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Many humanists collected and edited their own letters. Guarino, however, did not, possibly because the leisure necessary for making copies of everything he wrote, or the affluence which would have enabled him to employ an amanuensis to do so, was for most of his life denied to him. Only in the case of letters 7, 25, 27, 47, 54, 861, 862, 864, and 892, which formed part of the collection known as Chrysolorina, is he known to have amassed any. The vast majority have therefore been transmitted either fortuitously or through recipients who preserved them. As an example of how this happened, there seems to have been a collection of Guarino's letters made by his pupil, Leonello d'Este, for in an entry dated 22nd March 1437 in Archivio di Stato di Modena Registrum mandati 1436-38 f. 126 the Marquis Niccolò authorized a payment of one lira marchesana and fifteen soldi to bind the letters of Guarino at Niccolò's expense for Leonello.

In some instances, recipients would be motivated by an affectionate urge to keep something, however slight, written by a friend; in others, the motivation would be a desire to prove that one had corresponded with a great man. But in most cases, Guarino's letters were treasured as models of stylistic excellence. In an age when scholars were striving in increasing numbers to imitate and even surpass the Latin of the ancients, the effusions of a grand master like Guarino were naturally examined, admired, and
in turn used as mines to quarry for pungent vocabulary and elegant
turns of phrase. Their particular value lay in the fact that
Guarino was conspicuously successful in writing a Latin heavily
classical in flavour but expressive of the common ideas of his time.
Content and sincerity were less highly prized than form and style,
so that many letters of unimportant character have survived
along with major and more informative pieces. It is a remarkable
tribute to Guarino's fame, to the affection and respect he so widely
inspired, and to the vigour of his pen, that 773 of his letters have
survived through virtually no effort of his own.

Of these, 762 were published by Remigio Sabbadini in his
3 volume Epistolario di Guarino Veronese (Venice, 1915-1919), since
when others have come to light. These will be discussed in due course.

Sabbadini began his collation of MSS containing Guariniana
in 1882 and subsequently dealt with 548 MSS, dispersed throughout
Italy, France, Spain, England, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Poland,
Austria, Switzerland, and Yugoslavia. In Vol. III, p. xxi he stated:
"I am certain that none of the libraries in Europe has escaped my
notice." The list of MSS he used is printed in Vol. I, p. xv-xix,
and the various groups of letters, with comments on their provenience,
in Vol. III, p. vii-xxi. Although the utmost credit must be his
for completing this monumental task, he was able to draw upon the
work of earlier scholars, a brief account of whose activities follows.

Interest in Guarino began in the eighteenth century. The first
to express a desire to publish letters of Guarino was Scipione Maffei
in his *Verona Illustrata* (Verona, 1732) p. 67f., but the edition never appeared. The same is true of A. Zeno in *Dissertationi Voeciane* (Venice, 1752) I, p. 222, where he also said: "One could compile a vast volume of his (Guarino's) letters..." Maffei notes many of them. I touch on several...in the Vatican, Florentine, Estense, Ambrosian, and Veronese libraries; and perhaps there are some here (Venice)." Similarly, L. Mehus in *Leonardi Bruni Arretini epistolarum libri VIII* (Florence, 1741) I, p. LXVI promised to publish a group of Guarino's letters addressed to Diagio Guasconi "with many others of the same Guarino," but failed to do so.

Again, we gather from a note of J. Morelli in Codex Marcianus Latinus XIV 21 f. 24 that Girolamo Montanari promised to publish the letters of Guarino at Modena in 1768. The same unfulfilled promise was made in the latter half of the nineteenth century by the aged scholar Cesare Cavattoni, according to G. B. Giuliani in *Propugnatore* (1874) Pt. II, p. 265.

Ferrante Borsetti, author of the 2 volume *Historia alni Ferrariae Gymnasi* (Ferrara, 1735), compiled a great deal of bibliographical and biographical material in a MS entitled "Memorie per servire all' istoria della vita di Guarino Veronese," of which there are two copies in the Public Library at Ferrara, one of them Codex 186) with corrections in Borsetti's handwriting and dated 1775.

Cardinal A.M. Quirini mentions some Guariniana in his *Diatriba praeciliminaris* (Brescia, 1741) to the epistolary of Francesco Barbaro (which came out in 1743), but only insofar as they throw light on
Barbara. He cites letters of Guarino from a MS, given to him by Father Muselli, and others from an unspecified source. I am told by Monsignor Giuseppe Turini, librarian of the Chapter Library at Verona, that Muselli's MS, is there, classified as CCXCVI (369) MRCello, Guarino's letters occupy ff. 32r-54r.

Gioacchino Gabardi di Carpi left "manuscripts bearing on the life of Guarino," improving (according to Tipaldo, Biografia di italiani illustri del secolo XVIII Vol. VII, p. 407-09) on the work on Zeno, Maffei, Fabricio, and Mansi. No one, however, seems to have used these MSS, and I have been unable to trace their present location.

P.I. Affò, to assist his researches for his Scrittori parmensiani (Parma, 1789) had a copy made of Codex 57 of the Estense Library at Modena (op. cit. II, p. 139). This codex is now No. 1200 in the Palatine Library at Parma and is entitled Epistulae. The letters are all by Guarino and incorporated by Sabbadini in his edition.

G. Antonelli's Indice dei manoscritti della civica Biblioteca di Ferrara (Ferrara, 1884), and his earlier special compilation of the Ferrarese MSS containing Guariniana in Poligrafo (Verona, 1837) proved invaluable to Sabbadini.

A.D. Giuliai also collected much material, which Sabbadini acknowledged (G. Epistolario III, p. III) as the starting point of his own researches.

Finally, the German scholar A. Wilmanus should be honourably mentioned for calling Sabbadini's attention to various letters of Guarino, previously unknown, from his own collection.
The first scholar actually to publish letters of Guarino was B. Pez in *Thesaurus anecdotum novissimus* (Augsburg, 1729) VI, Pt. III, p. 154 ff, where the group addressed to Leonello d'Este is printed. Pez was followed by Giorgi, who published four of Guarino's letters from the *Chrysolorina* in *Raccolta di opuscoli di Calolera* (Venice, 1741) XXV.

The famous *Miscellanea Tioli* compiled in the eighteenth century by the Vatican librarian, Tioli, and his assistant Verani, and now in the University Library at Bologna, contains a vast amount of humanistic material, including letters of Guarino, from which Verani gave copious extracts in *Giornale dei letterati d' Italia* (Modena, 1780) XX, p. 235-305.

J. B. kittarelli in *Bibliotheca codicum manu scriptorum S. Michaelis Vezetiarum propo Muranum* (Venice, 1779) noted several letters of Guarino and gave extracts from codices containing Guariniana.

Finally, Carlo Rosmini in his 3 volume work *La vita e disciplina di Guarino Veronese e dei suoi discepoli* (Brescia, 1805-06) gave extracts from various letters of Guarino, but brought forth no material previously unknown.

Such is the general background to Sabbadini's collation. The only major source of MSS, to which he was unable to find access, was the great Philipps of Cheltenham collection, which in his time was in course of being sold off. In *G. Epistolario III*, p. XXI he suggested that more Guariniana might issue any day from "pecuniosa America" to which most of the lots went. Sotheby's, who handled
the sales, have no record of the various purchases, since their 
records were destroyed by fire. I have attempted to trace new 
Guariniana in Phillips of Cheltenham Mss. in America, but without 
success.

Some desiderata should, however, be mentioned. Maffei in 
*Verona Illustrata* (Milan, 1825) III, p. 158 mentions a Codex 
Bevilacqua 5 containing 22 letters of Guarino, then in Verona, 
among them a letter to the people of Vicenza. This can be securely 
identified as Letter 342. Maffei says the others were to Francesco 
Zandrata, Bartolomeo Bronzon, and Vitaliano Faella and that the MS. 
also contained the replies of these men. Since Francesco Zandrata 
does not figure as a known correspondent of Guarino, the letters 
to him would constitute a new group.

In *Memorie per servizio all' istoria letteraria* (Venice, 1755) 
V, Pt. II, pp. 9-12, 29, 31, 32, 36, 43-44 there is mention of a 
manuscript, the property of Count Onigo of Treviso, containing 22 
letters of Vergerio, letters of Giovanni da Spilimbergo, Leonardo 
Bruni, and one from Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna to Cardinal 
Zabarella, orations of Zabarella and orations and 32 letters of 
Guarino.

Quirini in *Diatribae praecipuus* pp. 121-122, 132, 140, 
142-143, 192, 209, and 374 cites a Brescian MS. Four of the letters 
can be identified as 142, 167, 170, 221 in Sabbadini's edition. 
All were to Bartolomeo Pellegrino.

Giuliani in *Archivio Veneto* VII, p. 177-79 discusses a MS "Saibante 428," now lost.
There is also a description by Verani in Giornale dei letterati d'Italia XX, pp. 286-87, 300-01 of a MS. in the Biblioteca Incoronata in Milan, which contained Letters 493, 494, 604, and 668.

