ROBERT BLACK

Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy

Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century

CAMBRIDGE

more information - www.cambridge.org/0521401925

This page intentionally left blank

HUMANISM AND EDUCATION IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE ITALY

This is the first comprehensive study of the school curriculum in medieval and Renaissance Italy. Robert Black's analysis finds that the real innovators in the history of Latin education in Italy were the thirteenth-century schoolmasters who introduced a new method of teaching grammar based on logic, and their early fourteenth-century successors, who first began to rely on the vernacular as a tool to teach Latin grammar. Thereafter, in the later fourteenth and for most of the fifteenth century, conservatism, not innovation, characterized the earlier stages of education. The study of classical texts in medieval Italian schools reached a highpoint in the twelfth century but then collapsed as universities rose in importance during the thirteenth century, a sharp decline only gradually reversed in the two centuries that followed. Robert Black demonstrates that the famous humanist educators did not introduce the revolution in the classroom that is usually assumed, and that humanism did not make a significant impact on school teaching until the later fifteenth century.

Humanism and Education is a major contribution to Renaissance studies, to Italian history and to the history of European education, the fruit of sustained manuscript research over many years.

ROBERT BLACK'S publications include *Benedetto Accolti and the Florentine Renaissance* (1985), *Romance and Aretine Humanism in Sienese Comedy* (with Louise George Clubb, 1993), *Studio e Scuola in Arezzo durante il medioevo e Rinascimento* (1996) and *Boethius's* Consolation of Philosophy *in Italian Medieval and Renaissance Education* (with Gabriella Pomaro, 2000).

A woodcut from Niccolò Perotti's *Rudimenta grammatices*, published by Christophorus Pesis at Venice in 1495. Copyright: The British Library. The woodcut illustrates the full grammar curriculum of an Italian Renaissance school. Elementary education is represented by the child on the right holding an alphabet table / psalter (reproduced here with a typical handle). On the left is a slightly more advanced pupil who has moved beyond the psalter to the parts of speech (Donatus); his own psalter is shown cast aside on the floor. Beyond him is a disciplinary whip. The pupils on the right appear younger than those facing them; the former seem to represent the level of secondary Latin grammar while the latter are possibly beginning the study of rhetoric and letter writing. It is significant that the pupils in the school have their own textbooks, illustrating pupil ownership of schoolbooks in Italian education, a practice documented as far back as the thirteenth century. This illustration may constitute an advertisement for Perotti's own textbook, published here, which covered the whole range of Latin grammatical education, from the alphabet and parts of speech, through secondary grammar (syntax), up to elementary rhetoric and letter writing.

HUMANISM AND EDUCATION IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE ITALY

Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century

ROBERT BLACK

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

© Cambridge University Press 2004

First published in printed format 2001

ISBN 0-511-03729-5 eBook (Adobe Reader)
ISBN 0-521-40192-5 hardback

Contents

Acknowledgements *page* viii
List of abbreviations x
Editorial note regarding citations from manuscripts and publications xiii
A note on chronological terminology xv

Introduction 1

1 Italian Renaissance education: an historiographical perspective 12

2 The elementary school curriculum in medieval and Renaissance Italy: traditional methods and developing texts 34
- *Doctores puerorum* 34
- *Tabula*, *carta*, *salterium* 36
- *Ianua* 44
  - *Ianua*: its origins and early character 45
  - *Ianua*'s early prevalence in Italy 48
  - Other early manuscripts of *Ianua*: the character and development of the text before the fifteenth century 50
  - The later development of *Ianua* 55

3 The secondary grammar curriculum 64
- The ancient and medieval background 64
- The twelfth century and the invention of secondary grammar 69
- The thirteenth century and the emergence of a distinctive Italian approach 82
- The fourteenth century and the rise of the vernacular 98
- The fifteenth century: an era of failed reform 124
- Conclusion 171

4 Latin authors in medieval and Renaissance Italian schools: the story of a canon 173
- Major and minor authors 173
- The Dark Ages: decline and renaissance of the classics 174
- The tenth and eleventh centuries: the ascendant classics 179
- The twelfth century: the classical apogee 185

The thirteenth century: revolution 192
The fourteenth century: counter-revolution 200
The fifteenth century: tenacious traditions and new fashions 225
The minor authors 225
Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* 236
The Latin classics 238
Lucan, Claudian, Seneca the Tragedian 239
Valerius Maximus, Statius and Horace 240
Ovid, Persius, Juvenal, Terence, Vergil and Sallust 247
Cicero 262
The late fifteenth century and the triumph of humanism 270
Conclusion 273

5 Reading Latin authors in medieval and Renaissance Italian schools 275
Glossing between the lines: the struggling pupil 275
The role of the vernacular 275
Word order 281
Interlinear Latin synonyms 283
Grammatical analysis 285
Glossing in the margins: the triumph of philology over morality 286
Rhetorical figures 286
Grammar 288
Mnemonic verses 290
Geography 293
History 293
Mythology 296
Paraphrase 298
Authorities 301
Introductory philosophy 304
Introductory rhetorical analysis 308
Introductory and accompanying material 311
Probationes pennae, drawings and colophons 311
Accessus 314
Metric analysis 318
Sententiae 320
Allegory 324
School glosses and learned commentaries: tradition and adaptation in reading Boethius's *Consolation* 325

6 Rhetoric and style in the school grammar syllabus 331
The secondary syllabus as an integrated curriculum 331
Grammar and rhetoric 336
Rhetoric and style in the Italian grammar syllabus before the Renaissance: the force of tradition 338
Rhetoric and style in the grammar curriculum during the fifteenth century: innovation triumphant 349

Conclusion 366

Appendix I BL Harley 2653: the earliest known manuscript of *Ianua* 369
Appendix II A handlist of manuscripts of *Ianua* 373
Appendix III Manuscripts of Tebaldo's *Regule* 379
Appendix IV Handlist of manuscripts of school authors produced in Italy and now found in Florentine libraries 386
Appendix V Theoretical grammar manuscripts in Florentine libraries examined and included or eliminated as Italian school grammars 426
Appendix VI Authorities cited explicitly in manuscripts of major school authors in Florentine libraries 428

Bibliography 435
Index of manuscripts 456
General index 466

Acknowledgements

I have accrued numerous debts of gratitude over the many years of working on this book, and it is a great pleasure to acknowledge the liberal support and help which I have been fortunate enough to enjoy. I have received generous financial assistance from the British Academy, the Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies (Villa I Tatti), the Leverhulme Trust, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the University of Leeds. I should also like to thank the staff of the Biblioteche Medicea Laurenziana, Nazionale Centrale and Riccardiana for their patience and indulgence in putting up with the excessive requests for manuscripts which my collaborators and I have had to make in the many years of preparation involved in this study; I am also particularly grateful to the directors of the Laurenziana and Riccardiana for repeatedly allowing us to see original manuscripts, rather than microfilm copies, from their reserve and excluded collections, as well as for the facility of inspecting manuscripts with ultraviolet light when necessary. I am also extremely grateful for assistance from Gian Carlo Alessio, Rino Avesani, James Banker, Alison Brown, Virginia Brown, Alan Bullock, Geoffrey Bursill-Hall, Angela Bussi Dillon, Francis Cairns, Maurizio Camaiti, Teresa D'Alessandro, Jonathan Davies, Albinia de la Mare, Teresa De Robertis, Claudio de' Stefani, Consuelo Dutschke, Vincenzo Fera, Arthur Field, Carla Frova, Luciano Gargan, Paul Gehl, Sebastiano Gentile, James Ginther, Peter Godman, Richard Goldthwaite, Paul Grendler, Jacqueline Hamesse, James Hankins, John Henderson, George Holmes, Kristian Jensen, Gavin Kelly, F. W. Kent, Christiane Klapisch, Jill Kraye, Vivien Law, Claudio Leonardi, David Lines, Alastair Minnis, Reinhold Müller, Birger Munk Olsen, Anna Maria Nada Patrone, Lodi Nauta, W. Keith Percival, the late Alessandro Perosa, Olaf Plauta, Malcolm Polfreman, Michael Reeve, Brian Richardson, Richard Rouse, Nicolai Rubinstein, David Rutherford, Federico Sanguineti, Franco-Lucio Schiavetto, Vito Sivo, Quentin

Skinner, Claudia Villa, Ronald Witt, Marjorie Curry Woods and Jan Ziolkowski. I also wish to pay tribute to the example, and express my gratitude for the enthusiastic encouragement, of the late Paul Oskar Kristeller. I owe a special debt to my wife Jane, not only for her moral support and editorial assistance, but also for her work as my research assistant during the academic year 1992–3. I am extremely grateful to Silvia Rizzo for reading the entire typescript and for pointing out a number of significant errors, especially in Latin. But my greatest academic and scholarly debt is to the palaeographer, Gabriella Pomaro, without whom, it is no exaggeration to say, this book could not have been written. Finally, I should like to express my deep gratitude to Cambridge University Press for their indulgence over repeated delays in the delivery of this book, and I am especially grateful in this regard to my editor, Richard Fisher. I should also like to thank my copy-editor, Jean Field, for her meticulous reading of the text.

This book is dedicated to my wife, Jane, and my two daughters, Emily and Alison.

School of History
University of Leeds
31 January 2000

Abbreviations

Aesop	*Fabulae*, tr. Walter the Englishman	
Ambros.	Milan Biblioteca Ambrosiana	
ASA	Arezzo Archivio di Stato	
	Provv.	Deliberazioni del Consiglio Generale
ASF	Florence Archivio di Stato	
	CStrozz.	Carte Strozziane
	MAP	Mediceo avanti il Principato
ASI	*Archivio storico italiano*	
ASPCD	Prato Archivio di Stato Comune Diurni	
ASPistoia	Pistoia Archivio di Stato	
	Provv.	Consigli Provvisioni
ASSColle	Siena Archivio di Stato Comune di Colle Valdelsa	
ASSG	San Gimignano Archivio storico comunale	
	NN	Serie NN
ASU	Udine Archivio di Stato	
Avianus	*Fabulae*	
BAV	Vatican City Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana	
	Arch. S. Pietro	Archivio San Pietro
	Barb. Lat.	Barberiniano Latino
	Ott. Lat.	Ottoboniano Latino
	Pal. Lat.	Palatino Latino
	Urb. Lat.	Urbinate Latino
	Reg. Lat.	Reginense Latino
	Vat. Lat.	Vaticano Latino
BL	London British Library	
	Add.	Additional manuscripts
	Royal	Royal manuscripts
BML	Florence Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana	
	AD	Acquisti e doni
	Ashb.	Ashburnham
	Ashb. Append.	Ashburnham Appendice
	CS	Conventi Soppressi
	dxt.	destro

