Barzizza's commentaries were, in their approach, to the products of the medieval schools. We saw that he sought older commentaries for consultation when writing his own, on the *De Officiis* for example, and with his commentary on Seneca's first letter to Lucilius we know that he drew on many earlier commentaries ('ex multorum commentariis'). This will be discussed in more detail later. Barzizza's method also shows that he continued the principles which his former master at Pavia, Travesi, had used in his commentaries on Boethius and on Prosperus.[51] This relationship between the work of Travesi and Barzizza needs closer analysis as it has been used to illustrate sweeping claims about the conflict between 'humanism' and 'scholasticism', a conflict not borne out by a closer comparison of their works, which rather indicates that Barzizza represented continuity and development in the grammar schools.

Professors Garin and Rossi saw Travesi and Barzizza as the exponents of two opposed movements; Travesi, the traditional scholastic master, employed the 'old method', whereas Barzizza, the child of Petrarchan humanism, championed new ideas. The departure of Barzizza from Pavia was seen as, probably, the result of a personal clash which, at bottom, was brought about by this deeper intellectual friction. That Garin and Rossi used this episode to illustrate a clash between two models of literary enquiry reflects their belief that humanism was essentially a non-university phenomenon and that where humanists attempted to introduce the 'new learning' into the schools either they met a bedrock of conservative resistance or their chequered achievements were largely ineffective.[52]

There are several objections to this view which must be set out not only in order to understand Barzizza's teaching, but to suggest a possibly sounder though less exciting interpretation of early humanist teaching as a whole. First, there is no evidence that Travesi and Barzizza disagreed, while there are some strong hints that Barzizza's departure from Pavia was motivated by reasons of communal finance.[53] Secondly, Garin regarded the method which Tràvesi followed in his commentaries as 'old' on account of their form (*modus tractandi*), their Latin usage, and their speculative content. Garin and Rossi, however, showed no signs of having studied Barzizza's textual glosses or his surviving commentaries. In fact, if we set the commentaries of the two men side by side, we find that their methods were

essentially similar in these respects. First, in their form they both used the *accessus*, the four causes and the standard divisions of the *argumentatio*. Secondly, although Rossi damned Travesi's Latin as irredeemably 'barbarous', with its neologisms, its contorted constructions, the ugly, monotonous rhythm of the *cursus* and its medieval orthography, these remarks could apply equally to Barzizza's commentaries, including the commentary on Seneca in San Daniele nel Friuli and the commentaries on the *De Amicitia* and *De Senectute* in Naples, which were most probably in Barzizza's hand.[54] His primary concern, as Travesi's, was to present and comment on the argument; Barzizza may have reserved his studied neo-classical *dictamen* for his letters and orations, or perhaps his attention to orthography came after his commentaries had been written (the orthographical manuals were written after 1418). Thirdly, the speculative purpose of both men was broadly the same: to explain the argument, providing glosses on persons and things where necessary. Thus, in the commentary on Boethius, Travesi has long digressions on cosmographical and natural phenomena, as well as biographical notes and explanations of references to mythology. Barzizza similarly discourses, at times, on historical references (for example, the gladiatorial games) or on questions of natural philosophy. If anything, Travesi goes further than Barzizza in that he comments also on style, grammatical anomalies and on the metre of the verses cited by Boethius. The second and ultimate purpose of both masters was to draw out the moral significance of the argument.

The differences between Travesi's and Barzizza's commentaries are in degree not in kind. Travesi wrote nothing on the scale of Barzizza's works not did he display the latter's weighty learning in classical literature, those reserves from which Barzizza could expound, cross-refer to other authors and illuminate the sense of the text. The comparison is one of erudition, not of basic method, although it should be remembered that Travesi was probably writing for boys between eleven and fourteen years old,[55] whereas Barzizza's commentaries on Seneca were intended for older students. The commentaries on the *De Amicitia* and *De Senectute* were perhaps written for the *latinantes* and, in their clarity and freedom from intricate debate, they probably serve as a better comparison with Travesi's writings.

Barzizza's method of expounding classical texts belonged to the particular tradition of 'reading the authors' in the Italian schools of grammar and, on that account, to that general framework of study constructed by the schoolmen. The deeper questions of why he studied the ancients and what he wanted their writings to yield were never stated by Barzizza, but it is apparent throughout his commentaries that he was predominantly interested in gaining sheer information about antiquity and in deriving moral edification from its literature. He saw his own age as bound to the moral and intellectual heritage of antiquity. There was no novelty in this view. Again, he was the product of the medieval schools while, at the same time, animating the old teaching with the spirit of enquiry which he had captured from humanist currents of thought.

He saw ancient literature as a kind of quarry from which one could extract every kind of information–historical, mythological, geographical, meteorological, botanical, medical, etc.. He had an eye for harvesting a rag-bag of facts, in much the same spirit that motivated the medieval compilers of *compendia* of knowledge and glossaries, the same spirit we saw in Barzizza's lexicons. However, he did use this well of erudition to elucidate a text, by setting the work as a whole in a literary-historical context or by explaining fully any allusion which may not have been obvious to the student. Some might see in this the beginnings of that urge to assimilate sheer information which led to those vast and specialized glossaries of the later Renaissance.[56]

More powerful was the veneration which Barzizza paid to the classical moralizers, especially Seneca and Terence, who had been favourite sources of *sententiae* during the Middle Ages. Most of his attention in his commentaries was given to examining (and relishing) the moral arguments in a text. From Barzizza's glosses on Seneca's *Tragedies* we get a clear idea of how he approached the content of a text. He was not at all concerned with linguistic usages, poetic figures of speech, or stylistic effects, nor did he consider the theatrical setting of the play or the dramatic development of character (although, admittedly, Seneca's plays do not lend themselves to these latter considerations). Many glosses deal with references to the 'historical' background, presumably in order to enable the student to set events and characters against a firmly drawn canvas. Also, the plot is marked out at every turn. But plot and background are seen only as a framework, against which Morality can be enacted. The drama does not evolve but consists of a set series of moral postures on the part of the characters. At all times, the moral significance of a passage is the material of textual criticism.

Barzizza's study of the *Tragedies* should be seen against an increasing interest in the plays among fourteenth and early fifteenth-century literary circles in Italy, among the Paduan 'pre-humanists' of the early *trecento*, and scholars in Pavia and Florence towards the end of the century.[57] Barzizza could well have been aware of these other studies on the *Tragedies*, just as he was aware of earlier and contemporary studies on Seneca's letters. In his introduction to his commentary on the letters Barzizza gives a summary of the main arguments of those *literati* and logicians who, since the mid-fourteenth century, had wrestled over the meaning of Seneca's first letter, the 'nodosa littera' as Barzizza called it, especially over the sense of the maxim: 'maxima pars vitae elabitur male agentibus, magna nihil agentibus, tota vita aliud agentibus'.[58] 'Everyone' was talking about it, including the 'most erudite', since the maxim was obscure and yet pregnant with meaning for the relationship between the 'moral' and the 'natural' life, between virtuous and vicious living, and for the question of how man can measure his moral resources against 'fuga temporis'. Many of the scholars in the debate were known to Barzizza at Padua or Pavia and it was his friends in Padua who pressed him to set out in detail all sides of the case and attempt to resolve the difficulties once and for all.[59]

First Barzizza discussed Petrarch's arguments which had been made known to him through his Paduan friend and professor of grammar, Lazaro da Conegliano, who had claimed to have heard these views from the 'mouth of Petrarch himself'. Then Barzizza summarizes the arguments of three Paduan physicians, Giovanni Dondi, Marsiglio of Santa Sofia, and Giraldo da Vicenza, a Bergamasco jurist and grammarian from a slightly earlier period, Alberico da Rosate (*c.*1290-1360), a Dominican friar, Domenico da Pisa, Salutati, who refuted the arguments of Domenico, and, finally, the arguments of Barzizza's Paduan friend, Francesco Zabarella. Having weighed up the various points of view, Barzizza finally accepted, with qualifications, the conclusions of Salutati, while adding that the problem of the 'nodosa littera' was ultimately 'insolubilis'.

The commentary on this letter is important for several reasons. First, Barzizza was summing up and contributing to a controversy which had nagged scholars for over half a century, a debate in which Paduan scholars had played a notable part. The interest of scholars from other disciplines, such as Dondi and Zabarella, shows how the revival of ancient moral debate attracted those outside the grammar schools and yet their discussions hinged on grammar in a way that was to give it a greater standing in the arts course. Secondly, the history of the debate illustrates the development of a critical method of textual interpretation, a development which grew out of this kind of puzzling over knotty passages. It is significant that Barzizza adopted Salutati's conclusions which had been based on a rigorous examination of the 'sensus grammaticalis' in the light of the 'contextus'.[60] Yet, if we call this a 'humanist' method, it merely constituted a more refined means of elucidating the argument of a moral author. All the participants in the debate were equally concerned with the moral questions arising from the passage; they regarded Seneca's authority in the same way. No one questioned the validity of Seneca's ideas; they merely attempted in various ways to elucidate what his text meant. This is true, at any rate, for the discussion of particular letters. In his general introduction, however, Barzizza does make some attempt to judge Seneca's worth as a moral philosopher in comparison with the other ancients and in doing this he made his own contribution to that debate over the relative merits of the active and contemplative life which seems to have concerned so many of his humanist contemporaries. First, Barzizza set Seneca's moral thought within the tradition of ancient philosophy, beginning with the early Greeks (Thales, Solon), progressing to the major Greek thinkers (Socrates, Plato and, above all Aristotle), ending with the Romans (Cicero and Seneca). Then he dealt with general principles.[61] He attacked those who think that true philosophy consists of knowledge and 'philosophizing' ('in cognitione rerum'), rather than in a considered pattern of living ('in constitutione vitae'), and, using this distinction, he argued that moral philosophers could be divided into two categories: on the one hand, there are those who teach us how to know 'virtus', how to inquire 'de principiis quibus humana vita regitur atque perficitur'; on the other hand, there are those who translate those moral principles

into their lives and action. Aristotle was the master of the first group, Seneca of the second; and it was precisely because Seneca acted out his moral philosophy in his life that Barzizza preferred him to Aristotle as a philosopher. Where Plato and Aristotle have taught us how to dispute, to question, and to understand, Seneca has taught us how to act;

Illorum [Plato and Aristotle] enim disputationes huius [Seneca] vero consilia et facta laudantur. Cum enim illi intelligere et loqui docuissent, iste omnem philosophie fructum in actione constituit.

Barzizza regarded Aristotle in conventional terms as The Philosopher and frequently, through the commentaries, consults the *Nicomachean Ethics* on points of ethical theory. Seneca, on the other hand, was The Moralist and Barzizza accepted his views without qualification so that the commentaries came to represent a vast labour of love in which all available knowledge was drawn upon in an attempt to clarify the moral signification of Seneca's letters. Barzizza claimed to have read many authors, including Cicero, in order to gain personal edification, but Seneca's moral thought is the richest. Barzizza's elevation of Seneca in moral philosophy was as passionate as his elevation of Cicero in rhetoric.

Since Seneca's thought and action were mutually sustaining, there had to be some account of his life and death which embodied so perfectly the harmony between 'cognitio' and 'actio', 'scientia' and 'vita'. Barzizza's biography of Seneca preceded the commentary on the text, being neatly worked into the general conceptual scheme in which Seneca was the 'efficient cause' of the letters. Also, the biography provided an historical setting for the text and was, therefore, a form of extended gloss on the whole epistolary collection. The biography ('De Vita et Morte Senece'), therefore, was more than an *exemplum* (although, of course, it was that) but had an integral place in the whole structure of the commentary.[62]

Barzizza's main sources for the biography were Suetonius, Eusebius, and Seneca's other writings, but rather than simply amalgamating his material, he carefully selected from it so as to highlight certain moral themes and shape the order of events. He rushes through the earlier narrative, then calls a halt and lingers on the long-drawn-out death scene which is presented as the final and sublime enactment of Seneca's Stoic principles. Thus, there are two parts, the Life and the Death. In the first, Seneca the Stoic is seen as inhabiting a kind of island amidst a sea of vice and corruption at the imperial courts of Claudius, Nero, and Agrippina. Either voluntarily or perhaps by force he went into exile in Corsica and then in Southern Italy, from where many of the letters were written; a period of 'quies' and 'otium' which presaged the final solution of death. Barzizza casts the death scene in the accepted Stoic mould; 'intrepide', 'nullum timoris vestigium', 'vultu et corde immobili', Seneca exhorted his familiars, converting their tears 'ad fortitudinem animi' and 'ad patientiam'. Barzizza then dwells unsqueamishly on the details of the suicide: the opening of the veins, the slowness of the hot bath and the growing

lifelessness. However, Barzizza saw the moral climax of the biography as coming, not with death, but with the Christian apotheosis of the philosopher, a transfiguration which Barzizza set out to prove. He produced the authorities, principally Jerome and Augustine, who believed that Seneca had intimations of the true God. Dante, also, placed Seneca in the first circle of Hell, along with the other pagan philosophers 'of divine virtue'. But Barzizza left the most telling piece of evidence to last: the correspondence between Seneca and St Paul showed that Seneca was not just a 'would-be' Christian, but was, in fact, one of the 'secret disciples' of the Apostle.[63] Finally, Barzizza took the theme to its conclusion: Seneca was a Christian martyr, baptized by blood and water in the manner of his death. Thereby, Stoic death was in harmony with the Christian immortality of the soul in that it witnessed, in action, the 'philosophiae precepta'.

The biography illustrates, yet again, the composite nature of Barzizza's instruction; a mixture of medieval legend and traditional Christian moralizing with elements of contemporary humanist discussion and the attempt to achieve a more polished *exemplum*. The weaving of old and new literary patterns and ideas continued throughout the commentaries. Thus, we saw the *accessus* applied to each letter but Barzizza incorporated within that scheme propositions which belonged to wider humanist debate. The *continuatio* and *intentio auctoris*, the first and third parts of the *accessus*, were used to demonstrate how rhetoric, the art of persuasion, was a discursive form more truly suited to questions of moral philosophy than the cold propositions of logical debate. Barzizza regarded the relationship between Seneca and Lucilius as that between a master and a pupil, the one guiding, providing and encouraging, the other questioning and responding. Although we have only Seneca's letters and not Lucilius's, Barzizza stressed (in the *continuationes*) the moral interaction between the two, so that, by cross-reference, the epistolary collection becomes an evolving moral disquisition, in which Seneca persistently opened up further moral propositions. Moral education is therefore properly conducted through *suasio*, since the rhetorical art of persuasion presupposes a certain disposition on the part of the *suasor* and that disposition was conditioned by more than mere reason. In turn, rhetoric appealed to more than reason in the *auditor*, but to his innate moral inclinations. Thus, the art of rhetoric was raised above its utilitarian, *dictamen* functions and shown to be an essential medium for moral enquiry.

As in the other parts of grammar, Barzizza's *studia litterarum* drew on two traditions. First, it continued, in many ways, the grammatical course familiar to the medieval Italian schools. The *lecturae ad auctores* had always had a place in the elementary classes and in the university arts course and, as we saw, Barzizza's conceptual framework in approaching a text had its roots in the schools. Moreover, the authors which he studied were a conventional group; Seneca, Terence, Virgil, Cicero, Pliny, and the others, including Dante. At the same time, by drawing on the work and ideas of his humanist connexions, he gave this course a greater scope and

a new purpose. He made textual emendation an integral part of his curriculum, or, at least, the necessary base for his teaching. We find a greater depth and intensity of study: each text was examined with more erudition and more awareness of its historical context, perhaps reflecting, in this way, the sharper consciousness of the 'otherness' of antiquity which was emerging in humanist circles. Furthermore, against the edifice of the scholastic commentary we find echoes of those debates among humanists who were outside a university setting: the relationship between the active and contemplative life, the intimate correlation between rhetoric and morality and, embracing both these questions, the new evaluation of education as a life-long progress of the individual's whole self.

There appears to have been no tension between the traditional methods of literary instruction and the heightened interest in classical antiquity. Rather, the scholastic framework could easily absorb these new intellectual horizons and the more refined textual appreciation.

CHAPTER VI

RHETORIC

In the *Ad Herennium* (I.II.3) the study of rhetoric was reduced to three principal aspects; knowledge of the rules ('ars'); imitation of models ('imitatio'); and continual practice by the student ('exercitatio'). The fundamental place held by this ancient text in the medieval schools of rhetoric probably ensured that this threefold aspect continued to be regarded as, at least, an ideal method. Around these three principles revolved every part of Barzizza's course on rhetoric.

(a) *The Theory of Rhetoric*

Barzizza taught the rules of the 'art' of rhetoric first and foremost by means of lectures and commentaries on the classical theorists and secondly by means of his own treatises on particular aspects of the subject.

He believed that Aristotle, in his *Rhetorics*, founded the art, and added that no Latin had yet adequately expounded this ancient text. Daniele Vettori encouraged Barzizza to write 'new' commentaries on the *Rhetorics*, but the latter doubted if he would have time for such an undertaking.[1] As far as we know, he did not write a commentary, but he may have lectured on the text or at least have used it in other lectures. He certainly possessed fragments of the work and was familiar with the whole of it, as we see from several detailed references in his glosses on the *De Oratore*. Moreover, he made glosses on an anonymous *Vita Aristotelis*, which was perhaps used in a course of lectures in the same way that the *Lives* of Seneca, Terence, Virgil, and Cicero were probably used as *praelectiones*.[2]

Cicero's *De Inventione* and the *Ad Herennium* (which Barzizza and his contemporaries believed to have been by Cicero) were the standard texts for rhetoric in the university arts course and Barzizza would have been expected to lecture on these *ordinarie*. Our only evidence for this course is a commentary on part of the *Ad Herennium*, a work which has so far not been examined. It is worth considering it since Barzizza's treatment of the text, as in his grammatical commentaries, was altogether a standard one, in the tradition of the fourteenth-century rhetorical schools in Italy.

The commentary deals with that section of the *Ad Herennium* (Book IV. 19 et seq.) which examines figures of speech and stylistic embellishments. It survives in two manuscripts neither of which is in Barzizza's hand.[3] It would seem that he had lectured on the first three books of the treatise, as his commentary on Book IV

presupposes in the student a grasp of rhetorical principles and terms, such as *genus accidentalis, constitutio*, and *argumentatio*, which were covered in earlier books. Indeed, he must have expected his students to know that section of Book IV in question since his aim was merely to supplement the text. For each embellishment (*color* or *exornatio*) the text gives only a short definition, some examples and, sometimes, one or two concluding remarks. Barzizza's purpose was to provide guidelines on where, in orations and letters, the different *exornationes verborum et sententiarum* could be variously used. For clarity he divised nine technical considerations which could be applied to each of the *exornationes* in turn. This scheme may have been Barzizza's, but the rules, the exceptions, the examples, indeed, his whole frame of reference, were taken from the medieval tradition of commentary on the *Ad Herennium* or, as he put it, 'the judgement of all who have written about the art', the generally held opinion ('publica sententia'). His ancient authorities included mainly Cicero and Quintilian and his 'moderns' included Balbi's *Catholicon*, particularly when discussing the Greek etymology of various *exornationes*, Bede and Gualfredus Anglicus, the early thirteenth-century grammarian who enjoyed some popularity in the fourteenth-century Italian schools.[4] The examples of usages may have been taken from a common stock of quotations from Virgil, Terence, and others.

In effect, Barzizza clarified the text, adducing, where necessary, the opinions of well known grammarians. The commentary was doubtless intended to take students through the text in a thorough and prosaic manner, in no way different from the approach followed by Barzizza's predecessors and contemporaries who lectured on the same material in other universities. We have evidence that he used or recommended to his pupils recent commentaries on the whole of the *Ad Herennium*, such as the one by Bartolino da Bologna, which was copied by a pupil of Barzizza, Pietro de Damiano.[5] Bartolino's work was not as ordered as Barzizza's with the latter's nine-point scheme, nor was the material packed as concisely; but the two commentaries are broadly similar. Bartolino also fills in what he thinks is omitted or unclear in the text and, much more than Barzizza, he paraphrases the original. Like Barzizza, he gives short definitions based on the Greek. Like Barzizza, his attention is focused solely on the *Ad Herennium* and the tradition of commentary on it; there is no attempt either to set it in a wider context of the ancient rhetorical schools or to give extensive examples from his own reading of literature. Both commentaries suggest that they were composed with a view to hammering home to students what was essential for them to know. Similar in its method was an anonymous early fifteenth-century commentary on the whole text of the *Ad Herennium* owned by Barzizza.[6]

However, Barzizza extended the material for rhetorical theory beyond the 'ordinary' texts. Besides his interest in Aristotle's *Rhetorics* we saw that the *De Oratore* and *Orator*, even in their mutilated form, were read in Barzizza's household, if not in public lectures, and Quintilian's *Institutes* were also incorporated

into the rhetorical syllabus. Moreover, Barzizza brought a new emphasis to bear on the classical art of oratory, an emphasis which can be partly seen in his formal study of Cicero's orations.

The first product of the humanist concentration on the art of oratory was Antonio Loschi's *Inquisitio super undecim orationes Ciceronis* written in Pavia between 1390 and 1396. Evidently, Loschi's work influenced his friend and contemporary at Pavia, Barzizza. Sometime before 1412 the latter wrote to Daniele Vettori that he had twenty-one of Cicero's orations belonging to Loschi and that he had bought seven orations besides, although these were also included in Loschi's collection. Moreover, he now possessed Loschi's *sententia* on eleven of the orations. Barzizza thought highly of Loschi's *argumenta* and had his copy circulated among pupils: in 1412, for example, he wrote to Francesco Barbaro asking him to pass it on to his nephew, Cristoforo Barzizza. Earlier in the same year Barzizza had given lectures on Cicero's orations and, from the size of the audience, these seem to have been a great success: 'augentur in dies auditores, etiam partim praelati et docti viri me, virtute sua, libenter audiunt. Instatur cum magno fervore quod orationes legam . . .'. In composing these lectures Barzizza had used Loschi's commentary, if we are to accept the evidence of Barzizza's pupil, Giovanni Tremonti, who followed a revised form of this lecture course in 1420.[7]

Loschi's work was continued by another Paduan humanist, Sicco Polenton, a notary in the communal chancery. In 1413 Polenton produced his *Argumenta* on sixteen of Cicero's orations not examined by Loschi, dedicating the work to the Paduan jurist, Giacomo Alvaroto. It is impossible to be sure if Sicco was influenced by Barzizza, although Professor B. L. Ullman thinks this was so, but both men had common acquaintances such as Antonio Carabello and the poet Antonio Baratella and clearly belonged to the same literary circle in Padua.[8]

The corpus of commentaries on Cicero's orations was notably increased by the discovery at St Gall in 1416 of Asconius Pedianus's commentaries on five of Cicero's orations, a work which Barzizza may have known as he included references to it in his *De Orthographia*.[9]

Barzizza's instruction in the art of rhetoric mainly took the form of lectures and commentaries on the ancient text-books and, particularly, on the works of Cicero, but he also wrote short treatises on various aspects of the subject. One of these was the *De Compositione* which examined one aspect of *elocutio* (comprising *elegantia, compositio*, and *dignitas*).[10] This work has been edited and fully examined by R. Sonkowsky. In general terms, the treatise advocated a return to the canons of style found in the ancient rhetors and, in so doing, details of existing Latin composition were implicitly called into question. For example, by arguing with Quintilian (*Institutes* IX, 45. 26) for placing the verb at the end of a construction, Barzizza hit at the heart of medieval syntax—the *constructio* set out, for example, in verses 1390-96 of the *Doctrinale* of Alexander of Villa Dei—which placed in order: nominative, verb, adverb, accusative, etc..[11] A succinct summary of the main

arguments used in the *De Compositione* entitled *Epilogus ac Summa Praeceptorum* followed the treatise in some codices, while in others the summary was copied as an independent work.[12]

A work of Barzizza which has so far not been noticed is a list and discussion of thirty-six precepts on various constructions used in orations (*Praecepta de partibus orationis componendis*).[13] This may be the work which Barzizza mentioned that he was writing for Daniele Vettori in a letter to Lorenzo Bonzio in 1418.[14] The precepts show how different parts of speech are used in various parts and types of the oration to give the best stylistic effect. Each precept is followed by examples, as in the following:

'Quintum praeceptum, quod oratio frequenter obliqua sit: id est a posterioribus et obliquis incipiat, sive id quod verbo supponit, verbum ipsum antecedat, sive postponatur. Exemplum primum. Ut neminem posse ad eloquentiam accedere Crassus inquit, nisi qui multarum scientia rerum instructus sit. Exemplum secundum . . .'.

Most of the examples and precepts seem to have been based on Cicero's orations, to which Barzizza frequently referred.

If Barzizza seemed to be mainly concerned with oratory, this was presumably because it was the branch of rhetoric which had most interested the ancients on whom he depended. Also, perhaps, it was a reaction to the general neglect of oratory in the medieval schools of rhetoric up to and during his own day. Reversing the bias in Antiquity, the medieval masters of rhetoric stressed the other branch of the subject, the art of letter-writing. Barzizza corrected the bias again, which meant that letter-writing still held an essential place in rhetoric, but it did not predominate. He was a product of the Italian *dictamen* tradition, but was also a reformer of it.

In a manuscript collection of works by Barzizza in Padua, there is a short treatise on the art of letter-writing.[15] The letter, Barzizza begins, has three functions: first, that friendship with distant persons may be won by an attractive missive; secondly, that matters which the correspondents wish to be hidden from a messenger can be divulged; thirdly, through a letter the accurate intentions of the sender are better registered than through even the most faithful secretary. Using Priscian as his authority, Barzizza then breaks down the letter into its five classic parts; *salutatio, exordium, narratio, petitio, conclusio*. Each part is then subdivided, often with further qualifications. Thus, the *exordium* is that part of the letter which wins favour from the recipient. There are six means of doing this: to commend the 'liberalitas' of the recipient or his, or his family's 'civilitas'; to warmly embrace the 'beneplacita' which the recipient has shown you, etc. The *petitio* has nine approaches, the *conclusio* six, and so on.

It could be argued that by constructing such an elaborate and rigid scheme, the letter becomes a wooden artifice, excluding, by its own rules, any spontaneity and sincere emotion on the part of the writer. Barzizza, however, would probably have

thought the opposite. For him, the formal rules were only the means by which the writer could express every shade of his emotions and every aspect of his intentions more clearly. Moreover, the treatise was a guide to cover all eventualities and, therefore, not only was the nature of every letter to be reflected in style, but also the status of every possible recipient, from popes, bishops, abbots, secular princes, and magistrates, to one's equals and inferiors. In this, Barzizza followed the *dictamen* tradition in which letter-writing was regarded as the necessary equipment for budding chancery secretaries or those who had dealings with the high. He had himself been a notary at the Visconti court and in 1414 he was thought qualified to be an apostolic secretary. Many of his pupils also entered chancery careers.

The *dictator*, Barzizza stressed, should aim at a polished Latin style and avoid flouting the rules of *elocutio* as set out in the *Ad Herennium*. 'Elegantia' is based on 'Latinitas et explanatio'; the first requires the avoidance of all the 'vitia grammaticae' (for which he refers the student to Donatus), the second requires 'oratio apta et dillucida'. These and other stylistic requirements were dependent upon correct punctuation and immediately after the treatise he proposes to write on this subject. There is a heading *De Punctis*, but the work is not written here (blank folios follow). However, it shows that Barzizza regarded the *ars punctandi* as an integral part of the *ars dictaminis*.

These short treatises on parts of the art of rhetoric show a united emphasis on style and the return to classical norms. As such, they stand at the beginning of a tradition of humanist tracts on rhetoric, such as the *Rhetorica* of George of Trebizond, the *De Imitatione Latinae Linguae* of Antonio da Rho and, most notably, the *Elegantiae* of Valla.[16]

It may reasonably be asked, however, why Barzizza and his successors wrote treatises on rhetoric. In a letter to Antonio da Rho about the *De Imitatione*, Cosma Raimondi (both men had been Barzizza's pupils in Milan in the 1420s) posed the obvious question: since everything relating to eloquence has been so thoroughly examined by the ancients, why is there a need for any more treatises on the subject? Cosma then provided the answer himself. Eloquence is such a large and diffuse subject that the ancients' treatment of it was not exhaustive, although 'almost' so; indeed, the subject can never be completely covered. Cosma regarded the task of the moderns as essentially one of supplementing and touching up the collective masterpiece of ancient writings.[17] The form of Barzizza's rhetorical works suggests that this was probably how he also regarded his task. In the *De Compositione*, for example, he wove together the *Ad Herennium* and the relevant parts from Quintilian's *Institutes*, adding a part from Martianus Capella. By gathering sources together and concentrating on one aspect of *elocutio*, he could provide a fuller treatment of *compositio* than could be found in any one alone of the earlier treatises. Likewise, in his commentary on Book IV of the *Ad Herennium*, Barzizza extended the discussion in the text by embracing subsequent authorities

and by multiplying examples and qualifications. Barzizza, as we will see, also composed model letters and *exordia*. Why did he not simply insist that his pupils imitate ancient examples of these? Again, it is probable that he constructed these models specially, to provide illustrations to every rhetorical *genus* found in the ancient texts; that is, he could present the material in a more teachable form. Then there was a practical limitation in that books were not readily available to many; in a sense, a master, by writing treatises which he could use in the class-room, was making his library available to all. The opening sentence of Antonio da Rho's work hit on precisely this point: 'Puto erit opere precium, doctissime Cosma, his qui eloquentie humanitatis studijs videntur aspirare dum liborum copiam quasi nullam habent, quam legere possint.'[18] Barzizza's works were never intended as substitutes for reading the authors themselves, but rather as catalysts, helping the student to transfer the principles and choice pieces of classical literature into his own writings and repertory.

(b) *Imitation*

Although Barzizza did not think precisely in terms of 'classical' and 'medieval' Latin, he discerned different periods in the development of Latin usage and style which amounted to much the same and he perceived an ideal standard of Latin composition upheld by certain ancient authors. In prose, Cicero was the master and in poetry Terence and Virgil were supreme. Barzizza's own letters and orations, because of their often detailed imitation of Cicero, were, therefore, attractive to adherents of pure classicism in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Italy, from Furietti to Sabbadini, who were the chief publishers of Barzizza's works in their times.