Finally, there is a group in a MS. now lost (See Letters 936-946 in Summaries).

Since Sabbadini's work, 11 new letters have come to light.

Perhaps the most interesting is a Greek letter, which I have identified as written to Leonardo Giustinian, which was found by E. Lobel in MS. Bywater 38 in the Bodleian Library and published, exactly as it stands in the MS., by Lobel in "A Greek letter of Guarino and other things," Bodleian Quarterly Record V (1926-29) p. 43. I deal with this as Letter 56A in Summaries and discuss it more fully in The letters written in Greek. MS. Bywater 38 was acquired for the Bodleian at Southeby's sale on 16th December 1903. It also contains a translation by Guarino of Isocrates' Laus Helenae (a translation previously unknown), the commentarioli of Guarino in slightly fuller form than had previously been known, and an interesting Latin letter from Guarino to P. Emilian, which I deal with as 4A in Summaries.

Four other letters have filtered through by what seems a bizarre route. In "Some unpublished correspondence of Guarino da Verona," Italian Studies II (1939), p. 110-117, Roberto Weiss called attention to MS. A 100,1300 in the Imperial University Library in Tokio. It had been a bequest of Canon Streeter in 1923, who had acquired it from his uncle. Whence his uncle acquired it is unknown. Weiss
suggests that the original items came to England via Richard Petworth, and were copied 1450–1460 for William Chart in the monastery of Christ Church at Canterbury. From Canterbury it passed to James Goldwell, Bishop of Norwich, who left it to All Souls College in Oxford. It was there during the Reformation but subsequently disappeared. The only important letter of the four I have called 193A in Summaries. The others are included as 200A, B, C.

Augusto Campana in "Una lettera inedita di Guarino," Italia medievale e umanistica V (1962) p. 171-178 discusses MS 135 in the University Library at Urbino, which contains Barbaro's De re uxoria and three letters addressed to Piero dei Medici, one of them headed "Guarinus Veronensis C.V. Petro Medico a.p.d." It bears the date 16th November, but no year. Campana argues successfully (p. 173-174) that it must have been 1458 or 1459, more probably the former. His arguments are readily available and need not be repeated here. I deal with this letter as 984 in Summaries.

P. O. Kristeller in "Renaissance Research in Vatican Manuscripts," Manuscripta 1 (1957) p. 80, n. 37 had stated: "In a miscellany of the fifteenth century, col. 100v.42 of the Cathedral Library in Toledo... I found several humanistic rarities by Guarino and others." The odd circumstances under which Kristeller chanced upon this MS are related by S. Prete in "Two humanistic anthologies," Studi e testi (Città del Vaticano, 1964) p. 9-10. It had in fact been referred to by Rosmini, Guarino II, p. 120,121 (in discussing the poems of Guarino's son Girolamo) and by Giuliani, Della Letteratura...
Veronese al cadere del secolo XV (Bologna, 1876) p. 78 (in listing the MSS. containing Guarino's poetry). Acting on Kristeller's hint, I obtained a microfilm of the Toledo MS. from the librarian Canon Francesco Ribera, but had time only to examine the Guariniana contained in it before the appearance in 1964 of the article, already referred to, by Prete in Studi e testi p. 7-72 (plus 4 appendices, p. 75-89 and an index of incipits of items in the Toledo MS and Codex Barberianus latinus, which contain many parallel items). I content myself with noting the items relevant to Guarino:

Item 10 (ff. 12r.-13v): a letter, hitherto unknown, from Guarino to a priest named "Marchio" ("Marchesco" in Italian). This is dealt with as Letter 985 in Summaries.

Items 12 and 13 (ff. 13r.-14r.; 14r.-20r.): Guarino's Letter 29 to Floro Valerio, already known, and his treatise on the diphthongs, of which there are many editions (See Giuliani, Della Letteratura Veronese pp. 78, 108, 112, 152).

Item 14 (ff. 20v.-21r.): Guarino's Letter 134 to Cristoforo da Parma.

Item 23 (ff. 63v.-64r.): Guarino's Letter 689 to Leonello d'Este.

Item 24 (ff. 64r.-65r.): Guarino's Letter 688 to Leonello.

Item 25 (ff. 65v.-66r.): Guarino's Letter 678, with the verses on the Seven Sages, to Leonello.

Item 26 (ff. 66v.-67r.): Guarino's Letter 687 to Leonello.

Item 27 (ff. 66v.-68v.): Guarino's Letter 710 to Leonello.
Item 28 (ff. 68v-69v): Guarino's Letter 593 to Leonello
Item 29 (ff. 69v-70v): Guarino's Letter 603 to Leonello
Item 30 (ff. 70v-72v): A letter addressed to Leonello requesting that he follow the example set by his father and grant a certain amount of oil for the altar lamp and a supply of wood for the resident priests in the Church of Santo Spirito (for the location of which see the map facing sec. 200 of my Life of Guarino). Prota attributes this letter to Guarino, without giving reasons for so doing. Presumably the position of the letter in the MS amid other Guariniana influenced him. But it cannot be by Guarino because (1) Guarino's name nowhere appears, nor is there any internal evidence to suggest his authorship (2) the style is not that of Guarino (3) it does not bear the classical salutation in the form habitually employed by Guarino (4) it is subscribed "Tui accolae Sancti Spiritus." C. Colombo, "Quattro lettere inedite di Guarino," Italia medioevale e umanistica VIII (1965) p. 213, n. 4 suggests that it may have been written by Guarino as a commission for the priests of Santo Spirito, but I would reject this for reasons 2-4 above. The letter is dated "VI nonas oc." (2nd October) and the year, I suggest, would be 1442, when Leonello succeeded to the marquisate and therefore an appropriate one to request the renewal of privileges accorded under his father's regime.
Item 31 (ff. 72v-75v): Guarino's Letter 684 to Leonello,
Item 35 (ff. 94v-95v): Francesco Barbaro's letter to Guarino printed as 573 in G. Enistolario.

Item 43 (f. 104v): a fragment of the oration delivered by Guarino at Easter 1430 on the knighting of Paolo Filippo Guantieri (cf. Life of Guarino sec. 175).

Item 61 (f. 157r): verses by Guarino in praise of Leonello on his accession as marquis (not published by Sabbadini in his list of G's poems in La scuola e gli studi p. 230-231)


Item 68 (f. 159r-v): verses "De nive" of Guarino to Leonello, published by Sabbadini, La scuola e gli studi p. 227.

Item 71 (f. 160r): Guarino's Letter 482 to Giacomo Zilioli

Item 73 (f. 160v): Guarino's verses to Gioacchino (Letter 390)

Item 77 (ff. 162r-164r): Guarino's Letter 386 to Pisanello

Item 85 (ff. 169r-170v): Guarino's Letter 599 to Verona


Item 90 (f. 173v): verses by Guarino on the burial of Niccolò, publ. by Borsetti, ibid. p. 41.

Item 91 (ff. 173v-174r): an epitaph on Niccolò, attributed to Guarino by Borsetti, ibid. 1, p. 41.

*I propose shortly to publish a selection of Guarino's orations, and a series of articles on items 43, 61, 89, 90, 91, and 144 in Frete's list.*

Item 96 (ff. 176r-178v): poem to Niccolò Strozzi by Guarino:

Item 122 (ff. 201v-202v): Guarino's Letter 612 to Marrasio


Item 168 (ff. 269r-272v): poem by Lodovico Sardi to Guarino.
(On Sardi, see Prete's Appendix IV)

Then in 1965 a Ms. in private hands yielded up three further letters of Guarino unknown to S babadini. This was Ms. 4,4, now in the Public Library at Como. It was discovered by Cesare Colombo, who published his findings in "Quattro lettere inedite di Guarino," Italia medioevale e umanistica VIII (1965), p. 213-242. There are in addition to many other humanistic pieces, 25 letters of Guarino, including the three hitherto unknown. These three I deal with as 986, 987, 988 in Summaries.

Colombo (ibid, p. 233-39) also published and discussed the text of a letter which S babadini had noted as Letter 950*, but attributed to Guiniforte Barzizza on stylistic grounds and because of the endings: "Vale pater optima et quod semper fecisti ama. Guinifortum tuum." Colombo argued (p. 233-37) that it was from Guarino to Bishop Zenone Castiglioni; but after his article had gone to press, saw that Bertalot had argued more convincingly that the letter should be assigned to Gasparino Barzizza. Colombo

*Colombo's reference (p. 233, n.1) is wrong.
accordirir; ly rotr¬acted bin opixio t "(p. P'37-38). .' Inca the letter 
exhibitc turne of pt rueo charactori^tfc tf Gas rarino t izzz t, nom e 
of them exactly paralleled in Letter 29 in Bertalot, "Die Altste 
Briefsammlung des Gasparinus Barzizza;" Beiträge zur Forschung, 
N.F., 2 (Munich, 1929) p. 75-76, there is little doubt that Bertalot 
was right:

Thus a total of 11 letters has been added since Sabbadini's 
edition, and it is still possible that more will turn up.