	Edili	Edili
	Med. Fies.	Mediceo Fiesolano
	Med. Pal.	Mediceo Palatino
	Pl.	Plutei
	sup.	superiore
	sin.	sinistro
BNCF	Florence Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale	
	CS	Fondo Conventi Soppressi
	Landau Fin.	Fondo Landau Finaly
	Magl.	Fondo Magliabechiano
	Magl. Append.	Magliabechiano Appendice
	NA	Nuove accessioni
	Pal.	Fondo Palatino
	Panciat.	Fondo Panciatichiano
BNP	Paris Bibliothèque Nationale	
	N. Acq.	Nouvelles Acquisitions
	Sorb.	Sorbonne
Bodley	Oxford Bodleian Library	
	Can. lat.	Canonici classici latini
	Can. misc.	Canonici miscellanei
	Lat. class.	Latini classici
	Lat. misc.	Latin miscellaneous
	Laud Lat.	Laudenses latini
	Rawl.	Rawlinson manuscripts
Boethius	*Consolatio philosophiae*	
Bonvesin	Bonvesin da la Riva *Vita scolastica*	
BRF	Florence Biblioteca Riccardiana	
Cato	pseudo-Cato *Disticha*	
Cicero	*O* = *De officiis*, *A* = *De amicitia*, *S* = *De senectute*, *SS* = *Somnium Scipionis*, *P* = *Paradoxa stoicorum*, *DT* = *Disputationes tusculanae*	
Claudian	*De raptu Proserpinae*	
DBI	*Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Rome 1960–	
Geoffrey	Geoffrey of Vinsauf *Poetria nova*	
GSLI	*Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*	
GW	*Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, Leipzig 1925–	
Hain	Ludwig Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum*, Stuttgart 1826–36	
Henry	Henry of Settimello *Elegia*	
Horace	*AP* = *Ars poetica*, *S* = *Sermones*, *E* = *Epistolae*, *CS* = *Carmen saeculare*, *Epo.* = *Epodes*, *O* = *Carmina*	
IGI	*Indice generale degli incunaboli delle biblioteche d'Italia*, ed. T. M. Guarnaschelli and D. Valenziani, Rome 1943–81	

IMU	*Italia medievale e umanistica*
JHI	*Journal of the History of Ideas*
John the Abbot	John the Abbot *De septem viciis et septem virtutibus*
JWCI	*Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*
MSV	*Miscellanea storica della Valdelsa*
n.n.	not numbered
Ovid	*Met.* = *Metamorphoses*, *Her.* = *Heroides, AA* = *Ars amatoria, RA* = *Remedia amoris*
PL	*Patrologia latina* ed. J. Migne, Paris, 1844–64
Plimpton	New York Columbia University Plimpton manuscripts
Prosper	*Epigrammata* (ed. *PL*, 51.499–532) and *Poema coniugis ad uxorem* (ed. *PL*, 51.611–16); these texts are normally presented as one work without a break (see below, 480 n. 90)
Prudentius	*D* = Prudentius *Dittochaeon*, *P* = *Psychomachia*
Pseudo-Boethius	*De disciplina scolarium*
RPL	*Res publica litterarum*
Sallust	*BC* = *Bellum Catilinae, BJ* = *Bellum Iugurthinum*
Seneca	*Tragoediae*
Silk	Edmund T. Silk, ed., *Nicholas Trevet on Boethius. Exposicio Fratris Nicolai Trevethi Anglici Ordinis Predicatorum super Boecio De Consolacione*, unpublished typescript in New Haven Yale University Library
SM	*Studi medievali*
sn.	*signum*
Statius	*A* = *Achilleis*, *T* = *Thebias*
STC	*Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in Italy and of Italian Books Printed in Other Countries from 1465 to 1600 now in the British Museum*, London 1958
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus *Facta et dicta*
Vergil	*A* =*Aeneid*, *E* = *Eclogues*, *G* = *Georgics*
WOM	Word-order marks

Editorial note regarding citations from manuscripts and publications

1. Vernacular glosses are indicated in italics.
2. [ ] means that letters or words enclosed appear in the manuscript but are thought to be erroneous; they are also used to enclose editorial comments such as [*sic*] [MS:] [space].
3. < > means that letters or words have been added for the sake of coherence; their omission may have been due to scribal error, or they may no longer be legible.
4. Letters or words enclosed in round brackets ( ) indicate an uncertain expansion of an abbreviation.
5. Question marks immediately following letters or words indicate an uncertain reading.
6. Italicized words indicate a lemma.
7. = is used to indicate an interlinear gloss. What appears on the left of the sign is the word or phrase being glossed; on the right, the gloss itself.
8. {} occasionally enclose an interlinear gloss which is supplying an understood word: e.g. {ego} inquam.
9. In the case of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, (1, p. 1, 1) or (1, m. 1, 1) and so on refer to the relevant prose passage or metre line of the Bieler 1984 edition.
10. The orthography and latinity of the manuscripts have been retained, although the punctuation and capitalization have been modernized. *Sic* has been indicated where there is a notable or gross divergence from correct grammatical or classical usage.
11. Folios will normally be indicated without the abbreviations fol., fo., f., or ff.
12. Normally manuscripts from the Plutei series in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana will be cited without Pl. Thus Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Pluteo 36.28 will be cited as BML 36.28. When a number of manuscripts from the Plutei are listed in

sequence (for example in ch. 4 or in Appendices IV and VI), the manuscripts will be listed in numerical order, not in the order they appear in Bandini's catalogues and in the card indices of the library (where manuscripts from Santa Croce with Plutei numbers including sin. or dxt. follow higher numbers from the principal collection, e.g. 24 sin. 5 after 76.23 and so on).

13 / = new verse or new line.
// = new folio.

14 Unless otherwise indicated, all dates have been modernized.

A note on chronological terminology

I have used a number of chronological terms in a conventionalized manner; no interpretation or greater significance is meant to be implied thereby.

later antiquity	300–600 AD
early middle ages	600–1000
Dark Ages	600–900
high middle ages	1000–1200
later middle ages	1200–1400
middle ages/medieval	600–1400
Renaissance	1400–1600
pre-humanist	1250–1400
humanist	1400–1600
Duecento	thirteenth century
Trecento	fourteenth century
Quattrocento	fifteenth century
Cinquecento	sixteenth century

In discussing manuscript glosses, the term 'contemporaneous' is used to described a writer working at about the same time as the copyist.

Dates according to centuries are indicated by Roman numerals (XVc.). XV^{1}: first half of the fifteenth century; $XV^{1/4}$: first quarter of fifteenth century; XVmid: mid fifteenth century; XIV/XVc: turn of the fifteenth century; XVex.: 1490–1500; XVin.: 1400–10; and so on.

Introduction

Latin education was the foundation stone of medieval and Renaissance Italian culture. The learning of the Latin language and the introduction to Latin literature were the principal preoccupations of schools throughout the middle ages and Renaissance: indeed, until the rise of abacus or commercial arithmetic schools in the thirteenth and especially fourteenth centuries, and before the introduction of Greek into the school curriculum in the fifteenth century, no subject other than Latin was studied at the lower stages of the educational hierarchy.

Given the fundamental importance of the subject, it may seem puzzling that there has been no comprehensive historical study of the Latin curriculum in medieval and Renaissance Italy. This has perhaps been due to the fact that the Latin syllabus has been shared among several modern academic disciplines. The most important work has been done by philologists, such as Remigio Sabbadini and Vittorio Rossi and their more recent Italian successors, for example, Gian Carlo Alessio, Rino Avesani, Giuseppe Billanovich or Silvia Rizzo. Their principal concern has, of course, been philological rather than historical: focusing on individual works and individual teachers, they have gone far in building up a picture of pre-humanist and humanist education; but because their discipline ultimately concentrates on the particular rather than the general, philologists have not aimed to reconstruct the story of the curriculum's development over a long period. Work of great importance has also been undertaken by students of linguistics, and in particular by Keith Percival, who has laid the foundations for a critical study of medieval and Renaissance theoretical grammar. But again, because a scholar such as Percival is concerned fundamentally with the theory and development of Latin language and grammar rather than with the history of Latin education, he has not been interested in reconstructing the multi-faceted story of the evolution of the elementary and secondary grammar curriculum from its foundations in the twelfth century through to the Renaissance.

The Italian educational syllabus has also been considered by philosophers and historians. In the earlier years of the twentieth century, it tended to be subject to current academic fashions, especially those of positivism and neo-Crocean idealism. Giuseppe Manacorda's classic survey of Italian education in the middle ages, a work which extends into the fifteenth century, deals in a typically positivist fashion with the curriculum: there is detail in abundance but no overall historical picture. Quite the opposite is true of the preeminent Italian historian of Renaissance philosophy, Eugenio Garin. He brilliantly succeeded in replacing the positivism of Sabbadini and Manacorda with an overarching scheme of historical development; the difficulty was that his vision of medieval and Renaissance education was thoroughly permeated with preconceptions derived from Hegelian/Crocean/Gentilian idealist philosophy and philosophical history. Among recent historians there has been renewed interest in school-level education, but in the work of scholars such as Giovanna Petti Balbi, Carla Frova, Giovanni Ortalli or Anna Maria Nada Patrone the curriculum has remained a secondary concern, overshadowed by the institutional and social dimensions of education; Paul Grendler has discussed the curriculum at greater length, but manuscript textbooks hardly enter his treatment,[1] which remains a synthesis of secondary sources (most importantly, the work of Garin) and published primary material, mainly writings of famous Italian humanists. Another limitation has been that, even for assiduous archival scholars, the documentary sources for the history of the curriculum are limited. Despite years of research in the Aretine and Florentine archives, for example, I have been able to find only a tiny cluster of documents relating to the curriculum (in contrast to the institutions and personnel of education); moreover, the archival curriculum documents, such as they are, almost invariably relate to the elementary, rather than the more advanced, levels of school education.[2]

One discipline largely absent from the study of educational history has been palaeography. Despite the fact that Italy can perhaps boast of the most sophisticated tradition of palaeographical manuscript study among all Western countries, this expertise has rarely been focused on the educational dimensions of manuscripts and particularly of schoolbooks. Notably absent has been the attempt to employ the tools of palaeography to date and localize manuscript schoolbooks, and then to use

[1] He considers four manuscripts of school authors (all of the *Disticha Catonis*), and a total of nineteen manuscripts: see Grendler (1989), 431–2.

[2] Black (1996d).

these results to develop a history of the canon of Latin authors read at school over a number of centuries.[3]

Another problem with modern scholarship on Italian curriculum history is that it tends to look from the top down. Dominant in previous writings have been the names of humanist luminaries such as Vergerio,[4] Barzizza, Guarino, Perotti, Valla and Poliziano. This has no doubt been due to the prominence in this field of philologists, who are justifiably concerned with outstanding and innovatory individuals. The humdrum anonymous school grammarians, glossators or pupils have scarcely interested the students of humanist philology. I remember vividly a conversation with the late Alessandro Perosa in the Biblioteca Riccardiana at the end of 1992. That luminary of Italian philology declared that too much effort had been spent on the *éminences* of humanism; it was now time to turn to the lower strata of culture in order to see how more than 99 per cent of the population actually learned Latin.