Barzizza was one of the earliest Italian masters of rhetoric to isolate style from content and presentation, and make it the object of close study. In so doing, he was not led into making attacks on the 'barbarous' Latin used by some of his Paduan predecessors, like the dismissive remarks of Guarino da Verona on Pietro da Muglio, but he did gain for himself a reputation as a stylist. In the literary histories of the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, he was given a special place at the fountainhead of the revival of pure Latin. 'Gasparinus Bergomensis unus ex iis vel in primis fuit, qui consopitam diu eloquentiam excitaverunt'; such was the judgement of Bartolomeo Facio in his *De Viris Illustribus* (1456). The notion that Barzizza had assisted in the resuscitation of Eloquence was repeated by Giovanni Andrea Bussi, who linked Barzizza with Guarino and Vittorino. Later in the century Iohannes Trithemius spoke of Gasparino. 'qui latini sermonis elegantiam semimortuam ab inferis resuscitavit', and, more precisely, Marcantonio Sabellico believed that Barzizza looked back to a period of elegance before 'that Gothic storm' ('Gothica illa tempestas') which had swept over Italy.[19]

Barzizza's reputation was based largely on his collections of letters and *exordia* which followed the ancient rhetorical conventions and could be used by students as models. In fact, his *Epistolae ad Exercitationem Accommodatae* emerged from the

tradition of form letters in the thirteenth and fourteenth-century *dictamen* schools, although he was developing this well established practice in accordance with humanist preoccupations.[20] First, his were familiar letters rather than the official or business letters which had received most attention in earlier schools of rhetoric and this change in emphasis reflected the new importance given to Cicero's *Epistolae Familiares*, as well as the increasing tendency in literary circles to regard writing in classical form as the ideal for all correspondence.[21] The popularity which Barzizza's letters enjoyed illustrates the movement in rhetorical schools away from professional training and towards a general training in letters for their own sake. Indeed, Barzizza helped to govern that movement. Secondly, in their style, spirit and subject matter, the model letters are Ciceronian and, in fact, constitute the most rigid reproduction of the techniques and assumptions of Cicero to be found in Barzizza's writings.

For the most part, the letters are set in Republican Rome, mentioning such characters as M. Antonius, Tiberius Claudius, and Q. Fabius, and discussing issues which appertained to the political, judicial, and social confines of the patrician order. The letters tend to be grouped under themes: personal relations between patricians; affairs of state, such as the dealings of the Senate, war against foreigners, the condition of the 'Civitas' and 'publica utilitas'; religion, moral philosophy, and the 'studia humanitatis'. Prominence, however, is given to matters such as 'concordia', sedition, war, the Senate, and forensic cases, so that the letters become a contrived reproduction of patrician correspondence in the Roman setting. Only when religion and moral philosophy, 'bene vivere' and the divine cult are discussed does Barzizza interpose the view of his own age towards the ancients. For example, two letters deal with the reading of St Basil and the 'Christianizing' of Plato.[22]

Little can be learned from the letters about Barzizza's knowledge of ancient history or about his own views on many of the questions which are mentioned since these are treated only in the broadest terms. He was concerned with style, as we can see from the subtle didactic techniques he employed. Letters on the same theme are placed together so that the same sentiment is deliberately expressed in different ways. Thus, one missive begins: 'Scio te novarum rerum cupidum esse, et accusasse me saepe, quia nunquam ad te scribo de his rebus, quae hic fiunt.' The following five letters begin by stating similar things in so many ways: 'Novissima res his diebus nobis accidit, neque ab ullo nostrorum civium alias audita, de qua ego te certiorem facere volui'; 'Si te nova delectant, habeo quidem unde possim abunde huic tuo desiderio satisfacere', etc.. The letters could be used as a synonymic guide to students.

The success with which Barzizza managed to make the letters serve a didactic purpose is attested by the undoubted popularity which they enjoyed, first in Italian and later in transalpine schools, until at least the end of the century. I know of thirty-four manuscript copies of the work in Italy . North of the Alps, the letters were first printed at the Sorbonne in 1470; in fact, they may have been the first

work to be printed there. A letter survives from Guillaume Fichet, a Paris theologian, to Jean Lapierre, another theologian, in which the latter is praised for editing the letters and having them printed by a German firm:

> Missisti nuper ad me suavissimas Gasparini Pergomensis Epistolas, non a te modo diligenter emendatas, sed a tuis quoque Germanis Impressoribus nitide et terse transcriptas. Magnam tibi gratiam Gasparinus debeat, quem pluribus tuis vigiliis ex corrupto integrum fecisti.

Fichet then praises Lapierre for concerning himself with good Latin which the age lacks: Barzizza's model letters have been chosen for printing because they serve as a good guide to the writing of pure Latin.[23] They were printed again in Paris in 1485, 1498, 1500, and 1505; in Basel in 1472, 1474, 1479, 1489, and 1499; in Strassburg in 1486; in Reutlingen in 1483; in Louvain in 1483; and in Deventer in 1483, 1485, 1486, 1487, 1491, 1496, and 1499.[24] Virulus, the humanist director of the *Pedagogicum Lilii* at the University of Louvain, used Barzizza's model letters in his own *Epistolarum Formulae*, published at Louvain in 1476.[25]

A similar model work which also enjoyed widespread popularity was Barzizza's collection of *exempla exordiorum*, serving letters and orations. In the printed edition of 1483, there are sixty-five examples, covering every rhetorical *genus* and approach.[26] Each variation is listed and an example follows which sometimes consists of only the opening (the most difficult) sentence. Most of the *exordia* were addressed to 'iudices' and the rest to 'principes' and 'patres conscriptos'. Like the model letters, these imitate the style of Cicero and are written almost entirely within the terms of reference found in Ancient Rome. It is difficult to know whether Barzizza intended the *exordia* to be purely academic exercises in classical Latin or whether he also had in mind the training of the advocate by presenting to the literary-minded lawyer the range of stylistic possibilities offered by the classical experience in forensic debate. It is perhaps not accidental that Matthaeus Cerdonis printed the work together with the manual of the Paduan poet and jurist, Gianiacopo de Cano, which suggests to the young jurist the advantages to be gained from a knowledge of ancient eloquence.

(c) *The Practice of Rhetoric*

Presumably, the most important part of the art of rhetoric was the individual's attempt to put the theory and what he had imbibed from examples into practice. Here we will examine Barzizza's literary exercises and the exercises which he encouraged his pupils and friends to follow. To meet his own and others' needs, he composed several practical note-books.

In Chapter IV we saw Barzizza's collection of lexicons and synonymic word-lists. These were not only aids towards learning the Latin language and understanding classical literature, but also handbooks which could be consulted by the practitioner of rhetoric. Synonyms taken from classical works were of obvious

relevance to those who wished to imitate the most polished letters and orations of Antiquity. An elaborate collection along these lines, a work which has not been studied, was Barzizza's *Exornationes et Constructiones*, now in the Vatican.[27] The work is in two parts. In the first part, he lists common phrases adding better ('ornatius') alternatives, citing, where necessary, an authority for a grammatical rule, for example:

Dicendo pure causam defendo, aliter sincere causam habeo et sincere causor, ut ait Nonius Marcellus, dici potest.
Dicendo hoc feram patienter, aliter id feram aequo animo, aequo cum diptongo, ut Papie videtur.
Dicendo hoc non utitur, ornatius nulla ratione confirmatum est.

Barzizza's grammatical authorities are taken from the same range of 'ancient' and 'modern' works which characterized his study of the Latin language. Most frequently used are Priscian's *Institutes*. Among the other ancients, he refers to Nonius Marcellus, Virgil, Juvenal, Cicero, and Sallust; among the moderns, Hugutius, Papias, and Guarino da Verona (*De Diptongis*). In the second part, Barzizza gives numerous synonymic variations of whole sentences, not unlike the technique he employed in the model letters.

Another kind of lexical note-book to assist the student was a collection of excerpts from the plays of Terence and Plautus, a *florilegium* of maxims and proverbs from Terence's comedies and from the first eight plays of Plautus.[28] The excerpts were both edifying and 'lectissima dicta delecta', the memorable and the quotable lines. They could be used in letters and speeches to add moral weight to an argument and, perhaps, like the modern dictionary of quotations, the *excerpta* provided a short-cut to apparent erudition. Although they were categorized according to act and scene, the excerpts were not ascribed to characters, nor were exact references made to lines. Barzizza was interested purely in the moral content, so this is abstracted from the dramatic setting. The fruit can be seen in his own letters and orations in which he quotes some of these moral sayings with affection.

In his concern to extract *dicta* from the ancients, Barzizza could be said to be encased in a medieval tradition. The *dictatores* encouraged the quotation of moral sentences, culled from ancient writings, although they reserved these specially for the *exordium* in a letter, whereas Barzizza used them more flexibly. We possess only the extracts from Terence and Plautus, though we know from his letters and speeches that Barzizza approached other major writers of antiquity in the same way and we know also that the *florilegium* method was to enjoy a long popularity among humanist masters. Closest to Barzizza was Guarino who knew the former's *Excerpta* and was himself to compile a *florilegium* from Terence's *Eunuchus*.[29]

The lasting testaments to Barzizza's practice in the art of rhetoric were his private letters and his orations.

His *epistolarium* comprised some two hundred and seventy letters and it is

unlikely that the collection, scattered as it is, is complete, since it is apparent from references in the letters themselves that others were written which have not come to light; again and again, a letter stands in the middle of a series of epistolary exchanges, or suggestions are made of earlier letters between friends.[30] Moreover, Barzizza did not have his correspondence collected and this may explain losses. However, it is unlikely that the correspondence would have approached the voluminous output of some of his humanist contemporaries, such as Vergerio, Guarino, and Salutati, although during his years at Padua he was the most prolific and respected letter-writer in the Veneto. In 1410, Donato degli Albanzani collected fourteen of Barzizza's letters and in *c.*1414 thirty-five of the letters were collected and copied. Later, in 1425 the scribe and friend of Barzizza, Damiano da Pola, transcribed in Padua 143 letters.[31]

Barzizza's *Epistolae Familiares* were addressed almost entirely to those associated with his Paduan school—former pupils, parents and members of his family—or to *literati* in Veneto towns. He did not enter into correspondence with any of the major humanists outside the Veneto. A large bulk were written to Venetian nobles connected with his school as former pupils or parents; Daniele Vettori, Andrea Giuliano, Marco Lippomano, Valerio Marcello, members of the Barbaro, Dandolo, Corner, Trevisan, and Giustiniani families. A large number were also written to Paduan friends and pupils: Francesco Zabarella, Antonio Cermisoni, Antonio Fantasello, and many others who are little more than names.

Although many of the letters imparted information or made specific requests, their utilitarian purpose was secondary, it seems, to didactic considerations, among which was the need to practise letter-writing regularly. Barzizza wrote to Giuliano that their correspondence has 'sharpened' his (Barzizza's) studies: 'vereor ne magnitudo negotiorum vestrum a me officium abducat, careamque illa iocundissima scribendi consuetudine, qua persaepe studia mea non modicum acuistis'.[32] Again and again, he praised the stylistic accomplishments of his correspondents. The letters reproduced the ancient *epistolaria* and the assumptions behind them: that familiar letters expressed and consolidated friendship, sodality, and all that springs from the 'humanitas' of the liberal man; that the letter was the vehicle of moral philosophy and an important means of rhetorical persuasion, through which the correspondents shaped each other's moral viewpoints. Thus, in a letter to Francesco Barbaro, Barzizza dealt, in a neo-Senecan manner, with the contraries, 'dolor' and 'voluptas'.[33] Perhaps with Seneca's *Epistolae Morales* in mind, many of the letters are taken up with coining a moral or maxim from some experience.[34]

Barzizza's correspondence has come down to us as one-sided, since only a handful of the letters written from others to him survive and, for all the exhortation which he gave to his pupils to write letters, none of these student exercises can be traced. We could assume that this was largely because copyists were interested in only what was stylistically important and this ruled out a large number of epistolary exercises. The fact that individual letters of Barzizza are often

included in anthologies of humanist prose in the first half of the fifteenth century would betray the same kind of thinking.[35] Barzizza certainly made style the object of special study, sometimes in an almost unreasonable way. For example, he showed his pupils a letter written by Daniele Vettori relating his brother's death. On reading it, most of them wept, we are told, partly because of their humanity and partly because they were affected by their master, Barzizza, whom they saw grieving openly. Barzizza then discussed the letter as a model for the letter of mourning.[36] A communication on a private matter has become the object of stylistic analysis in the classroom.

Barzizza's orations, like his letters, were probably not listened to or studied so much for their content as for their stylistic effect. The delivery of an oration was a public and formal act which was always only part of an elaborate ceremony. Many of Barzizza's university orations were given as part of the ceremony for conferring doctoral insignia, a quasi-sacred affair held in one of the large Paduan churches, and, presumably, as in Pavia, the oration was delivered from a pulpit. To take one example of many, in the 'Oratio in tradendis insignibus Juris Civilis Lucae Bondelmonti Florentino' references are made to the assembled dignitaries seated 'in hoc sanctissimo . . . templo'. The candidate, a man of high social dignity, is praised in the oration, which is then followed by the ceremonial bestowal of the *laurea*; the oration was only the introductory part of the occasion.[37] The other university orations were similarly included in a public ceremony: the orations to inaugurate a new academic year or a new course of lectures; orations for the election of a new rector; orations to welcome a new *podestà* to Padua or funeral orations for a university master.[38]

These orations were all 'demonstrative', rather than 'deliberative' or 'judicial' (*Ad Herennium*, Book I, II) and the content and style varied little from one to another. However, an audience, far from thinking it an adverse criticism of a piece that it had been heard many times before, were probably expecting the formal commonplaces. A style appropriate to the dignity of the occasion was what Barzizza strove to attain, not originality of content. Just as he was regarded as the master letter-writer in Padua, so he was esteemed to be the expert at composing orations, although he did not deliver them all himself. It was Barzizza's orations that were delivered on the most solemn occasions, such as the funeral of Jacopo da Forlì, the Professor of Medicine, in 1414, the address, certainly given by another, to Ferdinand of Aragon on behalf of the citizens of Syracuse, the oration on behalf of the Paduan *studium* for the new *podestà*, Fantino Dandolo, in 1412, and orations for the new Rector of the Artists' University. In 1412 both the in-coming and retiring rectors delivered orations written by Barzizza and, in doctoral ceremonies, Barzizza wrote orations both for the candidate to deliver and for the candidate's sponsor who was also expected to speak.[39] Again, he wrote *prolusiones* for every discipline. The *prolusio* was a general introduction to a course of lectures in which the value of the subject was stated ('De Laudibus Medicinae', 'Oratio in

Recommendatione Philosophiae', 'De Laudibus Juris', etc.). There survive six *prolusiones* to courses on natural philosophy, three of which are specified as lectures on Aristotle's *De Anima* and one on Aristotle's *De Natura Coeli et Motu Orbium*, as well as two *prolusiones* for medicine, one for a course on Hipprocrates and one on Avicenna. Another introduces a rhetorical course in Padua (*De Praeceptis ac De Praestantia Eloquentiae*) and one a course on Cicero's *De Officiis* given in Milan (in the latter, Barzizza places the text against a tradition of Stoic thought and relates Cicero's life, using Plutarch as his main source). Rather different is an *exordium* for a course on law given by a French master.[40]

Barzizza's talents, therefore, were in considerable demand in the *studium*. He seems to have been something of a resident, professional speech-writer, the function taken on by many literary masters in the Veneto towns during this period. Indeed, his talents were used by the Paduan citizens, as we see from an oration which he wrote to celebrate the appointment of a new master to the wool guild.[41] He also wrote addresses to the highest ecclesiastical and secular dignitaries.[42] The oration addressed to Pope Alexander V was spoken by the Venetian noble, Lauro Bragadeno, on the occasion of his visit to Alexander in 1410. Later, Barzizza wrote four eulogies to Pope Martin V. One, which was given at Padua on the election of the new Pope, rejoices in this turn in events after the lamentable conditions of a divided church. One was given in Milan on behalf of Filippo Maria Visconti and the Milanese people on the occasion of the Pope's visit to the city 'en route' from Constance in September 1418. The third praises the Pope for his patronage of the University of Pavia and the last was spoken by an ambassador of Filippo Maria Visconti. An address was also made to the Emperor, Sigismund, although we do not know when, where, or by whom. Sigismund is praised for his conquest of 'barbaras hostes' and for his efforts to heal the schism in the church, by which he shows himself to be a bringer of peace, the 'propugnator fidei at ecclesiae protector' whose weapons are 'consilium' and 'auxilium', as well as a ruler who could be called Caesar Augustus. Barzizza blended Christian and Stoic thought in his claim that peace between all men is part of a universal, human aspiration towards that perfect harmony which is attained in the after-life.

Barzizza also wrote several eulogies of kings, such as two addressed to King Janus of Cyprus, probably composed by Barzizza on behalf of pupils.[43] In the first, we are told that it is fifteen years since the orator and his brother left Cyprus to study in Pavia, Piacenza, Bologna, and Padua. Another brother had been a servant in the royal household and a fourth brother had recently taken up the same position. The second panegyric was probably delivered by a member of the same family, since the speaker thanks the King for the innumerable benefits showered on his house and particularly for patronage in allowing him to study the liberal arts. Then he relates briefly the deeds of the King's ancestors, beginning with Peppin's and Charlemagne's, and the subsequent glories of the royal house of the Franks. Again, far from Padua, we find one of Barzizza's compositions addressed, by

Jacopo de Catalonia, to Ferdinand, King of Aragon and Sicily, in his coronation year, 1412, and another, given in Naples in 1414 at the coronation of James, Count of the Marches, who married Joanna II, sister of the dead Ladislaus. Perhaps when he was in Pavia, Barzizza wrote a speech on the anniversary of Giangaleazzo Visconti, whom he compares to Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar since, like them, he embodied the ideal qualities of a prince; 'prudentia', 'sapientia', 'iustitia', 'clementia' and 'religio in divino cultu'. In similar terms Barzizza praised a retiring *podestà* of Milan, Giacomo Castelogni, and advised his successor, Zambone Maffei.[44]

One of Barzizza's funeral orations, the commemoration of Jacopo da Forlì, has been mentioned. In 1417, he wrote two orations on the death of Francesco Zabarella, the former Professor of Canon Law in Padua, cardinal and humanist. The friendship between the two men is attested by several letters and the first oration, given in Padua, is one of Barzizza's most finely constructed panegyrics.[45] The opening sections mention Zabarella's public life, including his origins from a noble Paduan family and his religious life. The central section commemorates his deep and varied scholarship in history, eloquence, jurisprudence, and theology. For Barzizza, he represented the ideal all-rounder: 'instituit ut non uno tum scientie genere esset contentus sed omnia tanto studio et vigilantia complexus est'. Zabarella moved quickly from grammar into the schools of civil law, where he excelled, and then to the study of canon law. Concurrently with these formal studies he turned to the study of the poets and orators and all the liberal arts, the fruits of which, we are told, can be seen in his book, *De Felicitate*. This work must have been known to Barzizza in Padua. Composed in 1400 and dedicated to Vergerio, it combined Stoic assumptions with Christian doctrine, combating first the Epicurean view of happiness (Book I), then proposing, in Stoic terms, that temporal happiness consists in the exercise of 'virtue' (Book II), which leads to the happiness of the heavenly blessed (Book III). Though Zabarella was no humanist in style, the quantity and selection of classical references and the unusual prominence which he gives to man's ability to achieve virtue and true glory in this world show his response to the new ideas.[46] Finally, Barzizza continues, he turned his learning to the service of theology and scriptural studies. A shorter section then deals with Zabarella's character and virtues. The other funeral oration on Zabarella was given in Bologna, perhaps to the *studium*, and was much shorter, being almost a summary of the Paduan speech. In Bologna also, an oration by Barzizza was given on the death of a young doctor of law, Jacopo, and, in Tortona, an oration on Marciano, a doctor of philosophy and secretary to Pope Gregory XII and to Filippo Maria Visconti.[47]

Barzizza wrote at least two nuptial orations, one for the wedding of Francesco Gonzaga of Mantua and a daughter of the Malatesta of Rimini and the other for the marriage of Francesca Visconti to Filippo Borromeo. Both works display a curious amalgamation of classical and ecclesiastical Latin, an adaptation which is fully exploited in his nine religious sermons for major feast days.[48]

The good speeches, like the letters, were circulated or copied as models, first

within the Paduan circle and then gradually among humanist circles elsewhere. We know from references in letters that Barzizza sent some of his orations to pupils for their study, such as the eulogy of Fantino Dandolo which he sent, in 1412, to Niccolò Barzizza, then in Ferrara. Andrea Giuliano in Venice asked Barzizza to send him some orations to help him practise forensic oratory. Collected together, the orations number seventy-five, many of which are included in those anthologies of humanist prose which seem to have been so popular in the fifteenth century.

For the purposes of teaching and practising oratory in his Paduan school, Barzizza encouraged debates between scholar and master, using the form of the classical oration. Nowhere more clearly do we see how Barzizza used and adapted university procedure than in these rhetorical disputations. The traditional scholastic form is upheld with an 'opponent' who argues the question and a 'respondent'. There survive two *exordia* to such disputations, one spoken by Francesco Barbaro and the other by Barzizza. Barbaro has as his respondent Giovanni da Friuli who is to reply to three questions in turn: whether opinions made through fear are to be called voluntary; whether rhetoric serves dialectic first or oratory ('civilis scientia'); and whether it is lawful to kill a tyrant. In the other *exordium* Barzizza tells us that he has already had a disputation with the young nobleman, Niccolò Contarini, on the duty of the orator ('de toto oratoris officio') and that now he will begin a disputation with Francesco Barbaro and invites him to enter the 'wrestling-ground' ('palaestra') of rhetoric.[49]

The disputations themselves do not survive, probably because, being oral exercises, they were not copied, but we do gather from the *exordia* that the disputations were conducted along the lines of classical rhetorical persuasion, drawing their moral propositions from what Barzizza called the 'media philosophia', as represented in the writings of Seneca and Cicero.[50] This use of rhetoric to discuss moral questions in a disputation had been discussed, apparently, among Barzizza's pupils, who were eager to try it out. Barzizza himself, however, had had reservations. He felt that eloquence had reached greater heights when used in speeches of praise than in disputations: 'semper tamen mea sententia fuit patres optimi eloquentie studia multo uberius atque preclarius benedicendo quam subtiliter et accurate disputando tractari'. When reading the Greek or Roman orators, he continues, one finds that disputations are less common than other forms of eloquence, and even when those orators did engage in disputations, their method was very different ('longe diversum') from contemporary practice. He confesses that he had not turned his attention to disputation but had studied other forms of eloquence and, therefore, feels a little ill at ease. However, he had been persuaded by his pupils to try a disputation:

Postea vero in quosdam nobilissimos huius amplissimi ordinis adolescentes incidi qui ut ceterarum artium optimarum sic et huiusce rationis dicendi avidissimi erant hi me ab hoc quietissimo et pervulgato genere doctrine quo maxime delector nonnunquam ad hanc nostram disputandi rationem transferre conati sunt . . . eo

productus sum ut voluntatem eorum pluris quam iudicium meum facerem.

At the insistence of these clamorous youths the rather unassuming Barzizza consented to enter the forum of debate. Among these youths was the talented Francesco Barbaro who was to debate with Barzizza the importance of civil law for the orator and the proposition that both depended on philosophy.

Barzizza, it would seem, had organized a series of debates as rhetorical exercises, by which pupils would develop memory and fluency in speech. He had adapted the classical oration to the standard university practice of the disputation.

CHAPTER VII

BARZIZZA'S HOUSEHOLD SCHOOL IN PADUA

Following a common practice of masters in medieval universities Barzizza ran a boarding house and private school or, as he called it, a *gymnasium*.[1] It was not unlike the hospices found in Bologna in the same period, the halls and hostels in Oxford and Cambridge, or the pedagogies in Paris.[2] Since it was a private school there survive no official records of the numbers of pupils, but from references in Barzizza's letters, from a few university documents, and from occasional signatures in manuscripts, we know of about seventy pupils between 1407 and 1421. Given that the pupils stayed on average between three and five years, it would be reasonable to guess that there were at least twenty pupils in the *gymnasium* at any given time.

As with other masters who ran similar halls, Barzizza's motives were partly financial and partly educational. He needed private fees to supplement his university salary as a lecturer, though, after he had paid the cost of food and housing rents, his income was still barely adequate, particularly in the years from *c.*1410 to *c.*1414 when the devastations of the Hungarian invasions into the Veneto and plague had greatly increased prices and made food scarce.[3] His finances were further strained after 1410 when his brother died and the eight children were taken into the care of their uncle.[4] In the face of all this he found it acutely difficult to keep down the fees to forty gold ducats a year, and one parent at least, Luchina 'ex Marchionibus Malaspinis', was quick to complain of the consequences, taking his children away from Barzizza because he could not feed them better. Defensively, Barzizza replied that he had protected the children, cared for their health and discipline, but his fortunes were low on account of the wars.[5] Material and financial arrangements, though usually less embittered, take up a good deal of space in his private letters.

The *gymnasium* was socially exclusive, made up of boys from the nobility and well-to-do professional groups, mainly from the Veneto and Bergamo. The largest single group were sons of Venetian aristocratic families. Some came from important families in Bergamo and Lombardy, with whom Barzizza had personal connexions, such as the Suardi, the Resta, and the Castiglioni. Others came from medical and legal families in Padua and Venice and a few from abroad, such as Alfonso of Portugal, Stephanus Teutonicus, and a Cypriot pupil who had come to Italy primarily to study law.[6] These wealthy families wanted their sons to be taught Latin

letters by the best master available in the region.

Barzizza provided for these pupils two kinds or levels of instruction. First, the *gymnasium* was an elementary grammar school for boys between the ages of about seven to fourteen. Again, it seems to have been not uncommon for university professors of grammar and rhetoric to run a private grammar school. Pietro da Muglio, Lazaro da Conegliano, and Giovanni Conversino, for example, had done so in Padua before Barzizza, and Barzizza's master, Giovanni Travesi, had followed this practice in Pavia.[7] At a higher level, Barzizza provided a varied and largely informal course of classical studies for students at the University.

The framework of studies which Barzizza adopted in his grammar school was used throughout Western Europe at that time, being a vestige of late Roman teaching.[8] The youngest pupils learnt how to read, write, and pronounce Latin correctly, gradually covering over three or four years all aspects of the language; orthography, etymology, prosody and syntax. In Chapter IV we examined Barzizza's approach to these essentials of grammar. Until they had completed this stage, at the age of about eleven, the pupils were called *non latinantes* and were taught by the *ludi magister*. Barzizza had been a *ludi magister* in the school at Bergamo, though it is likely that in Padua he left this elementary instruction and catechizing mostly to a *repetitor*. One such *repetitor* might have been Facino Ventraria of Bergamo since it was common for schoolmasters to employ fellow 'patriots' as assistants.[9] It was also common for *non latinantes* to receive instruction in arithmetic and in sacred texts, such as the Psalter and the moral extracts from St Augustine compiled by Prosperus Aquitanicus.

Having mastered the bare bones of Latin, the pupils became *latinantes* under the *grammaticus*, following four lines of study. First, they examined the finer points of Latin construction, using the grammar of Priscian, the basic text cited, for example, in Barzizza's revised and more advanced *De Orthographia*. Secondly, they studied chosen Latin authors. Some of Barzizza's expositions on classical texts, such as those on Terence, Virgil, and Valerius Maximus, were probably intended for this purpose. We must assume a good deal from what was common and expected in comparable schools. For example, the council of Chioggia in 1386 stipulated that, for the *latinantes*, their *grammaticus*, Cristoforo Dente, must teach passages from Latin authors; Aesop, Prosperus, Ovid, and Boethius being mentioned as suitable. If older boys were able and interested, they could go on 'audire tragedias, virgilium, lucanum, terentium et similles [*sic*] poetas et auctores'.[10] Giovanni Travesi had taught Virgil, Ovid 'Major' (*Metamorphoses*), Lucan, Statius, Seneca's tragedies, and Cicero.[11] These and other *auctores magni* continued to be the subject of study when pupils began their arts course at university. Thirdly, the art of formal composition, especially in letters, was introduced to *latinantes*, leaving a more extensive study of rhetoric to the university arts course. Finally, Barzizza probably taught some dialectic to boys, at least in the last stages of their primary schooling.[12]

Barzizza's elementary course of studies and his didactic techniques were in many

respects no different from those followed in numerous other grammar schools in the central and north Italian towns, for example, in the heavy stress which he laid on the pupil's memory. He employed the traditional mnemonic technique of jingle-jangle verse renderings of basic grammatical rules and he wrote his manuals in a clear and easily memorizable way, sometimes nudging the student with phrases such as, 'Hoc quoque quod sequitur in memorie cellula collocandum esse arbitror'.[13] Constant catechizing and repetition were perhaps the best aids to memory and his pupils probably chanted aloud in unison. This could be a very noisy activity, as we gather from various statutes in Bologna which prohibited deafening crafts anywhere near the schools or residences of doctors and students. These crafts included hammering metal, forging iron or the teaching of ten or more boys the sciences of grammar and logic.[14] Another common practice which Barzizza followed was the use of the *volgare* in explaining Latin terms to the youngest pupils.

Where Barzizza differed from the common run of *grammatici* was in his superior quality as a Latinist. As we saw in the chapters on grammar he managed to introduce into his teaching, at all stages, many of the results of humanist enquiries into Latin language and literature. This he managed to do to a much greater extent with the more advanced activities in the *gymnasium*.

Besides being a grammar school, Barzizza's household was what might best be described as an institute of classical studies and, as such, it was almost certainly the first of its kind, combining the features of a school, a library, a *scriptorium*, and a meeting place for discussions and debates. The members included university students who were studying the arts and who followed his private instruction to deepen and supplement what they had learnt from official lectures. They included also students in law and medicine who wished to keep up their literary interests, such as Francesco Barbaro and Niccolò Contarini who both became doctors of arts in 1410, but continued to study with Barzizza while working for their degrees in civil law.[15] The evidence is unclear as to whether the university students lived with Barzizza or whether they came to his house for instruction; some may have done the one, some the other. The household was also a meeting place for Barzizza's literary-minded friends from Padua and Venice.