In the main, I have been content to accept the readings in 
the text established by Sabbadini. I have, however, proposed 
elemendations in the text of Letters 1 and 829 (see The letters 
written in Greek) and 192 (see Summary). In matters of orthography, 
there is no doubt that Sabbadini followed Guarino's own practice, 
particularly in writing the diphthongs, as evidenced by the few 
autograph letters that have survived and by the fact that Guarino 
wrote a treatise on diphthongs and was one of the first champions 
of their restoration.

In some cases patience and acumen are necessary to establish 
what Guarino actually wrote. The multiplicity of MSS. for some 
letters, such as 669, made Sabbadini's task far from easy, but 
he clearly understood the source of the most common corruptions.

This was a desire on the part of copyists or collectors to "improve" 
the style. They had no conception of preserving the integrity of 
the text, because Guarino's letters were valued not as social or 
historical documents but as models of stylistic elegance capable 
of further elaboration.
For the text of Letter 2, for example, Sabbadini drew upon 2 MSS. At first he used only Codex Marcianus latinus XIV 30 f.19, which yields the following reading in lines 40-44 of Sabbadini’s text: “Sunt autem haec philocalos idest qui politus esse studiose curat; democratia, quod ex populo gubernatam significat civitatem; monarchia, unico administratam principem ditionem: philoponia, quod laboris amorem dicit et desiderium.” Later, however, he found another version in Codex Canonicus latinus 140 f.164 in the Bodleian Library, and in Vol. I, p.700-702 published another text of Letter 2 based on the Bodleian MS. The above passage in the Bodleian MS. runs: “Sunt autem haec: gr. philocalos idest qui politus esse. studiosus curat; et gr. democratia, quod ex populo gubernatam civilitatem, sicuti gr. monarchia unico administratam principem ditionem et gr. philoponia, quod laboris amorem dicit et desiderium.” The second version is probably closer to what Guarino originally wrote, because the scribe was conscientious enough to leave a fenestra in the text, indicating the omission of Greek words by the writer of Letter 2 had clearly been concerned to produce a free-running and more elegant text. It is easy to restore the Greek words φιλόκαλος, δημοκρατία, μοναρχία, φιλοπονία, and the reading: “principe,” which had obviously become “principem” in the second and otherwise more correct version because of the similarity of endings in the words on either side of it. Again, in the Bodleian MS. we find: “si eius sermonis oratum fortasse non explicaverit, quem prisci nostrates nihil admirabere,” which appears
in an "improved" but for that very reason probably less correct
version in Letter 2 as: "si sermonis ornatum fortasse non explicuerit,
quo modo prisci nostrates factitavere, nihil admirabere."

Since collectors were interested only in stylistic ideas to
be culled from the main body of the letter, in taking copies they
frequently omitted dates and the names of people as extraneous
details. Letter 121, for example, bears the curt salutation
"G. Pau" and no date. We may be sure, however, that Guarino
originally wrote something like "Guarinus Veronensis Paulo suo s.p.d."
and dated the letter. In other cases the salutations seem genuine at
first sight, but one finds variations in the MSS. For instance,
Letter 688 in the 6 sources used by Sabbadini bears the salutation
"Guarinus Veronensis illustri principi d. Leonello Estensi sal. p.d."
The case is by no means unique. As for the omission of proper
names, Letter 186 presents a typical case. The text is found in 3
MSS. in Ravenna, Lyons, and Padua. The Paduan MS. contains a
number of obvious scribal errors, but is probably closer to the
original text of Guarino because the others have clearly suffered
interpolations. The Paduan MS. gives the name "Iacobum Veritatem,"
which is pruned in the Lyons MS. to "Iacobum nostrum." The date is
missing in all 3 MSS.

Letter 275 is interesting because we possess the autograph
(Archipivo di Verona, Ospitale Varieta, A 8, 3) and the apograph
(Cod. Ferrariensis 16.NA.1 f. 19 in the Public Library at Ferrara).
A comparison of the readings illustrates three things: the ease with
which corruptions crept into the text; the misguided attempts of the apographer to "correct" the original; and his impatience with "irrelevant" details such as dates and proper names. The readings of the autograph are underlined.

(i) *ut...te ipsum audire visus sum* becomes "*ut...te ipsum audire visus sum*" — probably a mere slip of the pen.

(ii) *Venit praeterea nostrae consuetudinis in mentem et communium studiorum, quibus adeo animo delinitus sum, ut inter hos barbaros et agrestes homines versari me factus sum immemor et tecum esse tecum loqui tecum victitare me putem.* becomes "*Venit praeterea nostrae consuetudinis et communium studiorum, quibus adeo animo delinitus sum, ut inter hos barbaros et agrestes versari factus sum immemor et tecum esse tecum loqui tecum victitare me putem.*" The apographer clearly did not favour writing the diphthongs, and seems to have attempted improvements by omitting "homines" and the enclitic "que" in the triad at the end, contrary to Guarino's usual practice in such instances. Further, he was either a careless or merely ignorant copyist, since "sum" for "sim" appears again; one suspects ignorance, for he does not seem to have understood Guarino's genitive after a verb of remembering, and what he wrote yields no good sense.

(iii) *solicitutudinis* becomes "*solicitutudinis.*"
(iv) Tadea suae dulcissimae commatri pluriman salutem nuntiat is omitted

(v) Ex Pergen XVII octobris and the address Optimo ac peritissimo viro Damiano Eurpo compatri suavissimo, Veronae are both omitted.

Letter 500 shows how the text of a letter was often regarded as a mine for phrases. There are 2 MSS. of Letter 500. One in the University Library at Padua (1261 f. 42v) bears no salutation and begins: "Quantam in percipiendo amicitiae nostrae fructu iacturam fecerim proximis intellexi litteris, quas forti viro Iohanni Stelino commilitioni tuo ad me dedisti; in eis enim lecitantis tanta voluptate affectus sum, ut nihil supra." The other in the Vatican (Cod. Vot. 5127 f. 68) gives only the beginning of the letter, and in this form: "Guarinus Nicolao suo a.p.d. Si vales denique valeo. Quantam imperticiendo amicitiae nostrae fructu iacturam fecerim proximis intellexi litteris, quas a me dedisti. In his enim lectitantis tanta voluptate affectus sum quod vix dicere queo, quod vix fieri posse crediderim, quod vix explicari posse, quod vix dici possem, vixque dicere possem." Here we have the case of a writer, probably a beginner in Latin, simply tacking on a formula for opening letters (which is meaningless, since the letter was definitely written to Battista Bevilacqua) and collecting a series of alternative phrases for expressing the extent of one's joy (a commonplace which any would-be epistolographer would need).
It is ironical that Guarino, a cornerstone of whose teaching methods was to encourage students to collect phrases in this way, should fall a victim to butchers of his text. On the credit side, however, one can say that it was a compliment to Guarino that his letters proved a favourite hunting ground for authors of epistolary formularies, such as Erasmus' De arte conscribendi epistulas and Albrecht von Eyb's Margarita poetica, which uses short passages from Letters 142, 167, 170, 466, and 832.
In Epistolario di Guarino III, p. iv-v, Sabbadini makes much of their "familiar" character, claiming that they alone of all humanistic collections preserve a "candid and sincere document of the man and his times," and that the social historian may use their evidence as confidently as that of Cicero's Letters to Atticus. Sabbadini ascribes this happy condition to the fact that Guarino did not collect his own letters, and could not, therefore, have introduced the many changes, interpolations and embellishments, which disfigure the epistolaries of other humanists who edited their own letters for publication. Sabbadini notes certain phrases which occur here and there — for example, "plura non dicam" (Letter 431, line 20) and "tu tacebis" (Letter 432, line 11) — which, we are led to believe, stamp the entire collection as truly "familiar".

Unfortunately, Sabbadini does not define his use of the term "familiar" closely; nor does he discuss how many letters may justly be termed "familiar", in any sense, and how many may not. Instead, he gives the impression that virtually all of them may be read at their face value, and their information taken as literally true and entirely sincere. This is a misleading impression, and requires considerable qualification. In particular, I propose to examine the meaning of the term "familiar", and to separate, quantitatively, those letters which seem to me deserving of the tag "familiar" from a fair number which
are manifestly not.

By derivation, a familiar letter is one addressed to a friend, as opposed to the public at large. If we accept this working definition, we may term Cicero's letters to Atticus, and those of Guarino, "familiar," since they are addressed, ostensibly, to friends. But here a complication arises; for what are we to say of letters which, although nominally addressed to a friend, are in reality manifestos, intended for a wider public? One might instance Plato's Seventh Letter to Dionysius of Syracuse, a manifesto if ever there was one. Again, what of the myriads of letters written in later Greek and Roman times that were, openly or covertly, vehicles of ostentation? An honest critic cannot escape the need to draw at least a broad distinction between letters which are, in a sense, show-pieces, destined to enhance the writer's name and fame as widely as possible, and those which are spontaneous effusions, to answer a present and private need. It would seem to me that before a letter may be justly called "familiar" it must be addressed to one person, and be intended for the eyes of that person only. That is the criterion I have used in deciding what letters of Guarino are familiar. Having established it, I would anticipate some later remarks, by pointing the caution that even if a letter fulfils the conditions of familiarity, its candour and sincerity are not necessarily guaranteed; hence it seems unwarranted to assume, as Sabbadini does, that Guarino's letters contain, in every instance, the plain and unvarnished truth.
At this point, it will be necessary to discuss the elegant, showy kind of letter, intended primarily for the eye of posterity, a species which Horace Walpole, in writing to George Montague, stigmatized as "good letters," and affected to despise.