This book is an attempt to fill these gaps in modern scholarship. I have attempted to use the tools of palaeography and philology to amass the data required for an historical picture of the evolution of the Italian school curriculum. Here, I am the first to acknowledge the technical difficulties of the task undertaken. I began working in the later 1980s on the curriculum and in particular on schoolbooks as a source for the history of the educational curriculum. After nearly five years of what I readily acknowledge to be haphazard and amateurish research, I had the great good fortune to encounter one of today's leading Italian palaeographers: Gabriella Pomaro, who first became my research assistant and co-worker in January 1993. This collaboration revolutionized the possibilities for this study. On the basis of an examination together of 1,305 manuscripts in 1993 and 1994, besides a subsequent detailed study of a group of more than 100 codices (mainly Boethius, pseudo-Boethius, Ovid, Henry of Settimello and Statius) – work which has led to the joint publication of a book on Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* in Italian medieval and Renaissance education[5] – I hope to have been able to reconstruct a history of the Latin literary canon in Italian schools from the twelfth to the fifteenth century.

This book is offered as an account of the curriculum throughout medieval and Renaissance Italy. In fact, there was no such thing as a

[3] Paul Gehl's recent attempts (1989 and 1993) to use palaeography to study a limited time period (the Trecento) have technical and interpretative problems.

[4] For a recent treatment of his *De ingenuis moribus*, see McManamon (1996), 89–103.

[5] Black and Pomaro (2000).

regionalized Italian curriculum in the middle ages and the Renaissance. Although there were great variations with regard to educational preferences, both in terms of institutions and individual types of teaching employed throughout the Italian peninsula, it is clear that the middle ages and Renaissance witnessed the emergence of a general Italian syllabus. A main reason for this overall uniformity was the great mobility of teachers throughout Italy. Thus, to give just a few examples, in fourteenth-century Ravenna grammar masters from Cremona, Forlì, Pratovecchio, Fregnano, Camerino, Parma, Trent and Castrocaro are to be found;[6] Bassano wanted to appoint a teacher from Padua in 1396 but in the end had to settle for one from Bologna;[7] there was a strong prevalence of non-Genoese and non-Ligurian teachers in Genoa in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries;[8] in Venice teachers came not only from North Italy (Parma, Mantua, Milan, Ferrara, the Trentino) and even from the South (Calabria, Sicily, Puglia) but also from all over Europe (Albania, Bavaria, Germany, France, Portugal, Prague).[9] In Tre- and Quattrocento Piedmont there were teachers not only from Lombardy (Tortona, Cremona, Brescia, Pavia, Bergamo, Milan) but also from elsewhere in North Italy (Verona, Bologna, Trent) besides from France nearby (the Dauphiné, Embrun, Nice) and even faraway (Moulins (in Central France) and Paris).[10] In my own documentary history of Aretine education, there are teachers from Milan, Parma, Tolentino and Cittaducale, not to mention Picardy, Toledo, Bourges and Bohemia.[11] During his long teaching career, Giovanni Conversini da Ravenna (1343–1408) taught in Bologna, Florence, Ferrara, Treviso, Conegliano, Belluno, Venice, Udine and Muggia.[12] In his autobiography, Conversini eloquently summed up the reasons for teachers' itinerancy:

> I speak for a common cause, not just my own. The teachers of children who are hired by the people, must on no account place their trust in the present: they must beware of the fickleness of the populace. They should always keep their ears open for new invitations and for favours from abroad; for when they stay too long in one place, their authority declines and they are considered worthless and are despised, because the populace despises what it is accustomed to and what is too easy.[13]

A second underlying reason for this general uniformity was the fact that the entire European grammatical curriculum was overwhelmingly traditional, the heritage of the Roman world as gradually modified from

[6] Bernicoli (1927), 61–9. [7] Chiuppani (1915), 85.
[8] See Gorrini (1932), 274–7 for a wide-ranging list, including a number of non-Italians.
[9] Ortalli (1997), 895–6. [10] Nada Patrone (1996), 53–4. [11] Black (1996d).
[12] Kohl (1983), 574–8. [13] Sabbadini (1924), 164, tr. Rubinstein (1988), 159.

the fifth to the fourteenth century not so much by regional variations as by generalized European religious, political, institutional and social developments, leading first to the prevalence of monastic schools and then of those run by the secular clergy. It is no accident that the kind of curriculum evident in Italy at the beginning of the twelfth century, with its emphasis on taxonomic grammar and on immersion in the study of the Latin authors, is largely indistinguishable from that found in Northern Europe at the same time. When the Italian grammatical syllabus began to diverge from the Northern European pattern at the beginning of the thirteenth century, this was due to changes in the structure of higher education with the emergence of the professional universities weighted heavily in favour of medicine, law and notarial studies, as well as to pressures from the forces of secularization and urbanization which were increasingly coming to dominate Italian society. These were peninsular rather than merely regional developments, and it is therefore not surprising that the grammar curriculum evolved generally as a single entity in Italy: it is hardly remarkable to find, as a result, that a textbook such as *Ianua* developed in a uniform way throughout the peninsula in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and that the grammar of a Tuscan master such as Francesco da Buti became a best-seller all over Italy at the turn of the fifteenth century.

The findings here are based on an intensive study of manuscripts now found in Florentine libraries: from a census of 1,305 possible literary manuscripts actually examined (not to mention many more eliminated on the basis of catalogue entries) 324 manuscripts have been selected to form a handlist of school Latin authors now found in Florentine libraries. An examination of this handlist will provide the reader with a third and decisive reason why this book is published as a study of the Italian curriculum in general. Little more than a third of the manuscripts have been localized to Florence or Tuscany. The majority are either from other regions of Italy or are books that offer no clue as to their provenance but merely can, with security, be identified as Italian.

Locality	Number of codicological units[14]
Florence	79
Tuscany	46
Italy	145
Central Italy	17
Northern Italy	33
Southern Italy	10

[14] Counting each part of a composite manuscript as a separate unit.

For the study of theoretical grammar, the conclusions have been based on all the grammatical manuscripts of a school level which it has been possible to identify in Florentine libraries. A number of these (e.g. the grammars of Pietro da Isolella da Cremona, Pietro da Asolo, Gaspare Veronese or Pomponio Leto) have nothing to do with Tuscany, and, of course, other non-Tuscan published grammatical authors (most famously Guarino and Perotti) have been studied. Any work of history must of course be selective, but it seems to me that, from an historical viewpoint, systematic work through the manuscript collections of Florence as one preeminent Italian cultural centre may be preferable, or at least of equal value, to examination of individual manuscripts in a variety of collections which have characterized previous work on this subject. Florentine libraries offer an ideal opportunity for such a census: not only do the collections there offer a vast range of pre-Trecento literary manuscripts (not just in the Laurenziana but also, to a surprising extent, in the Riccardiana and Nazionale), but the huge spectrum of codices in the Laurenziana not only derives from fifteenth-century patrons and humanists (concentrated largely in the Laurenziana's Plutei, which include an enormous range of non-Florentine and non-humanist manuscripts as well) but also conventual (e.g. Fondi Conventi Soppressi, S. Marco, S. Croce), ecclesiastical (e.g. Fondo Edili) and later Florentine (e.g. Fondo Strozzi) and non-Florentine collections (e.g. Fondo Ashburnham); moreover, both the Laurenziana and Nazionale have large recent series of new acquisitions (Fondi Acquisti e Doni and Nuove Accessioni), where, of course, purchases have extended far beyond Florentine or Tuscan sources.

The first chapter of this book focuses on the historiographical perspectives which have shaped previous studies of the Latin curriculum. In particular, an attempt has been made to emphasize the advantages, as well as drawbacks, of both the positivist and the neo-Hegelian idealist approaches. I have also tried to suggest the merits and disadvantages of another study of humanist education by Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine (1986), a work which has been extensively criticized for its anti-humanist polemics but whose insight into the philological rather than moral nature of humanist teaching has not been fully appreciated; the main shortcoming of Grafton and Jardine's study is that they did not consider the medieval background to humanist philological teaching: here I hope to show that, not just in the Renaissance but also in the Italian middle ages, teaching was overridingly philological rather than moral.

In chapter 2, I examine the development of the elementary curriculum, showing how traditional methods of learning to read, developed in the middle ages (and in antiquity) before pupils had their own books, persisted into the fifteenth century, when pupil ownership of reading manuals gradually modified the reliance on memory in learning to read Latin in favour of translation. In this chapter I also deal in detail with the development of the fundamental Italian textbook of elementary education, the so-called *Ianua*, not only publishing for the first time a detailed analysis of the earliest known manuscript of this work but also showing how the nature of the text changed in response to evolving social and economic needs in later medieval and early Renaissance Italy.

In chapter 3, I focus on the fundamental changes which occurred in Latin education as a result of the emergence of a new philosophy of language in twelfth-century France. This innovative approach to language made possible the development of a comprehensive theory of syntax, enabling masters to work out a digestible system of teaching sentence structure and prose composition for the first time. This new theory and teaching method was popularized throughout Europe by one of the most significant textbooks of all time: Alexander of Villedieu's *Doctrinale*, published in 1199, a work just as influential in Italy as in Northern Europe. Alexander invented the secondary grammar manual – a work which presupposes the knowledge of Latin forms already learned at the elementary level. This new secondary grammar syllabus as defined by Alexander became widespread in Italy during the thirteenth century, not only through the circulation of his own work but also by means of the Italian prose textbook or *Summa* of secondary grammar, a genre which followed Alexander's syllabus closely. However, Italian grammar was already diverging from transalpine patterns in the sense that, whereas in Northern Europe grammar was taught by memorizing verse treatises such as *Doctrinale*, in Italy pupils tended to own their own copies of prose textbooks. In the fourteenth century, these prose *summe* were given a more systematic format; even more important was the introduction of the vernacular as a tool of Latin teaching in the Trecento. In contrast to all the rapid developments in secondary grammar from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries, the Quattrocento was a period of conservatism. The traditional character of the most widely circulated humanist treatises by Guarino and Perotti is well known through the fundamental work of Percival.[15] In this book I confirm that the vast majority of the

[15] Rizzo (1995) and (1996) has concurred in this view, adding that her study of humanist school grammars confirms that their terminology was little changed from medieval precedents.

lesser known and anonymous fifteenth-century secondary grammars were equally conservative.

The fourth chapter deals with the canon of Latin authors, divided since the twelfth century into minor (e.g. *Disticha Catonis*, *Ilias latina*, Prudentius, Prosper of Aquitaine, Henry of Settimello or Bonvesin da la Riva) and major (i.e. the Roman poetic and prose classics) authors. Based on the survey of 324 schoolbooks in Florentine libraries, the findings here have been that the burgeoning study of the Roman classics at school in Italy during the twelfth century collapsed in the thirteenth century. This result confirms the hypothesis originally put forward by Louis Paetow in 1910 of the downfall of the classics in thirteenth-century Europe and Italy as a result of the rise of the univerisities; this view, founded on contemporary witnesses, was dismissed, on the basis of impressionistic evidence, by E. K. Rand (1929) and Helene Wieruszowski (1967) but has recently been revived by Francesco Bruni (1988), only to be once more questioned by Gian Carlo Alessio and Claudia Villa (1990). The debate hitherto has had to rely on sporadic and impressionistic evidence, but the new positive and systematic data provided by this book will, it is hoped, raise the question to a new level of scholarly discussion. The fourteenth century witnessed an extensive revival of the school classics, as well as the continuation of the study of the texts (such as the minor authors and Boethius's *Consolation*) which had been substituted for the classics in the thirteenth century. Fifteenth-century humanism, in this context, represents a continuation of the Trecento revival, in which some authors such as Cicero and Vergil attained a level of popularity unprecedented in the middle ages. Throughout the first half of the century there was also continued study of the minor authors and of Boethius's *Consolation* on a level commensurate with Trecento activity on these texts. This mixture of innovation and tradition, characteristic of the school canon in the earlier fifteenth century, was not put aside until the last decades of the century, when the humanists, in their role as education censors, finally began to have success in purging texts such as Boethius's *Consolation* and many of the minor authors from the curriculum.