The household school served to supplement the 'ordinary' lectures and disputations in the University and, because it was free from formal teaching demands, it fostered a depth and intensity of study, as well as a greater readiness to explore new intellectual avenues. It was, therefore, in this setting that Barzizza's contact with humanist advances outside the university could make a mark. The university pattern of study, however, was taken as the starting point. Barzizza gave lectures on authors who were not covered adequately in the official curriculum, such as his lengthy course on Seneca's letters. These 'extraordinary' or 'voluntary' lectures were probably given on festive days or in the vacations. By 'lectures' we should include perhaps the 'reading' to oneself which Barzizza practised himself and encouraged in others. For example, in a letter to his son, Niccolò, who was

temporarily attending the grammar classes of Facino Ventraria in Ferrara at some time between 1410 and 1412, Barzizza advises him on his private reading: 'Satis est, si feriatis diebus vacas Terentio, non feriatis vero Valerio (Maximo), qui liber propter brevitatem historiarum et singulares locos philosophiae semper mihi visus est perdifficilis'.[16] Even in this matter of private reading, therefore, Barzizza advises a time-table which revolves around the university. Perhaps the supplementary nature of Barzizza's private teaching is nowhere more fully illustrated than in rhetoric. The theory, taken from the 'ordinary' texts of the *Ad Herennium* and *De Inventione*, was amplified by his informal exposition of the *Orator, De Oratore, De Officiis* and the *Institutes* of Quintilian, and rhetorical practice, which the 'ordinary' course made no provision for, was given a central place in the *gymnasium*. The rhetorical manuals and model writings which we saw in the last chapter were all composed for his private pupils.

In his school Barzizza not only greatly extended his public lectures but, in some respects, created a new area of study parallel to it. This can be seen in the discussions and debates, which took the university disputation as their starting point. Barzizza prepared his pupils for the formal disputations required for graduation, but, in addition, he gave a much wider meaning to *disputatio* just as he gave a looser and more informal meaning to *lectio*. In his private letters we find a few themes, recurring again and again, which were often proposed as topics for discussion in a way that suggests they were debating points among the household in Padua. These were the same ethical questions, taken from Christian and Stoic doctrines, which challenged humanists in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, particularly in Florence: how is the individual best to measure himself against capricious Fortune; what constitutes 'the good life'; what is the relationship between the active and the contemplative life, between 'otium' and 'negotium'; how can 'concordia et pax' be re-established in church and state in 'Italia' and what are the elements in good Christian government? The formulation of these and other related questions was determined by classical sources and so, to a large extent, was the language in which they were discussed; but, allowing for artifice and self-consciousness, these problems seemed to the humanists to have a deep relevance to the existing state of things. The fractured state of Italy had brought about a sharp reversal in the fortunes of individuals, such as the distinguished and once splendid house of Moriga which had fallen on hard times. Barzizza writes to his former pupil, Simone Moriga, recapitulating the dilemma which the two men had recently discussed: whether one should give oneself to public services ('civilibus negotiis') in the hope of ameliorating conditions or to a life of letters—or should a study of eloquence necessarily precede 'negotium'? Barzizza tends to accept the latter and believes that the active and contemplative strains should be combined and should inform each other.[17] For that reason, as we saw, he preferred Seneca and Socrates to Plato and Aristotle, since the former gave evidence of their philosophy in their actions whereas the latter were purely speculative. Related to this theme was that

of the 'bonus vir', the heart of Seneca's first letter to Lucilius which so occupied Barzizza's mind. He wrote to the grammarian in Venice, Lorenzo Bonzio, who sometimes attended Barzizza's private lectures, that he should read Seneca, who showed how the good man is the one who can conquer and correct the adversities of fortune and nature. Barzizza also proposed Aristotle's definition of 'the good man' which he hoped Bonzio might discuss with his two friends, Daniele Vettori and Andrea Giuliano, former pupils of Barzizza.[18]

For Barzizza, Fortune was viewed in the light of his own experiences of a war-weary, invaded Padovano and a strife-ridden Bergamo, which had brought about the material ruin of his own family.[19] As a solution to these disorders he put his hopes on the strong and good government of one man; the advent of Carlo Malatesta in the Veneto and Visconti rule in Lombardy.[20] Disorder in the state was compounded by schism in the church, the 'restitutio' of which was the theme of Barzizza's many letters to his friend, Cardinal Zabarella, and his orations to the popes, Alexander V and Martin V.[21] Again, he believed that concord could be restored only through the selfless efforts of powerful individuals–a good pope, Zabarella, the Emperor Sigismund. We learn that questions of good government were often discussed in the *gymnasium* from a letter of Barzizza to a former pupil, Domenico Ferufino, who had entered the service of a prince. He advised Domenico on the virtues of a good administrator, a subject which Barzizza used to expound often when Domenico was in the household school; 'de quibus cum apud me eras sepe me diserentem audiebas'.[22] Current humanist controversies also seem to have been discussed in Barzizza's circle, such as orthographical questions and the meaning of Seneca's first letter, as we saw, and probably other matters. For example, Barzizza sent Pietro Suardo a book containing a disputation between 'Collutius' (Salutati?) and 'Nicholaus' (Niccolò Niccoli?).[23]

The debates and private lectures were played off against a background of continuous borrowing and copying of books. Barzizza gave copying an integral place in his scheme of studies since it related equally to grammar and rhetoric. To transcribe a text correctly required not only a collation of all available manuscripts but also a good knowledge of classical composition, orthography, and punctuation, which helped to train the orator, as well as an interest in classical literature. Copying was probably also carried out for practical reasons. Because books were expensive and often scarce, it was usually better to borrow a book and copy it rather than make a straight purchase. For this kind of arrangement there is a lot of evidence. For instance, Barzizza borrowed a copy of Pliny's *Natural History* from Giovanni Corner in Venice which, unless a better one could be found, he would have transcribed quickly. His Venetian friends did find a better copy and, through the mediation of Pietro Tommasi and Marco Dandolo, Barzizza was able to borrow it from the owner, promising to return it within eight days.[24] To accomplish this considerable task in so short a time, there must surely have been some division of labour among Barzizza's students. Francesco (Barbaro?) sent Barzizza a 'libellus

Platonis' which had been transcribed by Façino Ventraria, probably in Ferrara. There had been a mistake, however, since Barzizza had asked Facino for the oration of Aeschines 'in Ctesiphontem', the exemplar of which Barzizza had wanted to copy and then send on to Lazarino Resta in Venice.[25] He made arrangements to borrow a Quintilian from Pietro Tommasi, through Andrea Giuliano. From Lazarino Resta he received a copy of the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius in 1410, and a copy of Cicero's *Epistolae Familiares* in 1411.[26]

Barzizza also lent some of his books to others or sent copies which had been made in his house. Some were sent to Ferrara where he had friends and where some of his family went during the period of plague and war in the Veneto (1411-12). He promised to lend some books to Paolo, a grammarian in Ferrara, and Lodovico Bonifazio, secretary to the Este, arranged for a servant to go to Padua to collect them. The *Argumenta in orationes Ciceronis* by Loschi were sent to Barzizza's nephew, Cristoforo, in Ferrara, through Francesco Barbaro. At the same time, Barzizza asked Barbaro to return the Plutarch which he had lent to a friend; if not, Barbaro was to send his own copy to Barzizza. Lodovico Bonifazio borrowed a Quintilian and two letters of Seneca which he wanted to copy. Some books were sent to Venetian friends: to Giuliano the *Letters to Atticus*; to Daniele Vettori a Florus, copied by a pupil, Matteo da Bergamo; to Lorenzo Bonzio the *Orator* and *Epistolae Familiares* of Cicero; to Federico da Parma a Cassiodorus and a copy of Petrarch's *Bucolics*, since Barzizza had two copies of the latter.[27]

Of course, many books had to be purchased, even though it was expensive. There is no evidence that Barzizza did business with the university stationers in Padua, though there is a hint of some dealings with booksellers in a letter to Pietro Suardi in which Barzizza promised to sell one of his books for him, pointing out that the 'going' price of books had dropped. Barzizza's purchases seem to have been through private arrangements. The earliest record is of a Justinus which Barzizza bought from one Francesco de Mangano at Pavia in 1405. From the grammarian at Treviso, Enrico Veronese, he had bought, through Antonio Fantasello, some anonymous commentaries on Cicero's *De Officiis*. In 1411 Barzizza wrote to Lazarino Resta that he had heard that Donato degli Albanzani in Ferrara was prepared to sell a Valerius Maximus, which at present was with Girolamo Anzelerio, a medical doctor. He asked Lazarino to write to Donato that the book should be priced at seven ducats. In 1416 the same book was sold by Barzizza for six and a half ducats to an Alessandro da Verona. In 1411 Barzizza also arranged to buy a Livy from Donato's heir, Antonio da Fiesso. In 1416 Barzizza sent Corner bills of exchange ('literas cambii') which he got out of his 330 ducats sent from Constance. This was almost certainly connected with book purchases.[28] Among Barzizza's associates Giovanni Corner stands out as a bibliophile. A Venetian aristocrat, he may have been taught by Barzizza in Venice or in Padua during the first year or two of Barzizza's residence there. He seems to have stood as a creditor to Barzizza's family, lending money to Giovanni Barzizza between 1408 and 1410 and making

up the further six ducats which Gasparino needed to buy the Livy. He gradually built up a collection of classical manuscripts until it became one of the richest in Venice, described as 'comptissimam' by Ambrogio Traversari during his stay in the city in 1433.[29]

For Corner and other friends, these bookish interests in the 1410s were the beginnings of that refined collecting of antiquities which we find in Venice and Padua in the 1420s and 1430s, a movement in which Barzizza deserves to stand as one of the early guiding figures. Corner was later a friend of that avid collector of antique coins, medallions, and Greek codices, Ciriaco d'Ancona, along with Pietro Tommasi, who seems later to have earned himself a reputation as a collector of rare Greek books and was much admired by Filelfo.[30]

The Paduan household, therefore, was much more than just a *scriptorium*; it became a centre for book dealing in the north-east of Italy. Barzizza's teaching requirements brought him into and stimulated the market of buying, selling, lending, and copying classical Latin manuscripts. As a deliberate result of these activities he gradually accumulated an important working library of classical texts. The library was a separate room in the house.[31] To compile an inventory of it would require a separate study by one who was skilled both in manuscript traditions and in Italian medieval and humanist scripts. Some attempt, however, will be made here to describe the library as it throws considerable light on Barzizza's teaching, giving us some idea of the range and, also, the concentration of his literary interests.

The evidence is of three kinds. First there are the manuscript books with a note of ownership or with strong clues of ownership by Barzizza. The largest collection of these are now in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples, the result of a large purchase made in Milan in the mid-fifteenth century by the Neapolitan humanist, Gian Parrasio, who acquired about fifty classical works, some of which had been in the possession of Barzizza's heirs.[32] A few of these have Barzizza's note of ownership, but it is impossible to know whether the other works, without such a note or signed marginal glosses, belonged to him or not. A few other manuscripts with Barzizza's signature are to be found in the Vatican Library, in Milan and in Bergamo. Secondly, we have references in letters to works owned by Barzizza or works which he was in the process of acquiring. The third kind of evidence is full of problems: namely, the references to classical authors found in Barzizza's works. He must have used Priscian and Donatus, for example, since these were fundamental in his course on grammar, and he must have had at least access to many works which he used in compiling his own manuals, such as a Plautus for the *Excerpta*, a Virgil for his lectures, a Martianus Capella for the *De Compositione*, and some of the many works which he used for the lexicons, though he may have taken some of these references at second hand. We know, for instance, that he taught Martial and knew a Latin translation of Euripides and Aristotle's *Ethics*. Even if we could compile a comprehensive inventory, it would still be impossible to know the size of the

library at any given time or trace its growth, because, at various times, books were sold and given away, such as in 1412 when, as he told Zabarella, he had to sell some of his 'many books' because of the hard times which had befallen him. The list which follows, therefore, is of the books which Barzizza definitely or almost certainly owned at one time or another. Those with an asterisk are books which we know he acquired after he left Padua.[33]

(1) Cicero, *De Inventione.*
(2) 'Cicero', *Rhetorica ad Herennium.*
(3) Anon. fifteenth-century commentary on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium.*
(4) Cicero, *Orator.*
(5) Cicero, *De Orator.*
*(6) Cicero, *Orator.*
*(7) Cicero, *De Orator.*
*(8) Cicero, *Brutus.*
(9) Cicero, four orations in *L. Catilinam.*
(10) Invectives of Sallust against Cicero and Cicero against Sallust.
(11) Cicero, orations *pro Rege Deiotaro, pro M. Marcello,* and *pro Q. Ligario.*
(12) Antonio Loschi, *Argumenta in orationes Ciceronis.*
(13) Cicero, twenty-eight orations.
(14) 'Asconius Pedianus', commentary on Cicero's Verrine orations.
(15) Cicero, *Philippics.*
(16) Cicero, *Epistolae ad Familiares.*
(17) Cicero, *Epistolae ad Atticum.*
(18) Anon. commentary on the *De Officiis.*
(19) Cicero, *De Officiis.*
(20) Cicero, *De Senectute.*
(21) Cicero, *De Amicitia.*
(22) Cicero, *Paradoxa.*
(23) Cicero, *Paradoxa.*
(24) Cicero, *Disputationes Tusculanae.*
(25) Cicero, *De Senectute.*
(26) *Epitaphia Ciceronis edita a duodecim sapientibus.*
(27) Anon. *Vita Ciceronis.*
(28) Macrobius, commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis.*
(29) Boethius, *De topicis differentiis.*
(30) Aeschines, oration *in Ctesiphontem.*
(31) Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria.*
(32) Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria.*
(33) Quintilian, *Declamationes.*
(34) Seneca (maior), *Declamationes.*
(35) Seneca, *Epistolae Morales ad Lucilium.*
(36) 'Seneca', *Epistolae ad Paulum.*
(37) Seneca, *Opera Omnia.*
(38) *Excerpta Quaedam de Paupertate et Divitiis ex Libris Senecae.*
(39) Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* (fragment).
(40) Anon. *Vita Aristotelis* and Aristotle's *Rhetorics* (fragments).
(41) Marius Victorinus, *De Orthographia.*
(42) Justinus, *Epitomen Historiarum Trogi Pompeii.*

(43) Livy, *Historiae Romanae Decas 1 et 111.*
(44) Plutarch (not specified).
(45) Suetonius, *duodecim cesarum Istorie.*
(46) Caesar, *De gestis cesaris in gallia.*
(47) Caesar, *De bellis civilibus.*
(48) Josephus, *Histories.*
(49) Florus, *Epitoma de Titolivio libri Quatuor.*
(50) Sextus Rufus, *De Historia Romana.*
(51) Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia.*
(52) Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae.*
(53) *Historia Augusta.*
(54) Persius.
(55) Petrarch, *Bucolics.*
(56) Petrarch, *Bucolics.*
(57) Petrarch, *Epystole metrice.*
(58) Claudian.
(59) Terence, the comedies.
(60) Plautus.
(61) Seneca, the tragedies.
(62) Dante, *La Divina Comedia.*
(63) Cassiodorus.
(64) Pliny, *Natural History.*
(65) Manilius, *Astronomici libri V* (fragment).
(66) One of Plato's works (not specified).
(67) Plato, *Respublica,* X (Latin translation by Uberto Decembrio), extract.
(68) Apuleius, *De deo Socratis.*

The contents of Barzizza's library confirm much of what has been said already about his teaching. We can see how he attempted to collect the *opera omnia* of Cicero. If we add the works of Quintilian and Seneca, the library amounted to a considerable collection of Roman rhetorical and philosophical writings. The rest is given over to historical works and the Latin poets. All these and possibly others were the working material for the Paduan school. The library was not as large as the court collection of the Visconti and no doubt would have looked slim beside other private collections, such as Niccoli's in Florence, but it was perhaps the first example of a comparatively well stocked classical library which was fully related to a teaching programme.

The library also reflects the concentration of Barzizza's teaching. Apart from the Dante, the works are in classical or near-classical Latin or in Latin translation. There is a striking absence of scriptural, patristic, and other sacred works, except for the fragment of Lactantius and the forged Senecan-Pauline correspondence. Missing also are Aristotelian and medieval works on logic, metaphysics, moral and natural philosophy. The library seems to have been collected single-mindedly for Barzizza's teaching requirements and suggests the exclusiveness and intensity of his curriculum.

He seems to have possessed no Greek works in Greek. Classical Latin was the object of his linguistic instruction; Greek literature was thought to need translating,

while some knowledge of Greek was regarded as necessary for understanding the etymology of Latin. Like many of his humanist contemporaries he identified himself with the Romans ('nostri'), seeing Greek civilization as essentially alien, though admirable. The Latins, he thought, had taken the best from Greek learning, improved on it and added their own contributions. Thus, in moral philosophy Seneca outshone Plato and Aristotle, in eloquence Cicero and Crassus learnt from Plato and Demosthenes, but ultimately surpassed them.[34] In poetry, however, Homer was still 'ille poetarum pater ac princeps'.[35] It could be noted in passing that Barzizza made these judgements from a distinctly slender acquaintance with Greek literature. However, while his teaching and assumptions were essentially Latin, he did help to open out the possibilities for Greek learning, to the extent that later writers assumed that he knew Greek well. Leandro Alberti, for example, described Barzizza as 'huomo perito tanto nella lingua Greca quanto nella Latina, come chiaramente si puo conoscere nell' opere da lui lasciate alli mortali'.[36] Mazzuchelli also believed that Barzizza knew Greek since he used Greek words in a few letters.[37] The evidence suggests that he had a smattering of Greek and showed an interest in promoting the subject rather than that he had a sound grasp of the language or conducted regular Greek studies in Padua in the way that Guarino was to do in Ferrara. Like many Italian humanists in the first decades of the *quattrocento*, he felt the effects of Chrysoloras's teaching, perhaps even meeting the Byzantine pedagogue in Lombardy. He probably knew Chrysoloras's elementary Greek grammar for Latins, the *Erotemata*, supported by discussions with Greek scholars, such as George of Trebizond and Guarino. From Guarino, probably the Italian scholar closest to Chrysoloras, he may have learnt some Greek when the former spent some months in Padua in 1416, at about the same time that Guarino was teaching Greek to Vittorino da Feltre. Some of Barzizza's pupils became notable Greek scholars such as Francesco Barbaro, Filelfo, and his son, Guiniforte Barzizza. He may have made provision for extra tuition in Greek and even in Hebrew for those students who were interested, as he says of Guiniforte; 'literis non modo Latinis, sed Graecis etiam partimque Hebraicis erudiendum curavi'.[38] The Greek, George of Trebizond, may have been a *repetitor* in Greek at the *gymnasium* in 1416-17, when he studied at the University and first met Filelfo. He may have visited Padua earlier when he was teaching in Venice (1412-16) and later (1417-20), when he studied Latin in Venice under Guarino and Vittorino.[39]

The success of the Paduan school was, to a large extent, due to the nature of Barzizza's curriculum and the increasing interest in classical studies among the professional ranks in the Veneto; but it was also due to the personality and enthusiasm of Barzizza himself. Of his enthusiasm there is little doubt. He was immensely hard-working, often reading and writing far into the night, producing prodigious results which are seen, most of all, in his commentaries; 'me studia mea sine intermissione teneant'.[40] He was disarmingly critical of his own works, either

revising or intending to revise them, never satisfied. He tells us that his commentaries on Cicero's *De Officiis* were 'jejuna ac cruda' and, if God should give him the time and ability, he would re-write his commentaries on Seneca, which were compiled anyway to please his friends rather than in the hope of receiving unmerited honour.[41] This is not false modesty but in character with what we know generally of the man, worried, self effacing and scrupulous, both in his public and private affairs. His letters are full of complaints that he is subjected to endless demands in his teaching duties, his family life and domestic affairs; 'rebus infinitis implicitus'.[42] Typical of him was the note at the end of his copy of Seneca's *Declamationes*. The work had once belonged to a friar preacher but then had changed hands twice before he bought it for four ducats. Should his suspicions that the work was acquired dishonestly from the friar be proved, he would restore the book and the four ducats to its rightful owner, if he could be found.[43] Besides being an honest man, both morally and intellectually, he does seem to have been genuinely unassuming, even allowing for the rhetorical topos of modesty. Of himself he once said, 'satis ac supra mihi est si inter modicos viros locum aliquem habeam'.[44] This is a refreshing contrast to some of his humanist contemporaries, as is his apparent lack of rancour or argumentativeness. He was almost universally liked and respected, and on the rare occasions when he was opposed, he stepped down, half apologetically, such as during the events leading to his departure from Pavia and in his reply to the disgruntled Luchina ex Malaspinis. Only one man attacked his teaching. Ognibene della Scola, the Paduan humanist and secretary. In a letter to Francesco Barbaro in 1412, Ognibene suddenly lashed out against 'virum quendam peregrinum' who, in a few days, made his pupils masters of eloquence. This attack may have sprung from a certain amount of jealousy. Ognibene had perhaps lost his post as secretary to the *podestà* in Padua, since he left Padua at about this time for ten years, and having never been regarded as a serious scholar he may have resented Barzizza, permanently employed in the University, enjoying sympathy for his school and a wide interest in his lectures and work. Barzizza, for his part, wrote to Ognibene three times, without receiving replies. The third letter survives and the tone is hurt:

Scire tamen ab te velim si facilitatem illam tuam et humanitatem pristinam observas, an postquam te non vidi durior factus sis, ut exinde consilium capiam, nam si mitis es, audebo, si inexorabilis, me contraham.[45]

But the olive branch, it would seem, was held out in vain.

Barzizza, however, was not a weak man. The support which he gave to his brother's family shows that he had considerable moral courage. Although he comes across as rather serious and unbending, he had a capacity for friendship and anyway he knew his limitations; 'ego ita ineptus ad facetias sum'.[46] His straightforward personality must have attracted pupils and encouraged parents, while his social background put him on a level with those he taught. Most important was that he

was first and last a teacher, even, we might say, a teacher by vocation, like Vittorino, whom he resembled in many ways. He was deeply interested in the nature of education and ran his private school according to a set of educational ideals, so that, with justification, he could be called the first humanist educator, in the same mould as Guarino and Vittorino later; but a mould which he, not they, had set.

Education, he believed, involved training of both the moral self and the mind. This notion of a 'broad' education was not a new one, for moral, as well as scholastic, regulation was a common feature in most medieval schools and usually took the form of guidelines for religious observance and for the general conduct and recreation of the student.[47] Moral theories had traditionally been advanced in relation to education since the *De Disciplina Scholarium* of Boethius and earlier. In Barzizza's letters we find many examples of commonplace pious exhortations to his former students: a syllabus of studies must go together with an attitude of mind; it is more important what virtues we have than what arts; the physical transition from boyhood to adolescence requires also a moral transition to 'alios mores, aliam, vitam'; 'ea quidem prima adolescentium laus est que maiorem honestatis et virtutis rationem habent, quam voluptatis'.[48] What made Barzizza perhaps different from his medieval predecessors was his belief, implicit in his teaching, that moral education was not additional to or parallel to a course of academic study, but could be gained from study itself when study involved a close and continuous consideration of those precepts entertained by the great authors of antiquity.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PLACE OF BARZIZZA'S SCHOOL IN PADUA AND THE VENETO

As I have suggested in previous chapters, the Paduan school of Gasparino Barzizza brought together two literary strands; grammatical and rhetorical activity in the Italian schools, on the one hand, and the less formalized literary interests of humanists on the other. Barzizza, however, did not just bring the two together: the one was made to modify the other and, therefore, there was constant literary development. On the one side, there was a fairly elaborate syllabus of grammar and rhetoric, essentially the syllabus of late Antiquity and the medieval schools, but incorporating the humanist preoccupations with positive grammar, with style, with correct construction and with close examination of existing and newly recovered classical texts. On the other side, Barzizza's household entertained less formal and more diffuse literary pursuits which characterized some of the humanist circles outside the schools (in Florence and the Visconti court, for example, and, to a certain extent, in Venice). One could include, here, the rather self-conscious correspondence in imitation of Ciceronian and Senecan styles, the collection and exchange of classical books, the beginnings of an interest in antique objects and the reproduction of debates in the ancient mould, moralizing on the great issues of the day and reflecting on the meaning of life and death. In turn, these humanist pursuits owed a good deal, in their style and content, to formal teaching and scholarship, while betraying a certain affectation, suited, perhaps, to the social privilege of many of Barzizza's pupils and friends.

Barzizza was both a figure in the University and a figure in the less confined literary world of Venice and the Veneto, just as, in Pavia, he had had one foot in the University and one in the court. To appreciate his influence in Padua and the Veneto one has to understand that he contributed to the teaching of the humanities, placing grammar and rhetoric on a higher rung in the *studium*, helping, thereby, to develop teaching in the Veneto grammar schools, and that, at the same time, he provided a centre for the more cultivated classical learning which was beginning to appeal to literary-minded sections of the aristocracy and the professions in the region. Although the history of Paduan humanism did not begin with Barzizza, as we saw in Chapter I, it could be said that its chief characteristic in the fifteenth century was stamped more clearly in his time; that is, the combination of close scholarship in a university mould and the amateur, slightly antiquarian

pursuits of a leisured or governing class. The latter element may have become more pronounced from the time of Palla Strozzi's literary circle in the middle of the fifteenth century to Pietro Bembo's in the early sixteenth, but this lies outside the scope of this work. What we see in Barzizza's time are the informal humanist interests of some leading Paduan jurists and medical doctors and of some aristocrats in the Veneto.

In the following pages I will look at, first, the extent of Barzizza's appeal in the Paduan *studium* and then the influence of his school in the Veneto.

(a) *Grammar, Rhetoric, and Other Disciplines*

One of the liveliest subjects for discussion among humanists in this period was the relationship between disciplines. We found an example of this in the Visconti court at Pavia. The object was to compare disciplines, pick out the special qualities of each one and find their common principles or starting points. Sometimes this involved the mere echoing of Cicero and Quintilian, who had linked all the arts, and sometimes it led to a sharp and, perhaps, exaggerated attack on current methods and values in teaching, such as Petrarch's celebrated attack on the medical doctors.[1] The humanists looked away from specialization and towards those principles which bound together all arts and disciplines; their relationship to philosophy, to virtue, to the ancients, to eloquence, to grammatical enquiry. The attacks of humanists, such as Petrarch and, later, Valla, were launched against those features of contemporary teaching which they thought were weakening the common links, such as narrow specialization, breaches of eloquence or the drift away from the pure text of an authority. That this search for connecting principles in all fields of enquiry took place in an age which also promoted the ideal of the 'all-rounder' is surely more than a coincidence.

The humanists in the universities were particularly interested in the relationship between their own and other disciplines. This kind of comparison was encouraged in a closely knit academic community, in which mutual rivalries and ties of friendship among masters of different disciplines were fostered. Barzizza spoke of a 'great chain and social bond' among the masters in Padua; 'est enim, sicut inter ipsas artes et scientias, ita enim inter illos, qui earum praeceptores et magistri sunt, magnum vinculum et societas'.[2] Also, the humanist taught grammar and rhetoric, those subjects which were taught to all students, so it was perhaps natural for him to regard his subjects in relation to the needs of many pupils who were going on to read law or medicine. Moreover, we saw in Barzizza's case that the master of rhetoric was often called upon to write orations for different faculties, such as his orations in praise of law or medicine at graduation ceremonies. Willy-nilly, therefore, he became used to discussing the qualities of every subject. Finally, grammar and rhetoric covered a wide range of subjects. The ideal rhetor, according to Cicero and Quintilian, needed to acquire a knowledge of many other disciplines and the grammarian needed to amplify the references to historical, geographical,

and many other matters in the texts which he was expounding.[3]

Barzizza's own broad view of the interdependence of disciplines may help to explain why he was able to make grammar and rhetoric into more solid links in the chain of university studies and have his own subjects taken more seriously by others. In his orations and private letters he frequently gave an appraisal or comparison of disciplines. All disciplines were united in that they comprised a body of knowledge handed down from Antiquity; the ancients provided the sources and constant points of reference. For example, in his funeral oration for the distinguished Paduan physician, Jacopo da Forlì, he listed the succession of great medical thinkers from Aesculapius and Galen to Serapio, Avicenna and, finally, to Jacopo himself.[4] Of course, his speeches were made up from rhetorical conventions and provided no analysis, but they were held together by this theme of the ancient legacy which, from the direction of his whole thinking, we know he believed to be the most vital spring of his own culture. From Antiquity came the two bonds which united all disciplines; eloquence and philosophy. By eloquence Barzizza meant much more than the formal study of rhetoric; he meant the clear and enlightened exposition of any material, an intellectual approach reflecting a frame of mind. Thus, Jacopo da Forlì, through eloquence, opened up to others the obscure fount of medical science. There are, Barzizza continued, two methods of transmitting knowledge and sharpening the mind; *lectura* and *disputatio*. Both need eloquence.[5] It is interesting to note how easily Barzizza translated classical notions of eloquence to a university setting.

Philosophy, also, embraced all the arts and sciences. Barzizza's view of philosophy approximated very closely to Cicero's, as stated in the *De Oratore* (I.iii.IO). There, Cicero had made an implicit distinction between philosophy in the general sense of love of wisdom or the knowledge of all things human and divine, and philosophy in the specific sense of the doctrines of certain schools, such as the Stoics, the Peripatetics, and the Sceptics. In his orations, Barzizza generally meant the first, wider sense of philosophy, although, like other humanists, he was aware of Cicero's distinction.[6] In the first place, philosophy was the fountainhead of all disciplines:

ut sive rerum naturae cognitio; sive legum urbiumque institutio; sive divinarum rerum humanarumve pervestigatio quaeritur: nihil horum existat, quod non ex ipsis philosophiae fontibus hauriendum sit, atque educendum. Nam . . . nulla vitae pars carere praeceptis, institutisque philosophiae potest.[7]

Philosophy is a divine gift sent to man and from it every discipline takes its starting point, its progress and its conclusion. It is by 'ratio' and 'sapientia', the attributes of philosophy, that men can approach God more closely than other living creatures. Philosophy most especially claims as her own civil and canon law, medicine, mathematics, oratory, grammar, and theology. The precepts of philosophy should be known to those who wish truly to govern cities, and philosophy informs even

the mechanical arts ('vulgi artes'). Philosophy is the 'procreatrix' of all the arts as well as their common 'spiritus', but more than the source of all enquiry, it is a guide to right living and salvation, teaching:

qua ratione homines, et in hac vita beate vivere possint, ut in reliqua in sempiterum illud Sanctorum Patrum domicilium pervenire, ubi perpetuo ac immortali aevo cum illis fruantur.[8]

Philosophy is almost too large to be adequately defined and reminds one of the story of Simonides, the poet of Syracuse, who found that the more he thought about God the less able he was to put his thoughts into language.[9]

Barzizza was returning to the ancient view that philosophy included every branch of learning and human aspiration and, in so doing, was by-passing the specialized philosophical system of the schoolmen who tended to make philosophy a self-contained discipline with special methods of enquiry. Indeed, one of the characteristics of Italian humanism was that it ignored, on the whole, any rigid or formal philosophical system and emphasized a more diffuse and comprehensive view of philosophy. 'One of the chief features of the early Renaissance is its entire simplicity and straightforward earnestness . . . it combated nothing in existing systems, because it made no claim to have a system of its own'. Mandell Creighton was thinking particularly of Vittorino da Feltre when he wrote this, but he could have applied it equally to Barzizza.[10] In fact, there is no evidence in Padua, at this period, of any disputes in the Arts Faculty between humanists and logicians.[11] Barzizza and his circle were mainly concerned with the promotion of good classical Latin, and even in the matter of Latin usage there is no evidence that humanists took their contemporary schoolmen to task, except for Vittorino da Feltre's criticisms, if we take Platina's word for it.[12]

In theory Barzizza believed that all disciplines were united by their common bonds with Antiquity, Eloquence, and Philosophy. In practice, his school provided a superior education in Latin letters which equipped his pupils for every kind of profession. To look briefly at the subsequent careers and interests of a few of the pupils will illustrate this. The pupils fall into three general categories: those who became masters of grammar and rhetoric and/or devoted their lives to letters; those who entered the government of the church or the state; and those who went on to careers in law or medicine. In many cases these categories overlap since we find those who went from law into government, for example, or from law into teaching the humanities. What is noticeable is the success of many of them and that a good number continued to keep up a lively interest in the humanities long after they had left Barzizza's school. One has the impression that, whatever else he did, Barzizza produced good latinists.