Under the Roman peace, time lay heavy on many well-bred hands, and letter-writing became a favourite diversion. This was natural in men whose education was predominantly rhetorical, but who could find no satisfying outlet for their accumulated skills, short of turning poetaster, professor or lawyer. Even politics offered little scope for rhetorical display after the establishment of autocracy and a regular civil service; and the adoption of a "useful profession" such as that of a teacher, held no appeal to most gentlemen. Juvenal's complaint against the "pestilential habit of scribbling" (Sat. 7, 51 "tenet insatiabile multos/Scribendi cacoethes") is well-known, and the most popular species of this general evil was the ceaseless production of polished letters, often on quite worthless themes. One is reminded of the remark made (perhaps unfairly) of the Renaissance humanists: "Having nothing to say, they said it interminably." So refined had the art become, even by the time of Demetrius of Phalerum (345-283 B.C.), that he listed twenty-one separate varieties of letter; and if one were lucky enough to live in the time of Proclus (412-485 A.D.) one could benefit from his classification of forty-one types, each divided into a variety of "moods." Cicero himself recognizes that there are many kinds of set letters, in Ad
Fam. II. 4. 1: "Epistularum genera multa esse non ignoras."
The prevalent fashion, then, from Hellenistic times down to the end of the Roman Empire, was to produce "good letters," full of recognized common-places, and subservient to some system of rhetoric. People kept such letters, and hoped that their own would be kept and transmitted to posterity.

The Younger Pliny was an inveterate correspondent on all manner of topics; but many of his letters were written purely as an exhibition of rhetorical pyrotechnics. One thinks of such letters as the fine piece on the eruption of Vesuvius and the death of his uncle. Even Cicero, busy politician that he was, found the time to compose an enormous number of letters. Such men were so steeped in rhetoric that composition must have flowed fast and gloriously from their pen, a skill recovered during the Revival of Learning and practised for centuries afterwards, but lost to our world.

Amidst this welter of fine writing, Cicero's letters have been held to be exceptional. He felt bound by no set rules and expressed himself at random on everyday topics. There is an interesting passage, referred to above, in Ad Fam. II. 4. 1, in which he discusses letters and their function: "You are aware that there are many kinds of letter, but the commonest is that for which the skill was invented, to inform those who are absent of anything which it is in their interests to know, or in ours that they should know... There are two remaining types of letter which greatly delight me, the one friendly and light-hearted (familiare et iocosum) the other formal and serious (severum et grave)." In the main, Cicero's
letters were intended to impart information and provide a substitute for direct conversation. The stand-point of nineteenth century scholarship, as exemplified in Sabbadini, was to assume, therefore, that everything in Cicero's letters may be taken as an unguarded truth, "sine fuco ac fallaciis," to use Cicero's own words. The argument that when a man unburdens himself in a letter to a friend he must be telling the whole truth seems attractive at first sight; but it is a dangerous assumption to make.

Even in the nineteenth century there were critics who realized this. Jeans, for example, observes in his Life and Letters of Marcus Tullius Cicero. Macmillan, 1887, p. VIII-IX: "Cicero must be used only with caution and knowledge as a historian. When Mr. Forsyth, for example, describes the tortures of Trebonius, or states that 'twenty thousand of the noblest youths in Rome testified their attachment for him by changing their dress,' because Cicero does so in a speech or a letter, he very justly exposes himself to the sarcasms of Professor Beesly" and "it is much too confidently asserted that we always have in the Letters a genuine record of Cicero's feelings." This is judicious criticism; for many of Cicero's letters, like Ad Fam. 1. 9. to Publius Lentulus Spinther, are in no sense familiar; and some others were clearly intended for publication. The fact that he sometimes forbids Atticus to circulate a particular letter, as in Ad Atticum 1. 16. indicates that he knew many were being circulated; and there is a revealing quotation in a letter discussed by Richard S. Stewart in Transactions and Proceedings of the American
Philological Association, Vol. XCIII, 1962, p. 465: "bre-vior haec ipsa epistula est, quod, cum incertus esset, ubi esset, nollebamus illum nostrum familiaris sermonem in alienas manus devenire." The fact that he specifically wants this letter to be private indicates that he was not so concerned in every instance. Finally, we know, from Ad Atticenum XVI. 5, that Cicero intended to edit some of his letters. Jeans believes that "it is in the highest degree improbable that Cicero should not have known that Atticus was preserving his letters for publication (Cornelius Nepos: Life of Atticus 16)."

If it is objected that Cicero's letters contain much that would be damaging to his career -- such as his sneers at Pompey or Caesar -- one may admit that Cicero obviously wanted some things to be kept secret, and these passages must hold a peculiar interest for historians. But Cicero knew he could rely on his friend's discretion, and it is at least a possibility that, while he knew certain letters would be kept hidden, he also hoped they would filter through to posterity and set the record straight, and specifically in the way Cicero wished it to be set straight. If Sabbadini was aware of any of these cautions, he gives no sign of it.

I should further add to Jeans' comments that I cannot believe that Cicero, or any other great man, including Guarino, ever writes in a completely unguarded way. He may indeed affect to be writing "off the cuff", or as Guarino often puts it in a phrase borrowed from Jerome, "quicquid in buccam
venerit"; but instinctively he tailors his thought to suit the addressee. Examples in Guarino are 281 and 350, to name but two at random. Again, we cannot invariably be sure that a writer will not falsify facts, or give a deliberately misleading slant to facts, for any number of private reasons. An example of this is 666, where Guarino, obviously to avoid the suspicion that he was a homosexual or that he favoured homosexuality, retracts his previous admiration of Panormita's *Hermaphroditus* (346). Finally, I do not think it likely that any man with literary pretensions ever writes without at least a sub-conscious thought for posterity. The letters of non-entities come under an entirely different set of psychological rules. The penalty of greatness is that one cannot escape it.

If, therefore, we exclude as "familiar" the elegant epistle addressed, to all intents and purposes, to the judicious critics of after ages, and concentrate upon letters which seem, at least, to have been written for a more ephemeral and practical purpose, we must not forget the need for caution even with these. Each must be judged useful as evidence only in the light of its attendant circumstances; and this is often a very subtle business. We must guard against lyrical claims, certainly, that the letters of Guarino are the only "true document of the man and his times." Guarino wrote, in my opinion, with a degree of caution which Cicero does not display. He is always careful with his style, despite many disclaimers of the kind we find in 665: "soleo namque familiari quodam nostrati et vulgari
scribendi genere uti, ut quicquid in buccam veniat excidat, nullis expolitum exquisitionibus ornamentis." One gets the feeling that this is only a device to disarm criticism, especially when one notes the excellence of the Latin and the seven quotations from Vergil, Terence and Persius that the author inserts in a letter of thirty-six lines. Again, he is punctilious, even painfully so, with his compliments, accurate with his citations and guarded with his comments, especially when they touch on the reputation of another scholar. It is true that he could be vicious, as in the invective against Niccoli (17), or hard-hitting, as in his famous polemic with Poggio over the relative merits of Scipio and Julius Caesar; but in such cases he is careful to back up his statements with reasons. These two, of course, are public show-pieces; but even in his "familiare" and "iocosum" vein, he is by no means cavalier with what he puts on paper. His letters are remarkably free from controversial material, as a general rule; and I believe this was a deliberate policy, which strengthened as the years passed. As his fame increased, so would his consciousness of it, allied with a regard for its preservation. Thus we sometimes find him shy of mentioning names (e.g. 431, where he warns Zilioli not to hire a certain man as a tutor for his sons, but declines to mention the candidate, Panormita, or the real reason, which was a suspicion of homosexuality) or resorting to initials (221 ...) or cryptic descriptions (427, 429). We must always allow for his consciousness that any of his letters might be passed round, a consciousness clearly shown as early as Letter 199, where he
defends himself against charges of slandering Leonardo Bruni by citing the letters he has written in praise of that scholar, and which are plainly assumed to be in circulation: "Exstant nonnullae qualescunque...non mediocres laudum suarum testes." Another example is 614, line 50: "cum complures ipsius ad Guarinum et Guarini ed eum epistulas extare nullus ignorat." I believe that Guarino was careful, because he was as concerned as anyone with his *fama*, or reputation; and this belief accords well with what we know of humanistic psychology.