Chapter 5 considers how the Latin authors were read at school. Some recent studies have tended to equate the contents of modern printed editions with what medieval and Renaissance schoolboys read and understood in these texts.[16] This assumption can disregard the overriding importance of glossing in the process of reading before the advent of

[16] Grendler (1989); Gehl (1993).

printing. This book takes another approach, basing its findings on a study of manuscript glosses of the 324 Florentine schoolbooks, besides a consideration of the school copies of Boethius's *Consolation* in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The conclusion is that the glossing and teaching of these authors throughout the middle ages and Renaissance in the Italian schoolroom was overwhelmingly philological; the few moral or philosophical glosses are invariably lost in a vast sea of philological detail. Teachers made use of the great medieval commentary tradition on an author such as Boethius, but they did so selectively and always with their rudimentary philological concerns at the forefront. Thus a basic schoolbook such as Boethius's *Consolation*, far from being used as a text of moral philosophy, appears to have been read in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as a convenient anthology of Latin prose and poetry, filled with valuable grammatical, mythological, geographical, lexical and metrical material. In this chapter the approach is topical rather than chronological: although there were a few developments in teaching literary texts in the Italian schoolroom, nevertheless the overwhelming conclusion of my study of manuscript glosses has been the continuity of educational methods and interests in the period from 1200 to 1500.

Chapter 6 deals with the question of how pupils were taught to refine their prose writing style. It is clear that they first learned Latin according to the word order and syntax of the modern Romance languages: in other words, they were first taught what we should now call medieval Latin. In the middle ages this type of language was given the name *ordo naturalis*. Once they had fully mastered this basic Latin syntax, they moved on to what was called *ordo artificialis*. This involved an ornamented prose style, one, however, which presupposed a command of the grammatical rules of syntax involved in *ordo naturalis*. In Italian schools from the beginning of the thirteenth up to the earlier fifteenth century, the key textbook for learning this style was Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova*, a work generally misunderstood as teaching poetic composition; in fact, the glosses to the text make it clear that the work, regardless of the author's intention, was used to teach prose style. Geoffrey taught what amounted to an abstract system of stylistics, based ultimately on Cicero and Roman rhetorical theory but distorted through the prism of medieval rhetoric, the *ars dictaminis*. Under the influence of humanism in the fifteenth century, this type of stylistic ornamentation became unpalatable; teachers such as Perotti and particularly Agostino Dati substituted an easy route to Ciceronianism in their best-selling abbreviated manuals

of style. Nevertheless, the basic division of teaching Latin into two stages, one grammatical, the other stylistic or rhetorical, remained. In the Renaissance, just as in the middle ages, pupils first learned *ordo naturalis* (or medieval Latin); they then gradually purified this language primarily through study of stylistic manuals, whether Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* or Agostino Dati's *Elegantiolae*.

Some definition of a few key terms may help to clarify the scope of this book. In England, the word school is strictly limited to pre-university education; pupils attend school, whereas universities admit students. In the United States, usage of these terms is more fluid: there are students at elementary (grammar) schools, just as there are at high schools; moreover, even great universities can be called schools. In Italy, *scuola* as an institution normally corresponds to the English usage of school, but one can speak of a preeminent university professor such as Bartolus of Sassoferrato and his *scuola*, meaning either the locality in which he taught or his pupils. In Italian, the term *scuola* tends to be broader than the English school, but not quite as wide as in American usage. In this book, I shall use the term school in the English sense. There is some contemporary justification for this. In the 1427 Catasto (tax declarations) of Florentines and their subjects, for example, there was a linguistic distinction between pupils who went to school (*scuola*) and students who went to university (*studio*),[17] as there was between school (*scholae*) and university (*studium*) in the statutes of Forlì from the second half of the fourteenth century.[18] For Italian readers of this book, the usage adopted for school here corresponds to the term *scuola di base* encountered in recent literature on the history of education; I should like to convey the point that in this book pre-university education is being discussed. These distinctions between school and university, of course, are relevant only to the thirteenth century and thereafter, when universities began to emerge. Nevertheless, even in the high middle ages there were curricular distinctions between lower and upper levels of study: it was generally recognized that youth was devoted to the pagan classics, whereas mature years should be dedicated to higher subjects (such as the Scriptures).[19] The focus of this book will be on these lower levels of the educational hierarchy, both before and after the rise of the universities. The picture which emerges from this study may seem conservative but it should be stressed that, when entering the Quattrocento, this book does not deal with the humanist school as a whole (an institution on

[17] See e.g. Black (1996d), 197–8, 429–36. [18] See Frova (1992), 181 n. 10.
[19] See e.g. texts by Lanfranc of Pavia and Gerald of Wales, cited by Munk Olsen (1991), 99.

which more research based on surviving schoolbooks is needed), but only with its lower strata (in Guarino's case, the so-called elementary and grammatical, but not the final rhetorical, levels).[20] There can be little doubt that, as the pupil reached the upper rhetorical levels and even the end of the grammatical syllabus treated in this book (see ch. 6 below), humanist teaching was ever more innovative; conversely, Quattrocento grammar instruction tended to be conservative, all the more so the lower the educational ladder was descended, and therefore it is little wonder that the humanists strove to free themselves as much as possible from the subordinate strata of the educational world (see ch. 1 below, 31ff).

[20] Sabbadini (1922), 40–2. Some students began their studies with humanists at an advanced age, for example, Giorgio Valagussa, who first went to Guarino's *scuola* (in modern Italian) but not school (in English) at about the age of nineteen (Resta (1964), 5).

CHAPTER I

Italian Renaissance education: an historiographical perspective

The history of education is particularly susceptible to influence from wider intellectual, philosophical and political movements; scholars have been tempted to justify their own intellectual formation by applauding or condemning the educational attitudes and assumptions of previous epochs. Historians have normally been university teachers and involvement in present-day educational issues has encouraged a tendency to see their own situation and ideals in past structures of learning. Justifications and critiques derived from contemporary educational preoccupations have frequently been imposed onto the remote past. It is necessary to begin this study of Italian pre-university education with these truisms in mind, because so much of what has been written about medieval and Renaissance education has been affected by contemporary agendas. An effort, however imperfect, must be made to identify modern preoccupations.[1] This is particularly important because current polemics have often had positive effects, leading to new insights into the past, but these genuine perceptions must be distinguished from the mass of anachronistic distortion. Historical fashions have often had beneficial results: automatic scepticism in the face of innovation can be mistaken for trenchant criticism; here too one must weigh up fashion's advantages and limitations.

A case in point comes from the great age of Italian positivism, which at the turn of the twentieth century encouraged widespread research in local archives and led to the publication of numerous fundamental documentary studies, including Bellemo on Chioggia; Cecchetti, Bertanza

[1] The purpose of this chapter is to bring into focus some of the major issues in the history of Italian school education and its curriculum which developed in scholarly literature in the course of the twentieth century and which will be explored in this book; its aim is historiographical, not bibliographical. Therefore, many notable studies will not be mentioned here. Further bibliography for the medieval and Renaissance Latin school curriculum will be found at the end of the volume. Recent bibliographical surveys can be found in Petti Balbi (1990); Ortalli (1993); Frova (1996); Nada Patrone (1990), a preliminary version of Nada Patrone (1996).

and Della Santa and Segarizzi on Venice; Barsanti on Lucca; Debenedetti on Florence; Gabotto on Piedmont; Massa on Genoa; Zanelli on Pistoia and Battistini on Volterra.[2] Archival work was complemented by the study of manuscripts and early printed editions, particularly focusing on the contribution of prominent teachers, including for example Rossi on Travesio, but most notable here was of course Sabbadini with his work on Giovanni da Ravenna, Barzizza and especially Guarino.[3] Such studies formed the basis of Manacorda's *Storia della scuola in Italia. Il medio evo*,[4] which, although primarily concerned with the earlier middle ages, nevertheless extended its scope into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

All these works, including Manacorda's survey, enjoyed the advantages as well as the limitations of other studies influenced by positivist fashions. The contents and the problems were usually determined by the documentary evidence uncovered. Little need was felt to go beyond empirical discussion to form a broader or more analytical view of the development of schools and education in Italy. Much important material was brought to light, but no overall synthesis or general picture emerged. There was, for example, almost no assessment of the impact of humanism and the Renaissance on education; not even Sabbadini came up with a coherent evaluation of Guarino's place in the overall history of schools and teaching.

When Eugenio Garin turned to the study of Renaissance education after the Second World War,[5] Italian intellectual fashions had changed: positivism had been discredited and the dominant current was neo-Hegelian and often Crocean or Gentilian idealism. Garin's reaction to Sabbadini's work on Guarino shows how much the climate had changed:

> On closer inspection, the fact that several decades of tireless and constant work, conducted with great rigour and over a vast horizon, did not even lead to an attempt at [genuine] history is not without good reason. The material, at times chaotically assembled, was too much and too little [. . .] Whoever looks at Sabbadini's notes and at his attempts at synthesis will be almost dumbfounded: the contours are dulled; all is lost in a uniform grey. The discussion of particular points does not always meet the need for a comprehensive judgement; all historical perspective is diminished.[6]

[2] Bellemo (1888); Cecchetti (1886); Segarizzi (1915–16b); Bertanza and Dalla Santa (1907); Barsanti (1905); Debenedetti (1906–7); Gabotto (1895); Massa (1906); Zanelli (1900); Battistini (1919).
[3] Rossi (1901); Sabbadini (1866) (1891) (1896) (1906) and (1924).
[4] Manacorda (1914).
[5] Garin (1953) (1957) (1958) (1967).
[6] Garin (1967), 79–80.

Garin here revealed the impatience of a new generation with the outdated ways of their predecessors.

Garin, unlike his positivist predecessors, did not see his principal purpose as an intellectual historian in bringing to light new evidence or information which then of itself would lead to greater knowledge; although he examined and even edited a number of unpublished sources for Renaissance education,[7] most of his work consisted of reinterpreting published texts and secondary material. Indeed, his major contribution was to have developed a highly focused, yet broad-ranging view of Renaissance education and particularly of the impact of humanism on schools and teaching.