Of the humanists and literary masters taught by Barzizza one could mention Francesco Filelfo, who spent at least two years in Padua (1416-17), and the young Leon Battista Alberti who probably attended Barzizza's school between 1415 and

1418, together with his brother, Carlo, before going on to Bologna to study law.[13] The Greek, George of Trebizond, was also a member of the school, with his friend, Filelfo, before going on to Venice in 1417 to continue his study of Latin under Guarino and Vittorino. Later, George was to be a *repetitor* in Greek at Vittorino's school in Mantua. A close friend and pupil of Barzizza was the Latin poet, Antonio Baratella, whose career, in some ways, closely resembled Barzizza's.[14] Born at Loreggia in the Padovano in *c.*1385, Baratella practised as a notary in the small town of Camposampiero, north of Padua, from 1405 until at least 1412. During this time Baratella went 'part-time' to study law at Padua, but, in fact, he seems to have availed himself of almost everything the University had to offer, going to lectures by the mathematician Prosdocimo Beldomandi, the philosopher and astrologer Biagio Pelacani, the philosopher Paolo Veneto, and, of course, Barzizza, in addition to his studies in law under the famous Pietro Alvarotti, who was also something of a humanist. Probably through Barzizza, Baratella became friendly with Lodovico Sambonifazio, the secretary of the Este in Ferrara, later marrying his niece. We next hear of him as a *magister scolarum* in Padua in 1415-16, before going on to Venice where he seems to have remained during the 1420s, desperately, but unsuccessfully trying to be appointed as poet to the Doge. In 1429-30 he was back in Padua, opening a school for rhetoric and poetry and, incidentally, keeping up ties with Barzizza's nephew, Cristoforo. From 1430-34 he went as schoolmaster to Belluno and then, until his death in 1448, he kept a school in Feltre, through the intervention of Vittorino da Feltre. Throughout, Baratella had written countless poems to Venetian patricians, prelates, generals, doctors, and masters–Barzizza, Vittorino, Filelfo, Guarino, and others. His career illustrates the informal yet close ties between the Paduan or Veneto humanists, although, for Baratella, that career had something of the sad tale of a 'hanger-on'. He always felt himself to be the misunderstood genius, who deserved the poet's crown, let alone the benefits of a sympathetic Maecenas, yet neither of these was forthcoming.

One of Baratella's associates in Padua and another future master of rhetoric was Antonio Carabello (or Picino) of Bergamo, who attended Barzizza's lectures between 1408 and 1411.[15] Arriving in Padua as a young man, Carabello looked for help from the master from his own *patria*, Barzizza. In 1411 Carabello went to Bologna, probably to study law, and in that year he joined those who tried to persuade Barzizza to leave Padua and take up a teaching appointment in the older university. In 1415 we find Carabello giving an oration on behalf of the Bolognese *studium* to salute the new governor of the city. In 1420 he was again in Padua where he took up permanent residence, gained Paduan citizenship and, in 1427, married a Paduan gentlewoman. During this period he probably ran a private grammar school, since he was appointed professor of rhetoric in the *studium* for the years 1430 and 1434-36. Rather like Baratella, Carabello seems to have repeated in some respects, the pattern of life and interests of his master, Barzizza. He wrote many orations, including one on Cicero's principles of oratory, producing model

exordia of orations for his pupils, and he took part in disputations.

It could be argued, probably rightly, that those of Barzizza's pupils who took public office did so because of their training in law or because of their social background, rather than because of their initial study of letters under Barzizza. However, Barzizza's training set them off to a good start and it is significant that so many distinguished local families should gravitate towards his school and that, whenever the evidence allows us to follow in any detail the careers of these men, we see that they continued to cultivate the *studia humanitatis* alongside their public activities. Clearly this was the case with Francesco Barbaro and Andrea Giuliano, both the subjects of full biographies, and also Daniele Vettori who, with the other two, continued to study the classics in Venice, at Barzizza's instigation, under the master, Lorenzo Bonzio. Barbaro is perhaps the best example in this period of the Renaissance type; courtier, soldier, and scholar.[16] Up until 1419, when he was twenty-nine, Barbaro pursued various studies; first at the grammar school of Giovanni Conversino in Venice from 1405 to 1408 and then with Barzizza at Padua until 1412, along with other Venetian sons of great houses, such as Ludovico Trevisan, who later became Patriarch of Aquilea and Cardinal. After gaining a doctorate in arts in 1412, Barbaro went on to study civil law in Padua, gaining a doctorate in 1416, while interspersing his legal studies with literary pursuits, learning Greek from Guarino during stays in Venice and making a trip to Florence in 1415-16, where he met prominent humanists. The year 1419 saw the beginning of his political, military, and administrative career in the service of the Venetian state. At the height of his career we find Barbaro exploring the works of antiquity for sheer pleasure and pure scholarship.

There are examples of pupils achieving high positions in the church, such as Daniele Scoti (1393-1443), the nephew of Gabriele Condulmer (later Pope Eugenius IV). Born at Treviso, Scoti attended the local grammar school there and then entered Barzizza's school. Following what can be said to be the normal pattern, he stayed on in Padua to gain a doctorate in law (1419). After this he rose rapidly in the church, as a canon at Treviso, then apostolic treasurer in Rome, and bishop of Concordia, attending the Councils of Basel and Florence.[17] One of the nephews of Cardinal Branda Castiglione, Zenone, became Bishop of Lisieux and then of Bayeux, and Pietro Donato became Archbishop of Candia (Crete), then Bishop of Castello (Venice) and, finally, Bishop of Padua.[18]

It can be seen already that many of Barzizza's pupils went on to study law. One or two became professors of civil or canon law, such as Guarnerio Castiglione and Niccolò Contarini. Barzizza encouraged this link, for, like Petrarch, he saw law and rhetoric as necessarily complementary. Writing to his son, Niccolò, who was teaching rhetoric in Bologna, he insisted that he should find time to study law since, without legal instruction, he could not aspire to be a proficient orator. In Antiquity, he continues, oratory was practised in the court-room; now there are few advocates who are eloquent. Somehow the two arts must be yoked again. In

another letter to Niccolò, written from Constance, Barzizza again exhorted his son to take up law, adding that Cardinal Zabarella and others also hope that he will agree to the suggestion. From Milan in the early 1420s, Barzizza wrote to another son, Guiniforte, encouraging him in his study of civil law under his (Barzizza's) old friend and professor of law at Padua, Raphael Fulgosius, 'iureconsultorum completissimum'. Also in Padua, a third son, Giovanni Agostino, studied civil law. Both as a student of Antiquity and as one from a legal family himself, Barzizza was entirely convinced of the advantages of a legal training.[19]

Looking at the list of Barzizza's pupils, one notices how their careers and backgrounds reflect the two elements in his school which I have mentioned. There was what one might call the aristocratic element, those from important north Italian (mainly Venetian) families who entered public service, while often keeping up an informed, but amateur interest in classical scholarship. Then there were those who became schoolmasters or university men. The same kind of division can be seen in Barzizza's circle of friends. First there were the noble houses, who played an important part in government and, in some cases, were connected with Padua. Most of these were Venetian; Zaccaria and Pietro Barbaro, Fantino Dandolo, Leonardo Giustiniani, Zaccaria Trevisan, Martino Garanelo, Marco Lippomano, Pietro and Valerio Marcello, and Carlo Zeno. Some were Bergamaschi or Lombardi; Giovanni Agliardi, Zebedeo de Ponte, the Suardi and Resta families. Secondly, there were the university figures and schoolmasters, who have been mentioned in previous chapters, and to these could be added the small group of medical doctors in Venice: Pietro Tommasi, Guglielmo Ghezzi, Girolamo Anzelerio, Tommaso Dandolo, and one Giorgio.

While a catalogue of names tells us a little of Barzizza's ambience, it does not really answer the question of his influence, and influence is always difficult to assess anyway. To discover whether and in what ways Barzizza's school was making itself felt in the *studium* or, at least, was strengthening the position of grammar and rhetoric, I have chosen three types of evidence, which, taken separately, may not amount to much, but together are substantial. The first is the increasing importance which seems to have been attached to the literary style of the university oration. The second is the interest in humanist studies shown by certain members of the law and medicine faculties. The third and, perhaps, most convincing is the steady rise of Barzizza's personal standing in the *studium*.

It seems to have been a tradition in medieval Italian universities that orations were given to celebrate important occasions, such as the visit of a dignitary, to applaud a great event or, more commonly, to praise a newly graduated doctor. There is record of such orations in Padua in the later fourteenth century and closer investigation might trace the practice back to the thirteenth century, to the time in which Boncompagno discussed the art of university speaking in Bologna.[20] Francesco Zabarella, for example, gave several orations.[21] On the death of Francesco I da Carrara in 1393, Zabarella was chosen by the *studium* to give a

public eulogy of the prince, in the presence of the heir, Francesco II. In 1397 Zabarella was again chosen by the *studium* to commemorate the affairs of the ruling dynasty, first in a funeral oration on the death of Francesco II's son and, later, to celebrate the marriage of Francesco's daughter into the Este house. It seemed fitting, therefore, that Zabarella should deliver an oration on behalf of the Paduan commune when it formally submitted to Venice on 3 January 1406. A year later, Zabarella gave an address on the doctorate in canon law of Fantino Dandolo.[22] This was perhaps the finest of his orations and was copied as a model. Barzizza may have given some assistance in its composition: indeed, two manuscripts wrongly attribute the speech to Barzizza.[23]

Certainly by the early fifteenth century, we find conscious attempts to polish the art of formal speech to a high degree and along classical lines. There seems to have been greater study of the art, imitation of the best pieces and, naturally, a healthy rivalry. It was Barzizza, more than anyone else, who develped the art, taught it, practised it and encouraged others. Thus, in 1407, Zaccaria Trevisan gave two orations as Venetian legate to the Holy See, one to Pope Gregory XII and the other to the 'Lord of Avignon' ('ad Dominum Avenionensem'), Pietro de Luna, called by some Pope Benedict XIII.[24] Immediately, Barzizza wrote to Trevisan praising the speeches.[25]

Barzizza himself was asked to give numerous orations for the *studium*, as we saw in Chapter VI. He set a new standard in university oratory and we find many attempts, along similar lines, by his pupils and friends. There is strong evidence that the neo-Ciceronian oration was becoming the expected form in ceremonial speeches. Of course, this literary movement, even in the Veneto, was wider than Barzizza's own personal influence, but in Padua his teaching seems to have been a driving force and his literary talents were probably borrowed by many. For example, we have two orations composed by Barzizza's close friend and professor of medicine, Jacopo da Forlì. These 'orationculae' echo Barzizza's, both in style and content, the former being a rather awkward imitation of classical construction, the latter a series of commonplaces, such as the connexions between deeds, virtue, and philosophy. It seems as if Jacopo was merely following an academic fashion. An oration thanking Jacopo follows in the manuscript and is almost certainly by the candidate for a doctorate, a pupil. Here, too, we find platitudes, such as the 'sacredness' of letters and philosophy, and trite classical allusions, but the style is self-consciously literary. With the funeral oration for Manuel Chrysoloras by Andrea Giuliano, Barzizza was well pleased. Francesco Barbaro also gave a university oration 'pro conventu d. Alberti guidaloti de perusio'.[26]

This kind of oration, in a slightly wooden Ciceronian mould, was fully under way by the time of Barzizza's departure from Padua in 1421. Some were better than others. For example, the jurist, Agostino Michiel, whose style was distinctly amateurish and stilted, wrote to Francesco Barbaro saying how envious he was of Barbaro's facility in composition (1424); 'utinam in me esset, francisce, tue

eloquentie ubertas'.[27] More sophisticated was the funeral oration in 1429 of Barzizza's nephew, Cristoforo, a medical doctor in Padua, on Paolo Veneto, the great Paduan logician and natural philosopher.[28] Another pupil of Barzizza, Giona Resta, in an undated oration, introducing lectures on Aristotle's *De Anima*, acknowledged his debt; 'pro ea eruditione quam omnem ab integerrimo viro et etatis nostre oratorum facile principe Gasparino pergamensi edoctus sum'. He divided philosophy into four parts; dialectic, moral philosophy (most especially, he claims, the province of the orator), natural philosophy, and metaphysics.[29] Nothing new is said, but we see an attempt to give some literary polish to conventional matter.

One can assume, therefore, some demand in the *studium* for this kind of exercise, particularly if we take into account the evidence that some jurists and medical doctors were showing an informal interest in classical learning, seen in the writing of some Latin poetry, the acquisition of a modest library of classical texts, or in the attempt to acquire better techniques of public speaking. There were several literary-minded jurists in Padua in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, principally Barzizza's friend, Zabarella, and the latter's distinguished pupils, the brothers Pietro and Giacomo Alvarotti, to the latter of whom were dedicated Sicco Polenton's commentaries on Cicero's orations in 1413. Tommaso Cambiatore taught law in Padua in 1409 while, in his spare time, corresponding on moral questions with, 'inter alios', Bruni in Florence, P.C. Decembrio in Milan, and with Guarino in the Veneto. This dabbling in the classics by jurists continued later, as can be seen, for example, in the library of Vittore Dolce da Feltre and the literary pursuits of the Capodilista family in the middle of the century, and may have helped to build the foundation for that application of humanist philological techniques to juristic texts by Italian and Northern jurists in the early sixteenth century.[30]

As we have already seen, there was a certain amount of literary enquiry among medical doctors. Here one could mention a speech in praise of rhetoric by Jacopo da Forlì, in which he discussed the importance of the rhetorical art for government and stressed that a tenacious memory was needed for public speaking. Citing Aristotle and Cicero, he proposed that the orator be learned 'in cunctis rebus', especially in law and customs. The clinching argument in favour of rhetoric was its value to great men of Antiquity, from Plato and Aristotle to Cicero and Quintilian.[31] Another Paduan master of medicine, Antonio Cermisoni, sent his son to Barzizza's school and seems to have shown at least a passing interest in literature, since he was the recipient of a Latin eclogue, written for him by one Antonius de Camplo.[32]

Humanist studies provided something unique in the *studium*; an education which need not serve professional interests, but could be undertaken for its own sake, as a pursuit which all men could follow alongside their specialized subjects. The examples which are given above show that this was appreciated by many; and

though they may not be individually very significant, they do build up a persuasive picture of the nature and extent of Barzizza's influence. More tangible still is the way in which we can trace the steady rise of Barzizza's standing in the eyes of the authorities, between 1407 and 1421. First, his salary was increased by the Venetian Senate. In 1407 he was paid 120 ducats a year; five years later, he was given an increase of 40 ducats, through the mediation of the *podestà* of Padua, Fantino Dandolo. This increase may well have implied some recognition of Barzizza's services, since it was at the same time (1412) that he took more of an active and important part in university affairs. He gave two public orations on behalf of the *studium* for the *podestà* and also wrote two orations, one delivered by the outgoing rector of the Artists, Filippo di Treviso, and the other by the new holder of the office. In 1414 he composed a funeral oration for the professor of medicine, Jacopo da Forlì, and also an epitaph for his tomb.[33] Also, we are told, Barzizza's lectures were becoming increasingly popular in the *studium*, drawing large crowds.[34] Because of his merits as an educator and latinist, Barzizza was nominated as apostolic secretary by Pope John XXIII in 1414, probably on the recommendation of Zabarella.[35] Again, after 1412 he was frequently present at degree ceremonies, either as a witness or *promotor*, a sign, perhaps, that he was becoming an established university figure.[36] In one of the records of these occasions (1418) he was described as 'facondissimus et eloquentissimus arc. (ium) decor' and, in another (1420), as 'art.doct.et in orbe eloquentie profundissimo'. These epithets were echoed by Barzizza's contemporaries in Padua; for example, by his pupil, Baratella, who dedicated one of his poems to Barzizza, 'oratorem divinum; praeceptorem suum cultissimum', and by another pupil, Pietro Donato, who, in an oration in praise of philosophy, described Barzizza as 'vir integerrimus et nostrae aetatis Oratorum facile princeps'.[37]

Perhaps the strongest evidence of the high esteem in which Barzizza was held was the energetic attempts made by the Venetian authorities to keep him as a teacher in Padua on the occasions when he tried to leave for employment elsewhere. His requests to leave were always met with hot intransigence by the Senate. In 1410-11 the *Studium* of Bologna offered a post to Barzizza with better conditions and salary. He was very tempted and, indeed, made preparations to go, but eventually changed his mind because of the resistance from Venice and because he was reluctant to uproot himself and his family.[38] Again, there is some evidence which suggests that in 1413-14 he was offered a teaching post in Siena, and his visit there in 1414 may have been in connexion with this, as well as with the fact that the Pope was in temporary residence there, and Barzizza went in person to receive his appointment as apostolic secretary. This episode, however, is not well documented. It was his more serious and, eventually, successful attempt to leave Padua for Milan and for the employment of the Visconti which met with the most severe opposition from Venice, especially as Barzizza had become a Paduan citizen. In 1420 Barzizza's term of contract with the Venetian Republic had come to an

end and he was now free from those obligations which had rendered vain his earlier plans to move. While Barzizza was preparing to leave, the Senate, acting on the recommendation of the *podestà* and *capitano* of Padua, Marco Dandolo and Francesco Bembo, immediately renewed Barzizza's terms of employment for a further five years. He then appealed personally to the Doge for permission to leave, but the Doge refused, reminding Barzizza of the benefits he had received from his post. He wrote to a friend in Lombardy about the whole episode and his deep disappointment. To another friend in Lombardy, Count Francesco Carmagnola, he wrote of his strong desire to return there ('quantum amor patrie me ipsum excitet') and asked the count to use his good offices with the Duke of Milan to have him (Barzizza) recalled. In fact, he was recalled by the Duke (technically, he was a subject) and the Venetian authorities eventually let him go. The last record of his stay in Padua is for 19 June 1421. Sabbadini is probably right in thinking that Barzizza left Padua because of a strong nostalgia for his native Lombardy.[39]

What undoubtedly helped Barzizza was the fact that several of the Venetian nobles he knew were closely involved with the running of the *studium*. With the absorption of Padua by Venice in 1406, the *studium* became more or less a department of the Venetian state and the Venetian governors of the city of Padua, the *podestà* and the *capitano*, took an interest, 'ex officio', in university affairs, particularly in finances and administration, whereas the traditional head of the *studium*, the chancellor (Bishop of Padua) was limited more and more to the degree-giving and ceremonial side of university life. Several of these Venetian officials in the early fifteenth century were friends or pupils of Barzizza and were actively interested in the humanist school and its fortunes. Zaccaria Trevisan was *capitano* in 1405-06 and 1412-13, Lorenzo Bragadin in 1418-19, and Francesco Barbaro in 1424-25, after Barzizza had left. Francesco Cornaro was *podestà* in 1407-08, Fantino Dandolo in 1412-13 and 1418-19, Marco Dandolo in 1419-20, and Andrea Contarini in 1420-21.[40] Padua was governed by a line of cultivated Venetians.

(b) *Grammar and Rhetoric in the Studium after Barzizza*

No general account of humanism in Padua in the fifteenth century has yet been written, but I will try to give a brief sketch of the teaching of grammar and rhetoric in the *studium* up to *c.*1460 so that Barzizza's achievements can be thrown into some relief.[41]

After Barzizza's departure until the middle of the *quattrocento*, there was a lull in humanist studies in Padua; Ferrara under Guarino and, to a lesser extent Mantua under Vittorino da Feltre, came into the vanguard of philological studies and rhetorical training. The teaching at Padua seems to have been solid, but second-rate. The humanist friar, Alberto da Sarzana, at any rate, was quite certain about where the best teaching could be found. He wrote to Niccolò Niccoli in Florence in the early 1420s that he had found himself in Padua where there were then teachers

only of the second rank and a thousand obstacles were placed in the path of that erudition he so wanted. He would find Guarino (in Verona), sit at his feet and learn Greek. Apart from Vittorino, who held the chair of rhetoric from 1422-23, there were no outstanding humanist masters in the generation which succeeded Barzizza.[42]

Jacopo Languschi of Venice, who taught rhetoric from 1423-31, had distinguished humanist friends, such as Aurispa, Bruni, and Francesco Barbaro, and was an apostolic secretary, but he himself seems to have been a man of little influence.[43] Antonio Carabello, the pupil of Barzizza, held the chair of rhetoric between 1432 and 1436 and was succeeded, for only a few months, by Egidio Carpio, who then went on to Bologna to teach. During 1437 Matteo de Rido of Padua took the chair, although we do not know for how long. After the mid-century, we find a more distinguished series of teachers, with the pupil of Guarino, Galeotto Marzio (1450-61) and, later, Cataldo Siculo, Raphael Regius, and Giovanni Calfurnio, under whom Padua became an international centre of humanist studies, especially with its connexions with the Aldine presses in Venice.

Humanist teaching in Padua flourished in the early and later parts of the fifteenth century and it is perhaps significant that Raphael Regius, the most renowned of the later teachers, should look back to his fellow Bergamasco, Barzizza, in his panegyric on eloquence (1484). Raphael compared the salary in his day of 400 gold ducats for some professors with the tiny sum of 40 (in fact, 120) given to Barzizza as master of rhetoric; 'tum vero Gasparinus Bergomas conterraneus meus, qui primus elegantiora studia excitavit, ad Rhetoricam profitendam in hoc Gymnasio conductus fuit as quadraginta . . .'. Between the early 1420s and *c*.1460 the university teaching of classical studies was unexciting; more important were the bibliophile activities, the promotion of Greek and the collecting of antique objects in Venetian noble households, such as Leonardo Giustiniani's, and in the Paduan household of Palla Strozzi, who was an exile in Padua from 1434 until his death in 1462. It was partly due to Strozzi's efforts that a chair in Greek was set up in the *studium* in 1463, marking an important step in Paduan humanism, for, until then, literary teaching had been almost exclusively Latin.[44]

(c) *Barzizza and the Veneto Schools*

Barzizza's household was an elementary grammar school as well as a centre for university studies and he built up many contacts with other schoolmasters in the towns of north east Italy, with the result that some of his teaching manuals became known in the local schools, on which the *studium* depended for its students.

He knew some of the private masters in Venice, such as Damiano Gallinetta da Pola, who had been a tutor in the house of Lodovico Barbo in the early 1400s and who, twenty years later, made a collection of Barzizza's letters in Padua, and Lorenzo Monaco, a teacher whom Barzizza particularly admired, recommending Giuliano, Vettori and Lorenzo Bonzio to study together 'sub egregio poeta et

oratore'. One of Barzizza's close friends and perhaps a pupil was Antonio Fantasello of Vicenza, who lived in Venice, where he was probably occupied in teaching. Another friend, Cristoforo Scarpa da Parma, was a tutor to the young Bernardo Giustiniani in 1416 and, again, from 1418 to 1420. In 1425 Cristoforo registered as a Paduan citizen and he remained there almost continuously as an elementary teacher until his death in 1458. Cristoforo seems to have held Barzizza in high esteem as a Latinist; as late as 1448 he sent Barzizza's oration in praise of Martin V to Fantino Georgio to be studied as a model, describing it as 'epistola clarissimi rhetoris Gasparini bergomensis'. We saw earlier that one of Barzizza's pupils, Antonio Baratella, passed his time between Venice and Padua teaching grammar, and that his colleague, Vittorino da Feltre, taught grammar in Padua between *c.*1410 and *c.*1415.[45]

Looking further around the Veneto towns one sees more evidence of humanist developments in the grammar schools. From 1418 to 1429 Guarino had a boarding school or *contubernium*, like Barzizza's, at Verona. The grammar school at Vicenza employed Cristoforo Scarpa in 1417-18 and, again, in 1420. In *c.*1440 the school of the *Ospedale* in Treviso employed Cristoforo as a master for two years; he was given L.100 in money, L.100 in bread and wine and was to teach twelve scholars. He must have left some mark since his *Orthographia*, which had influenced Barzizza's, was one of the first books to be printed in Treviso in the second half of the century. At Treviso Cristoforo was succeeded by one of Vittorino's pupils, Ognibene da Lonigo. About ten years earlier, the school had invited Damiano da Pola to teach, but he had declined and Pietrobon da Belluno was employed instead. Almost certainly known to Barzizza was Giovanni Mainardi di Amaro, who studied medicine in Padua (1407-08) under Barzizza's friend, Pietro Tommasi, and knew Baratella. Mainardi probably taught grammar in Venice between 1417 and 1427 and then, until his death in 1429, in Cividale nel Friuli. He possessed a considerable library of 107 books, mainly works of grammar, rhetoric, and Latin literature.[46]

Barzizza's manuals seem to have been used for teaching purposes by several masters in the Veneto. It would appear that it was from the library of Pietro floriani de Montagnama that Barzizza's *De Compositione*, the commentaries on the letters of Seneca, and a collection of his familiar letters fell into the hands of the library of S. Giovanni di Verdara in Padua. Pietro was rector of the parish of S. Fermo in Padua from 1432 and a publicly paid master of grammar.[47] In Piove di Sacco in the Padovano, we have record of an inventory (1427) for the library of Cristoforo da Legnago, a master of grammar and notary of the small town; he had most of the standard ancient and medieval grammars and rhetorical manuals and one contemporary work, the model letters of Barzizza.[48] In San Daniele del Friuli, we find that in the library of Guarnerio, rector of the town, there were in *c.*1460 two copies of Barzizza's *Exordia*, a copy of the *De Compositione* and a copy of his commentaries on the letters of Seneca. It is likely that these came from the library of the master, Giovanni da Spilimbergo, who taught in Udine, since we know that

Guarnerio had borrowed Giovanni's books for copying in 1457 and a manual on orthography by Giovanni is included in a volume with a copy of Barzizza's *Exordia*.[49]

Indeed, numerous copies of Barzizza's manuals were made throughout north Italy during the thirty years or so after his death and it seems plausible that many were intended for teaching purposes. Unfortunately, we know the names of only a few copyists. *Magister* Ambrogio de Carlis copied the *De Orthographia* now in Bergamo, Leonardo da Trento the Brescia Orthography, and one Bartolomeo de Cervio copied the *De Orthographia* in Trent in 1442. It seems most probable that these were used in local schools, such as the one in Asolo, for which the master, Bartolomeo Spera di Treviso, a pupil of Barzizza, copied his master's *De Orthographia* between 1447 and 1455. Bartolomeo was also a notary and had taught at Treviso. A copy of the same work was made in Conegliano in 1450 by another notary and schoolmaster, Francesco Ferraresi.[50]

The grammar schools are a rich undergrowth which deserves exploration by those who wish to understand the depths of humanist culture. Communal schools all over central and north Italy came into being during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, creating a demand for new manuals on grammar and rhetoric; Barzizza himself, as we have seen, was both a product and benefactor of this movement. The picture which emerges is one of modest, but serious educational reform in the Veneto schools, which tended to look to Barzizza's school in the university town of Padua. Padua was the centre for learning in the Venetian dominion, the centre of a network of schools, teaching posts, and opportunities, which allowed masters to move around; indeed, following the career of one master generally takes one around most of the towns in the area. Rarely is one taken further afield, as in the case of Antonio da Pisa. The commune of Pistoia had invited Antonio to take up the post of schoolmaster and, anxious to write his acceptance in a letter which would convince the Pistoian authorities of his literary talents, he sought the assistance of Barzizza, who, in fact, wrote the letter for him, in which he spoke of the necessity of literary studies for the political and moral well-being of the state.[51] For a while, Ferrara came within Barzizza's ambit. The aged Donato Albanzani del Casentino (†1411), the friend of Petrarch and tutor to the Este, made a collection of Barzizza's letters in *c.*1410 and Barzizza bought some classical books from Donato's heirs. One Paolo, *grammaticus* at Ferrara, borrowed books from Barzizza and the latter wrote to one Himericus Ferrariensis, 'multarum litterarum genere doctissimus', thanking him for his many favours; perhaps for book loans or perhaps Himericus played some part in educating Barzizza's family, who were sent to Ferrara in 1411 because of plague and the threat of armed invasion in the Padovano.[52] A pupil of Barzizza, Facino Ventraria of Bergamo, was entrusted with the main responsibility for teaching the children and, at the same school, Facino also taught the young Federico Cornaro.[53] Between the schools at Ferrara and Padua, as we saw, there was a good deal of exchanging and buying of books.

CHAPTER IX

BARZIZZA'S LAST YEARS, 1421-1430

Barzizza's last ten years were spent mainly in Pavia and Milan, in those parts where he had passed his early life. He had left Pavia in 1407 as a little-known master, struggling for teaching appointments, lucky to have a few contacts in Venice and Padua. He returned in 1421 to help disentangle the most important textual discovery of the day, the Ciceronian manuscripts from Lodi and to take up a teaching appointment at the behest of Filippo Maria Visconti, Duke of Milan. Barzizza was now something of a grey eminence, paid homage from all sides. His reputation had been made in Padua and he was still to be an active, prominent figure amidst the flourishing humanist studies in Lombardy in the 1420s. It is worth pursuing his career for these reasons alone, but also because the chronology of the last years, like that of the early ones, has not yet been properly established; indeed, it is sometimes hard to be certain of his whereabouts, and even the exact date of his death has not yet been established.