We know, for instance, that they attached great importance to the opinion of posterity. Petrarch had begun the active cult of *fama* and it was in full swing by the early fifteenth century. Scholars believed that they would be judged primarily on the beauty of their Latin style; but they were also at pains to set their actions and thoughts in the best possible light. To both ends, Petrarch, Salutati, Boccaccio, Bruni, Traversari, Poggio, Guiniforte Barzizza, Francesco Barbaro, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini and Francesco Filelfo are all known to have spent much time and effort on revising the text of their collected letters. They kept copies of everything and finally issued definitive epistolaries, but only after omitting much and adding more, with considerable stylistic embellishments. In the process, spontaneity and truth were sometimes obscured; so that we cannot, in every case, be sure that we are reading the writer's original thoughts. Petrarch, for example, in his *Familiares I. I.* expanded three classical quotations in his original letter to no fewer than ten in the revised edition (Sabbadini, Rendic. R. Inst. Lomb.)
sc. lett. XXIX, 1906, p. 869-72). The labour of revision is attested by Petrarch himself, Pier Candido Decembrio, Panormita, Bruni, Salutati and Piccolomino; and however felicitous their final results may be, their letters must be regarded as vitiated documents.

Sabbadini makes much of the fact that Guarino did not edit his letters in this way. Indeed, he bases his claim for their candour and sincerity, and hence their complete reliability as evidence, on this circumstance. But as Sabbadini himself admits, Guarino was not alone amongst the humanists in failing to keep copies of his letters. Lorenzo Valla (Opera p. 45) says: "I do not have my letters, because I am not in the habit of copying them and putting them into books." Aurispa was another. But the fact that these three scholars did not collect their own letters does not mean that they were careless about what they put down on paper.

There is a good prima facie case for saying that this was true of Guarino. When would he have found time to copy, collect and edit all his letters? He must have been the busiest scholar of his age. Petrarch's search for patronized leisure did him no credit, even with his friend Boccaccio. Poggio, as Apostolic secretary, often had time on his hands, as at Constance when he had so little work to do (indeed he was unemployed for a time) that he passed two years rummaging for manuscripts in monasteries; and as Chancellor of Florence, he probably had more time than he cared to admit. It is interesting to note that Lauro Martines lends support to this contention, in his recent book The Social
World of the Florentine Humanists, Princeton U.P., 1963, p. 258: "Poggio, counting on his name and reputation, had neglected the office's minor duties." There was, according to Martines, a strong feeling that the office should not be a burden to the incumbent; and there is no reason to believe that it was to Salutati or Bruni. Piccolomini was not overworked, for he spent much time in literary pursuits such as the Commentaries, while Biondo seems to have been the willing horse of the Vatican. Panormita and P.C. Decembrio spent years in private employment, more or less as status symbols, and neither the King of Naples nor the Duke of Milan seems to have extracted his pound of flesh. By contrast, Guarino's life was an almost continual round of work, as his correspondence clearly shows. He often talks of his unending labours (e.g. in 558, 577), usually as an excuse for failing to write, but probably sincerely; for when he was not actually teaching, which involves much preparation and some correcting, he was preparing translations from Greek, writing practical text books or commissioned speeches, superintending his property, looking after his family and pupils, engaging servants and so on. At Verona, he was called upon to fulfil various civic functions, such as envoy to Venice (cf. Anon. Panegyrist) and official German interpreter to a guild of merchants (Life, sec. 119). When he retired to the country, he liked to relax with some light reading. The marvel is that he contrived, amidst this multifarious activity, to write so many letters. It seems to have been beyond Vittorino. But even granting Guarino a constitution like the Hellenist, Didymus "Bronzeguts"
the task of editing so many letters must have seemed impossible.

A grave objection to Sabbadini's claim for the universal familiarity of Guarino's letters is the fact that many are show-pieces. One might call them "good letters." These I have listed in the table at the end of this discussion, and they are set-pieces, which he wished or hoped would be circulated, or letters of dedication, which would be seen by many people.

As in later Antiquity, so during the Revival of Learning it was a common practice to keep letters and show them to others. But the humanists did not write letters out of mere indolence. They had a vested interest in the skill, and their ceaseless production was the outcome of necessity. Quite apart from their native Italian taste for ostentation and oratory, they were inveterate advertisers; for their prime consideration was to secure a position, and having secured it, to keep it, in the teeth of fierce competition. One method of commending oneself to prospective employers is to insist frequently, by virtuoso performance, on one's own genius. Friends were important to the humanists, because they could be counted on to spread one's praises, and sometimes damn one's enemies. A typical illustration is Letter 22: "(his letter) in which the more exaggerated the claims he makes for me, the more affection and goodness does he display towards me... he boasts of me as though I were the sort of man he is himself and the sort he would wish me to be, and praises me in his writings; which is the duty of a good man and a friend."
That Guarino was well aware of the value of publicity emerges again and again from his letters. Typical is Letter 129: "It is exceedingly gratifying to me to be loved by you (i.e. Battista Bevilacqua) but the most pleasing aspect is that this is known and talked about by people. It is, indeed, no mean praise to be discussed as pleasing to men of the first-rank, such as yourself." This sentiment, often backed by the quotation, "principibus placuisse viris non infima laus est," is so frequently voiced that it is a commonplace of the letters. The love of personal glory was undoubtedly a strong motive amongst the humanists; but glory without the financial fruits of glory was no comfort to the hungry professional scholar. Rich amateurs, like Niccoli or Giustinian, could afford to seek glory for its own sake, but men like Guarino and Filelfo, with large families to feed, were constrained to be pragmatic. There can be little doubt that large numbers of letters written by professional humanists were intended to be seen and admired by as many of the right people as possible. Jobs changed hands rapidly, and the price of security was eternal ostentation. Although Guarino's position was securer than most of his rivals', it was never assured. In this connexion, it is worth reading the speech of the Anonymous Panegyrist, translated as Appendix B.

Sabbadini glosses over the number of letters written by Guarino as advertisements of one kind or another. Indeed, he calls them nothing so brutal: "Eccezionalmente qualche lettera la divulgo egli stesso, p.e. la 56...e le 25 e 27," and he calls 145 an "exercise in composition." Letters 25 and 27
were surely circulated not merely to commemorate the death of Chrysoloras, but to show the world of prospective employers what a pupil of Chrysoloras could do; and 56, on the battle of Gallipoli, is a laudation of Venice and would certainly increase Guarino's popularity there. As for 145, one can hardly assume that Guarino was still writing schoolboy exercises at the ages of forty-five. What are we to call the many letters to Churchmen and princes, with whom he was scarcely on intimate terms? I have classed many of them as "familiar," but the note of deference is unmistakable; for example, in 875, to Bessarion, he uses "vestra" instead of his usual "tua," out of respect for Bessarion's rank. Letters 701 and 702 show the same tendency to choose words carefully; and 281, 350 and 395 are all good examples of how Guarino was careful to suit his words to the character of the addressee. What of the early letters to Mazzolato (e.g. 368, 369, 370), who was in a position to secure employment for him? Since Guarino wrote so many letters to people to whom he had to show deference, or whom he felt constrained to impress (e.g. 230, 352, 138, 875), I cannot but think the strictly "familiar" content of the epistolary is thereby lessened. It is an extremely subtle business sorting out what letters are intended to increase Guarino's public image from those which are merely ephemeral communications, with no thought of self-advantage in a professional sense. In the table at the end of this discussion, I have listed any letter, over which I had the least doubt, as familiar. The other headings include all
letters which seem obvious specimens of ostentation or ingratiating. Out of a total of 765 letters, 125 will be found to be non-familiar, and 640 are classed as familiar. But even in the latter class, there are many where professional advantage is a concomitant and instinctive consideration. Having pointed out some necessary cautions, and discussed the limitations we must impose on Sabbadini's assessment, I must now agree that there is real value in Guarino's letters for the social historian. They are certainly more interesting than the average letters of his times; and this is due, in part, to their function in Guarino's life, and to the nature of the subjects on which he chose to write.

Despite the care he took with them, he does not appear to have regarded them as the ultimate repository of his fame, and nowhere even hints that he might have; although in 862, he is plainly relieved that an early and un-Ciceronian letter, unearthed by his son, will not be disseminated beyond the family circle, and there is some notion that he destroyed a group of juvenile letters, lest their frivolous nature should tarnish his reputation (cf. my essay, 'Guarino and Humour'). Any hopes of immortality he nurtured were probably based on his standing as a scholar and his translations from Greek. In support of this, we have Letter 6, where he asks Roberto dei Rossi for his candid criticism of a version of Plutarch's Life of "Flaminius," "ut quid de me ipso expectem in posterum tua auctoritate velut oraculo quodam aut commonefactus aut confirmatus intelligam."

Whether "in posterum" refers to his prospects in this life, Guarino consistently writes "Flaminius". It should be "Flamininus".
or to posthumous fame, it is clear he values his translations highly. For the humanists of that time, they were the most obvious source of honour and income.