Garin's interpretation was based on a sharply drawn contrast between the middle ages and the Renaissance. He painted a gloomy picture of late medieval scholastic methods, aims and curriculum. He suggested that barbarous discipline was the norm in medieval Italian schools.[8] The mainstays of the curriculum were manuals such as *Ianua*, Alexander of Villedieu's *Doctrinale*, Evrard de Béthune's *Graecismus*, Giovanni da Genova's *Catholicon*, Papias and Hugutio of Pisa's *Derivationes*; these were, he continued, read mainly in conjunction not usually with the Roman classics but with the traditional school authors such as pseudo-Cato's *Distichs, Ecloga Theoduli*, *Facetus*, Matthew of Vendôme's *Thobias*, *Liber parabolarum*, Aesop's fables (translated by Walter the Englishman), *Floretus*, Prudentius's *Dittochaeum*, Prosper of Aquitaine's *Epigrams* and *Physiologus*.[9] From such a curriculum boys were taught contempt for the secular world; indeed, all medieval education – even at its most classicizing – was directed, according to Garin, to religious, theological and spiritual goals.[10] When the Roman classics were occasionally brought into the schoolroom, they were a means to an end, not an end in themselves.[11] Indeed, for Garin, it had been the fundamental antipathy of the middle ages to classical culture more than the barbarian invasions which had destroyed the ancient world.[12] When secular learning was cultivated in the later middle ages, it was for technical, professional training, to allow each individual to fit into his appropriate level in the social hierarchy.[13] Scholastic education was fundamentally antipathetic to the empirical study of nature or to any real content in education; texts, not genuine subjects in themselves, were the objects of learning.[14]

For Garin, Renaissance humanism represented a revolutionary

[7] See especially Garin (1958), 434ff, 534ff. [8] Garin (1957), 21.
[9] Garin (1957), 26; Garin (1958), 91–104. [10] Garin (1957), 82–5. [11] Garin (1957), 51–2.
[12] Garin (1957), 44. [13] Garin (1957), 71, 93. [14] Garin (1957), 70ff.

change in European cultural history, and this dramatic new force was particularly powerful and effective in the classroom. Most important were new aims for education:

> The school created in fifteenth-century Italy was […] an educator of man, capable of shaping a child's moral character so as not to be preconditioned but free, open in the future to every possible specialization, but before all else humane and whole, with social links to all mankind and endowed with the prerequisities for the mastery of all techniques but in full self-control […] and not liable to run the risk of becoming a tool itself.[15]

In this new process of the liberal education of the whole man, Garin emphasized the role of the classics – 'the discovery of the antique accomplished by the humanists, their discovery of man as an individual entity, historically concrete and determinable'.[16] The study of the ancients represented the

> acquisition of historical consciousness and critical consciousness, of awareness of self and others, of an understanding of the fullness of the human world and its development […] The revived study of the ancients, rediscovered as such, came to signify the discovery of a sense of human colloquium and collaboration, the initiation to the world of men. Educating youth in the classics truly thus helped to provide the beginning of an awareness of the human community in its development and its unity.[17]

Garin's view was that objective self-knowledge is developed only through knowledge of others; to know himself, an individual must be able to take someone else's perspective. This is what Garin believed humanist educators accomplished with their revival of antiquity. Through their philological, critical, historical understanding of the ancients, they enabled their pupils to know the great, exemplary figures of antiquity and hence to know themselves. This could not have occurred in the middle ages because antiquity was not then studied historically for its own sake but subjectively and uncritically, and so medieval classical studies – in so far as they existed – could not lead to the development of the whole man.

New aims meant a new curriculum and so Garin pointed to 'the abrupt change of textbooks. The *auctores octo* tend to disappear rapidly from Italian schools […] In their place are substituted manuals and adaptations by Guarino and the direct reading of the classics.'[18] New aims also meant new types of institutions. The humanist schools were identical neither to the elementary schools nor to the universities of medieval Italy:

[15] Garin (1967), 75. [16] Garin (1957), 102. [17] Garin (1957), 103. [18] Garin (1958), xxii.

a new school, intermediate between elementary and university, is on the one hand formed as a renovation and unification of elementary teaching, while on the other it encroaches on the teaching of [university-level] disciplines.[19]

Educators such as Guarino Veronese or Vittorino da Feltre, as well as their humbler imitators among communal teachers, developed broader institutions of secondary instruction, which provided a wide general education, taking pupils from elementary Latin up to the threshold of professional university study. According to Garin, they were not mere grammar schools but provided teaching in all the subjects of the trivium and quadrivium, as well as in philosophy in its widest sense. They minimized the study of formal grammar, emphasizing instead the direct reading of the classics; moreover, they used texts not as ends in themselves as in the middle ages but as genuine gateways to real subjects. They were not guardians of the social hierarchy, giving technical training for narrow professions or occupations, but they educated all men equally before the choice of a career. True to their concern with the development of the whole man, humanist educators abandoned the cruel and barbarous discipline of the medieval schoolmasters in favour of persuasion, example and reason.[20] To underline the importance of these new humanist schools, Garin suggested that there was a shift in the centres of cultural gravity from traditional universities to 'private schools, individual courses, academies'.[21] From Italy, this educational revolution engulfed Northern Europe: a Parisian master, if he had reawakened after 'a century's sleep, in the Cinquecento, would not have recognized the world of learning, would have found nothing with which he had been familiar. In Italy, the phenomenon occurred first, almost a hundred years before.'[22]

Garin's formulation quickly established itself as the orthodox interpretation, and it was only in 1982 that a significant challenge was mounted by Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine with their article on the school of Guarino,[23] which was then incorporated into their book, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*.[24] While Garin lacked sympathy with scholasti-

[19] Garin (1958), xix.

[20] See especially Garin (1967), 74ff; Garin (1953), 1–10; Garin (1958), xi–xiii, xix–xxi; Garin (1957), 21, 24, 27, 85ff, 102ff, 114, 120–1, 124, 137. [21] Garin (1957), 123–4. [22] Garin (1957), 14.

[23] Grafton and Jardine (1982).

[24] Grafton and Jardine (1986). An earlier, more limited critique of Garin's work on humanist education had been made by Robey (1980), where he argued that Vergerio's treatise *De ingenuis moribus* is more concerned with learning for its own sake than with inculcating civic virtue in pupils.

cism and deeply identified with humanism, the opposite is true of Grafton and Jardine: they see humanism as the foundation of the modern liberal arts movement in education, whose values they reject. In essence they renounce the equation between character building and the study of a canon of texts, a link which is fundamentally assumed in all systems of liberal education, whether by Cicero and Quintilian or the Renaissance humanists, Gentile and Garin, or Eliot and Leavis. On the other hand, they champion the merits of scholasticism on intellectual as well as utilitarian grounds.[25]

Each of these phases in historiographical development has yielded beneficial results. Without positivists such as Sabbadini or Manacorda there would have been far less evidence for Garin to analyse; without Garin it would have been less obvious that all the undigested research of the positivists failed to constitute a coherent historical view; without Grafton and Jardine, Garin's picture of humanist achievement would still seem all too persuasive. Yet the studies of Garin, on the one hand, and of Grafton and Jardine, on the other, are not necessarily the balanced reflections of uncontroversial authorities; their works need to be approached as contributions which have set the terms of a heated debate. Indeed, both camps have felt that more was at stake than simple historical investigation and analysis. Grafton and Jardine openly acknowledge that they have been influenced by the climate of modern educational polemics; Garin was equally affected by twentieth-century educational currents. Grafton and Jardine may reflect the resentment of the New Left at the élitism of an establishment whose status has been guaranteed by a mystique surrounding the classical, liberal arts education provided by the public schools and Oxford and Cambridge, while Garin's works are redolent of Italian educational preoccupations before and after the Second World War.

In 1923 the idealist philosopher, Giovanni Gentile, as minister of education, reorganized Italian secondary schooling, shifting the emphasis from a technical to a broader non-specialized curriculum. After primary school, *scuole complementari* were established, furnishing the majority with a general academic education and replacing the old technical schools, which were abolished; the remaining technical institutes were downgraded, providing for only about half as many pupils as formerly. Gentile reorganized the syllabus, too, putting more stress on humanities such as Italian literature and history; Latin, previously limited to the *licei*, was

[25] Grafton and Jardine (1986), xii–xiii.

introduced into technical institutes, teacher-training schools (*istituti magistrali*) and scientific and girls' *licei*. Philosophy was to be taught not only in *licei classici* but even in *istituti magistrali* and *licei scientifici*, becoming the key, unifying subject of the curriculum. Even when these reforms were watered down throughout the 1930s, the humanist tone of Italian secondary education remained, and Latin became the core subject of the curriculum at the new *scuole medie* established as junior secondary schools for most of the population.[26]

Of course these reforms, introduced by and identified with the Fascist regime, came under attack in the political atmosphere of post-war Italy. As Gentile's protégé, Garin entered the fray to safeguard what many Italian intellectuals considered to be a principal achievement of the Fascists under his mentor's guidance – the establishment of a national humanist, liberal arts education not just for an élite but for a wide segment of the population. Hence, Garin's impassioned defence of the humanist school in the foreword to *L'educazione in Europa*; indeed, he explicitly related his forthcoming historical treatment of Renaissance education to contemporary 'debates, ever more intense, on the reform of Italian schools'.[27] For him, humanist education was not the study of dead languages but a moral formation in contact with exemplary human experience, shaping the critical historical consciousness. Humanist education gave freedom from tyranny, whether of bosses, institutions, machines, organizing groups, church, or state. The association with heroic individuals of the past led to critical and tolerant understanding and a concrete sense of humanity. He rejected a type of schooling in which each person was given a technical training according to his social station and function, thus perpetuating class differences. Instead, youth should be brought by general education to the point of professional choice, so that they could think, direct and control the political leaders themselves.[28] Garin might just as well have been speaking of the dispute between humanists and scholastics during the Renaissance as of the debate between Gentilian theorists and technocrats in the twentieth century. He identified the educational issues of contemporary Italy with those of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Moreover, Garin's thesis was not only the product of educational politics but also of the intellectual world of neo-Hegelian idealist philosophy, which had a profound influence on twentieth-century Italian

[26] Clark (1984), 276–8. Minio-Paluello (1946) contains a clear outline of educational reforms in Italy under the Fascists, besides a lucid explanation of Gentile's educational theory and its close parallels to Croce's ideas on 68–75. [27] Garin (1957), 5. [28] Garin (1957), 5–11.

thought, especially in the field of Renaissance intellectual history. Bertrando Spaventa introduced Hegel into Italian philosophical circles during the 1860s,[29] and his approach was a determining influence on the two giants of Italian philosophy in the early twentieth century – Croce and Gentile. Benedetto Croce gave little attention to humanism, but his support for the Hegelian literary historian De Sanctis and criticisms of the pro-Catholic revisionist Toffanin added weight to this tradition in Italy.[30] It was above all Giovanni Gentile who developed an Hegelian/idealist interpretation of Renaissance humanism in Italy: the middle ages had devalued man and life in this world; Italian humanism, by contrast, restored the dignity of man, the potential of the human mind and the value of earthly existence.[31] This Hegelian approach continued to find powerful support in contemporary Italian philosophical circles, and Garin, as Gentile's protégé, gave particular emphasis to this view of Renaissance humanism as a new philosophy of man, in contrast to the medieval devaluation of humanity.[32]

Garin, moreover, also embraced the other colossus of Italian neo-Hegelian idealism. In emphasizing freedom as the end result of a humanist education and maintaining that liberal studies created the free man, he recalled Croce's central tenet that the history of mankind represented an instinctive striving for freedom, that history was the story of liberty. Croce's stress on the development of the human spirit through history was reflected in Garin's view that through the historical study of the ancients the whole man was formed. Croce's rejection of materialism in favour of idealism was seen in Garin's view that a humanist education gave men ideals, not material benefits gained through vocational competence; similarly, this Crocean emphasis on the historical development of ideas rather than things was found in Garin's view that the difference between the middle ages and the Renaissance was not so much a material distinction in the level of classical culture as a new intellectual attitude towards the classics. Garin was a true Crocean historicist: historicism's axiom that there are no absolute standards and that everything is contingent on its historical position is found in Garin's emphasis on the humanists' discovery, through their liberal education, of the diversity of man and his development: they acquire an almost Crocean enlightened relativism, realizing there is no unique truth, that 'knowledge [*scienza*] in 1400 cannot be the same as [it was] in 500 BC, that

[29] Spaventa (1867); Ferguson (1948), 222.
[30] De Sanctis (1931); Croce (1941); Ferguson (1948), 240–1, 350.
[31] Ferguson (1948), 222–3, Gentile (1912) (1931) and (1968). [32] Garin (1965).

it is organic and the rational result of precise data'.[33] For Garin, through philology and liberal education, pupils in the Renaissance became aware of the individuality of all human societies and of the entire historical process; his view that true classical learning resulted only from historical understanding reflected historicism's postulate that genuine knowledge could be obtained only through history.