Barzizza's reputation was enhanced considerably by his part in the Lodi discoveries, which occupied him as soon as he returned to Pavia (Milan?) in late 1421. Earlier in the year, Bishop Gerardo Landriani of Lodi found in his cathedral archives an important group of Cicero's rhetorical works. These were first copied by Cosma (Cosimo) Raimondi of Cremona, under the supervision of Barzizza and with the assistance of Giovanni Omodeo, a student of law in Pavia. In June 1422 Guarino, in Verona, sent one of his pupils, Giovanni Arzignano, to get copies of the new texts and, at the same time, wrote to Barzizza in glowing terms. It was certain, he claimed, that Barzizza should take first place in promoting Ciceronian studies in Italian schools: 'quem enim potius quam te Cicero ipse deligeret, cuius ductu atque auspiciis amatur, legitur et per Italorum gymnasia summa cum gloria volitat?'. In fact, Arzignano returned to Verona with a (not very good) copy of only the *Orator*. In the same year, Flavio Biondo was in Milan, transcribing the *Brutus* to send to Guarino and to Leonardo Giustiniani.[1]

Barzizza surrounded himself, as in Padua, with a group of eager students and distinguished friends in public life, but it is extraordinarily difficult to get at Barzizza himself in these years. There are numerous references to him, including many warm tributes to his skills as a master, but we learn virtually nothing about what he was teaching and what exactly brought out admiration in others. One is left with the task, therefore, of bringing together his associates and of trying to

track him down in any given year.

Cosma Raimondi, of a legal family in Cremona, attended Barzizza's school for a period of nine months in 1421-22. In 1427-28 Cosma is himself found teaching letters, in Milan.[2] Another pupil, the Franciscan Antonio da Rho, was also to take up the teaching of rhetoric, in Pavia in the 1430s.[3] A better-known student of Barzizza is Pier Candido Decembrio, who once described his master as 'singulare litterarum et doctrinae utriusque humanitatis et virtutis monumentum', and recorded his instruction when writing about another pupil, Giovanni Pietrasanta: 'aequalis meus quocum primis eloquentiae disciplinis assueram praeceptore Bracigia (Barzizza)'. Pier Candido's brother, Angelo, also studied under Barzizza in 1430 and from 1432 to 1438 he was in Ferrara, where he studied medicine under Ugo Benzi and literature under Guarino.[4] Then there was Francesco Mariano, an Abruzzese, for whom Barzizza tried to get a teaching appointment in Verona, and Giacomo Beccheti da Monza, who was to hold a school of rhetoric in Genoa in 1430.[5] Another budding schoolmaster, Giovanni Lamola, included Barzizza's teaching in what amounted to a tour of the best humanist schools of the day. Born in Bologna in *c.*1407, he was taught by Guarino in Verona (1422-25), by Vittorino in Mantua (1425-26), by Barzizza (1426-28), by Filelfo in Florence (1429-30), by Guarino in Ferrara (1430-32) and, again, by Filelfo in Florence (1433-34). Finally, in 1434, he returned to Bologna to begin teaching. At the heart of humanist instruction, Lamola becomes almost the archetypal representative of early Renaissance teaching. To complete the picture, he obtained from Barzizza the Ciceronian codex from Lodi, which he copied for Guarino, and, in 1427, he discovered a manuscript of Celsus in the basilica of Sant'Ambrogio in Milan.[6] Antonio Beccadelli (Panormita) was another renowned humanist of the mid-fifteenth century who began his studies under Barzizza, for whom he had a profound respect. He reassured three of his colleagues, Marcolino Barbavara, Francesco Piccinino, and Domenico Ferufino, that the obscure points in Plautus which defeated them would be resolved by Brazizza: 'Gasparinum nobilem grammaticum patrem ac praeceptorem nostrum consulite veluti Delphicum quoddam oraculum'.[7]

There was a kind of aura about Barzizza in these years. If his achievements were in Padua, he gained the laurels in Lombardy. There survives in Venice an oration by an anonymous pupil of Barzizza. Addressed to 'viri Mediolanenses', it is taken up with an elaborate eulogy of Barzizza on his return to Milan in 1421. The first part deals with the importance of eloquence--for generalship, for other *artes*, for government, and for virtues. Then, he goes on to say that it is because the Duke of Milan has seen how necessary is the 'ars oratoria' for a 'florentissima civitas' that he has appointed Barzizza:

Nam cum videamus florentiam leonardum aretinum virum eloquentissimum. venetias vero atque paduam prope Gasparinum Bergomensem summo ingenio summaque doctrina exornatum in hac benedicendi arte maxime florere: quanto magis vos mediolanenses pro ea dignitate qua hec vestra civitas florentissima ceteris

civitatibus antecellit. decebat hanc insignem atque magnificam virtutem possidere. Quod si in ulteris mundi partibus is vir prestantissimus vitam agere et tamen a nobis esset propter amplissimas virtutes suas in hanc magnificentissimam civitatem advocandus. Certe civitates ad viros excitandos doctissimos atque habendos quotidie legatos mittunt. Vos enim virum non cognoscetis qui omnibus nostris studiis etatem suam consumpserit. Padua atque Venetie beatissimas se fore iudicant quod hunc eloquentissimum virum apud se retinuerunt. infelices vero quod amisserunt. Quanto hec nostra civitas clarissima maiorem debet leticiam percipere:

Tante est enim sui vel in legendo subtilitas vel in explicando prudentia vel in pronuntiando suavitas: ut molesta nemini sed iocundissima videri omnibus possit eius oratio. Neque adhuc quisquam fuit qui eum in legendo defatigatum unquam fuisse conspexerit. Quid aliud dies ac noctes excogitat quam ut possit iuventutem Mediolani in dies doctiorem efficere.[8]

Praise of the master and civic pride are here blended. Earlier in the speech the author gave his own, Milanese version of cultural history: had not St Augustine taught rhetoric in Milan; did not rhetoric subsequently go into darkness ('in tenebris'); and was it not now being revived by Barzizza? The Milanese Giuseppe Brivio, in a letter to Bartolomeo Magri (1426 or 1427), saw his master, Barzizza, in a slightly different light, as the embodiment of Cicero's ideal orator:

Quem tibi in studiis eloquentie habere potes sapientiorem magistrum aut praestantiorem quam eum ipsum quem habes Pergamensem Gasparimum? Qui . . . alter Quintilianus enitet, famosissimus quidem nostra aetate rhetor et expertissimus ad docendum artem et dicendum . . . Hic est ille orator eloquens quem Cicero noster effingit . . .; hic etiam preclarus est moralis philosophus et poeta, qui omnes morum et poesis historieque autores novit.[9]

Besides his teaching, Barzizza kept close relations with several prominent figures in Milanese society and around the court, such as Bartolomeo Capra, Archbishop of Milan, a man of taste and a researcher of ancient texts, and Cambio Zambeccari of Bologna, a man of importance at court and a passionate student of the ancient moralists, especially Plutarch. Then there was the ducal secretary, senator and bibliophile, Giovanni Corvini, to whom Barzizza wrote a consolatory letter on the death of his son, another senator, Thaddaeolus de Vicomercato, and Abbot Riccio of Sant'Ambrogio.[10]

It is fairly easy to bring together the *literati* and scholars around Barzizza or, at least, those of whom we have some record. More difficult, however, is the attempt to reconstruct the chronology and location of Barzizza's last years. If we follow him year by year, then the problems will emerge.

For the academic year 1421-22, Barzizza was employed by Milan, as there is a record of his salary: 'In Mediolano: M. Gasparinus, pro ducatis CCCL, flor. DXLVI sol. XXVIIJ'.[11] This is rather confusing, first because we are not told what he was being employed to do and, secondly, because it is not clear whether he was working in Milan or whether he was teaching in Pavia and the salary was being recorded in

Milan. The latter would seem perhaps more likely, since the note of salary is included in the list of professors at Pavia, which, of course, came under the ducal administration in Milan. Anyhow, there was probably a good deal of coming and going between Milan and Pavia. It would appear that Barzizza spent a considerable amount of time in both places during these years.

There is no record of him for 1423 and 1424. A letter from Barzizza is marked Pavia, February 1425, but nothing is known about his activities until the autumn of 1426 when, curiously enough, there was this inclusion in the list of lecturers for the new academic year at Bologna: 'M. Guasperinus de Pergamo deputatus ad lecturam Rethorice et Poesie'. He must have taken up the appointment as it was renewed for 1427-28. During 1428 he would have been in the company of his former pupil, Filelfo, who lectured in Greek and rhetoric.[12] Other evidence can be fitted around the Bologna period. Giovanni Lamola, as we saw, was taught by Barzizza from 1426 to 1428 and, while Sabbadini assumed this was in Milan, there is no reason to suppose that it could not have been in Bologna. Indeed, since Lamola was Bolognese, it may have suited him to return to his native city after four years away. Again, in September 1427, Barzizza was visited in Milan by Cardinal Niccolò Albergati, but the former could well have spent the summer vacation in Milan, returning to Bologna for the opening of the *studium* in October.

After Bologna there is a long, empty gap, which ends in another surprise; on 12 September 1429 Barzizza is found witnessing a degree in arts in Padua.[13] Again, the circumstances are unknown. Perhaps he went to visit his nephew, Cristoforo, or because of other interests which he still had in Padua. It would be tempting to suppose that, as he was approaching seventy, Barzizza went for the last time to visit some of his old friends. Anyway, he was back in Pavia within three months, as he is listed on a university record for Pavia (11 December), in which it is stated that he should be given an 'honorarium', and, in another record, he is mentioned on a list of professors at Pavia for 1429-30:

Ad lecturam Rethorice
M. Gasparinus de Barziziis de Pergamo cum salario consueto
D. Antonius Panormita assumptus die 15 martii flor. CCCC.[14]

It would seem that he taught until the end of the academic year in 1430, although, in about April, his younger colleague, Panormita, expressed concern for Barzizza's health: 'Gasparinus hic senio iam et invalitudine confectus'.[15]

In a note at the end of a funeral oration for Barzizza, the author, Cabrino Cabrini da Bergamo, explained the circumstances of its composition, which included a visit to the dying Barzizza in Milan:

Preparavi ego Cabrinus predictus sermonculum predictum circa finem mensis Junii MCCCCXXX cum tunc vissitassem prefatum Magistrum Gasparinum de Barzizis de Pergamo iacentem tunc infirmum in lecto in porta Ucellina Mediolani et dubitarem de eius morte plus quam quasi de vite salute. Ipseque postea decessit seu fuit

tumulatus die sabbati primo mensis jullii anni 1430 me nesciente quicquam de eius morte et qui ab eo longe stabam per unum miliare videlicet in porta horientali Mediolani ut prope ipsam portam ubi iam steteram per plures annos propter guerras Venetorum unde non ego sed alius et theologus fuit aliter sermocinatus et ut audivi dici legendo in scriptis sermonem a se ea de causa dictatum et dicendo se non potuisse propter temporis brevitatem illum ad plenum memorie commendare. De predicto tamen sermonculo preparato ut supra dedi unam copiam sapienti viro domino Guiniforti eius filio qui mihi cum me fuisse sic preparatum audivisset copiam requisivit quando postea eum visitavi.[16]

Barzizza, therefore, was buried on 1 July 1430. However, there survives an oration written by him to praise the outgoing Venetian governor of Bergamo, Marco Giustiniani, who left in July or August 1430.[17] This led Cremaschi and Magni to suppose that Barzizza spent his last days in Bergamo, dying in late 1430 or early 1431 (the generally accepted year of his death). The later date is no longer valid, in the light of Cabrini's statement, which Cremaschi and Magni do not appear to have seen. Knowing that a change in governors was due in July or August, Barzizza could have prepared the speech some time in advance and, in the event, as was quite common, it was delivered (and finished?) by someone else.

Barzizza's exceptionally long life affords us an unusually good insight into the world of early Italian humanism. His literary career spanned two generations; as a young man, he explored Antiquity in the shadow of Petrarch, along with other early humanists with whom he can be associated (Loschi, Uberto Decembrio, Salutati, Luigi Marsigli, Niccolò Niccoli); in middle age and old age, he taught and guided the new generation of *literati*, who were to become prominent in the middle decades of the *quattrocento* (Filelfo, Panormita, Pier Candido Decembrio, Francesco Barbaro, Alberti). Although it may be a little false to divide humanists into generations, there were perceptible differences; the earlier group was primarily occupied with discovery and classical Latin scholarship, whereas the later humanists showed greater versatility, in their style and in their added familiarity with Greek, while adopting a more questioning and confident approach. Secondly, Barzizza takes us through a fairly good cross-section of the Italian schools at the time. As an elementary schoolmaster in Bergamo, a private tutor in Venice, a university master in Pavia, Padua and, for a short time, in Bologna, he was familiar with every level and development of literary teaching in north Italy. A product of traditional instruction in grammar and the *ars dictaminis*, he was to play an important part in the new movement to open out the course, to elevate the study of letters and to adapt a conventional curriculum to humanist pursuits. In short, he helped to create those conditions in which Italian schools were to be the foremost centres of classical education in Europe in the fifteenth century.

The last word, however, should be left to his Bergamaschi compatriots. On 25 April 1937, the commune of Bergamo set up a commemorative plaque, composed by Don Emilio Roti:

A–Gasparino Barzizza–Nato nel 1360–morto nel 1431–Letterato di notevole fama–Fortunato ricercatore–E–Felice emendatore di Codici. Il Commune–Orgoglioso di avergli dato i natali.

NOTES

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, II, 51. Full publication details of works cited in the notes can be found in the bibliography.
2. *The Classical Heritage*, pp.329-33.
3. See Rashdall, II, 1-62.
4. R. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese* (1896); W. H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre* (1897).
5. See P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, pp.92-119 and *Renaissance Thought II*, pp.1-9; Manacorda, *Storia della scuola in Italia*, II, 255-79.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Manacorda, I, 164-85 (for the emergence of communal schools), II, 283-337 (for a geographical dictionary of grammar schools).
2. See V. Cian, 'Della Santa, storia della cultura in Venezia', p.175. Similar ratios between schools and population exist for Milan and Florence; see D. Waley, *The Italian City-Republics*, p. 102.
3. A. Serena, 'La cultura umanistica a Treviso nel secolo XV', p.61.
4. Gloria, II, 2,366; also, Gloria, II, 1,103-5 for other *collegia*.
5. K. W. Humphreys, *The Library of the Franciscans of the Convent of St Antony, Padua*, pp.27-8.
6. Manacorda, I, 237.
7. Examples of these arrangements can be found in Chioggia and in Bologna: see V. Bellemo, 'L'insegnamento e la cultura in Chioggia fino al secolo XV', pp.294-5; Manacorda, I, 116,119, II, 228.
8. See G. Brotto and G. Zonta, *La Facoltà Teologica dell' Università di Padova*, p.4.
9. Gloria, I, 9,23,370-3,526,529-31; II, 52; Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna*, pp.74-95.
10. A. Serena, p.49.
11. Manacorda, I, 287.
12. Gloria, I, 372; G. Billanovich, 'Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro da Moglio, Francesco da Fiano', p.207.
13. See H. Wieruszowski, 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century' and ' "Ars Dictaminis" in the Time of Dante'. The best of the older studies is A. Gaudenzi, 'Sulla cronologia delle opere dei dettatori bolognesi da Boncompagno a Bene di Lucca'.
14. Oratory, it is true, did have some place in the *dictamen* schools; see P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, pp.104-5.
15. C. S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400)*, Chapter 8; A. Corradi, *Notizie sui professori di Latinità nello studio di Bologna*, p.378; Manacorda, II, 269-74; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana* (Milan, 1822-6), V,639-40.
16. See N. G. Siraisi, *Arts and Sciences at Padua*, Chapters 1 and 2.
17. *Ibid.*, Chapter 3. In 1419 Sicco Polenton found that the full *quadrivium* was taught publicly only in Bologna; *Catinia*, ed. G. Padoan, *Memorie dell' Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*, 34 (1969), 115.
18. Gloria, I, 13.
19. Malagola, p.448.
20. See below, pp.30-32.
21. L. Gargan, 'Due biblioteche private padovane del Trecento', pp.10, 13.
22. G. Facciolati, *Fasti gymnasii Patavini*, p.51; L. Frati, 'Pietro da Muglio e il suo commento a Boezio', p.249.

Notes to Chapter I, Continued

23. Rashdall, II, 18.
24. G. Arnaldi, *Studi sui cronisti della Marca Trevigiana nell' età di Ezzelino da Romano*, pp.85-91.
25. See E. H. Wilkins, 'The Coronation of Petrarch', pp.158-66.
26. G. Gatari, *Cronica Carrarese*, ed. A. Medin, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, XVII, 1 (Città di Castello, 1909), 214.
27. See Siraisi, Chapter 5.
28. 'Die Statuten der Juristen-Universität Padua', ed. H. Denifle, p.461; Gloria, II, 1,518.
29. On 'free' schools see Manacorda, I, 138-64.
30. Salutati, *Epistolario*, II, 182; *Le Lettere di Boccacio*, p.333.
31. Petrarch's views on education were set out most clearly in the *Familiares*, VII, 17; see the Edizione Nazionale, ed. V. Rossi (Florence, 1934), II, 133-6.
32. On what follows see R. Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna.*
33. *Ibid.*, p.99, n.2.
34. Quoted in Gargan, p.11.
35. See E. Levi, 'I Maestri di Francesco Novello Da Carrara', pp.391-403; G. Zanato, 'Il grammatico Simone Mazeri da Parma e i suoi versi', pp.82-7.
36. See the edition by A. Gnesotto (Padua, 1918); English translation by W. H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators*, pp.93-118.
37. Woodward, p. 108.
38. *Petrarch's Testament*, ed. T. E. Mommsen, introduction pp.21-5, text pp.78-81.
39. Woodward, p. 3. For what follows on Petrarch's library see Salutati, *Epistolario*, I, 330-1; P.de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, I,87-100. Barzizza came to own Petrarch's copy of the *Periochae Livianae*; see below pp.77, 79.
40. Petrarch, *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae*, III, 403-4.
41. See L. Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell' umanesimo in Venezia.*
42. J. E. Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism*, p.41.
43. Woodward, p.107.
44. Petrarch, *Opera Latina* (Venice, 1501), fols 10,5r-11,4r (*Senilium Liber*, Lib.1,Ep.1); Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna*, pp.181-2; H. Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (revised one vol.ed., Princeton, 1966), pp.134-45; D. Robey, 'P. P. Vergerio the Elder'.
45. See B. Ziliotto, 'Rime dell' Istriano Nicoletto di Alessio'; G. Cittadella, 'Petrarca a Padova e ad Arquà', pp.68-9 (extracts from Zenone's *Pietosa Fonte*); E. Levi, pp.391-5; E. Morpurgo, 'L'umanesimo padovano e l'astraria', pp.24-5.
46. See Tiraboschi, V,651-2; Lazzarini, pp.121-8.
47. Sabbadini, pp.31,91.
48. Sabbadini, 'L'ortografia latina di Vittorino da Feltre', p.214.
49. See P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, pp.9-11.
50. A. Campana, 'The Origin of the Word "Humanist" ', p.67.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. See A. Michiel's article in *L'Eco di Bergamo*, 31 October 1962.
2. Quoted by R. Sabbadini, 'Spogli ambrosiani latini', p.363.
3. G. Martellotti, 'Barzizza', *DBI*, VII,34.
4. R. Cessi and B. Cestaro, *Spigolature Barzizziane*, pp.1-13; A. Mazzi, 'Nota genealogica sui Barzizza', pp.135-9.
5. For Barzizza's early career in general see D. Magni, 'Gasparino Barzizza, una figura del primo umanesimo', pp.104-18; also, Manacorda, I,59,II,25,288.
6. *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, I, 99,120,159,191,212.
7. *Statuti e ordinamenti dell' Università di Pavia, 1361-1859*, p.124; *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, I,208; see also Malagola, pp.486-7.
8. Gloria, II, 1,539.
9. A. Mazzi, 'Nota genealogica', p.137.
10. Furietti, part 2, p.13.
11. See the document published in *Bollettino della Civica Biblioteca di Bergamo*, 5 (1911),52; Martellotti, *DBI* VII,34-5.
12. Furietti, introduction p.XXVII; F. Argelati, *Bibliotheca scriptorum Mediolanensium*

Notes to Chapter II, Continued

(Milan, 1745), vol.2, column 2061.
13. Gloria, II, 1, no. 1036, 529-30; II,2,365.
14. *Epistolario di Pier Paolo Vergerio*, pp.351-6.
15. *DBI*, VII,35.
16. *Cod.dipl. Univ.Pavia*, II,no.57,38-40; and on what follows II,no.62,42; no.107,67-8; no.140,83-4; no.142,85; no.143, 85-6; no.146,87.
17. D. Bianchi, 'Per Giovanni Travesio da Cremona', pp.40-4; V. Rossi, 'Un grammatico cremonese a Pavia', p.34; G. Mainardi, 'Il Travesio, il Barzizza e l'umanesimo pavese', pp.13-25, and 'Ancora il Travesio, il Barzizza (etc.)', pp.19-42.
18. A. Corbellini, 'Appunti sull' umanesimo in Lombardia', pp.331-41.
19. *Cod.dipl. Univ. Pavia*, II, no. 148,88; no. 166,99.
20. R. Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna*, p.99.
21. Quoted in A. M. Querini, *Francisci Barbari et aliorum ad ipsum epistulae* (Brescia, 1743), p.313; see also Querini, *Diatriba praeliminaris ad Francisci Barbari epistolas* (Brescia, 1741), p.27.
22. See Giuliano's letter to Barzizza quoted in S. Troilo, *Andrea Giuliano, politico e letterato veneto del Quattrocento*, p.194.
23. See L. Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell' umanesimo in Venezia.*
24. B. Belotti, *Storia di Bergamo e dei Bergamaschi*, II, 287-8, 416-22 and *passim*.
25. It is interesting to note that, by the term *artes*, the university notary, Albertolo, meant only logic and philosophy; see V. Rossi, 'Un grammatico cremonese', p.21,n.3.
26. Z. Volta, 'Dei gradi academici conferiti nello "Studio Generale" di Pavia', pp.519,523; *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, I, 138-9, 186, 225,228,312,422 and II, 38-40,94,97,99.
27. *Memorie e Documenti per la storia dell' Università di Pavia*, pt 1, p.154.
28. For what follows see *Statuti e ordinamenti dell' Università di Pavia*, pp.124-6.
29. Z. Volta, pp.572-3.
30. *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, I,208.
31. *Ibid.*, I,186.
32. See below pp.84-5.
33. See E. Garin, 'La cultura milanese nella prima metà del XV secolo', pp.547-69.
34. *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia,* I,116,120,125,142.
35. Furietti, pp.15-17,93.
36. See Salutati, *Epistolario*, II, 355; V. Rossi, 'Un grammatico cremonese', p.31.
37. Antonius Luschus, *Inquisitio super XI orationes Ciceronis* (Venice, 1477): the work is dedicated to Astolfino Marinoni (fols a.2r-a.5r).
38. V. Rossi, 'Il Petrarca a Pavia', pp.367-437.
39. E. Garin, 'La cultura milanese', pp.549,n.1, 553.
40. R. Sabbadini, 'Spogli ambrosiani latini', pp.370-1; U. Lepore, 'Postille petrarchesche o note del Barzizza', pp.347-51.
41. Salutati, *Epistolario*, II, 337,355; III, 327-30.
42. Bruni addressed his preface to Plato's *Phaedro* to Loschi; see H. Baron, *L. Bruni Aretino, Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1928), pp.125-8.
43. See E. Pellegrin, *La bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza, ducs de Milan au XVe siècle* (Paris, 1955), and the supplement to the same (Florence, 1969).
44. For these various humanist works see Garin, 'La cultura milanese', pp.549-63.
45. R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, I, 34.
46. Cicero, *De Oratore,* Book 1; Quintilian, *Oratoria*. Book 2, XVI-XVII.
47. *Inquisitio*, fol.a.4v; Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana (hereafter BA) MS B 123 sup. fols 97r-101r.
48. See L. Paetow, *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities*; H. Parker, 'The Seven Liberal Arts', pp.417-61; also, below pp.119-21.
49. BA MS L 69 sup.fols 214v-215r.
50. In his *Dialogue of Timotheus* Maffei spoke of 'Gasparinum Bergomensem preceptorem meum'; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter Vat.) MS Vat. Lat. 5076 fol.84r. See also Guarino da Verona, *Epistolario*, III, 210.
51. See P. Vaccari, *Storia della Università di Pavia*, Chapters 2-5.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. See below pp.100-03.

Notes to Chapter III, Continued

2. See G. Post, 'Masters' Salaries and Student Fees in Medieval Universities', pp.181-98; J. Le Goff, 'Dépenses Universitaires à Padoue au XVe siècle', pp.377-95.
3. I. P. Tomasinus, *Gymnasium Patavinum . . . libri V* (Udine, 1654), pp.19-20.
4. P. Kibre, *Scholarly Privileges in the Middle Ages*, pp.68-70.
5. *Spigolature Barzizziane*, pp.13-14.
6. Tomasinus, pp.19-20: 'quia sunt . . . multi alii Doctores, ultra illos famosos'.
7. Venice, Biblioteca Marciana (hereafter Marc.) MS Lat. 80 (3057) fol.249.
8. Facciolati, pt 1, p.52; pt 2, pp.119-21.
9. *Acta graduum*, numbers 230,235,238,244,279,290,330,335,336,339,347,490.
10. *Ibid.* no. 302. Another notarial record of this is published by Cessi and Cestaro, p.14.
11. On Paolo Veneto see *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, ed. A. B. Emden (Oxford, 1959), III, 1944-45.
12. See below pp.87-88.
13. Furietti, p.25.
14. *Statuta dominorum artistarum achademiae patavinae* (Padua, 1496); *Statuti e ordinamenti . . . Pavia*, pp.124-6; Malagola, pp.213-481.
15. See P. Vaccari, p.43.
16. *Acta graduum*, numbers 484,490,530,547,556.
17. A staute to this effect is quoted in J. Le Goff, p.385.
18. Cessi and Cestaro, pp.15-16.
19. Malagola, pp.250,488.
20. *Statuta . . . artistarum . . . patavinae*, Book 2, rubric 15, fol.24v.
21. Tomasinus, pp.24-6.
22. See below pp.91-93.
23. See Rashdall, I, 205-6, 433-4. Between 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' lectures there lay also a difference in salary; thus, at Pavia (1406) Barzizza was paid 125 florins for the former and 25 florins for the latter (*Cod.dipl. Univ.Pavia*, II, no. 140).
24. *Statuta . . . artistarum . . . patavinae*, Book 2, rubric 23, fol.26r; also, Book 2, rubric 19 fols 25r-25v for what follows; compare Malagola, pp.260-64.
25. Furietti, p.153.
26. *Statuta . . . artistarum . . . patavinae*, Book 2, rubric 17, fols 24v-25r.
27. See the voting order for lectureships (*ibid.*, Bood 2, rubric 3, fol.21; rubric 4, fol.21v) and the undemanding qualifications for lecturing in rhetoric (Book 2, rubric 5, fols 21v-22r).
28. Malagola, pp.251-3; 274-7.
29. See below p.101.
30. Venice, Museo Correr (hereafter MC) MS 1437, fol.2r.
31. The commentaries are discussed below pp.86-89.
32. *De Vita Victorini Feltrensis* in T. A. Vairani, *Cremonensium Monumenta* (Rome, 1778), p.16.
33. D. Magni, 'Gasparino Barzizza, una figura del primo umanesimo', p.144; R. Cessi, 'Il soggiorno di Lorenzo e Leon Battista Alberti a Padova', p.355; Cessi and Cestaro, p.11.
34. Furietti, p.182.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. *Vocabularium Breve* (Venice, 1545), title page.
2. See H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de L'Éducation dans L'Antiquité*, pp.369-79. Barzizza's definition almost reproduces that of Giovanni Balbi, *Catholicon* (Venice, 1495), fol.a.2r. The *Catholicon* (1286) was popular in Italian schools; see E. Garin, *L'educazione in Europa 1400-1600*, pp.18-19. So also was the late twelfth-century *Derivationes* of Uguccione da Pisa; see A. Marigo, *I codici manoscritti delle 'derivationes' di Uguccione pisano* (Rome, 1936).
3. This approach is indicated by Priscian's constant reference to literary examples and is stated in his *Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri XVIII*, preface, pp.1-3. Donatus's *Ars Grammatica* draws heavily on Virgil in its rigid classification of the Latin language.
4. See R. H. Robins, *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe*; R. W. Hunt, 'Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries' and 'Studies on Priscian in the Twelfth Century–II: The School of Ralph of Beauvais'.
5. Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria (hereafter Padua BU) MS 534, fol.67r (being a short summary of orthographical rules).