The main function of letters, therefore, was to oil the wheels of life; so apart from those written for purposes of business, obligement, flattery, recommendation, advertisement, and panache, there were many -- and they are the majority -- written purely for pleasure. It is a commonplace of this group, borrowed, of course, from Cicero: Ad Fam. II. 4. l. and Jerome: Enist. 29. l., that letters bring friends together and provide an agreeable substitute for direct conversation. A typical example is Letter 150, lines 7-11: "tecum inter legendum esse videor, te audire, te videre; quo fit ut litteris ipsis gratias et ingentes quidem habeam, quarum beneficio factum est ut longinquus tibi proximus et absens praesens fiam et qui te videre non possum tamen audiam." The Ciceronian passage on which such sentiments are modelled has already been referred to and translated. That of Jerome states: "The function of a letter is to write something of a familiar nature (de re familiaris) or about a topic of everyday conversation (de quotidiana conversatione) and in some manner bring those who are absent from each other together, as they exchange news concerning what they want or what has taken place; it is allowed that such a banquet of conversation be spiced betimes with the salt of learning." Good humanist that he was, Guarino took the lesson to heart. It is, however, interesting to read in Letter 762, of the year 1440, that the qualities he admired in Leonardo Bruni's let-
ters, which he claims to have read several times, from beginning to end, are "facilitas ingenii, splendor orationis, sententiarum gravitas et, quod in primis maximi facio, rerum de quibus ad amicos scribitur dignitas" -- vivacious thought, splendour of diction, the seriousness of the sentiments and dignity of subject. He goes on to say that Cicero's letters to Atticus are considered most dignified because they deal with politics and subjects of such weighty import, just as Bruni's deal with the history of the Roman curia and the Schism between the Churches. They are recommended to his young correspondent as a mine of knowledge on weighty matters and a sovereign guide for living, pleasurable to read and useful to remember.

If he really valued these qualities, which certainly characterize the letters of Bruni, a vast proportion of his own letters do not measure up to Bruni's standards; and this is our gain. It is quite true that the laudation of Bruni's work could apply to his own show-pieces; but most of the strictly familiar letters are, fortunately, on quite innocuous subjects, details of how the family is doing, what translations he is doing, what new manuscripts have been found, remarks on pupils' progress, requests for trifling loans, and so on; but because these details are innocuous, they are certain to be true. It is upon such that the social historian must fix, thankful that Guarino pursued a quiet life, away from the political arena so attractive to the Florentines and Lombards, and without a burning ambition for fame, based on an elaborate collection of "good letters."
If we treat each letter with care, we shall not allow this pleasant fact to run away with our judgement. We must not regard the epistolary as a consistently reliable document. The scholar is always there, thoughtful, guarded, and weighing his words; and we must be equally careful in weighing his. The following table, constructed after much thought, may be found useful.

Letters which may be termed "familiar" (particularly clear cases underlined)

Letters of dedication, intercession, or ingratiating:
2, 3, 4A, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 19, 21, 23, 29, 34, 35, 66, 138,
229, 230, 261, 342, 352, 426, 497, 513, 557, 560, 561, 574,
584, 619, 644, 650, 651, 667, 675, 676, 697, 706, 723, 727,
739, 771, 778, 812, 831, 856, 889, 905, 912, 913, 914, 915.

Letters of recommendation:
68, 87, 91, 92, 93, 100, 101, 102, 103, 293A, 294, 306, 309,
326, 396, 463, 565, 640, 689, 792, 922.

Letters of consolation:
72, 76, 104, 212, 414, 564, 798.

Show-nieces and didactic letters:
1, 17, 25, 27, 56, 113, 132 (verse), 133 (verse), 145, 189,
386 (verse), 390 (verse), 482 (verse), 520 (verse), 537
(verse), 580, 593, 599 (verse), 604, 620, 638 (verse), 775,
777, 779, 780, 785, 796, 803, 804, 805, 808, 813, 825, 890,
921 (verse), 926 (verse).

The remaining letters published by Sabbadini are as follows: 144 from others to Guarino, 7 by Guarino on behalf of others, 5 of doubtful authenticity, and 29 falsely attributed to him.
Guarino's Latin style and orthography

Sabbadini states in *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino* p. 83 that in letter-writing more than in any other literary form the humanists abandoned mediaeval Latin style. It seems therefore appropriate to review Guarino's style as found in his letters.

One short fragment fortuitously preserved in Letter 862 suggests that in his youth Guarino had inclined to the Latinity favoured by Marzagaia, who was probably his first teacher (Cf. my *Life of Guarino* sec. 9). We know from Marzagaia's *De modernis gestis* that he cultivated bizarre rhetorical effects, perverse word order (the verb, for example, rarely comes at the end), needless repetitions, and neologisms. Guarino's "Marzagaian" sentence reads: "Vobis regratior, quia de concernentibus capitaniatui meo tam honorificabiliter per unam vestram litteram vestra me advisavit sapientitudo." Further, if Guarino attended the notarial school of Giovanni Conversino da Ravenna at Padua, as seems likely, he would have been familiar with legalistic Latin and the methods of the mediaeval *Dictamina*. The latter were handbooks of style, divided into two parts: the first part dealt with *elocutio*,

...
which was subdivided into elegantia, compositio, and ornatus (figures of speech), as in the pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium, and a fourth section, derived from Martianus Capella, called numerus oratorius; the second part dealt with the rules for writing (dictare was the word used) history, contracts, charters, and letters. Of these the most important section was that on epistolography; it was mainly concerned with the correct use of set formulae in writing to dignitaries, especially those of the Church.

If Guarino composed much in these styles—and it is likely that he did—there are strong indications that he desired his early works suppressed after he gave his allegiance, sometime in the 1390's, to the humanistic movement: in Letter 4, 138, he dismisses Francesco Barbaro's request for some early prose and verse compositions with the words, "Desine igitur et dignas latebris nugas ne sub lucem retrahe"; and the fact that virtually nothing has survived from his juvenilia suggests that he destroyed as many of them as possible.

The change from mediaeval to humanistic style in Italy was a gradual and uneven process, begun by Petrarch and taken up with varying degrees of
enthusiasm and competence by avant garde scholars, who in general repudiated the living Latin of the artes (as mediaeval grammars were called), and began consciously to imitate the autores, among whom Cicero was commonly, although not universally, regarded as the sovereign model of excellence. But neither Petrarch nor his admirers claimed to be imitating Cicero's style prescriptively; the early humanists aimed only at eliminating "barbarisms" and infusing as much classical "purity" as possible into their Latin. Petrarch relied heavily on Cicero, but his style is distinctively his own; he was not so much writing "dead" Latin as attempting under the auspices of Cicero to cleanse, re-invigorate, and exalt the Latin of his own time. The same was true of Guarino. It was a sensible and realistic plan, for there were no adequate dictionaries or grammars of classical Latin in existence. Guarino's own Regulae (see Life of Guarino sec. 91) and De diphthongis (ibid sec. 92) were actually pioneer efforts in the direction of pure classicism. The early humanists had to study the received texts of classical authors, and build up their diction, grammar, and syntax by observation and memorization of the forms they found there. With
some justice Sabbadini gives Barzizza most credit for setting about a study of Cicero in a thoroughly systematic way with such works as his De compositione (Barzizii Opera 1 p. 1-14); but it should not be forgotten that many scholars before Barzizza had made detailed observations of Cicero's style. The later fruits of all this labour were such compilations as Mario Nizzoli's Observationes in Marcum Tullium Ciceronem, more usually referred to as Thesaurus Ciceronianus, in which are listed alphabetically, with their Greek equivalents, all the words used by Cicero, and a selection of phrases drawn exclusively from his works to illustrate his syntactical usages. The apex of prescriptive Ciceronianism came about the beginning of the sixteenth century with Cardinal Pietro Bembo, whose syntax was impeccably Ciceronian, and whose classicism was such that he always dated by the Kalends, Nones, and Ides; even in ecclesiastical documents he would use divi for "saints," senatores for "cardinals," and respublica for the Church.

But Guarino lived before Ciceronianism was propounded as a strict doctrine. Nevertheless he praises Cicero time and again, not only as "the father of eloquence", but as the finest
source of "character, learning, and eloquence."
A good idea of the value he placed on Ciceronian
studies may be gathered from his introductory
remarks to a course on the De officiis, translated
after Letter 213 in Summaries, but his passages
in praise of Cicero are legion. All his life
he admired Cicero's limpid beauty, virile refine-
ment, and pleasing sonority; but he was never
an apal of Cicero, and not hesitate to draw
upon Pliny, Valerius Maximus, Jerome, Augustine,
or any author who suited his purpose; for instance,
one of his most recurrent phrases is "pro mea
parvitate," a far from Ciceronian borrowing
from Valerius Maximus. He also used common mediaeval
vocabulary for such words as angelus (angel),
ecclesia (church), sancti (saints), and cardinales
(cardinals), without ransacking Cicero for their
nearest classical equivalents. His method of
dating, too, varies between such expressions as XII
Augusti and the formulae involving the Kalends, Nones,
or Ides. Guarino, then, was not attempting an
exact reproduction of Ciceronian style; indeed, he
often disclaims any real success as a stylist in the
Ciceronian manner. The sheer speed with which he
wrote his familiar letters would in any case have
precluded perfection of the kind sought by Bembo.
Guarino probably realized this, and he quite often disarms criticism by modestly claiming to write "quicquid in buccam venerit," a phrase used by Cicero in *Ad Atticum* 1, 12, 4, and also by Jerome. It is noticeable, however, that in letters obviously written for public dissemination (such as the polemic with Poggio over Caesar and Scipio) his style comes nearest to Ciceronian elegance. The wonder is that Guarino and the best of the early humanists were able to catch so much of Cicero's style and spirit (see, for instance, *Life of Guarino* sec. 104); their successes were many and brilliant, their failures few and excusable.