Particularly historicist were Garin's tendency to see events in terms of a larger historical process and his suggestions that only through comprehending these greater historical abstractions could concrete events be understood. Thus the succession of Barzizza to Travesio as the communal grammarian of Verona represented a profound 'change of times'.[34] Gregory the Great's and Peter Damian's criticisms of secular learning were not mere polemical positions, specific to particular controversies (the suppression of paganism or the encouragement of purer monasticism), but for Garin they became signs of the profoundly anti-classical *Weltanschauung* of the middle ages.[35] Cicero was revived by earlier humanist teachers not because of their greater enthusiasm for antiquity but because of their new focus on man, with whom Cicero had been completely preoccupied.[36] Poliziano's rejection of Cicero as a model and his stress on self-expression represented the growth of historicist individualism, not merely a preference for Quintilian (who stressed *ingenium*) over Cicero (who emphasized *imitatio*). Valla's revival of Latin was not the result of his Roman patriotism but of his recognition of the universal human community and of a general human, not just Roman, renaissance.[37]

As has been seen above, the roots of twentieth-century Italian idealism are in Hegel, and so it is not surprising that Garin voiced a number of Hegelian commonplaces. The notion of the essential interrelation of different aspects of life in a given period – central to the Hegelian concept of the spirit of the age[38] – is seen in Garin's vision of a new poetry, linked to a new education, to a new political and social equality, liberty, humanity, secularism.[39] The Hegelian view of the Reformation as the religious embodiment of the Renaissance is apparent in Garin's assertion that humanism led to a religious reform because it freed man's critical spirit.[40] The Hegelian historian with whom Garin particularly sympathized was Burckhardt,[41] whose famous motto, 'the discovery of man and the world', he repeated and paraphrased.[42] Indeed, Garin's view that objective self-knowledge was accomplished by the revival of

[33] Garin (1957), 104. [34] Garin (1957), 37. [35] Garin (1957), 44. [36] Garin (1957), 86.
[37] Garin (1957), 107–8. [38] Gombrich (1969). [39] Garin (1957), 81.
[40] Garin (1957), 115. [41] Gombrich (1969). [42] Garin (1957), 71, 86–7.

antiquity was foreshadowed by Burckhardt;[43] in fact, Garin explicitly acknowledged his affinity with Burckhardt.[44] Characteristic of the Hegelian/Burckhardtian approach to historical periodization were Garin's chronological ambiguities. Just as Burckhardt had to push the beginnings of the Renaissance back to the court of Frederick II, so Garin had to allow for the appearance of typically Ciceronian (and Renaissance) attitudes to language, eloquence, character formation and education under the Carolingians and in the twelfth century.[45] Similarly, in order to find concern with subjects apart from texts he seemed to make Descartes appear as a Renaissance philosopher.[46]

A recent approach to this philosophical and political/ideological penetration of scholarship on Renaissance education has been an inclination to reinforce historical orthodoxy.[47] Paul Grendler tends to accept Garin's view of the influence of humanism on Renaissance education, while discounting the critique of Grafton and Jardine. He adopts the Burckhardtian strains in Garin's work, painting a negative picture of late medieval Italian school education: he plays down the teaching of the Roman classics and affirms the predominance, until the arrival of the humanists, of the traditional medieval school authors,[48] while emphasizing the wider limitations of medieval thought.[49] The coming of the *studia humanitatis*, on the other hand, represented 'a curriculum revolution, one of the few in the history of Western education, in the relatively short time of about fifty years – 1400 to 1450'.[50] There was a decisive rejection of the medieval syllabus: 'The humanists of the fifteenth century changed the Latin curriculum, a major academic revolution. They discarded the late medieval Latin curriculum of verse grammars and glossaries, morality poems, a handful of ancient poetical texts, and *ars dictaminis*.'[51] Grendler accepts that there was some teaching of classical Latin poetry in the medieval classroom,[52] but sees a new approach in the introduction by humanist teachers of Cicero's letters into the grammar syllabus.[53] Grendler defends Garin's orthodoxy against the heterodox blasts of Grafton and Jardine, suggesting that their critique is anachronistic.[54]

More profitable than adherence to one or the other side of this debate would perhaps be an attempt to identify the major issues which this

[43] Burckhardt (1990), 199. [44] Garin (1965), 221. [45] Garin (1957), 50–8.
[46] Garin (1957), 73. [47] Grendler (1989). [48] Grendler (1989), 111–17.
[49] Grendler (1989), 255. [50] Grendler (1989), 140–1. [51] Grendler (1989), 404.
[52] Grendler (1989), 116–17. See Garin (1953), 5. [53] Grendler (1989), 404.
[54] Grendler (1989), 407.

dialogue has raised. One of these is obviously the question of the contrast between medieval and humanist education. Here adversarial polemics have tended to reinforce the assumption that schools and curriculum in the middle ages and Renaissance were radically divergent. Indeed, one feature shared by Garin's, Grafton's and Jardine's and Grendler's work is an emphasis on the gulf separating medieval and humanist education: while Garin and Grendler highlight the limitations of the medieval Italian school in comparison with its Renaissance successor, Grafton and Jardine reinforce precisely the same historical mould by insisting on the vitality of scholastic education in contrast to the rigidity of humanist teaching. Nevertheless, by sustaining the view that the coming of humanism at the turn of the fifteenth century signalled, whether for better or worse, an educational revolution, these approaches tend to obscure significant elements of continuity before and after 1400; moreover, by focusing on the advent of humanism as the decisive turning point in the history of late medieval and early modern education, such perspectives sometimes overlooked other significant moments of change.

Grafton and Jardine, as well as Garin, highlight the contrast between humanism and scholasticism when comparing medieval and Renaissance education at the school level. And yet this point of view disregards one fundamental fact: scholastic subjects were rarely studied before university. Logic, philosophy, medicine, law and theology were the almost exclusive preserve of the Italian *studia*. To contrast scholasticism with humanism is to set university-level instruction against pre-university learning; humanist teachers are comparable with thirteenth- or fourteenth-century grammar and/or rhetoric masters rather than with dialecticians, philosophers or theologians. The assumption of a sharp contrast between middle ages and Renaissance in terms of the dispute between humanism and scholasticism has diverted historical study from a systematic comparison between medieval and Renaissance elementary and grammar teaching. When such an analysis is undertaken – whether in terms of theoretical textbooks,[55] or of practical teaching techniques[56] – then it will be seen that tradition is at least as striking as innovation with regard to a number developments in Italian education during the fifteenth century. Even with regard to the canon of authors read at the grammar school level, it will become clear that the Quattrocento presented a complex picture of tradition and innovation

[55] See below, chs. 2, 3. [56] See below, ch. 5.

in the study of Latin literature in the Italian schoolroom.[57] The most novel feature of the school curriculum in the fifteenth century was the teaching of Latin prose writing: it will be seen that Ciceronian style was introduced into the classroom in the course of the Quattrocento. And yet even at this level, the overall curricular structure remained, as it had been in the earlier period, based on a progression from natural and simple language to artificial and ornate style; pupils continued to learn two kinds of prose at school, with medieval Latin remaining the point of departure for stylistic ornament and artifice.[58]

Moreover, the preoccupation of scholarship with the educational changes brought in the wake of the fifteenth-century Renaissance has tended to put into the shade the possible effects on pre-university education of other major intellectual upheavals. It is well known that the rise of the universities and of scholasticism after the turn of the thirteenth century constituted one of the major turning points in the history of Western learning. As Italian universities concentrated on and gained a monopoly of higher professional education particularly in law and medicine but also in philosophy (the so-called arts), it will be seen that the preliminary grammar or Latin curriculum also became compartmentalized, entrusted to specialist grammar teachers. The effect of this new specialization of education is well known at the university level: Italian scholasticism became ever more preoccupied with the philosophical, scientific and, eventually, theological disciplines. However, there has been little attention devoted to the collateral effects of these developments on the grammar schools. It must be asked whether broader philosophical studies and questions (especially moral philosophical issues and topics) continued to be pursued at the school level, or whether they were now relegated to the universities. The rise of scholasticism brought new authors into vogue: not just Aristotle and the Arabs but also new grammatical texts such as *Magnae derivationes*, *Doctrinale*, *Graecismus* and *Catholicon*; it must be wondered whether the old stalwarts of the classroom, such as Vergil or Cicero's shorter moral treatises (*De amicitia*, *De senectute*, *Somnium Scipionis*, *Paradoxa stoicorum* and *De officiis*) suffered a corresponding loss of popularity. Another major intellectual change in the thirteenth century was the rise of the Italian vernacular. Although it may have remained theoretically inconceivable to teach elementary reading and writing in the *volgare*, nevertheless increasing use of the vernacular in literary, commercial, religious and political life will be seen to have

[57] See below, ch. 4. [58] See below, ch. 6.

exerted profound effects on educational practice; indeed, it needs to be considered to what extent the *volgare* was used in the actual teaching of Latin.[59] Moreover, the end of the thirteenth century saw the rise of pre-humanism, with the introduction of new texts previously little read in the middle ages, such as Seneca's tragedies or Valerius Maximus's *Facta et dicta*; it must be asked to what extent such works began to enter the grammar curriculum during the fourteenth century, well before the advent of the humanist educators.[60] Overall, it will become clear that curriculum change at the pre-university level was a complex development from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries in Italy: spotlighting Renaissance humanism as the only or even the paramount influence in the history of education over these three centuries is to oversimplify a complex and many-sided historical process.