Notes to Chapter IV, Continued

6. *Orthographia Clarissimi Oratoris Gasparini Bergomensis* (Bodley incunable Auct. VII, Q.VII 57); fols a.1r-d.4v contain a treatise on orthographical principles and fols. e.1r-t.4 contain a Latin glossary. Henceforth the work will be referred to as *Orthographia (Bodley)*. The quotation here is from fol.a.2r.
7. 'N' is Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale (hereafter N.B.Naz.) MS XIII G 9; 'F' is Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale (hereafter Fl.B.Naz.) MS Fondo Magliabechiano, Cl.VI 203, fols 1r-23v; 'L' is Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana (hereafter Fl.B.Laur.) Ashb.881 (812). See Sabbadini, 'Spogli ambrosiani latini', pp.364-5, who believed 'L' to be the only known example of the first version.
8. For example N fol.1r gives: ad reliquam orationis dignitatem ab oratione[*sic*] euphonie atque ex usu maiore perfecta tum erudite tum copiose scripta apud aliquos reperiatur. F fol.1r and L fol.1r give: ad reliquam orationis dignitatem accedat. Et licet huiusce rei sive ars quaedam sive consuetudo a ratione euphoniae, atque ex usu maiorum perfecta tam (L 'tum') erudite tam (L 'tum') copiose scripta apud alios reperiatur.
9. For students' notes (*reportationes*) in medieval universities see B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, pp.200-8.
10. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fol.c.3r. In certain classical authors (Gellius, Suetonius) 'praetextatis' (with the toga) meant boys under seventeen, and here they are 'adoloscentes' and, therefore, over fourteen.
11. Marc. MS Lat. XI 21 (3814), fol.20v.
12. Both passages are given by Sabbadini, pp.365-6; other changes in the second version are discussed on pp.366-9.
13. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fol.a.3.
14. *Ibid.*, fols a.3r, b.1r, r.3v. Iohannes Pierius Valerianus in his *Castigationes Virgilianae* (1521) mentioned a fragment of Victorinus given to him by Gian Parrasio. This may have been Barzizza's copy originally as a large number of his books came into Parrasio's hands. See *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil (Leipzig, 1874), VI, introduction p.IX; R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici*, I, 36.
15. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fol.e.1r; Sabbadini, II, 237.
16. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fols n.3r, q.4v. See J. F. Mountford and J. T. Schultz, *Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aeli Donati Tractatorum* (New York, 1930), p.117.
17. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fols e.3r, h.3r, m.3r, o.2r; also, Sabbadini, I, 77-8, II, 202-3.
18. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fol. h.2v; also, fols e.1r, g.1r, i.3r, l.2r, o.2v, p.1v, t.1r. See Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese*, pp.50-1.
19. Sabbadini, 'Spogli ambrosiani latini', pp.374-6.
20. *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fol. e.3v and Sabbadini, pp.370-1.
21. *Ibid.* fol. b.4v.
22. For example, *ibid.* fol. c.1r (on the use of the 'hypsilon') and fol. g.4r (where Isidore is criticised).
23. On Barzizza's Greek see fols. c.2v-3v, g.1r; Sabbadini, pp.366-8.
24. *Ibid.* fol.b.4v: Barzizza refers to 'a very ancient codex of mine' containing *De Oratore, Orator* and *Brutus*. These are the famous Ciceronian texts discovered at Lodi (1421) and examined by Barzizza.
25. *Ibid.* fol. h.1v, h.3v-4r.
26. *Ibid.* fol.b.2r and Sabbadini, pp.371-2.
27. For example, *ibid.* fol.a.5r.
28. *Ibid.* fols a.2v-3r, a.5r, b.1r, b.2r, n.3r, s.1r.
29. *Ibid.* fols b.3r, i.2r.
30. Brescia, Biblioteca Civica Queriniana, MS H II 17, fols 151r-154r.
31. *Ibid.* fol.115r.
32. For example, in the section on the 'h' aspirant (fols 121v-6v).
33. Fl.B.Laur. MS Ashb. 1658(1581), fols 211v-39v.
34. MC MS 1039, fols 49r-70v; Padua BU MS 1743, fols 77r-110r. Padua BU MS 517, fols 52r-5v is a fragment of this work.
35. MC MS 1039, fols 49r-53r; Padua BU 1743, fols 77r-80v. Compare N.B.Naz. MS XIII G 9, fol.1r.
36. Padua BU MS 534, fols 67r-75r.
37. Fl.B.Naz. MS Magl.Cl.VI 203, fols 23v-24r; N.B.Naz. MS V C 11, fols 19r-21v.
38. Oxford, MS Bodley Can. Misc. 362, fols 150r-6v.

Notes to Chapter IV, Continued

39. See Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino*, pp.48-52.
40. Vat. MS Lat.2714, fols 135v-40r; BA MS R 67 sup., fols 110v-4r; BA MS L 54 sup., fols 119v-23r; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 362, fols 150r-6r.
41. MS Bodley Can. Misc. 362, fol. 152v.
42. *Ibid*. fol. 152r.
43. I have examined the following MSS of this work: MS Bodley Can. Misc. 12, fols 74v-7r; N.B.Naz. V C 34, fols 23r-4v; N.B.Naz. V C 11, fols 19r-21r; MC MS 1039, fols 71r-2r; Padua BU MS 1743, fols 106v-8r.
44. 'Note sulla punteggiatura medievale e il segno di parentesi'.
45. N.B.Naz. V C 34, fols 25r-6r.
46. For example, N.B.Naz. XIII G 9, fol. 42; BA MS Fondo Cimelii H 48 inf., fols 103r-4v.
47. Classical and medieval writings on punctuation are explored by F. Novati, 'Di un *ars punctandi* erroneamente attribuita a Francesco Petrarca'.
48. Roncaglia shows how Barzizza resurrected the classical sign of parenthesis which had been dropped by the *dictatores*.
49. This 'school' was examined by Sabbadini in two articles: 'L'ortografia latina di Foca'; 'L'ortografia latina di Vittorino da Feltre e la scuola padovana'; also, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino*, pp.49-50. I am here essentially summarising Sabbadini's research.
50. Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, MS Vitt. Eman. 731 (926.423), fols 122r-3v. Sabbadini thought the work may have been composed *c.*1435, but there seems no reason against assuming an earlier date.
51. *Epistolario di Guarino*, I, 394.
52. N.B.Naz. MS XIII G 9, fol. 8r.
53. Sabbadini, *Vita di Guarino Veronese*, pp.15-21; G. Gualdo, 'Barbaro, Francesco', *DBI*, VI, 101.
54. See B. L. Ullman, *The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati*, pp.44, 108-12; Sabbadini, *Storia del ciceronianismo*, pp.99-102.
55. 'From the Revival of Letters to the Reform of the Arts: Niccolò Niccoli and Filippo Brunelleschi', pp.71-82.
56. Fl.B.Laur. MS Plut. 90 sup. 47, fol. 184.
57. N.B.Naz. MS XIII G 9, fols 42v-3r; Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino*, pp.78-9.
58. *DBI*, VII, 37.
59. See R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, pp.268-75.
60. Azzoni, 'Ricerche Barziziane', pp.15-26. See Sabbadini, p.41 and *Il metodo degli umanisti*, p.12; also, Bolgar, p.111.
61. Padua BU MS 534, fols 23r-67r; N.B.Naz. MS V C 11, fols 14v-16r.
62. Querin. MS H II 17, fols 186v-210v: inc. 'Inter metum et timorem et pavorem interest quod metus futura prospicit, timor subita mentis consternatio. Pavor animi metus. Unde etiam pavida iumenta dicimus. Inter que et ve . . .'.
63. R. Sonkowsky, introduction to his edn. of *De Compositione*, p.VIII; *DBI*, VII, 37.
64. *Margarita Poetica* (Basel, 1495), copy in the Bodleian Library.
65. Vat. MS Reg. Lat. 1469, fol. 137r.
66. N.B.Naz. V C 34, fol. 26v. The others are N.B.Naz. V C 39, fols 105v-6v; Fl.B.Laur. Plut.89 inf.34, fol. 2v; Padua BU 534, fol. 22v.
67. See R. Weiss, *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity*; the pseudo-Livy epitaph is discussed pp.20-1.
68. Ed. B. L. Ullman, pp.97-107. Ullman (p.XIII n.3) believed Sicco may have been inspired by Barzizza's work and also, perhaps, by a work attributed to Petrarch, *De dignitatibus et officiis Romani populi*.
69. Azzoni, p.19 n.24.
70. For example, Fl.B.Laur. MS Plut. 89 inf. 34; Vat. MS Lat. 1541; Vat. MS Reg. Lat. 786.
71. BA MS H 56 sup., fol. 91v; also, N.B. Naz. IV C 32, unnumbered final leaf.
72. Fl.B.Laur. Plut. 89 inf. 34, fols 3v-4r, following the *Epilogus*.
73. See Sabbadini, *Il metodo degli umanisti*, pp.29-32.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. The four terms are taken from Marius Victorinus: see E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, pp.438-9; also, Bolgar, pp.29, 40-2. A similar scheme can be found in Cicero, *De Oratore*, I,XLII, 5-7, and Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, I,IV,2.

Notes to Chapter V, Continued

2. See L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribers and Scholars*, pp.102-116.
3. The series of letters about the Pliny are in Bertalot, nos 48-51.
4. 'I codici delle opere rettoriche di Cicerone', pp.100-6.
5. Quoted by Sabbadini, p.104.
6. For example, his glosses on *De Oratore*; N.B.Naz. MS IV A 43.
7. Bertalot, nos 5, 24, 53-4. See Furietti, pp.113-14, 194-5 and Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, pp.388-93.
8. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici*, I, 76-7.
9. Bertalot, no. 54; Sabbadini, *Studi di Gasparino Barzizza su Quintiliano e Cicerone*, pp.2-3. See also Martellotti, *DBI*, VII, 35 and A. C. Clark, 'The Reappearance of the Texts of the Classics', pp.24-31.
10. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici*, I, 100-1; E. Malcovati, 'La tradizione del "Brutus" e il nuovo frammento cremonese'; F. Novati and G. Lafaye, 'L'anthologie d'un humaniste italien au XVe siècle. Le manuscrit de Lyons', pp.41 ff.
11. For example, Marcantonio Sabellico, *De Latinae Linguae Reparatione* (Venice, 1505), fol. 110; J. P. Forestus, *Supplementa Chronicarum* (Venice, 1513), fol. 274v; also, *Epistolario di Guarino*, I, 332ff., 345, III, 135ff.
12. E. Malcovati, p.32 n.11.
13. 'The Character of Humanist Philology', pp.119-28.
14. Vat. MS Lat. 1753, fol. 53r.
15. Milan, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, AH XII 16, fol. 5v.
16. Bertalot, no. 21. For the reading of Latin prose and *volgare* poetry to learned gatherings see J. Larner, *Culture and Society in Italy 1290-1420*, pp.162-8.
17. See Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, pp.28-9.
18. For example, in Barzizza's copy of Florus's *Epitoma de Titolivio libri quattuor*; N.B.Naz. MS IV C 32, fols 1-29.
19. N.B.Naz. MS IV B 16, fols 25r-37v.
20. Vat. MS Lat. 1753, fols 1r-53v. Similar glosses are found in Barzizza's copies of Seneca's *Declamationes* (*ibid.* fols 54r-74v) and *Tragedies* (N.B.Naz. MS IV D 49, fols 1-211).
21. 'Postille petrarchesche o note del Barzizza'.
22. N.B.Naz. MS IV A 43; BA MS M 5 sup..
23. N.B.Naz. MS IV A 43, fols 2v-139r (*De Oratore*), fols 139v-77r (*Orator*). Many notes also summarise the text.
24. BA MS M 5 sup., fol. 62.
25. See below pp. 83-84.
26. See, for example, the note on the legendary foundation of Milan in his glosses on Claudian; BS MS 5 sup., fol. 66r. Barzizza seems to have instilled into his pupils this urge for fact finding. The young Pier Candido Decembrio, for example, reported back to Barzizza the results of enquiries into the various winds and parts of the world which were mentioned by the Ancients; Milan, Biblioteca Braidense, MS AH XII 16, fols 6r-7r.
27. BA MS M 5 sup., fol. 62r.
28. 'Le Periochae Livianae del Petrarca possedute dai Barzizza'; see also U. Lepore, 'Postille petrarchesche'.
29. See E. A. Quain, 'The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores', pp.228-61; B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, pp.46-66; Bolgar, pp.41-42, 145-46, 216-24.
30. MC MS 1437 has 348 folios in double column, each column being 26mm.x7mm.
31. Bertalot, nos 5-6, 8-9, 45-6; Furietti, pp.134-35.
32. See above pp.43-44.
33. Marc. MS Lat. XI 101 (3939), fols 76r-81r.
34. MC MS 1437, fol. 2v. On the textual tradition of Seneca's work see L. D. Reynolds, *The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Letters* (Oxford, 1965).
35. MS Bodley Can. Misc. 101, fols 256v-7r; Furietti, pp.136, 138-9, 190-92.
36. Sabbadini, 'Spogli ambrosiana latini', p.363; *Bibliotheca Instituta et collecta . . . a Conrado Gesnero, deinde in Epitomen redacta . . . per Josiam Simlerum* (Tiguri, 1574), fol. 220.
37. Furietti, pp.190-1.
38. G. M. Mazzuchelli, *Gli Scrittori d'Italia* (Brescia, 1758), II, pt 1, p.502; Simler, fol. 220.
39. There is an outside chance that an anonymous fifteenth century commentary on Cicero's letters in Bergamo could have been Barzizza's work, since the script strongly resembles his autograph glosses; B.Civ.Berg. MS Sigma 6 39, fols 1r-25v. For Barzizza's copy of the letters see Furietti, pp.194-5.

Notes to Chapter V, Continued

40. See below p.99.
41. Furietti, p.199. On Terentian studies in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Italy see U. Bucchioni, *Terenzio nel Rinascimento*, who assumes Barzizza's authorship of a commentary (pp.59-61); also, Sabbadini, 'Biografi e commentatori di Terenzio', pp.309-27.
42. Furietti, p.150.
43. Colombo, no. 5.
44. Bertalot, no. 49.
45. *Ibid.* nos 6, 40, 46; see E. Sarri, 'Gasparino Barzizza', p.150 and Martellotti, 'Barzizza, Guiniforte', *DBI*, VII, 40.
46. Vat. MS Chis. J VII 266, fols 35v-7r (*Praelectio* on Terence), 37r-8v (*Praelectio* on Virgil); BA MS Fondo Trotti 83, fols 107r-16r (*Vita Ciceronis*).
47. Martellotti, *DBI*, VII, 36; N.B.Naz. MS V B 35, fols 109r-17r entitled: 'Argumenta super XV orationibus M. T. Ciceronis . . . per Laurentium Bontium breviter collecta ex dictis Gasparini Pergamensis . . . dum easdem padue legeret anno 1420'.
48. See E. A. Quain and also for what follows on the *accessus*.
49. N.B.Naz. MS V C 11, fol. 23r.
50. MC MS 1437, fols 2v-6r.
51. See D. Bianchi, 'Opere di Giovanni Travesio', pp.8-27; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 23, fols 1-61 (*Nova lectura super beato Prospero*).
52. Garin, 'La cultura milanese', pp.573-4; Rossi, 'Un grammatico cremonese a Pavia', pp.16-46.
53. See above pp.26-27.
54. San Daniele nel Friuli, Biblioteca Civica Guarneriana, MS 76; N.B.Naz. MS V C 11, fols 23r-41v.
55. See *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, I, 139,159,186.
56. See Bolgar, pp.373-8.
57. See E. Franceschini, 'Glosse e commenti medievali a Seneca tragico', in *Studi e note di filologia latina medievali*, pp.8-43; R. Weiss, 'The Dawn of Humanism in Italy', p.4, and 'Notes on the Popularity in Italy of the Writings of Nicholas Trivet O.P.', *Dominican Studies*, 1 (1948), 261-5.
58. MC MS 1437, fol. 2r.
59. *Ibid.* fols 7v-10v for what follows.
60. *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, III, 239-58.
61. MC MS 1437, fols 1r-2r.
62. *Ibid.* fols 3v-6r.
63. The idea that Seneca was converted by St Paul is not found until the mid-fourteenth century, in Italy; before then, Seneca was regarded as an 'honorary' Christian. See B. Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity*, p.46, n.2.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Bertalot, nos 18-19; see Sabbadini, *Studi di Gasparino Barzizza su Quintiliano e Cicerone*, pp.1-2.
2. N.B.Naz. MS IV B 16, fols 38r-41v; G. Lacombe and L. Minio-Paluello, *Aristoteles Latinus* (Cambridge, 1955) II, no. 1469; N.B.Naz. MS IV A 43, especially fols 13v, 14r, 69v, 71r.
3. Marc. Lat. XIV 68 (4735), fols 77r-112r; Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1438, fols 108r-16v.
4. See Manacorda, II, 213-40. The *Poetica* of Gualfredus was one of the books on which the Paduan University statutes of 1331 fixed a tariff (Denifle, 'Die Statuten . . . vom Jahre 1331', p.459).
5. Vat. MS Ottob. Lat. 1438, fols 30r-77v.
6. N.B.Naz. MS V D 18, fols 2r-94r.
7. Furietti, pp.146, 206; G. Magni, 'Gasparino Barzizza', p.154; Martellotti, *DBI*, VII, 36.
8. Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino*, p.60; A. Segarizzi, 'Antonio Carabello', pp.470-74, and *Antonio Baratella e i suoi corrispondenti*, pp.3-32, 73-139; Polenton, *Scriptorum Illustrium Latinae Libri 18*, ed. B. L. Ullman. pp.XI-XII.
9. See above pp.52-53.
10. In manuscript copies the work was given various titles; *Praecepta Rhetoricae, De Elocutione, Practica Oratoris seu de tribus elocutionis partibus.*

Notes to Chapter VI, Continued

11. Sabbadini, 'La scuola', pp.75-6.
12. Ed. Sonkowsky in *Studies in Honour of B. L. Ullman*, II, 268-76.
13. Vat. MS Ottob. Lat. 1348, fols 143r-7v.
14. Bertalot, no. 53: 'Cepi ad Danielem nostrum de partitionibus rhetoricis scribere'.
15. Padua BU MS 534, fols 75r-80r.
16. See Sabbadini, *Il metodo degli umanisti*, pp.61ff..
17. BA MS H 49 inf., fols 209r-10r.
18. *Ibid.* fol. 210v.
19. Guarino's letter is published by G. Billanovich, 'Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro da Moglio, Francesco da Fiano', p.322; Facio, *De Viris Illustribus* (Florence, 1745), p.28; *S. Hieronymi Epistolae* (Rome, 1468), II, introduction by Giovanni Andrea Bussi, fol. 2v; J. Trithemius, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* (Basel, 1494), fol. 105r; Sabellico, *De Latinae Linguae Reparatione* (Venice, 1502), fol. 110.
20. Most of the letters were published by Furietti, pp.220-336.
21. See L. Lazzarini, *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell' umanesimo in Venezia.*
22. Furietti, p.285.
23. Quoted in A. Chévillier, *L'Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris* (Paris, 1694), pt 1, p.40.
24. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (Leipzig, 1928), 3, columns 552-8; L. Hain, *Repertorium Bibliographicum* (Tubingen, 1826), I, 348, no. 2675; W. A. Copinger, *Supplement to Hain's Repertorium Bibliographicum* (London, 1898), p.101, no. 911; G. M. Mazzuchelli, *Gli Scrittori d'Italia*, II, 1,502-3.
25. See A. Gerlo, 'The "Opus de Conscribendis Epistolis" of Erasmus and the Tradition of the "Ars Epistolica" ', pp.109-10; also, J. Ijsewijn, 'Humanism in the Low Countries before 1500', p.117.
26. *Exempla Exordiorum* (Padua, 1483), now Marc. incunabulum 1044.
27. Vat. MS Lat. 6870, fols 61r-81v.
28. BA MS Z 55 sup., fols 16-132v; see Sabbadini, 'Briciole umanistiche', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 46 (1905), 74-5.
29. See H. Wieruszowski, ' "Ars Dictaminis" in the Time of Dante', p.105; U. Bucchioni, *Terenzio nel Rinascimento*, p.57 and *passim*; Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, pp.265-75, 295-301; Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, p.248-9.
30. Many of the MSS of the letters are listed by Sabbadini, 'Lettere e orazioni edite e inedite di Gasparino Barzizza'.
31. See Bertalot, pp.42, 47.
32. Bertalot, no. 2; cf. Furietti, pp. 202-3.
33. MS Bodley Can. Misc. 225, fol. 22v.
34. For example, Furietti, pp.106, 140,142,144.
35. I have seen eighty-three such anthologies in Italy.
36. Furietti, pp.170-1.
37. Furietti, pp.67-71. The ceremony is described more fully in an oration for a medical doctor; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 217, fol. 57.
38. Furietti, pp.22,50-2,64-9; B. Angel. MS 1139, fols 25v, 90v, 113r, 128v, 135r; BA MS D 93 sup., fols 163v-4r.
39. Furietti, pp.18-26, 62-4; B. Angel. 1139, fol. 88v.
40. Marc. MS Lat. XI 101(3939), fols 44v-6v; Furietti, pp.40-4, 53-4, 73-5; K. Müllner, *Reden und Briefen italienischer Humanisten*, pp.56-9; Marc. MS Lat. XI 102 (3940), fols 7r-8v; B. Angel. 1139, fol. 120v. *Prolusiones* which do not specify the lecture course are in Furietti, pp.55-6 and B. Angel. 1139, fols 6v-10v.
41. B. Angel. 1139, fols 91v-2r.
42. For what follows, Furietti, pp.15-17, 76-85; BA MS D 93 sup., fols 41-4v; B.Civ.Berg. MS Gamma V 20 (18th century transcription), pp.1-3, 46-50.
43. Furietti, pp.33-6; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 360, fols 114v-6v. See Sabbadini, 'Briciole umanistiche. L'orazione del Panormita al re Alfonso'; G. Resta, *L'Epistolario del Panormita* (Messina, 1954), p.86, n2.
44. Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana (henceforth Fl.B.Ricc.), MS 784, fols 124v-5r; Fl.B.Naz. MS Magl. XXXIV 86, fols 152v-4v; Furietti, pp.27-33; B. Angel. 1139, fols 16r-17v, 84v-8r. For other orations to *podestà* see BA MS Sussidio D 20 (F.S.V.21), fol. 8v and below p.136.
45. B. Angel. 1139, fols 121r-4v.
46. See G. Zonta, *Francesco Zabarella, 1360-1417*, p.21.

Notes to Chapter VI, Continued

47. B. Angel. 1139, fols 125r-6v (for Zabarella), 126v-7v (for Jacopo), 15r-16r (for Marciano).
48. *Ibid*. fols 1r-3v; BA MS M 40 sup., fols 20r-4r; B. Angel. 1139, fols 4r-6v, 27v-30v, 55r-78r and Furietti, pp45-60 (the sermons).
49. B. Angel. 1139, fols 117v-8r (Barbaro), 118v-94 (Barzizza); also, fols 119v-20r, an oration, composed by Barzizza, introducing a disputation at Pavia in which his son, Guiniforte, took part.
50. Evidence does survive of notes made by the audience at these disputations; see P. Gothein, *Francesco Barbaro*, p.30.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. The term is used, for example, in two letters: BA MS P 4 sup., fol. 83r; Fl.B.Ricc. MS 779, fol. 304r.
2. Malagola, p.249; A. B. Emden, *An Oxford Hall in Medieval Times*; Rashdall, I, 497-539, III, 293-324.
3. Furietti, pp.18, 20-1, 64, 121. See R. Cessi, *L'invasione degli Ungari e lo Studio di Padova, 1411-13*.
4. Furietti, pp.98-103, 108-9, 115.
5. See G. Magni, 'Gasparino Barzizza', p.146; Furietti, p.147. Barzizza also borrowed money (*ibid*. p.145) and was forced to sell many of his books (pp.157-8).
6. *Acta graduum* no. 193; Furietti, pp.194-5.
7. On Travesi's school see *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, I, 139,159,186.
8. See H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'Education dans L'Antiquité*, pp.359-89; Manacorda, I, 145-85, 253-80; Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino*, pp.33-144. Garin tends to exaggerate the novelty of the humanists: *L'educazione in Europa*, pp.13-153.
9. Furietti, p.138.
10. V. Bellemo, 'L'insegnamento e la cultura in Chioggia fino al secolo XV', App. A, pp.49-50.
11. See Rossi, 'Un grammatico cremonese a Pavia', pp.27-8.
12. Furietti, pp.106-8. Barzizza would certainly have been qualified to teach some logic.
13. Vat. MS Reg. Lat. 1469, fols 143r-4r (notes on grammatical constructions). See Sabbadini, 'L'ortografia di Foca', pp.529-44. Guarino advised his pupils 'memoriter ediscere' (*Epistolario*, II, 270).
14. Malagola, pp.166-7.
15. *Acta graduum*, nos 87-8,90,207,257,264,323,373,378.
16. Furietti, p.150.
17. Fl.B.Naz. MS Magl.Cl.VI n.144, fols 35v-6r.
18. Furietti, pp.184-5.
19. See Barzizza's letter to Zebedeo de Ponte (MS Bodley Can. Misc. 484, fol. 63) and to his brother, Iacobo (MS Bodley Can. Misc. 225, fols 31v-2r).
20. Bertalot, no. 30; Furietti, pp.151-3.
21. For example, B. Angel. MS 1139, fols 92v-3v, 94v-5r (letters to Zabarella).
22. B. Civ.Berg. MS Lambda 2 32, fols 48v-9r.
23. MS Bodley Can. Misc. 225, fol. 35v.
24. Bertalot, nos 48-51.
25. Furietti, p.193. The oration of Aeschines was translated into Latin by Leonardo Bruni in 1412; see Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, pp.435,462.
26. Bertalot, no. 8; Furietti, pp.110, 113-14.
27. Furietti, pp.199,146,212-13; Bertalot, nos 5, 23-4, 47; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 101, fol. 257v.
28. On Barzizza's book purchases see Bertalot, nos 44, 48; Colombo, nos 5, 8; Furietti, pp.113-14, 134-9, 181; Iannellius, p.103; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 225, fol. 30r.
29. Furietti, p.129; L. Mehus, *Vita Ambrosii Traversari Camaldulensis* (Florence, 1759), p.308. For Corner's copy of the *De Oratore* see Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, pp.108-11, 453.
30. Mehus, p.XXV; see P. Ginanni, *Memorie degli scrittori Revennati* (Faenza, 1769), II, 412-19.
31. Bertalot, no. 9.
32. See Iannellius, *passim*.
33. (1)(2) N.B.Naz. MS IV A 37; Iannellius, pp.32-3.

Notes to Chapter VII, Continued

(3) Vat. MS Ottob.Lat. 1438, fols 30-77v.
(4)(5) N.B.Naz. IV A 43; Iannellius, pp.36-7.
(6)(7)(8) Sabbadini, 'I codici delle opere rettoriche di Cicerone', pp.107, 113-15.
(9)(10)(11) Iannellius, pp.32-3.
(12)(13) Furietti, pp.146, 206; also Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici*, II, 181 and *Storia e critica di testi latini*, pp.20-1.
(14) *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fols e.3r, h.3r, m.3r, o.2r; also Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, I,77-8, II,202-3; *Epistolario di Guarino*, I,284.
(15) Barzizza's text is referred to in glosses on a fifteenth-century copy of the *Philippics*; Vat. MS Lat. 1757, fols 16r, 64v, 82v.
(16) Furietti, pp.113-14, 194-5.
(17) Bertalot, no.5; Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, pp.83-5.
(18) Furietti, pp.134-9, 181.
(19)(20)(21)(22) N.B.Naz. IV G 7; Iannellius, p.216; Bertalot, no.25.
(23) Holkham Hall MS 428, fols 79v-80r.
(24) Bertalot, no.53.
(25)(26) N.B.Naz. MS IV B 16; Iannellius, pp.58-9.
(27) N.B.Naz. MS IV A 43; Iannellius, pp.36-7.
(28) N.B.Naz. MS V A 11; Iannellius, pp.256-7.
(29) N.B.Naz. MS IV A 37; Iannellius, pp.32-3.
(30) Furietti, p.193.
(31) Bertalot, no.8.
(32) *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fol.h.2v; Sabbadini, *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino*, pp.50-1.
(33) Vat. MS Lat. 1773, fols 1-53v.
(34) *Ibid.* fols 54r-74v.
(35) N.B.Naz. MS IV G 50; Iannellius, p.237.
(36) As (35). This work was almost certainly owned by Barzizza. I would like to thank Mme Fohlen of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in Paris for this information.
(37) Bertalot, no.40.
(38)(39) N.B.Naz. MS IV G 7; Iannellius, p.216.
(40) N.B.Naz. MS IV B 16; Iannellius, pp.58-9.
(41) *Orthographia (Bodley)*, fols a.3r, b.1r, r.3v; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, I,36.
(42) N.B.Naz. MS IV C 43; Iannellius, pp. 102-3.
(43) N.B.Naz. MS 32 (Vindob. lat.5); Colombo, p.8; G. Billanovich, 'Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy', esp. pp.140-1.
(44) Furietti, p.146.
(45)(46)(47) Vat. MS Barberiniano Lat. 148 (IX 17).
(48) See Barzizza's letter published by Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, pp.389-90.
(49) N.B.Naz. MS IV C 32; Iannellius, pp.96-7.
(50) See n.(43) above.
(51) Colombo, pp.5-6; Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, I,36; Furietti, pp.113-14.
(52) Furietti, p.110.
(53) Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, I,36.
(54) B.Civ.Berg. MS Lambda VII 25.
(55)(56) Bertalot, no.47; Furietti, pp.212-13.
(57) Holkham Hall, MS 428, fols 3r-78v.
(58) BA MS M 5 sup.
(59)(60) Barzizza's commentary on Terence and his *Excerpta* from Terence and Plautus strongly suggest that he owned copies of the two authors' works. See also Sabbadini, *Le scoperte*, I, 36.
(61) N.B.Naz. MS IV D 49; Iannellius, pp.145-6; Furietti, pp.149-51.
(62) Bertalot, no.40.
(63) See n.(55) above.
(64) Bertalot, nos 48-51.
(65) See n.(43) above.
(66) Furietti, p.193.
(67)(68) Holkham Hall, MS 428, fols 80v-2r (Apuleius), 82v-3r (Plato). This MS is described by N. Mann, 'Petrarch Manuscripts in the British Isles', *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, 18 (1975), pp.198-9.