It is not known exactly when Guarino committed himself wholly to humanism, but it must have been before 1403, when he set out for Constantinople, and pretty certainly before 1400. He provides no real clue as to when he rejected mediaevalism or who or what spurred him on to do so. It was probably a gradual process culminating in the decision to visit Constantinople. What does seem clear is that he gave Petrarch no credit for his conversion. In letter 862, 20 ff., he reviews for the benefit of his son, Battista, the process by which letters were re-born in Italy: whereas once Ciceronian eloquence had been universally
sought, there followed a long period when it was unknown ("ignorabatur"), and its place was taken by "Prosperos Evas Columbas et chartulas," giving rise to "quaedam ... dicendi et scribendi horrens et inculta barbaries." The reference here is to the Epigrammata of Prospero of Aquitaine, a mediaeval scholastic text containing versified sententiae from the works of St. Augustine; to the Dittochaeon of Prudentius which consisted of 49 hexametric tetrastichs on biblical themes and began: "Eva columba fuit;" and to the De contemptu mundi minor, of uncertain authorship (Migne: P.L. 184 c. 1307), which began: "Chartula nostra tibi mittit, Raynalde, salutem." Sabbadini suggests (Guarino, Epistolario vol. 3 p. 462) that the form in which Guarino alludes to these works shows that he had not actually read them. But surely this is unlikely; his recollection of them in 1452, the date of Letter 862, would be blurred, but in any case he seems simply to be using a contemptuous farrago. The break from the barbarity represented by these words came, according to Guarino, spontaneously and without leadership from anyone ("nullo duce"); out of nature's goodness ("ex naturae bonitate") a spark began to glow, but "our ancestors" -- by whom
he means scholars of the fourteenth century -- "were too bleary-eyed ( lippiscentibus oculis ) to bear its light." Guarino then assigns the credit for restoring the true light in Italy to heaven and Manuel Chrysoloras (not necessarily, one feels, in that order). As I have elsewhere suggested (Life of Guarino secs. 12 and 23) it is a pity Guarino so little appreciated the Trecento scholars, especially Petrarch, who tells us in no uncertain terms: "Ab ipsa pueritia, quando ceteri omnes aut Prospero inhiant aut Esopo, ego libris Ciceronis incubui."

Traces of the pre-humanistic habits were still with him in Constantinople, the most obvious one being that of signing his name at the end of his letter. We have only three Latin letters from this period (2, 3, and 4). Only the body of the letter is preserved in the manuscripts of Letters 2 and 3, but in Letter 4 he subscribed: "Tuus ut optas Guarinus de Guarinis de Verona." In all his other letters, with the exception of 615, 812, and 156, which were of an official nature, 803 and 914, which were to dignitaries, and 899, which was in Italian, Guarino followed the classical method he found in the letters of Cicero and later, Pliny (1415), of placing his name and that of his addressee at the
beginning of the letter with the *salutem plurimam dicit*. In Letter 742 he took his pupil Leonello d'Este gently to task, for having disapproved of the ancient method. Guarino was also noticably classical in his consistent use of the singulars "tu" and "tuus" instead of the polite mediaeval forms "vos" and "vester", which were used even when the reference was singular.

In spite of Guarino's success in capturing so much of the classical manner, however, he never quite eliminated certain traces of his early style. In *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino* p. 4, Sabbadini points to "a certain superfluity (una certa sovrabbondanza), the use of ill-chosen and poetical words, the frequent use of abstractions (frequente astrattegiare) and a lack of connection (sconnessione) in his sentences", all of which were characteristics of Marzagaia and of pre-humanistic style in general. This statement requires some qualification and comment.

With regard to "sovvabbondanza", there is no denying that Guarino was copious in expression. Like Cicero, he abounds in words, and very often uses more of them than are strictly necessary. A typical sentence is the opening of Letter 535: "Quo magis magisque tuam experior in dies benivolentiam, eo certiores edis notas et testimonia tuae in me peitatis," where "magisque," "et testimonia," and possibly "tuae in me" could have been omitted without
Undue violence to the meaning. This is "superfluity" of a kind, but quite different from that of which Marzagaia and Giovanni Conversino were guilty, that of saying precisely the same thing in a variety of ostentatious ways. There is a difference between copiousness and mere redundancy. Occasionally Guarino does seem guilty of a genuine redundancy, as in Letter 760, 71-73: "Te vero... sic in amore complector, sic in sinum accipio..." but here, and in other such cases, he was aiming at emotional intensification, and the repetition is not gratuitously made. I should not say, therefore, that the superfluity of Guarino's style owes much, if anything, to pre-humanistic style, but rather to his close and intensive study of Cicero. In both Guarino and Cicero one often feels they could have expressed themselves more concisely, yet somehow, if one attempts to prune their Latin, rhythm, sonority, and clarity vanish, and the whole emotive content is vitiated, if not destroyed. In both writers their natural exuberance is tempered with good taste and sensible restraint.

Admittedly there are some tediously verbose passages in Guarino, more especially in the opening paragraphs of letters. But this can be accounted for by a convention of polite letter-writing, whereby
the addressee was complimented, while the writer was at pains to disclaim any comparative merit. Guarino varies the theme ingeniously, but basically it was this: he thanks the addressee for speaking or thinking well of him or his work, denies that such approbation is merited, but exhorts the addressee to continue in his laudatory vein, since it will cement their friendship and enhance Guarino's public image. The latter sentiment is often backed up with the quotation from Horace Epistles 1, 17, 13:

"Principibus placuisse viris non infima laus est"

--itself a subtle form of flattery. The genesis of this tedious convention (which in some humanistic letters is carried to absurd lengths) lay partly in the practice of polite letter-writers of the empire, such as Pliny the Younger, and partly in that of the mediaeval dictamina, all of which recommended set honorific formulae with which to address dignitaries. Sabbadini (La scuola e gli studi p. 83) refers to a letter from Cosimo Raimondi to Archbishop Capra of Milan, which begins: "R. mo. d. Bartholomeo archiepiscopo mediolanensi Cosmas Raymundus s. d."

and goes on to defend this classical salutation on the grounds that "quas apponi solent" (the customary additions) would be inconsistent with Ciceronian good taste ("tullianae deliciae respuere haec videntur"). The normal salutation to an archbishop would have
included all his titles and "in Christo patri et domino, dei et apostolicae sedis gratia etc." A glance at official documents in Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum scriptores* will reveal that usually only the main titles were listed, followed by *etc.* The taste for honorific agglomerations has never flagged in the Roman Catholic church: witness the many titles of the Pope, and the Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary, approved by Sixtus V in 1587, where Mary is 11 kinds of Mother, 6 virgins, 17 miscellaneous varieties of worthy, and 12 queens. The habit of larding letters with honorific adjectives and set epithets such as "reverendissimus archiepiscopus" and "illustriissimus marchio" seems to have spilled over from the *dictamen* into familiar letters of the humanistic variety, where appositions like "vir doctissimus" and "femina primaria" are common. It was not, of course, uncommon to find such expressions in classical Latin, but I do not think the influence of the *dictamen* should be discounted. This convention tires the modern reader and embarrasses the translator, but provides the consolation that the same linguistic extremism that produced fulsome also exploded at times into lively vituperation.

Another tedious aspect of Guarino's letters that adds somewhat to a general impression of superfluity in one familiar with the text is his recurrent
commonplaces, most of which can be found in a collection made by Guarino of 50 letters from Cicero's *Ad familiares* and almost certainly used as a text book by his students. These letters seem to have been the ones best known to Guarino. Sabbadini (*La scuola e gli studi* p. 84) reported in 1896 that Guarino's anthology is in codex Vindobonensis 48 (Endlicher) with the title: M. Tullii Ciceronis viri ornatissimi epistolae ... sublatae ex volumine epistolae maiori per Guarinum Veronensem artis grammaticae et rhetoricae professorem." Among the phrases from this collection most commonly used in Guarino's own letters are: "condemnabo eodem ego te crimine" (II, 1, 1), "pudor quidam subrusticus ... epistula enim non erubescit" (V, 12, 1), "his litteris magnum cepi fructum et iudicii ..." (V, 19, 1), "redisse cum veteribus amicis idest cum libris nostris in gratiam" (IX, 1, 2), "virtute duce, comite fortuna" (X, 3, 2), "λακωνισμόν " (XI, 24, 2), "ingressum pleno gradu" (XII, 6, 2) and "scire potes etiam me tacente" (XII, 6, 1). To this list should be

---

* i.e. in S. Endlicher, *Catalogus codicum philologiorum latinorum Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis* (Vienna, 1836).
added "quicquid in buccam venerit" (Ad Atticum 1, 12, 4) and the dominant commonplace of Guarino's letters, also to be found in his Ciceronian collection, that the purpose of familiar letters is "ut certiores faceremus absentes" (Ad familiares II, 4, 1)--a passage also used by Jerome (Epistulæ 29, 1) where he gives as the purpose of letters "de re familiari aut de quotidiana conversatione aliquid scribere it quædammodo absentes inter se praesentes fieri." Guarino also uses the passage from Jerome extensively.