Another important issue arising out of the debate over humanist education is the moral content of grammar teaching, a question forcefully raised on a concrete level by Grafton and Jardine, who examine Guarino's actual classroom practice on the basis primarily of four commentaries apparently deriving from his school. These seem to show that, whether Guarino was teaching his own lexical *Carmina differentialia*, Vergil's *Georgics, Rhetorica ad Herennium* or Cicero's *De amicitia*, his focus was on language, grammar and philology (in its broad sense including historical, mythological and geographical exegesis), not on moral philosophy;[61] in other words, despite Guarino's own claims that he shaped his pupils' characters, equipping them for the active life in order to benefit state and society, he in fact offered little explicit training in morals. Grafton and Jardine therefore conclude that the product provided by humanist teachers did not live up to the claims of their advertising.[62]

Why then did parents, civic governments, rulers or the church employ these self-important and dubious educators? Grafton and Jardine answer that humanist education was not successful or appealing because it created better men but rather because its tedious philological and mnemonic methods, with their emphasis on rote learning rather than analysis and logical argument, trained pupils to be docile – hence the potentially malleable bureaucrats in the emerging absolutist regimes of early modern Europe; scholasticism, on the other hand, was unsuited for this new social and political function of education because it trained men to think and argue for themselves.[63]

[59] See below, 106ff and 275ff. [60] See below, 200ff.

[61] Grafton and Jardine (1986), 12–15, 18–19, 22.

[62] Grafton and Jardine (1986), 2–3, 14, 23, 25. [63] Grafton and Jardine (1986), xiii–xiv.

Grendler rejects Grafton's and Jardine's conclusion that the content of humanist teaching did not live up to its pretentious claims of moral improvement. They have objected, he declares,

> that Italian Renaissance Latin education failed to inculcate the values of the citizen-orator, partly because of a preoccupation with the minutiae of learning Vergil, Cicero, and others. Obviously, schools devoted a great deal of effort to minutiae, particularly at the primary and secondary levels. But there seems no reason to doubt that teachers and theorists who asked students to compile notebooks of moral and civic *sententiae* tried to teach these values. And the reading, from the *Disticha Catonis* to Cicero's letters, was full of moral and social commonplaces.[64]

Such a point of view, however, presumes that the medieval and early Renaissance reader approached the text in the same way as the modern reader, but this assumption can overlook the essential contribution of the commentary and glossing tradition. Indeed, such were the technical hurdles in the period before printing that one must assume that what the medieval reader took from a classic text is what appears in the glosses, not in the original text. In the middle ages and early Renaissance, there were no readily accessible, easily used editions of literary texts such as began to appear in print from the end of the fifteenth century. The manuscript copies which readers had to cope with were highly corrupt, often difficult or impossible to decipher; moreover, pupils were working with a language which was not their mother tongue and of which they usually had a far from competent knowledge. Even more significant was the difficulty of the Latin literary canon itself: these were not works to be easily comprehended, like now, in accessible translations. They were composed in a deliberately elevated and even obscure style; thorough comprehension of this canon was more than a life's work for the greatest scholars. Pupils (and readers in general) coped with these immense difficulties through glossing and commentary. It will be seen that they used a wide range of interlinear and marginal techniques in order to begin to climb the mountain of textual understanding.[65] It is clear that they were able to extract far less, not more, from these texts than was offered by the glossing and commentary tradition; the fact is that whatever their glosses reveal constitutes the limit, not the minimum, of their comprehension and understanding. Glossing was an inherent and essential aspect of reading in the middle ages, as witnessed by the proliferation of commentaries on such texts as Boethius's *Consolation*. As Egbert of Liège declared,

[64] Grendler (1989), 408. [65] See below, 275ff.

You who rummage in the writings of Vergil without glossing them pick only at the shell without tasting the nut.[66]

Similar had been the experience of a ninth-century Italian teacher, who complained that lack of an adequate commentary had prevented him from coming to terms with Juvenal's last two satires.[67] The reliance placed by medieval and Renaissance readers on glossing is further demonstrated by Boccaccio, who found that, without them, he could not do justice to Statius's *Thebais*.[68] Indeed, it is no accident that the medieval method of reading, involving copious interlinear and marginal glossing, not to mention the entire handwritten commentary tradition, eventually waned with the progress of the printed book; stable texts, published translations and printed commentaries eventually obviated the need for painfully gradual comprehension based on interlinear and marginal glossing.

Further investigation and study of school glossing is called for, all the more so in view of suggestive remarks regarding manuscript schoolbooks before the age of humanism made by Paul Gehl, who observes that the glosses on these characteristic school texts were philological, not moral.[69] Grendler too finds that the methods of sixteenth-century teachers similarly resembled the practices of their fourteenth- and fifteenth-century forerunners: indeed, one of the most interesting patterns to emerge from his discussion of sixteenth-century teaching is the general absence of morals as a topic in school-level commentaries: 'Despite the barrage of humanistic assertions that Terence taught virtue, printed commentaries did not draw out moral lessons but confined themselves to expository paraphrase, grammatical analysis, and explanation of unfamiliar persons and terms';[70] 'Renaissance commentators on Horace confined themselves to grammatical, rhetorical, and poetical analysis';[71] the 'commentary tradition of Caesar consisted almost exclusively of geographical and historical information', nor 'did the commentaries draw moral lessons from Caesar's works';[72] a 'teacher who paraphrased the text and explained Sallust's meaning did not have to develop moral lessons from historical behavior, because Sallust did it for him';[73]

[66] 'Qui sine commento rimaris scripta Maronis, / Inmunis nuclei solo de cortice rodis': Egbert von Lüttich (1889), 154, vv. 923–4: see Riché (1979), 247; Alessio (1995), 35.

[67] 'Mox pariter primo Iuvenale [...] / cuius nempe duos extremos carpere libros / egestas commentorum nos distulit egre': cited by Villa (1983), 10, 38; see Alessio (1995), 35–6.

[68] Billanovich (1945), 75: 'Nam cum pridem casu fortuito pervenisset ad manus meas liber pulcerrimus [...] emi pro pretio competenti: sed cum sine magistro vel glosis intellectum debitum non attingam [...]'

[69] Gehl (1989), 407–8.

[70] Grendler (1989), 252.

[71] Grendler (1989), 253.

[72] Grendler (1989), 259, 260.

[73] Grendler (1989), 261.

'Valerius Maximus might be seen as a moral philosopher, but Renaissance schools treated him as a historian.'[74] All these suggestive hypotheses by Grafton and Jardine, Gehl and Grendler have inspired the further study of manuscript glosses contained in this book, whose findings, as will be seen below, have been to confirm the view that glossing and commentary at the school level in medieval and Renaissance Italy was philological, not moral.[75]

A close study of school glosses, therefore, will tell a different story from the one detailed in Gehl's own work on Trecento Tuscan education, where he relies on the contents of modern printed texts rather than on accompanying manuscript glosses as a guide to the lessons which might have been learned in the medieval and Renaissance schoolroom. His justification for this procedure is signalled in the title *A Moral Art*: Latin was a moral, not just a philological and grammatical subject in the middle ages. The implication is that the study of glosses is less than imperative, because morality was being taught anyway through the very nature of the subject. What this approach tends to overlook is that Latin's status as a morally inspiring study has been a commonplace taken for granted throughout the history of Western education since antiquity. Roman educational theorists such as Cicero and Quintilian had stressed the moral aims of education and yet when the actual educational practices of grammarians such as Donatus, Servius or Priscian are examined, one finds only grammar and philology, not morals; indeed, despite emphasizing the moral utility of the classics,[76] Quintilian's own description of how they should be commented upon in the schoolroom focuses exclusively on philological details.[77] The logical consequence of all this is not that actual teaching was in fact moral because the Latin language was assumed to be an ethical subject but the very opposite: because it was taken for granted that Latin was a moral discipline, teachers did not have to inculcate moral lessons in the classroom. For the very reason that Latin was assumed to be a moral art, teaching in the schoolroom did not have to focus on lessons for good behaviour but could concentrate on technicalities of grammar and philology.

Like Grafton and Jardine, Grendler produces evidence that among sixteenth-century Italian teachers too there is evidently the same tacit assumption that close reading itself engendered morality: although their commentaries on Terence contained no moral lessons, some 'instructors developed the moral lessons orally. The editor of a new Aldine printing

[74] Grendler (1989), 263. [75] See ch. 5 below. [76] *Institutio oratoria*, I.viii.1–12.
[77] *Institutio oratoria*, I.viii.13–21.

(1570) of the *Comoediae*, who claimed to have spent years teaching Venetian youths, made this point. One must explain orally to boys that Terence develops virtue. His ingenious artifices and situations engender delight and teach good habits to the young, he wrote.'[78] Similarly, despite the solely literary and rhetorical character of Horace commentaries, 'Giovanni Fabrini in 1566 summarized the view that moral philosophy could be taught through Horace: "Horace's intention is to bring man to perfection, filling him with those moral virtues that make him perfect, in effect rational and, as a consequence, blessed."'[79] These Italian teachers asserted that there was a connection between reading classical literature and the development of good character, but their classroom practice (not surprisingly, given the dubious morality of so much Roman poetry and drama), as revealed by their commentaries, did not develop the links explicitly or concretely.

The determination to refute Grafton's and Jardine's thesis that grammar was not a moral art has tended to divert attention from a pressing historical question: why was this moral content so egregiously absent in school education particularly during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries? Here further study of the commentary tradition is essential. Indeed, if one considers earlier medieval teachers such as Remigius of Auxerre, William of Conches or Nicholas Trevet, who have left, for example, fundamental commentaries on a canonical educational text such as Boethius's *Consolation*, it will be found that their teaching was not only philological and grammatical but also embraced a wide range of philosophical topics (including morals), not to mention natural science and theology.[80] On the other hand, the commentaries by Italian teachers of Boethius, such as Pietro da Moglio and Giovanni Travesio, have been found to be almost entirely grammatical and philological.[81] Discounting or overlooking the glossing tradition shifts the focus away from this fundamental problem of educational history: why were medieval and scholastic teachers so much more concerned with philosophical (including moral) questions than their Italian successors in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries?

This question demands more detailed consideration than has been offered by historians of schools and teaching: if medieval education is identified with Aristotelian scholasticism, then the possibility of a comparative examination of the glossing of similar school texts over a chron-

[78] Grendler (1989), 252. [79] Grendler (1989), 254. [80] Silk (1935); Silk; Nauta (1999).
[81] Black and Pomaro (2000), esp. 23–7; Federici Vescovini (1958); Frati (1920).

ological range embracing both the middle ages and Renaissance does not arise. Once, however, it is realized that similar texts were read and glossed at school throughout the medieval and Renaissance periods, then there arises the problem of why humanist educators and their medieval forerunners, the Italian schoolmasters of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, eliminated the rich moral and philosophical content of the commentary tradition emanating from earlier medieval schools.

When the question is posed in this way, it is not difficult to find the answer. Indeed, the crux of the issue is the specialization of education which occurred in the course of the later twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the wake of the emergence of the universities. In earlier medieval schools, on the one hand, there had been a unitary curriculum, beginning with elementary reading and grammar and terminating with philosophy/theology, all of which was taught within one institution;[82] on the other hand, with the new specialized educational system which emerged at the turn of the thirteenth century, higher studies such as law, medicine, philosophy and theology became the preserve of universities and *studia*, whether secular or conventual. Their counterparts were similarly emerging specialized institutions of lower education, both primary and secondary: elementary schools for reading and writing, grammar schools for Latin and abacus schools for mercantile studies. Corresponding to these specialized institutions were specialist teachers: *doctores puerorum* for reading and writing, *maestri di abaco* for commercial arithmetic and *magistri grammatice* for Latin. The horizons of elementary teachers hardly extended further than the most rudimentary knowledge of Latin; the culture of abacus masters was firmly rooted in the vernacular, which was the language of their textbooks and curriculum; Latin was the province of the grammar masters, whose interests and preparation were limited to Latin language, literature and basic philology.