34. For example Furietti, pp.67, 75 and Marc. MS Lat. XI 123 (4086), fols 9-10.
35. Furietti, p.43.
36. *Descrittione di Tutta Italia* (Bologna, 1550), fol. 368.
37. *Gli scrittori d'Italia*, II, 1, 501 n.3; also, for example, Furietti, p.203.
38. Furietti, p.89.
39. See Sabbadini, 'Giorgio da Trebisonda', *Enciclopedia Italiana*, XVII (1933), 180.
40. Bertalot, no. 7; compare Furietti, p.111 and Colombo, no. 4.
41. Bertalot. no. 45; MC MS 1437, fol. 2v.
42. Colombo, no. 5.
43. Vat. MS Lat. 1773, fol. 74v.
44. Quoted in G. Magni, p.105.
45. The letters are quoted in Magni, p.157; see G. Cogo, 'Di Ognibene Scola, umanista padovano'.
46. Marc. MS Lat. XI 21 (3814), fol.19r (letter to Guarino); compare Furietti, pp.211-12.
47. For university halls in Oxford and Paris see Emden, chapter nine and Rashdall, I, 445,470-7, III, 143.
48. Fl.B.Naz. MS. Magl. Cl.VI no. 144, fols 35r, 37r; Bertalot, no. 27.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. See Kristeller, 'Il Petrarca, l'umanesimo e la scolastica a Venezia'; *La disputa delle arti nel quattrocento*, ed. E. Garin.
2. Furietti, p.19.
3. Cicero, *De Oratore*, I, XVI; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, II, XXI; see Bolgar, pp.29-31.
4. Furietti, pp.24-5.
5. Compare B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible*, p.208.
6. Compare L. Bruni, 'Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus', in *Prosatori Latini del Quattrocento*, ed. E. Garin (Milan-Naples, 1952), p.54.
7. Furietti, pp.40-1 ('oratio de laudibus philosophiae').
8. *Ibid.* p.56; compare the oration in Marc. MS Lat. XI (3939), fols 44v-46v, where the bond between disciplines and philosophy is likened to that between 'comites' and 'dux', or between children and their 'communem parentem'.
9. MS Bodley Can. Misc. 217, fol. 57r.
10. 'A Schoolmaster of the Renaissance', p.107; see also E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, pp.209-13.
11. See Po. O. Kristeller, 'Il Petrarca, (etc.)' and B. Nardi, 'Letteratura e cultura Veneziana del Quattrocento'.
12. See above p.44.
13. Facciolati, *Fasti gymnasii*, p.52; C. Grayson, 'Alberti, Leon Battista', *DBI*, I (1960), 702.
14. See B. Ziliotto, 'Baratella, Antonio', *DBI*, V (1963), 778-80; A. Segarizzi, *Antonio Baratella e i suoi corrispondenti*, pp.3-32.
15. See A. Segarizzi, 'Antonio Carabello, umanista bergamasco del secolo XV', pp.470-74.
16. P. Gothein, *Francesco Barbaro*; S. Troilo, *Andrea Giuliano*. For the best summary of Barbaro's career see G. Gualdo, *DBI*, VI (1964), 101-03.
17. A. Serena, 'La cultura umanistica a Treviso', p.53.
18. See T. Foffano, 'Tra Padova, Parma e Pavia: appunti su tre allievi di Gasparino Barzizza', and P. Sambin, 'Ricerche per la storia della cultura nel secolo XV: la biblioteca di Pietro Donato'.
19. Bertalot, nos 32, 33, 40, 43; also, R. Cessi, 'Di alcune relazioni famigliari di Gasparino Barzizza', p.742. For Petrarch's view on law and rhetoric see J. E. Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism*, p.41.
20. Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Archivio Morelliano (hereafter A. Morell.) 46, fols 60v, 103v, 105r; Bonocompagnus, *Rhetorica Novissima*, II, 266ff.
21. G. Zonta, *Francesco Zabarella*, p.29.
22. BA MS D 93 sup., fols 163v-4r (printed in L. Bertalot, *Eine humanistische Anthologie* (Berlin, 1908), pp.40-1); fol. 162 contains another of Zabarella's university orations.
23. British Museum MS Harleian 2268, fol. 22r; Stuttgart MS HB VIII Philol. 264 26 S 24, fol. 2r.
24. Both speeches are published by P. Gothein, 'Zaccaria Trevisan', pp.34-46.

Notes to Chapter VIII, Continued

25. Marc. MS Lat. 80 (3057), fol. 249.
26. Jacopo's orations are in Treviso, Biblioteca Capitolare, I 177, fols 111v-113r; Furietti, p.210 (for Giuliano); BA MS D 93 sup., fols 166v-7v (Barbaro).
27. Marc. MS Lat. XI 102 (3940), fol. 56.
28. B. Angel, MS 1139, fols 11r-13r; also Sambin, *DBI*, VII (1965), 34.
29. Marc. MS Lat. XI 102 (3940), fol. 59; fols 58, 62-3 contain three other orations by Resta. Various university orations of the 1420s by the medical doctor, Giovanni Calderia, and by a group of young jurists, Agostino Michiel, the brothers Mauroceno and Giovanni Alberti da Venezia are found at fols 45r-55v, 65v-81r.
30. See M. Blason Berton 'Una famiglia di giuristi padovani: Pietro, Giacomo e Francesco Alvarotti (Speroni) e la loro biblioteca di diritto (1460)'; Sabbadini, *Vita di Guarino Veronese*, p.9 (for Cambiatore); L. Montobbio , 'Vittore Dolce da Feltre (+ 1453) e la sua biblioteca'; R. J. Mitchell, 'Gabriele Capodilista'; Sabbadini, *Storia del Ciceronianismo*, pp.88ff.
31. N.B.Naz. V C 39, fols 376v-9r.
32. Marc. MS Lat. XI 100 (3938), fol. 231.
33. The epitaph is quoted in G. Magni, p.158.
34. Bertalot, no. 16.
35. Magni, p.159.
36. *Acta graduum*, nos 230, 235-6, 238, 244, 279, 290, 330 336, 347, 355, 484, 490, 530, 547, 556.
37. MS Bodley Lat. 115, fol. 92r; Baratella's poem *Echatometrologia* follows (fols 92r-197v); Furietti, p.XXXIX.
38. For a full discussion of the proposed transfer to Bologna see Colombo, pp.10-16 and letters nos 3-4.
39. For the Sienese visit see Bertalot, no. 32 and Magni, p.159. For Barzizza's departure from Padua see Cessi and Cestaro, *Spigolature Barzizziane*, pp.17-19; MS Bodley Can. Misc. 225, fol. 6v; *Acta graduum*, no. 556; *Epistolario di Guarino*, III, 126-7.
40. Padua BU MS 2231, fols 61r-70r (lists of *capitani* and *podestà*).
41. For what follows see Facciolati, pp.53-4; A. Morell, 46, fols 70, 88v, 102-3 and 75, pp.52-3.
42. On Vittorino's whole career in Padua see B. Nardi, 'Contributo alla biografia di Vittorino da Feltre'.
43. See A. Segarizzi, 'Iacopo Languschi: rimatore veneziano del secolo XV'.
44. See A. Diller, 'The Greek Codices of Palla Strozzi and Guarino' and G. Cammelli, *Demetrio Calcondila*, pp.27-30.
45. See Lazzarini, pp.120-1, Bertalot, p.42 and R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford, 1963), p.111 (for Damiano da Pola); Bertalot, no. 14 (Monaco); Furietti, p.138 (Fantasello); A. Serarizzi, 'Cristoforo de Scarpa', pp.209-20 and Marc. MS Lat. XI 101 (3939), fol.16 (letter to Fantino); W. H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre*, pp.8-17. Woodward claims that Vittorino lived in Barzizza's house in Padua; this is quite possible but I have found no evidence for it.
46. See Sabbadini, *Vita di Guarino*, pp.41-88; Sansonetti, 'Le pubbliche scuole in Vicenza', p.169; Serena, 'La cultura umanistica a Treviso', pp.61, 69; A. Battistella, 'Un inventario di libri e oggetti domestici d'un maestro friulano del Quattrocento', pp.137-59.
47. P. Sambin, 'La formazione quattrocentesca della biblioteca di S. Giovanni di Verdara in Padova', p.268.
48. Segarizzi, 'Inventario dei libri e dei beni di un maestro di scuola del secolo XV', pp.32-4.
49. G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia* (Forlì, 1893), III, 100-9.
50. See Serena, pp.64-7; B.Civ.Berg. MS Delta V (Ambrogio's copy); Pavia, Biblioteca Universitaria MS 253 (Bartolomeo de Cervio's copy).
51. Marc. MS Lat. XI 21 (3814), fols 28r-9r.
52. Marc. MS Lat. XI 80 (3057), fol. 156r.
53. Furietti, pp.116, 130, 153.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, pp.135-36; Magni, pp.207-08.
2. Sabbadini, pp.115-16, 121.
3. Vat. MS Lat. 1592, fol. 122r is an oration by Antonio in praise of Barzizza.

Notes to Chapter IX, Continued

4. Magni, p.220; Sabbadini, 'Decembrio, Angelo', *Enciclopedia Italiana,* XII (1931), 457.
5. C. Grayson, 'Giacomo Beccheto', *DBI*, VII (1965), 490-1.
6. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, pp.114, 311.
7. Sabbadini, *Ottanta lettere inedite del Panormita*, pp.119-20.
8. Marc. MS Lat. XI 3 (4351), fols 78v-83v.
9. Quoted in G. Billanovich, 'Auctorista, Humanista, Orator', p.161.
10. See Garin, 'La cultura milanese', pp.576-7; Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, pp.427-9 and 'Lettere e orazioni edite e inedite', pp.568-9; BA MS L 69 sup., fols 215v-17r (Barzizza's letter to the abbot).
11. *Cod.dip.Univ.Pavia*, II, 198 no. 296.
12. U. Dallari, *I rotuli dei lettori, legisti e artisti dello studio bolognese*, IV, 53-6.
13. *Acta graduum*, no. 734.
14. *Cod.dipl.Univ.Pavia*, II, 264 no. 394, 267 no. 396.
15. Magni, p.221.
16. Published in P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* (Leiden, 1967), II, 172.
17. The oration is examined and edited by G. Cremaschi, 'Ignoto discorso politico di Gasparino Barzizza'.

LIST OF BOOKS AND MANUSCRIPTS USED

(A) MANUSCRIPT SOURCES
Works are by Barzizza unless otherwise stated

BERGAMO
Biblioteca Civica

MS Delta IV.30, fols 40-51v (*De Compositione*), 248-251 (orations).
MS Delta V.16, fols 1-55v (model letters), 59-70v (*Sinonima Ciceronis*), 58-59, 73-80v (orations).
MS Delta V.25, fols 52v-53v (orations).
MS Gamma V.20 (letters and orations).
MS Lambda II.32 (letters and orations).
MS Lambda VII.25 (glosses on Perseus).
MS Sala II. Loggia K.6.5 (1-21), fols 1-4 (Antonio Baratella; elegy to Barzizza).
MS Sigma II.47, fols 83-137 (*Vocabularium Breve*).
MS Sigma VI.39, fols 1-10, 12-25v (commentaries on Cicero's letters), 26-32 (fragment of commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*), 33-37v (part of commentary on Cicero's *De Senectute*), 76-77v (model letters).

BRESCIA
Biblioteca Civica Queriniana

MS C.V.II, fols 120-124v (letters).
MS C.V. 26, fols 45v, 47 (letters).
MS H.II.17, fols 115-154 (*Orthographia*), 155-186v (*Sinonima Ciceronis*), 186v-210v (synonyms).

FERRARA
Biblioteca Communale Ariostea

MS 110.NA.4, fols. 59-60 (letter of Guiniforte Barzizza to King Alfonso of Aragon concerning Gasparino's commentary on Seneca's letters).

FLORENCE
Biblioteca Laurenziana

MS Ashb. 278, fols 20-21v (letters).
MS Ashb. 881 (812) (*De Orthographia*).
MS Ashb. 1658 (1581), fols 211v-239v (*Orthographya per alphabetum*).
MS Plut. 47. 35, fols 123r-173v (model letters), 174r-197v (*Exempla Exordiorum*).
MS Plut. 48.6, fols 145-153 (orations).
MS Plut. 50.1, fols 55-93 (text of *De Oratore* with marginal references to Barzizza's emendations).
MS Plut 89 inf. 34, fols 2-4 (word lists).
MS Plut. 90 sup. 47, fols 175-184v (*De Compositione*).
MS Plut. 91 sup. 23, fols 154-156v (*Exempla Exordiorum*).

FLORENCE
Biblioteca Nazionale

MS Magl. C1.VI.25, fols 181-244 (model letters), 246-265 (*Exempla Exordiorum*).
MS Magl. C1.VI.134, fols 39v-40, 46 (orations).
MS Magl. C1.VI.144, fols 37v-41v (19 model letters not in Furietti), 21-23v, 31 (orations).
MS Magl. C1.VI.197, fols 57-62 (*De Compositione*), 47v-48 (letters).
MS Magl. C1.VI.203, fols 1-23v (*De Orthographia*), 23v-24 (short notes), 27-33v (*De Compositione*), 41-44 (word list), 56-62v (*Sinonima Ciceronis*).

FLORENCE
Biblioteca Riccardiana

MS 226, fols 115-126v (*De Compositione*).
MS 779 (model letters).
MS 1206, fols 101-106 (*De Compositione*).

MILAN
Biblioteca Ambrosiana

MS Ambros. A. 135 sup. (*De Orthographia*).
MS Ambros. B.116 sup., fol 136v (Martino Recco's commentary on Seneca's first letter to Lucillius).
MS Ambros. B.123 sup. (Uberto Decembrio, *Moralis Philosophie dialogi*).
MS Ambros. B.124 sup. fols 1-5 (oration by Guarnerio Castiglione).
MS Ambros. D.93 sup. fols 162-167v (university orations of Zabarella, Tadeo Quirini and Francesco Barbaro).
MS Ambros. E.124 sup. fols 1-30 (model letters).
MS Ambros. F.55 sup. fols 59-64 (Guiniforte Barzizza, *Proemium in lectionis Senecae*).
MS Ambros. G.44 sup. fols 1-33v (Sinonima Ciceronis), 34-45v (*De Compositione*).
MS Ambros. H.49 inf. fols 209-218v (part of Antonio Rho's *De Imitatione Eloquentie*).
MS Ambros. H.56 sup. fol 91v (word list).
MS Ambros. L.54 sup. fols 1-118v (*De Orthographia*), 119-123 (*De Diphthongis*).
MS Ambros. L.69 sup. fols 27-29, 210-237 (orations).
MS Ambros. M.4 sup. fols 113-184v (model letters).
MS Ambros. M.5 sup. (Claudian, *Carmina de perfidia Rufini*, with glosses by Barzizza).
MS Ambros. M.44 sup. fols 206-215 (Cosma Raimondi, *De Laudibus Eloquentie* and verses).
MS Ambros. Q.20 (*Vocabularium Breve*).
MS Ambros. R.1 sup. fols 99-115v (*De Compositione*).
MS Ambros. R.67 sup. fols 1-110 (*De Orthographia*), 110v-114 (*De Diphthongis*).
MS Ambros. Z.55 sup. fols 16-132v (*Excerpta* from Plautus and Terence).
MS Ambros. Sussidio H.52, fols 51v-53v (Antonius Tarvisinus, oration in praise of the Barzizza family).
MS Cimelii H.48 inf. fols 91-99v (*De Compositione*), 99v-103 (*Epilogus ac Summa Preceptorum*), 103-104v (*De Punctis*).
MS Trotti 83, fols 107-116 (*Vita Ciceronis*).

MILAN
Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense

MS AH. XII.16, fols 5v-7 (letters of P.C. Decembrio to Barzizza).

NAPLES
Biblioteca Nazionale

MS IV. A. 37 (Barzizza's copy of various Ciceronian works).
MS IV. A. 43 (anon. *Life of Cicero* and Barzizza's glosses on the *De Oratore* and *Orator*).
MS IV. B. 16 (Barzizza's copy of the *De Senectute* and his glosses on an anon. *Life of Aristotle*).
MS IV. B. 36, fols 197-219 (model letters).
MS IV. C. 43 (Barzizza's glosses on Justinus).
MS IV. D. 3, fols 69r-70v (*Epilogus ac Summa Preceptorum*).
MS IV. D. 49 (Barzizza's glosses on Seneca's tragedies).
MS IV. G. 7 (Barzizza's copies of the *De Officiis*, the *Paradoxa, De Amicitia* and *De Senectute*).
MS V. C. 11 fols 1-14 (*Sinonima Ciceronis*); 14v-16r (word list); 19-21v (*De Punctis*); 23-41v (Barzizza's commentaries on the *De Amicitia* and the *De Senectute*).
MS V. C. 19, fols 1-33v (anon. fifteenth-century treatise on orthography).
MS V. C. 34, fols 1-22 (*Sinonima Ciceronis*); 23-24v (*De Punctis*); 25-26v (another *De Punctis*); 26v (word list); 37-54v (*Exempla Exordiorum*); 55-65v (model letters); 73-190v (*De Orthographia*).
MS V. C. 39, fols 105v-106v (word list); 106v-108v (*Epilogus de Magistratibus Romanis*); 380v-383 (oration by Jacopo da Forlì).
MS V. D. 18, fols 2-94 (anon. fifteenth-century commentary on the *Ad Herennium*).
MS V. D. 20 (Barzizza's commentaries on Seneca's letters).
MS XIII. G. 9 (*De Orthographia*).
MS Lat. 32 (Barzizza's copy of Livy, Sextus Rufus and Manilius).
MS Lat. 51 (Barzizza's commentaries on Seneca's letters).

OXFORD
Bodleian Library

MS Can. Misc. 12, fols 5v-24 (*De Compositione*); 24v-50 (*Exempla Exordiorum*); 51-67 (model letters); 67v-77 (two works on punctuation).
MS Can. Misc. 217, fols 31-51 (Leonardo Bruni, *Vita Ciceronis*); 51-57v (orations).
MS Can. Misc. 225 (letters).
MS Can. Misc. 360, fols 112v-121v (orations).

PADUA
Biblioteca Universitaria

MS 517, fols 1-49 (lexicon part of *De Orthographia*).
MS 534, fols 1-21 (*Sinonima Ciceronis*); 21-22 (word list); 23-30, 35-67 (Latin-*volgare* word lists); 67-71v, 72-75 (various orthographical works); 75-80 (short work on letter-writing).
MS 899, fols 1-88v (*De Orthographia*); 89-92 (*De Diphthongis*).
MS 1743, fols 77-110 (*De Orthographia*).

ROME
Biblioteca Angelica

MS 1139 (letters and orations).

SAN DANIELE NEL FRIULI
Biblioteca Civica Guarneriana

MS 76 (Barzizza's commentaries on Seneca's letters).

TREVISO
Biblioteca Capitolare

MS I. 177, fols 26-43v (*Exempla Exordiorum*); 46-47 (letters), 53v, 98v-103 (orations), 111v-113 (orations of Jacopo da Forlì).

Biblioteca Communale

MS 56, fols 1-67v (*De Orthographia*).

UDINE
Biblioteca Communale

MS Fondo Manin 1336 (177) (letters).

VATICAN CITY
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

MS Barberiniano Lat. 148, fols 1-66v (Barzizza's glosses on Suetonius's *Lives*); 67-154v (Barzizza's glosses on Caesar's *Gallic Wars*).
MS Chigi Chis. J. VII. 266, fols 35v-38v (*praelectiones* on Terence and Vergil).
MS Ottoboniano Lat. 1348, fols 143-147v (*Precepta de partibus orationis componendis*).
MS Ottoboniano Lat. 1438 (commentaries on Book IV of the *Ad Herennium*).
MS Urbinate Lat. 218 (commentaries on Seneca's letters).
MS Vat. Lat. 1697 (a fifteenth-century MS on the *De Inventione, Ad Herennium* and *De Officiis* with glosses referring to Barzizza's emendations on the same).
MS Vat. Lat. 1706 (a fifteenth-century MS of the *De Officiis* and *Orator* with glosses referring to Barzizza's emendations on the same).
MS Vat. Lat. 1757 (a fifteenth century MS of Cicero's *Philippics* with glosses referring to Barzizza's emendations on the same).
MS Vat. Lat. 1778 (Barzizza's copy of Quintilian's *Declamationes* and Seneca's *Declamationes* with glosses).
MS Vat. Lat. 2714, fols 135v-140 (*De Diphthongis*).
MS Vat. Lat. 2944, fols 26-35 (*Vita Ciceronis*).
MS Vat. Lat. 6870, fols 61-74v (*Exornationes et constructiones*).

VENICE
Biblioteca Marciana

MS Ant. Lat. 21 (3814), fols 14-39 (letters).
MS Ant. Lat. 34 (4354), fols 27-32v (*Epilogus ac Summa Preceptorum*).
MS Marc. Lat. VI.111 (2556) (a humanist collection of writings on Seneca).
MS Marc. Lat. XI.3 (4351), fols 78v-83v (oration in praise of Barzizza by an anonymous pupil).
MS Marc. Lat. XI.20 (3925) (model letter with headings).
MS Marc. Lat. XI.100 (3938), fols 24-25, 28, 44v-46v (orations); 83-93 (*Exemplia Exordiorum*, variations based on Barzizza's work); 203, 228, 229v-231 (model letters, some not in Furietti).
MS Marc. Lat. XI.101 (3939), fols 44v-46v (orations), 76-81 (introduction to a lecture on Seneca's letters).
MS Marc. Lat. XI.102 (3940), fols 10v-11 (oration of Pietro Donato to a pope); 45-81 (university orations by Paduan students).
MS Marc. Lat. XI.123 (4086), fols 9-10v (university orations by Francesco Barbaro).
MS Marc. Lat. XII.26 (3906), (Seneca's tragedies with glosses made in 1395 by Francesco Zabarella).

MS Marc. Lat. XIV.12 (4002), fols 119-120v (university oration of Francesco Barbaro).
MS Marc. Lat. XIV. 68 (4735), fols 77-112 (commentary on Book IV of the *Ad Herennium*).
MS Marc. Lat. XIV.254 (4535), fol 83r (P.P. Vergerius, *De Vita Senecae*).

VENICE
Museo Correr

MS 856 (Barzizza's *De Orthographia* revised by Pietro da Montagnana).
MS 1039, fols 71-72 (*De Punctis*).
MS 1437 (commentaries on Seneca's letters).

(B) PRINTED SOURCES

(1) *Primary Sources*

Acta graduum academicorum gymnasii Patavini ab anno MCCCCVI ad annum MCCCCL, curantibus C. Zonta et I. Brotto, Instituto per la storia dell' Università di Padova (Padua, 1922).
Balbus (Johannes) de Janua, *Summa que vocatur Catholicon* (Venice, 1495).
Barzizza, Gasparino, *De Compositione*, ed. R. Sonkowsky (unpublished dissertation, Chapel Hill, 1958).
—— *Epilogus ac summa praeceptorum*, ed. R. Sonkowsky in *Studies in honour of B. L. Ullman*, 2 vols (Rome, 1964), II, 268-76.
——*Gasparini Barzizii Bergomatis et Guiniforti Filii Opera*, ed. J. A. Furietti (Rome, 1723), 2 parts.
—— *Orthographia* (Bodley incunable Auct. VII, Q. VII 57).
—— *Vocabularium Breve* (Venice, 1545).
Bertalot, L., 'Die älteste Briefsammlung des Gasparino Barzizza', *Beiträge zur Forschung*, n.s.II (1929), 39-84 (57-82 give the texts of fifty-five letters).
Boccaccio, G., *Le Lettere edite e inedite di Messer Giovanni Boccaccio, tradotte e commentate*, ed. F. Corazzini (Florence, 1877).
Boncompagnus, *Rhetorica novissima*, ed. A. Gaudenzi, *Bibliotheca iuridica medii aevi*, 3 vols (Bologna, 1892), II, 249-99.
Chrysoloras, Manuel, *Erotemata* (Venice, 1547).
'Cicero', *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi*, ed. H. Caplan (Loeb Classical Library, London, 1954).
Cicero, *De Inventione*, ed. H. M. Hubbel (Loeb Classical Library, London, 1949).
Cicero, *De Oratore*, ed. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham, 2 vols (Loeb Classical Library, London, 1942).
Codice diplomatico dell' Università di Pavia, ed. R. Maiocchi, Vols 1-2(2) (Pavia, 1905-13-15).
Colombo, C., 'Gasparino Barzizza a Padova: nuovi ragguagli da lettere inedite'. *Quaderni per la storia dell' Università di Padova*, 2 (1969), 1-27.
Donatus, A., *Ars Grammatica*, ed. T. Mommsen, in *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil, 7 vols (Leipzig, 1855-80), IV, 366-402.
Eyb, Albrecht von, *Margarita Poetica* (Basel, 1495).
Facio, Bartolomeo, *De Viris Illustribus* (Florence, 1745).
Forestus, J. P., *Supplementa Chronicarum* (Venice, 1513), Book XIV.
Garin, E. (Ed.), *Prosatori Latini del Quattrocento* (Milan-Naples, 1952).
Guarino da Verona, *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese*, ed. R. Sabbadini, 3 vols (Venice, 1915-19).
Loschi, Antonio, *Inquisitio super undecim orationes Ciceronis*, (Venice, 1477).
Memorie e documenti per la storia dell' Università di Pavia, ed. A. Corradi and others (Pavia, 1877-8), 3 parts.

Monumenti della Università di Padova (1222-1318), ed. A. Gloria (Venice, 1884).
Monumenti della Università di Padova (1318-1405), ed. A. Gloria, 2 vols (Padua, 1888).
Müllner, K., *Reden und Briefen italienischer Humanisten* (Vienna, 1899).
Petrarch, F., *Senilium Liber*, Lib. XIV, Ep.I, in *Opera Latina* (Venice, 1501), fols 10.5r-11.4r.
—— *Epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae*, translated by G. Fracassetti (*Lettere di Petrarca; delle cose familiari libri ventiquattro, lettere varie libro unico*) 5 vols (Florence, 1863-5).
—— *Familiarium Rerum Libri*, edizione nazionale, Vols 1– (Florence, 1926–), Vols X-XIII ed. V. Rossi (1933-42).
—— *Petrarch's Testament*, ed. T. E. Mommsen (New York, 1957).
Platina, B., *De Vita Victorini Feltrensis*, in T. A. Vairani, *Cremonensium Monumenta* (Rome, 1778), pt 1, pp.14-28.
Polenton, S., *Scriptorum Illustrium Latinae Linguae Libri XVIII*, ed. B. L. Ullman (American Academy in Rome, 1928).
Priscian, *Institutionum Grammaticarum Latini*, ed. M. Hertz, in *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil, 7 vols (Leipzig, 1855-80),Vols II-III.
Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. H. E. Butler, 4 vols (Loeb Classical Library, London, 1921-2).
I rotuli dei lettori, legisti e artisti dello studio bolognese dal 1384 al 1799, ed. U. Dallari, 4 vols (Bologna, 1888, 1919, 1924).
Sabellico, M., *De Latinae Linguae Reparatione* (Venice, 1505).
Salutati, C., *Epistolario*, ed. F. Novati, Fonti per la storia d'Italia, 4 vols in 5 (Rome, 1891-1911).
Statuta dominarum artistarum achademiae patavinae (Padua, 1496).
'Die Statuten der Juristen-Universität Padua vom Jahre 1331', ed. H. Denifle, *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 6 (1892), 309-562.
Statuti delle Università e dei Collegi dello Studio Bolognese, ed. C. Malagola (Bologna, 1888).
Statuti e ordinamenti dell' Università di Pavia, 1361-1859, ed. L. Franchi (Pavia, 1925).
Vergerio, Pier Paolo, *De Ingenuis Moribus et Liberalibus Studiis Adulescentiae*, ed. A. Gnesotto, *Atti e Memorie dell' Accademia di Scienze e Lettere di Padova*, 34 (1918), 75-156.
—— *Epistolario di Pier Paolo Vergerio*, ed. L. Smith, Fonti per la storia d' Italia (Rome, 1934).
Volta, Z., 'Dei gradi accademici conferiti nello studio generale di Pavia sotto il dominio visconteo', *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, s.2, 17 (1890), 517-84.