[82] There had been precedents for an institutional division between elementary and secondary education, for example, the Roman distinction between teachers of reading and writing, on the one hand, and grammar on the other (Quintilian, I.iv.1); with the contraction of education in the earlier middle ages, however, the tendency had been to see the school, whether monastic or cathedral, as a single institution: Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis* of 789, providing for 'scholae legentium puerorum […] psalmos, notas, cantus, compotum, grammaticam per singula monestaria vel episcopia' (cited by Riché (1992), 33 n. 1), seems to imply single schools encompassing both the trivium and the quadrivium. Carolingian external schools were little developed and even so did not imply a hierarchy of learning: Hildebrandt (1992). The document describing the division of Milanese cathedral schools in the earlier XIc. into two groups, one 'ad docendos pueros', the other 'philosophorum vero scholae diversarum artium peritiam habentium, ubi urbani et extranei clerici philosophiae doctrinis studiose imbuebantur' (Sasse Tateo (1992), 25 and n. 16), seems to imply an institutional division between schools for boys and study at a higher level, not one between elementary and secondary schools.

There is all the difference in the world between a teacher such as William of Conches, whose interests and knowledge ranged from grammar to philosophy, science and theology, and his later Trecento Italian counterpart, Pietro da Moglio, grammarian at Bologna, with horizons scarcely reaching beyond Latin grammar, philology and rhetoric. The humanist successors of these medieval Italian grammarians, of course, took the linguistic and philological interests of their predecessors to new and previously unimagined depths, but they fundamentally remained within the context of the same specialized educational system which had developed in the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: it will hardly come as a surprise to find that, like their humbler medieval Italian predecessors, they too focused on grammar and philology, not on philosophy, in their school-level glosses and commentaries. This demotion of grammar to a school-level subject was peculiar to later medieval Italy; in Northern Europe the study of grammar continued to extend into higher education, closely associated with logic and philosophy: hence speculative and modistic grammar – a subject to which Italians made almost no contribution – was a university, not a school-level discipline north of the Alps.[83]

However, the specialization of education in the later middle ages and early Renaissance did not stop with the division between elementary and grammar teaching. A further type of specialist master emerged in the fourteenth century: the *auctorista*, who developed his particular expert knowledge in lecturing and commenting on the classical authors. Earlier in the middle ages, teachers such as Remigius of Auxerre or William of Conches had covered an enormous spectrum, as is revealed by their commentaries, which ranged from treatments of relatively simple grammarians such as Donatus and of typical school authors such as Cato or Prudentius, to the Roman classics such as Ovid or Vergil and rhetorical texts by Cicero, not to mention their expositions of philosophy and theology. In the fourteenth century, however, there emerged a new type of specialist master who gave particular attention to the authors and to rhetoric. Famous examples of such teachers were Giovanni del Virgilio in the early Trecento, Nofri di Giovanni at Colle Valdelsa in 1382,[84] and Gasparino Barzizza at the turn of the fifteenth century. Of course, there continued to be an overlap between *auctoristi* and *grammatici*. Towns such as Arezzo, especially in the later Tre- and

[83] For the division of grammar into two streams during the XIIc. and XIIIc., one directed at school-level education, the other towards higher levels of study (especially logic and philosophy), see Kessler (1981), 287; Gardenal (1988b), 6, who cites further bibliography, 17 nn. 8–10.

[84] See Bacci (1895), 89 and below, 200–2.

earlier Quattrocento, expected their *maestri di grammatica* to cover both grammar and the classical authors: it is no accident that from this broad Aretine environment there emerged a teacher such as Domenico di Bandino, who taught not only basic and secondary grammar, but also lectured on classical authors such as Cicero and Statius in Bologna. But at the same time there were clear signs of specialization, as in the case of Giovanni Travesio, who after 1391 was exempted from teaching basic grammar to boys ('doctrina puerorum et gramatice positive'), and promoted now 'ad legendum auctores magnos, rethoricam et grammaticam speculativam'.[85] Similar indications of specialization also found expression in the contrast between *auctorista* and *grammaticus* which was articulated with clarity at Fano in 1405, when the citizenry expressed the desire to have a grammarian, not an *auctorista*.[86] It is well known that the *auctoristi* of the later middle ages became the *umanisti* of the Renaissance.[87] Of course, some humanists continued to wear two hats in the Quattrocento: renowned examples were Guarino Veronese or even Lorenzo Valla. But the growing division between the two areas of the curriculum is unmistakable. Petrarch, of course, was, as in so many other things, a harbinger of future developments: not only did he resist becoming a grammar teacher all his life but he wrote famously to a prominent grammarian and friend, Zanobi da Strada, upbraiding him for his ignoble profession.[88] Even a master who loved teaching such as Giovanni Conversini could bitterly refer to 'pedagogii sordidum munus', 'infestum fedumque negocium discipulare' and 'sordida et humilis grammatice veritatis catedra'; Conversini himself was reproved by a friend for his 'fedissimum exercitium'.[89] These attitudes and trends were given concrete expression in countless university *rotuli* of the fifteenth century, where teachers of grammar were distinguished both in terms of title and of salary from professors of rhetoric and poetry.[90] It is no accident that Suetonius's distinction between the *grammaticus* and

[85] Rossi (1930), 13.

[86] Bartoccetti (1929), 169: 'uno maestro che sia bono gramaticho senza esser auctorista o poeta, sperando che i loro figlioli impareno gramaticha e non più, e chi volesse che imparassero più, gli mande a studiare altrove'.

[87] See Billanovich (1965), 152–60. A transitional moment is noticeable in 1459, when a grammarian in Modena bought a house from his earnings 'ex exercitio legendi in scolis et docendi gramaticam, poetas, rethoricam et humanitatis auctores': Vicini (1935), 69.

[88] Petrarca (1933–42), III, 17–21. See Rubinstein (1988), 161 n. 32; Grendler (1989), 3.

[89] Sabbadini (1924), 101–2, where similar examples from Vergerio, besides from Ferrara and Naples, are cited. See Rubinstein (1988), 161 n. 32, who rightly points out that this view of the grammar schoolmaster was not just a topos.

[90] Park (1980); Davies (1998); Verde (1973–95), I, 298–383 *passim*; Dorati da Empoli (1980), 118–26, 142–5; Chambers (1976). For the same kind of curriculum divisions operating in Venice, see Ross (1976), 521–36, 561–6.

grammatista[91] came back into vogue in the later Quattrocento.[92] In terms of the school curriculum, the *studia humanitatis* were becoming separate from mere *grammatica*, each emerging as the preserve of its own particular class of teachers, *grammatisti* as distinct from *umanisti*.[93]

This further specialization had significant curriculum implications. Humble and limited in their preparation and knowledge, the horizons of Italian grammar teachers in the fifteenth century hardly extended beyond the Latin language: it is no accident that their glosses on the authors rarely ranged further than simple philology, with little sign of moral or other philosophical interests. The pretensions and scope of the humanists, in their role as professors not so much of grammar but of rhetoric and moral philosophy, sometimes extended further, as can be seen in the commentaries of a figure such as Barzizza.[94] But the curriculum division is still evident in humanist teachers who remained firmly

[91] *De grammaticis*, 4: 'Sunt qui litteratum a litteratore ita distinguunt, ut Graeci grammaticum a grammatista, et illum quidem absolute, hunc mediocriter doctum existimant.' See *De grammaticis*, 24.

[92] See Pico's famous letter to Ermolao Barbaro: 'movent mihi stomachum grammatistae quidam, qui cum duas tenuerint vocabulorum origines, ita se ostentant, ita venditant, ita circumferunt iactabundi [...]' (ed. Garin (1952), 822). See also ibid. 806: 'Viximus celebres, o Hermolae, et posthac vivemus, non in scholis grammaticorum et paedagogiis, sed in philosophorum coronis, in conventibus sapientum [...]' See also Poliziano's distinction: 'Grammaticorum enim sunt haec partes, ut omne scriptorum genus [...] ennarent. Nostra aetas, parum perita rerum veterum, nimis brevi gyro grammaticum sepsit [...] Nec enim aliud grammaticus graece, quam latine litteratus: nos autem nomen hoc in ludum trivialem detrusimus, tanquam in pistrinum [...] Caeterum apud graecos hoc genus non grammatici sed grammatistae, non litterati apud latinos sed litteratores, vocabantur' (Poliziano (1925), 220–2: see Billanovich (1965), 59; Scaglione (1961), 61–8). See Poliziano (1533), 1, 645–6: 'odio omni fastidioque dignissimos, qui quamquam semper elementarii sunt, vindicare tamen inter doctos fautores audent sibi censuram litterarum'. See citations from Francesco Baldelli and Agostino Mascardi dating from the late XVIc. and earlier XVIIc., in Battaglia (1961–), s.v. *grammatista*.

[93] See Grendler (1989), 23–9; Campana (1946), 61, 65–6; Kristeller (1979b), 99, 283; Avesani (1970), 212–24; Grendler (1971); Billanovich (1965), 160. From 1506, a specialized appointment was regularly made in Modena 'pro doctore publico humanitatis': see Vicini (1935), 80ff, and Bertoni and Vicini (1905–6), 240–1, 249, 252; for 'maestri di humanità' in XVIc. Lucca, see Berengo (1965), 418 n. 1, 422, cited by Billanovich (1965), 159. In XVImid. Vicenza, no one could be admitted as a physician who himself or whose father or brother had during the previous ten years exercised an 'artem mecanicam et ruralem', including 'ludum litterarium, scilicet docendo grammaticam': Zanazzo (1963), 33. The distinction between humanists and humble grammarians was drawn forcefully in the 1587 edition of Tommaso Garzoni's *Piazza universale*, as cited by Avesani (1970), 222 and Grendler (1971), 462–3: 'si scuopre manifesto l'errore, e la prosontione d'alcuni, che quando a pena sono tinti de' primi elementi di grammatica, & insegnano que' principij per non dir pedantarie si arrogano questo nome, & vogliono esser chiamati Humanisti, profanando con la loro prosontione questo nome honoratissimo [...]' Similar was the distinction drawn by Marco Antonio Mariago in his commentary on *De oratore*, also published in 1587: 'Hinc satis apparet, quam imperite faciunt ii, qui humanitatem pro grammatica tantum accipiant et professores humanitatis appellent eos, qui grammaticam docent' (cited by Avesani (1970), 223).

[94] See e.g. Panizza (1977), 297–358.

committed to the grammar school: it is no accident that moral philosophy is almost entirely absent from the commentaries of Guarino.[95] Here he was wearing the hat of his grammatical colleagues, in whose glosses, as will be seen below (ch. 5), the occasional superficial reference to moral philosophy is almost invariably lost in a vast sea of basic philological detail.

[95] See e.g. his commentaries on Terence and Valerius Maximus in BRF 3607, where, following the pattern established in the earlier middle ages (see below, 315–16), Guarino announces a high moral purpose in the *accessus* (2v) but in the body of the commentary offers only philological comments.