(2) *Secondary Sources*

Arnaldi, G., *Studi sui cronisti della Marca Trevigiana nell'età di Ezzelino da Romano*, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, Studi Storici 48-50 (Rome, 1963).
Azzoni, A., 'Ricerche Barziziane', *Bergomum*, 54 (1960), 15-26.
Baldwin, C. S., *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400)* (New York, 1928).
Baron, H., *Leonardo Bruni Aretino, Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften* (Leipzig, 1928).
Battistella, A., 'Un inventario di libri e oggetti domestici d'un maestro friulano del quattrocento', *Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi*, 21 (1925), 137-59.
Bellemo, V., 'L'insegnamento e la cultura in Chioggia fino al secolo XV', *Archivio Veneto*, 35 (1888), 277-301; 36 (1888), 37-56.
Belotti, B., *Storia di Bergamo e dei Bergamaschi*, 3 vols (Milan, 1940), Vols I-II.
Bertalot, L., *Eine humanistische Anthologie* (Berlin, 1908).
—— 'Eine Sammlung Paduaner Reden des XV Jahrhunderts', *Quellen und*

Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven, 26 (1936), 245-67.
Bianchi r Giovanni Travesio da Cremona', *Bollettino della società pavese di storia patria*, n.s.6 (1954), 37-44.
–– 'Opere di Giovanni Travesio', *ibid.*n.s.7 (1955), 3-31.
–– 'Ultima battuta su Giovanni Travesio', *ibid.* n.s.10 (1958), 91-5.
Billanovich, G., 'Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 14 (1951), 137-208.
–– 'Giovanni del Virgilio, Pietro da Moglio, Francesco da Fiano', *Italia medioevale e umanistica*, 6 (1963), 203-34; 7 (1964), 279-324.
–– 'Auctorista, Humanista, Orator', *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale*, 7 (1965), 143-63.
Blason Berton, M., 'Una famiglia di giuristi padovani: Pietro, Giacomo e Francesco Alvarotti (Speroni) e la loro biblioteca di diritto (1460)', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, 53 (1964), 95-150.
Bolgar, R. R., *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge, 1973), especially Chapters 6-7.
Brotto, G. and Zonta, G., *La Facoltà Teologica dell 'Università di Padova* (Padua, 1922).
Bucchioni, U., *Terenzio nel Rinascimento* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1911).
Cammelli, G., *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell' umanesimo I: Manuele Crisolora* (Florence, 1941).
–– *I dotti bizantini e le origini dell'umanesimo III: Demetrio Calcondila* (Florence, 1954).
Campana, A., 'The Origin of the Word "Humanist" ', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 9 (1946), 60-73.
Cavazza, F., *Le scuole dell'antico studio bolognese* (Milan, 1896).
Cessi, R., 'Il soggiorno di Lorenze e Leon Battista Alberti a Padova', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, ser.5, 42 (1909), 351-7.
–– 'Di alcune relazioni famigliari di Gasparino Barzizza', in *Scritti vari in onore di Rodolfo Renier* (Turin, 1912), 737-46.
–– *L'invasione degli Ungari e lo Studio di Padova, 1411-13* (Padua, 1913).
Cessi, R. and Cestaro, B., *Spigolature Barzizziane* (Padova, 1907).
Cian, V., 'Della Santa, storia della cultura in Venezia', *Archivio Storico Italiano,* ser.5, 41 (1908), 172-89.
Cittadella, G., 'Petrarca a Padova e ad Arquà', in the collection of essays *Padova a Francesco Petrarca nel quinto centenario dalla sua morte* (Padua, 1874), pp.15-76.
Clark, A. C., 'The Reappearance of the Texts of the Classics', *Library*, ser. 4, 2 (1922), 13-42.
Cogo, G., 'Di Ognibene Scola, Umanista padovano', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto,* 8 (1894), 115-26.
Corbellini, A., 'Appunti sull' umanesiom in Lombardia, *Bollettino della società pavese di storia patria*, 15 (1915), 331-41.
Corradi, A., *Notizie sui professori di Latinità nello studio di Bologna* (Bologna, 1886).
Creighton, M., 'A Schoolmaster of the Renaissance: Vittorino da Feltre', *Historical Essays and Reviews,* ed. L. Creighton (London, 1911), pp.107-34.
Cremaschi, G., 'Testi classici medievali e umanistici in un codice miscellaneo della Biblioteca Communale di Bergamo', *Aevum*, 26 (1952), 276-9.
–– 'Ignoto discorso politico di Gasparino Barzizza', *Bergomum*, 50 (1956), 1-10.
Curtius, E. R., *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, translated from the German by W. R. Trask (London, 1953).
Diller, A., 'The Greek Codices of Palla Strozzi and Guarino'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 24 (1961), 313-21.
Emden, A. B., *An Oxford Hall in Medieval Times*, (Oxford, 1927).
Facciolati, G., *Fasti gymnasii patavini ab anno universitatis primo ad annum 1756*,

(Padua, 1757), 3 parts.
Foffano, T., 'Tra Padova, Parma e Pavia: appunti su tre allievi di Gasparino Barzizza', *Quaderni per la storia dell' Università di Padova*, 2 (1969), 29-41.
Franceschini, E., *Studi e note di filologia latina medievale* (Milan, 1938), especially pp.8-43.
Frati, L., 'Pietro da Muglio e il suo commento a Boezio', *Studi e memorie per la storia dell'Università di Bologna*, 5 (1920), 239-76.
Gargan, L., 'Due biblioteche private padovane del Trecento', *Quaderni per la storia dell' Università di Padova,* 1 (1968), 1-14.
Garin, E., *La disputa delle arti nel Quattrocento*, edizione nazionale dei classici del pensiero italiano, 9 (Florence, 1947).
— 'La cultura milanese nella prima metà del XV secolo', *Storia di Milano*, Fondazione Treccani degli Alfieri per la storia di Milano, 16 vols (Milan, 1953-66), VI, 547-608.
— *L'educazione in Europa 1400-1600* (Bari, 1957).
— *Il pensiero pedagogico dell'umanesimo* (Florence, 1958).
Gaudenzi, A., 'Sulla cronologia delle opere dei dettatori Bolognesi da Boncompagno a Bene di Lucca', *Bollettino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano,* 14 (1895), 85-174.
Gerlo, A., 'The "Opus de Conscribendis Epistolis" of Erasmus and the Tradition of the "Ars Epistolica" ', *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500-1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1971), pp.103-14.
Goff, J. le, 'Dépenses Universitaires à Padoue au XVe siècle', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, 68 (1956), 377-95.
Gombrich, E. H., 'From the Revival of Letters to the Reform of the Arts: Niccolò Niccoli and Filippo Brunelleschi', *Essays in History of Art Presented to Rudolf Wittkower* (London, 1967), pp.71-82.
Gothein, P., *Francesco Barbaro: Früh-Humanismus und Staats-Kunst in Venedig* (Berlin, 1932).
— 'Zaccaria Trevisan', *Archivio Veneto*, 21 (1937), 1-59.
Grayson, C., 'Alberti, Leon Battista', *DBI*, I (Rome, 1960), 702-09.
— 'Beccheto, Giacomo', *DBI*, VII (Rome, 1965), 490-1.
Gualdo, G., 'Barbaro, Francesco', *DBI*, VI (Rome, 1964), 101-03.
Humphreys, K. W., *The Library of the Franciscans of the Convent of St Antony, Padua, at the Beginning of the Fifteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1966).
Hunt, R. W., 'Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 1 (1941-3), 194-231.
— 'Studies on Priscian in the Twelfth Century–II: The School of Ralph of Beauvais', *ibid*, 2-3 (1950), 1-56.
Ijsewijn, J., 'Humanism in the Low Countries before 1500', *Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500-1500*, ed. R. R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1971), pp.115-18.
Kenney, E. J., 'The Character of Humanist Philology', *ibid,* pp.119-28.
Kibre, P., *Scholarly Privileges in the Middle Ages*, (London, 1961).
Kristeller, P. O., *Renaissance Thought* (New York, 1961), especially Chapters 1, 5, 6.
— *Renaissance Thought II* (New York, 1965), especially Chapters 1-2.
— 'Il Petrarca, l'umanesimo e la scolastica a Venezia', in *La civiltà veneziana del Trecento* (various printed lectures), Centro di Cultura e Civiltà, Fondazione Giorgio Cini, (Florence, 1961), pp.149-78.
— *Iter Italicum,* 2 vols (Leiden, 1963 and 1967).
Larner, J., *Culture and Society in Italy 1290-1420* (London, 1971).
Lazzarini, L., *Paolo de Bernardo e i primordi dell'umanesimo in Venezia*, Biblioteca dell'Archivum Romanum, ser.1, vol. 15 (Geneva, 1930).
Lepore, U., 'Postille petrarchesche o note del Barzizza', *Giornale italiano di filologia*, 3 (1950), 347-51.
Levi, E., 'I maestri di Francesco Novello da Carrara', *Atti del Reale Istituto*

Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 67 (1907-8). pt II, 385-407.
Magni, G., 'Gasparino Barzizza, una figura del primo umanesimo', *Bergomum*, 31 (1937), 104-18, 143-70, 205-22.
Mainardi, G., 'Il Travesio, il Barzizza e l'umanesimo pavese', *Bollettino della società pavese di storia patria*, n.s.5 (1953), 13-25.
—— 'Ancora il Travesio, il Barzizza e l'umanesimo pavese', *ibid.* n.s.9 (1957), 19-51.
Malcovati, E., 'La tradizione del "Brutus" e il nuovo frammento cremonese', *Athenaeum*, n.s.36 (1958), 30-47,
Manacorda, G., *Storia della scuola in Italia, I: il medio evo*, 2 vols (Milan, 1913).
Marrou, H. I., *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1955).
Martellotti, G., 'Barzizza, Gasparino', *DBI*, VII (Rome, 1965), 34-9.
—— 'Barzizza, Guiniforte', *ibid.* 39-41.
Mazzi, A., 'Nota genealogica sui Barzizza', *Bollettino della civica biblioteca di Bergamo*, 2 (1908), 135-9.
Mazzuchelli, G. M., *Gli scrittori d'Italia*, 2 vols (Brescia, 1753).
Michiel, A., 'Gasparino Barzizza', *L'Eco di Bergamo*, 31 October 1962.
Mitchell, R. J., 'Gabriele Capodilista', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, 50 (1961), 183-200.
Montobbio, L., 'Vittore Dolce da Feltre (+1453) e la sua biblioteca', *ibid.* 46-7 (1957-8), 169-94.
Morpurgo, E., 'L'umanesimo padovano e l'astrario', in Giovanni Dondi dall' Orologio, *Tractatus Astrarii*, ed. A. Barzan, E. Morpurgo and others (Vatican, 1960), pp.19-44.
Nardi, B., 'Contributo alla biografia di Vittorino da Feltre', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova*, 45 (1956), 111-42.
—— 'Letteratura e cultura veneziana del quattrocento', in *La civiltà veneziana del quattrocento* (various printed lectures), Centro di Cultura e Civiltà, Fondazione Giorgio Cini (Florence, 1957), pp.101-45.
Nolhac, P., *Pétrarque e l'humanisme*, 2nd ed., 2 vols (Paris, 1907).
Novati, F., 'Di un "ars punctandi" erroneamente attribuita a Francesco Petrarca', *Rendiconti del Reale Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere*, ser.II, 42 (1909), 84-118.
Novati, F. and Lafaye, G., 'L'anthologie d'un humaniste italien au XVe siècle. Le manuscrit de Lyons', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire publiés par l'école francaise de Rome*, 12 (1911), 41ff...
Orme, N., *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London, 1973).
Paetow, L., *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities* (Champaign, 1910).
Parker, H., 'The Seven Liberal Arts', *English Historical Review*, 5 (1890), 417-61.
Post, G., 'Masters' Salaries and Student Fees in Medieval Universities', *Speculum*, 7 (1932), 181-98.
Quain, E. A., 'The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores', *Traditio*, 3 (1945), 215-64.
Rashdall, H., *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, 3 vols (Oxford, 1936).
Reynolds, L. D. and Wilson, N. G., *Scribes and Scholars* (Oxford, 1968).
Robey, D., 'P. P. Vergerio the Elder: Republicanism and Civic Values in the Work of an early Humanist', *Past and Present*, 58 (1973), 3-37.
Robins, R. H., *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe* (London, 1951).
Roncaglia, A., 'Note sulla punteggiatura medievale e il segno di parentesi', *Lingua Nostra*, 3 (1941), 6-9.
Rossi, V., 'Un grammatico cremonese a Pavia nella prima età del Rinascimento', *Bollettino della società pavese di storia patria*, 1 (1901), 16-46.
—— 'Il Petrarca a Pavia', *ibid.* 4 (1904), 367-437.
Sabbadini, R., *Storia del Ciceronianismo* (Turin, 1886).
—— *Studi di Gasparino Barzizza su Quintiliano e Cicerone* (Livorno, 1886).
—— 'Lettere e orazioni edite e inedite di Gasparino Barzizza', *Archivio Storico*

Lombardo, 13 (1886), 363-78, 563-83, 825-36.
—— 'I codici delle opere rettoriche di Cicerone', *Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica*, 16 (1887), 97-120.
—— *Vita di Guarino Veronese* (Genoa, 1891).
—— *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese* (Catania, 1896).
—— 'Biografi e commentatori di Terenzio', *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, 5 (1897), 289-327.
—— 'Briciole umanistiche: l'orazione del Panormita al re Alfonso', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 31 (1898), 246-50.
—— 'L'ortografia latina di Foca', *Rivista di filologia classica*, 28 (1900), 529-44.
—— 'Spogli ambrosiani latini', *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, 11 (1903), 363-76.
—— 'Le Periochae Livianae del Petrarca possedute dai Barzizza', *Francesco Petrarca e la Lombardia,* ed. F. Novati (Milan, 1904), pp.195-201.
—— 'Briciole umanistiche', *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana,* 46 (1905), 74-5.
—— *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols (Florence, 1905, 1914).
—— *Ottanta lettere inedite del Panormita* (Catania, 1910).
—— *Storia e critica di testi latini* (Catania, 1914).
—— *Il metodo degli umanisti* (Florence, 1922).
—— *Giovanni da Ravenna* (Como, 1924).
—— 'L'ortografia latina di Vittorino da Feltre e la scuola padovana', *Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Licei,* 4 (1928), 209-21.
Sambin, P., 'La formazione quattrocentesca della Biblioteca di S. Giovanni di Verdara in Padova', *Atti dell' Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti,* 114 (1955-56), 263-71.
—— 'Ricerche per la storia della cultura nel secolo XV: la biblioteca di Pietro Donato (1380-1447)', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova,* 48 (1959), 53-98.
—— 'Barzizza, Cristoforo', *DBI*, VII (Rome 1965), 32-4.
Sansonetti, V., 'Le pubbliche scuole in Vicenza durante il medioevo e l'umanesimo' *Aevum,* 26 (1952), 156-79.
Sarri, F., 'Gasparino Barzizza', *La Rinascita*, 1 (1938), 144-51.
Segarizzi, A., 'Antonio Carabello, umanista bergamasco del secolo XV', *Archivio Storico Lombardo,* 30 (1903), 470-83.
—— 'Iacopo Languschi: rimatore veneziano del secolo XV', *Atti I. R. Accademia di scienze, lettere ed arti degli agiati in Rovereto*, 10 (1904), 179-82.
—— 'Cristoforo de Scarpa', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, n.s.29 (1915), 209-20.
—— *Antonio Baratella e i suoi corrispondenti* (Venice, 1916).
—— 'Inventario dei libri e dei beni di un maestro di scuola del secolo XV', *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Padova,* 10 (1907), 32-4.
Seigel, J. E., *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism* (Princeton, 1968).
Serena, A., 'La cultura umanistica a Treviso nel secolo XV', *Miscellanea di Storia Veneta, R. Deputazione Veneta di Storia Patria,* ser. III, 3 (1912), 45-148.
Siraisi, N. G., *Arts and Sciences at Padua: the Studium of Padua before 1350* (Toronto, 1973).
Smalley, B., *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1952).
—— *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1960).
Troilo, S., *Andrea Giuliano, politico e letterato veneto del quattrocento* (Geneva-Florence, 1932).
Ullman, B. L. *The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati* (Padua, 1963).
Vaccari, P., *Storia della Università di Pavia* (Pavia, 1957).
Weiss, R., *Humanism in England in the Fifteenth Century,* 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1967).
—— *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity* (Oxford, 1969).
—— 'The Dawn of Humanism in Italy', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 42 (1969), 1-16 (a revised version of the 1947 lecture of the same title).

Wieruszowski, H., ' "Ars Dictaminis" in the Time of Dante', *Medievalia et Humanistica,* 1 (1943), 95-108.
—— 'Arezzo as a Center of Learning and Letters in the Thirteenth Century', *Traditio,* 9 (1953), 321-83.
Wilkins, E. H., 'The Coronation of Petrarch', *Speculum,* 18 (1943) 158-66.
—— *Life of Petrarch* (Chicago, 1961).
Woodward, W. H., *Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge, 1897).
Zanato, G., 'Il grammatico Simone Mazeri da Parma e i suoi versi', *Quaderni per la Storia della Università di Padova,* 2 (1969), 82-7.
Ziliotto, B., 'Rime dell' Istriano Nicoletto di Alessio, cancelliere dei Carraresi e amico del Petrarca', *Archeografo Triestino,* 14-15 (1948), 161-87.
—— 'Baratella, Antonio', *DBI,* V (1963), 778-80.
Zonta, G., *Francesco Zabarella, 1360-1417* (Padua, 1915).

INDEX

An asterisk denotes Barzizza's pupils or probable pupils

Ad Herennium, see Cicero, Pseudo
Aeschines, 111, 113
Agliardi, Giovanni, 124
Agliardi, Lucrezia, 24, 26, 29
*Alberti, Leon Battista, 3, 121-2
Alessio, Nicoletto d', 22
Alexander, V., pope, 32-4, 102, 110
*Alfonso of Portugal, 50, 106
Amaro, Giovanni Mainardi di, 130
ancient remains, study of, 20, 55, 67
Apuleius, 114
Aquitanicus, Prosperus, 107
Aristotle, 36, 39, 83-4, 91, 102, 109-10, 112-15, 126
arithmetic, 11
Asolo, 8, 131
astrology, 30
Averroism, 39-40

Balbi, Giovanni, 9, 50-1, 65, 92
*Baratella, Antonio, 93, 122, 127, 130
Barbaro family, 27, 39, 100, 124
*Barbaro, Francesco, 3, 6, 27-8, 52, 54, 63, 74, 76, 93, 100, 104-5, 108, 110-11, 115-16, 123, 125-6, 128-9
*Barbavara, Marcolino, 133
Barzizza, Antonio, 25
*Barzizza, Cristoforo, 93, 111, 122, 126
*Barzizza, Giovanni Agostino, 124
*Barzizza, Guiniforte, 25, 82, 115, 124
Barzizza, Jacopo, 25
*Barzizza, Niccolò, 81, 104, 108-9, 123-4
Barzizza, Pietrobono, 24-5
*Beccadelli, Antonio, see Panormita
*Beccheti, Giacomo, 133
Bede, 92
Belluno, 8, 16, 122
Bergamo, 6, 24-6
*Bergamo, Matteo da, 111
Béthune, Eberhard of, 57, 62
Boccaccio, Giovanni, 16, 53
Boethius, 57, 83-5, 107, 113, 117
Bologna, 4, 6, 10-13, 16, 40-1, 135
Bologna, Bartolino da, 92
Boncompagno da Signa, 10-11, 13, 124
*Bonzio, Lorenzo, 73, 94, 110-11, 123, 129-30
Bracciolini, see Poggio
Brito, 51, 53
*Brivio, Giuseppe, 134
Bruni, Leonardo, 21, 34, 52, 63-4

Caesar, Julius, 76, 114

Capella, Martianus, 53, 95
Capelli, Pasquino, 32-4
Capra, Bartomoleo, 52, 134
*Carabello, Antonio, 93, 122-3, 129
Carrara family, 21-2
Carrara, Francesco I da, 9, 13, 19, 124-5
Carrara, Francesco II da, 13, 17-9, 26, 124-5
Carrara, Iacopo da, 19
Carrara, Ubertino da, 18
Cassiodorus, 111, 114
Castiglione family, 106, 123
*Castiglione, Guarnerio, 123
*Castiglione, Zenone, 123
Cermisoni, Antonio, 27, 100, 126
Chrysoloras, Manuel, 34, 51, 54, 59-60, 63, 114-15, 125
Cicero, 16, 18, 35-6, 39, 46, 53, 57, 66, 72-85, 91-9, 104, 107, 109, 111, 113-16, 119-20, 122, 126, 132; *Brutus*, 74, 132; *De Amicitia*, 81, 83, 85; *De Inventione*, 9-10, 31-2, 41, 61; *De Officiis*, 80-2, 84, 102, 111; *De Oratore*, 73-5, 77-8, 81, 92, 120; *De Senectute*, 77, 81, 85; *Letters to Atticus*, 21, 73, 111; *Orator*, 73-4, 77, 92, 132; *Philippics*, 81; *Tusculan Disputations*, 73
Cicero, Pseudo, 9-10, 32, 41, 91-2, 95, 109, 113
Cividale nel Friuli, 130
Claudian, 77-9, 114
Conegliano, 8, 16, 131
Conegliano, Lazaro Malrotondi da, 8-9, 26-7, 86-7, 107
confraternities, 8, 25-6
Constance, council of, 25, 52-3, 74, 111
Contarini family, 28, 128
*Contarini, Niccolò, 104, 108, 123
Conversino, Giovanni, 9, 15-17, 21-2, 26-7, 29, 62, 107, 123
Corner family, 100
*Corner, Giovanni, 72-4, 81-2, 110-12
Corvini, Giovanni, 134
Cremona, Giovanni Travesi da, see Travesi

*Damiano, Pietro de, 92
Dandolo family, 28, 100
Dandolo, Fantino, 101, 124-5, 127-8
Dandolo, Marco, 74, 110, 128
*Dandolo, Tommaso, 81
Dante, 82, 89, 114
*Decembrio, Angelo, 133
*Decembrio, Pier Candido, 3, 54, 76, 133
Decembrio, Uberto, 2, 32, 34-5, 54, 114
dialectic, see logic
dictamen, 9-11, 14, 20, 61, 68, 89, 94-7, 99
Donato family, 27
*Donato, Pietro, 123, 127
Donatus, 28, 47-8, 51, 83, 95
Dondi family, 14
Dondi, Giovanni de', 22, 86-7

Euripides, 112
Eusebius, 53, 88
Eyb, Albrecht von, 66

*Fantasello, Antonio, 80-1, 100, 111, 130
Feltre, Vittorino da, see Vittorino
Ferdinand, king of Aragon, 102-3
Ferrara, 21-2, 80, 111, 131, 133
*Ferufino, Domenico, 110, 133
Fieschi, Stefano, 66
Figulus, Nigidius, 51-2

Filargo, Pietro, see Alexander V
*Filelfo, Francesco, 3, 112, 115, 121-2, 133, 135
Fiocco, Andrea, 68
Florence, 1, 4, 6, 28, 33-5, 52, 63
Florus, 111, 114
Forlì, Jacopo della Torre da, 38-40, 101, 120, 125-6

Garanelo, Martino, 124
Gellius, Aulus, 51, 53, 77, 111, 114
Genova, Bartolomeo Jacopo da, 32, 34
geography, 20, 68
geometry, 11
Ghezzi, Guglielmo, 124
*Giuliano, Andrea, 28, 73-4, 80, 100, 104, 110-11, 123, 125, 129-30
Giustiniani family, 100, 130
Giustiniani, Leonardo, 27, 124, 129, 132
Giustiniani, Marco, 27, 136
grammar, speculative, 48, 56
Greek, study of, 54, 114-15
Gualfredus Anglicus, 92
Guarino da Verona, 2, 6, 15, 17, 22, 29, 36, 43, 51, 54, 59, 62-4, 74, 96, 99-100, 114-15, 117, 122-3, 128-30, 132-3

Historia Augusta, 114
history, 18, 20, 32
Homer, 115
Hugutius, 9, 50-1, 54, 62, 99

Isidore of Seville, 50-1, 61-2

Janus, king of Cyprus, 102
Josephus, 114
Justinus, 111, 113
Juvenal, 57, 99

Lactantius, 113
*Lamola, Giovanni, 133, 135
Languschi, Jacopo, 129
law, teaching of, 4-5, 7-8, 10-14, 18, 20-2, 30, 79
Legnago, Cristoforo da, 130
Lippomano, Marco, 100, 124
Livy, 57, 67, 77, 111-12, 114
Lodi, discoveries at, 74-5, 132
logic, 11-12, 30-1, 35-6, 39, 48, 56, 107-8
Loschi, Antonio, 2, 32-6, 83, 93, 111, 113
Lucca, Bono da, 9

Macrobius, 57, 76, 113
Malatesta family, 103, 110
Manilius, 114
Manzini, Giovanni, 32-4
Marcello, Pietro, 17, 124
Marcello, Valerio, 100, 124
Marcellus, Nonius, 51-2, 99
*Mariano, Francesco, 133
Marinoni, Astolfino, 32-3
Martial, 28, 76
Martin V, pope, 102, 110
Maximus, Valerius, 39, 76-7, 81-2, 107-9, 111, 114
medicine, teaching of, 4-5, 7-8, 11-14, 18, 30-1
Milan, 6, 25, 132-6
Monaco, Lorenzo, 129-30
Montagnana, Pietro Floriani de, 130

*Moriga, Simone, 109
Muglio, Pietro da, 9, 12, 15-16, 20-1, 96, 107
music, 11, 18, 22, 30
Mussato, Albertino, 13

Niccoli, Niccolò, 2, 52, 59, 63, 110
notarial work, 8-10, 14, 22, 24-5, 28, 30

oratory, 10, 92-4, 98, 101-5
Orosius, 77
Ovid, 53, 78, 107

*Panormita, 3, 28, 133, 135
Papias, 9, 50-1, 54, 59, 65, 99
*Parma, Cristoforo Scarpa da, 62-3, 130
Parma, Simone Mazeri da, 17, 22
Parmenides, 51, 53
Pavia, 6, 12, 24-7, 29-36, 39-41, 132-5
Pedianus, Asconius, 51-3, 74, 93, 113
Persius, 114
Petrarch, 2, 52-3, 63, 71-2, 75, 79, 86-7, 111, 114, 119, 123; influence in Padua, 13, 16-23; influence in Lombardy, 33-4
philosophy, 11, 18, 30-1, 36, 39, 120-1
*Piccinino, Francesco, 133
*Pietrasanta, Giovanni, 133
Piso, 53
Pistoia, Zenone da, 22
Pizolpasso, Michele, 68
Plato, 87-8, 97, 109-11, 114-15
Plautus, 57, 99, 114, 133
Pliny (the Elder), 53, 65, 72, 82, 110, 114
Plutarch, 77, 114, 134
poetry, 18
Poggio Bracciolini, 52, 71-2, 74
Pola, Damiano da, 80, 100, 129-30
Polenton, Sicco, 67-8, 93, 126
Ponte, Zebedeo de, 124
'pre-humanists', 18, 86
Priscian, 9, 12, 31, 40-1, 46-8, 50-1, 54-5, 57, 62, 69, 94, 99, 107

Quintilian, 16, 18, 35, 41, 51-3, 55-6, 73-4, 76-8, 92-3, 95, 109, 111, 113, 119-20

*Raimondi, Cosma, 74, 95-6, 132-3
Ravenna, Giovanni Conversino da, see Conversino
Regius, Raphael, 129
Resta family, 106, 111, 124
*Resta, Giona, 126
*Rho, Antonio da, 95-6, 133
Riccio, abbot of Sant' Ambrogio, 134
Rolandino, 9, 11, 13
Rome, 4, 16
Rufus, Sextus, 114

St Augustine, 16, 19, 57, 107, 134
St Basil, 97
St Gall, discoveries at, 52-3, 74, 93
St Jerome, 16, 52-3, 89
Sallust, 53, 77, 99
Salutati, Coluccio, 2, 16, 21, 71-2; contacts with Lombard humanists, 34-5; orthographical interests, 63; study of Seneca's letters, 86-7; disputation with Niccoli, 110
San Daniele del Friuli, 8, 130
Santa Sofia family, 28, 31, 38, 86-7

schools, communal, 8, 24-6, 28, 129-31; ecclesiastical, 8-9; private, 7-8, 15-18, 25-6, 28-9, 44-5, 106-8, 129-31
Scola, Ognibene della, 17, 116
*Scoti, Daniele, 123
Seneca, 36, 39, 53, 59, 104, 109-10, 113-16; Barzizza's studies on the *Epistolae Morales*, 43-4, 80, 82-90; the Tragedies, 81, 107
Seneca, the Elder, *Declamationes*, 78
Seneca, Pseudo, 16
Servius, 51-2, 55, 65, 83
Seta, Lombardo della, 19
Sigismund, emperor, 102, 110
Signa, Boncompagno da, see Boncompagno
Spilimbergo, Giovanni da, 9, 130-1
Statius, 57, 77, 107
Suardi family, 29, 106, 110-11, 124
Suetonius, 77, 88, 114

Terence, 39, 46, 53, 57, 81-3, 96, 99, 107-9, 114
*Teutonicus, Stephanus, 106
theology, 18
Tommasi, Pietro, 72, 110-12, 124, 130
Tortona, Marciano da, 36, 103
Travesi, Giovanni, 25-7, 30-3, 36, 39, 48, 84-5, 107
*Trebizond, George of, 95, 115, 122
*Tremonti, Giovanni, 93
*Trento, Leonardo da, 56-7, 66, 131
Trevisan family, 27, 100
*Trevisan, Ludovico, 123
Trevisan, Zaccaria, 29, 39, 73, 124-5, 128
Treviso, 8-9, 38, 111, 130-1
*Treviso, Bartolomeo Spera di, 131
Triviolo, Tonolo de, 25

Udine, 130
Uguccione, see Hugutius
university, examinations, 30-1; graduation ceremonies, 5, 25, 31, 40, 101; inaugural addresses for each academic year, 43, 101

Valla, Lorenzo, 43, 95, 119
Varro, 51
Veneto, Paolo, 39, 126
Venice, aristocratic circles, 2, 22, 27-9; conquest of Padua, 21; control of Padua university, 38, 40, 127-8; private schools, 8, 16, 129-30; support for humanism, 2, 19
*Ventraria, Facino, 82, 107-11, 131
Vergerio, Pier Paolo, 17-8, 20-2, 26, 54, 99-100, 103
Verona, 8, 34, 38, 130
Verona, Guarino da, see Guarino
*Verona, Paolo Maffei da, 36
Veronese, Enrico, 46, 111
Vettori family, 28, 39
*Vettori, Daniele, 50, 73-4, 76, 81, 91, 93-4, 100-01, 110-11, 123, 129-30
*Vettori, Domenico, 50
*Vettori, Pietro, 50
Vicenza, 8, 38, 130
Victorinus, Marius, 51-2, 113
Villa Dei, Alexander of, 51, 62, 64, 93
Virgil, 33, 39, 53, 57, 59, 78, 82-3, 96, 99, 107
Visconti family, 19, 25-6, 29, 33-4, 38, 103, 110
Visconti, Filippo Maria, 25, 102, 127-8, 133-4
Visconti, Giangaliazzo, 25, 32, 103
Visconti, Giovanni Maria, 26-7
Vittorino da Feltre, 2, 6, 15, 17, 22, 29, 44, 62-3, 96, 115-17, 121-2, 128-30, 133

women, education of, 16-17, 34

Zabarella, Francesco, 29, 38, 86-7, 100, 103, 110, 124-7
Zambeccari, Cambio, 134
Zeno, Carlo, 124

NOTE
The following are pupils of Barzizza not mentioned in the text

Alberti, Carlo, brother of Leon Battista (*q.v.*)
Anzelerio, Paolo, from a medical family
Barzizza, Giovanni Paolo, son of Gasparino
Bernardo, Pietro
Blanco, Cristoforo, a student of civil law in Padua
Bonromei, Vitaliano, from a noble family in Lombardy
Calderio, Giovanni de, graduated in arts at Padua (1420)
Castiglione, Baldassare, brother of Guarnerio (*q.v.*) and Zenone (*q.v.*) and a secretary at the Visconti court
Cermisoni, Ettore, son of the professor of medicine in Padua, Antonio (*q.v.*)
Cocco (Cauco), the brothers Giovanni and Marco and other brothers
Corner, Federico, son of Giovanni (*q.v.*)
Corradino, Giannino, Venetian medical doctor
Curte, Giovanni de, of a noble family
Dandolo, brother of Tommaso (*q.v.*)
Ferufino, Antonio
Folperto, Saglimbeno, of a noble family
Gabio, Sempronio, entered public service in Rome
Loredan, Giovanni, Venetian aristocrat, related by marriage to Francesco Barbaro (*q.v.*)
Malaspina, children of the Marchese Luchina de Malaspina
Marcello, son of Valerio (*q.v.*)
Moriga, Fabrizio
Omodeo, Giovanni, Milanese jurist
Suardi, children of the brothers Giovanni and Baldo; perhaps Pantaleo, Iacopo and Petro who studied law in Padua
Talenti, Rolando, secretary to Zenone Castiglione, bishop of Bayeux
Tedi, Marino da
Terdonensis (da Tortona), Hilarius
Treviso, Antonio da, rector of the Paduan arts faculty (1424) and graduate in medicine (1425)
(?) Ventraria, Domenico, relative of Facino Ventraria (*q.v.*)
Zeno, a relative of the Venetian aristocrat and admiral, Carlo Zeno (*q.v.*); perhaps Iacobo Zeno who became a doctor in both laws in Padua and was to write a biography of his uncle, Carlo