One stylistic trait is particularly recurrent, that of using strings of nouns, usually in triplets, in which case Guarino joins the last two nouns by et- (an un-classical habit), whereas in longer series there is no connective; as in Letter 785, 60-67: "Id quoque fixum tenebis animo, care fili, non minus famulantibus principes quam principibus famulantes commendatos esse debere, quippe cum principum laus decus et gloria non mediocri ex parte de familiarium fide castitate abstinentia taciturnitate vigilantia pendeat; nam quotiens imperatorum gesta tolluntur in cælum, quae dormientibus illis administrorum prudentia studio et probitate gubernata et absoluta fuerant!"

Other habits which contribute to Guarino's "sovrabbondanza" are a fondness for adjectives and adverbs and the superlative degree, a liberal
sprinkling of words like "sic", "etiam", and "quoque" to clarify the sense, the frequency of "cum...tum" meaning "both...and", and the comparative rarity of that space-saver, the ablative absolute contraction. Guarino's style is far from paratactic, yet one feels sometimes that where he uses "et" or "sed" Cicero would have been hypotactic.

One must therefore agree with Sabbadini that Guarino's style has elements of superfluity; but it was a Ciceronian more that a Marzagaian superfluity. Within the exuberant style natural to his genius, Guarino wastes surprisingly few words.

Sabbadini's charge that Guarino uses many abstract words, where classical Latin might have expressed the sense in concrete terms, is certainly just, and this tendency may have been inherited from Marzagaia; but Guarino does avoid oddities, neologisms and abstractions invented by the mediaeval schoolmen, for whom he had no time whatever. Take an instance like Letter 670, 620-1: "Desine igitur virtutis et laudis opera largitioni et turpitudini assignare," which has a quasi-Tacitean ring, and it is doubtful if a verb and adjective combination could have produced neater or better Latin. After all, the genius of Latin is not unamenable to abstractions provided they do not cloud the sense.
One could go further and say that it tolerates abstractions even where they do. Guarino's use of abstractions is never offensive and always neat. They seem to me, indeed to enhance, rather than detract from, the quality of his Latin.

The other charge of "sconnessione"—disjointedness or lack of cohesion in Guarino's periods—is hard to fathom. Guarino's sentences seem to me to hang together very well; asyndeton is non-existent. The sequence of his sentences is logical and clear, and he makes good use of connecting particles (Oddly enough, he had little mastery of particles in Greek, to judge at any rate from the few samples of Greek he has left us.) The only genuine lack of connection discernible by me in Guarino occurs when he switches from one topic to a different one; but to criticize him for this is trifling, for it is a natural and almost universal practice in familiar letters. In letters or orations where Guarino gives extended treatment to a single theme he arranges his material in an orderly, logical, and artistic sequence. Sometimes, of course, he wrote at high speeds under pressures that would have subverted a meaner intelligence (as in Letter 832 to Giovannì da Prato) and flaws crept in; but amid a mass of writing that is truly so clear and excellently arranged it is a little
ungracious to pin-point accidental and rare slips. To claim that these few cases of "sconnessione" are a throw-back to Marzagaia seems flatly wrong.

There is, however, more substance to the charge that Guarino uses ill-chosen words and poeticisms. Let us deal first with his "ill-chosen" ("non bene scelte") words.

This really boils down to the use of rare words; but it is difficult to decide in many cases what constitutes a rare word, for the reader familiar mainly with classical Latin must often consult such a work as the *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis* to find the meaning of a mediaeval word, such as "auripellis" or "broilum", or of one such as "comes" or "vicarius", which is classical in origin, but which has obviously undergone a semantic change. Many of these words cannot justly be called rare, however unfamiliar they are to us, since their meaning would have been clear to Guarino's contemporaries. "Comes" for instance, was a count, and "vicarius" meant the feudal executive or representative of an overlord. The best one can do is list samples of what seem rare or comparatively rare words, whether or classical or later origin. The labour involved in a complete enumeration would not repay one, so I have taken some cross-samplings at random, listing verbs in the present infinitive active, nouns and adjectives
in the nominative.

**Letters 2-8 and 10 (490 lines)**

inexsuperabilis, primitiae, paraenesis, saepenumero
in Guarino (which is far commoner than *saepe*), alienigena,
momentaneus, phaethonteus, rudiusculus, accuratio,
ingeniolum, helluo, parvitas, tardiusculus, obeliscus,
studiolum, pensilis, protonotarius (although this word was probably common enough in the fifteenth century), specimen, phoenix, chorographia, cosmographia, gerulus.

**Letters 118-129 (476 lines)**

laconicus, subdubitare, conversatio, scholasticice,
nocumentum, subdubitatio, chirographum (a word which would be well-known to lawyers), praegustatio,
multotiens (also commoner than *saepe*), conciliatrix,
praevaticari, apricatio, tumultuarius.

**Letters 290-308 (390 lines)**

propudium, puerpera, multotiens, mitigatio,
pervestigare, apprime, pecuniola, inhabitate, ulixeus.

**Letters 446-54, 456-460 (390 lines)**

informatio, fatigatio, carnaliter, pulchellus,
internuntius, deambulatio, gerinare, grandescere,
materia.

**Letters 522-533 (337 lines)**

accola, camora, levamen, meliuscule, pusillus, compater,
morellus, villicatio, diploides, macritudo, suburbium, bulleta.

Letters 679-682, 684-691 (554 lines)

pauculus, codocefacere, homuncio, sør mociatio, comparatiuncula, perdicalis, aquatilis, lusio, alimonia, interpeuatrix, baiulare, pastorius, praepinguis, phasianus, ortygeometra, degustatio

Letters 808-819 (415 lines, omitting 809-11, 817)

dominatio, figmentum, indagatrix, denominatio, soloecismus, barbarismus, barbarolexis, applausio, idioma, vitricus, granditas

The total number of lines is 3,052, the number of words listed above is 92; the percentage of their incidence is approximately 0.033, on an average of nine words per line. This cannot be said to be high. It should be noted, however, that Guarino uses more rare words than Cicero.

One feature of Guarino's style that emerges from the above list and will be confirmed by a reader of his epistolary is his fondness for abstract nouns ending in -io, and for diminutives, of which there are 10 in the 92 words listed.

But a much more striking feature of Guarino's style is his habit of quoting from the poets. As a rule he does not acknowledge these citations, and only their familiarity or metrical character give them away. When he does indicate his source, as in Letter
454, 3, "ut vere Terentianum dicere queas, 'nugaris, cum tibi, calve, pinguis aqualiculus propenso sexquipede (sic) extet'", he normally indicates only the author (These quotations are from Terence. Andria II, 2,1, and Persius 1,57, respectively). He attempts further precision only on rare occasions when he tacitly or explicitly invites a correspondent to check his authority for a particular statement. For example, in the polemic with Poggio, Letter 670,66, he specifies his source for some statements from Cicero by "Sic in Bruto" (a reference to Cicero's Brutus), while elsewhere in the same important letter he merely says, "Plutarch tells us", or "according to Cicero", etc. Such methods seem cavalier, but they were common practice in Guarino's day, when the very titles of certain works had not yet been traditionally fixed, let alone standard methods of reference by books and line numbers, or acts and scenes. To take but one example, it would have been hard to give an exact reference in Plautus or Terence, the early manuscripts of whose plays "contain only slight traces of a division into acts", according to S. G. Ashmore (The comedies of Terence, N. Y. Univ. Press, 1908, p. 38). Such a division was not made definitely until the edition of Plautus by J. B. Pius in 1500.

Unacknowledged citations in Guarino are of two kinds: literal quotation, and what one might term
"oblique quotation", that is, where the grammar and syntax of the original are swept into the syntax of Guarino's sentence. Literal quotation is usually limited to short phrases, such as "caeco carpitur igni" (Vergil, Aeneid IV, 2) in Letter 196, 22-3, and "i prae, sequar". (Terence, Andria 1, 1, 144). Sometimes a short quotation is woven so inobtrusively into the text that only the well-read scholar could spot it, as in Letter 350, 37-8: "Hoc autem meum de viro iudicium et amorem ne cunctis aperias cautio est, nisi certis", where "cautio est" is from Terence, Andria II, 3, 26. Sometimes, too, a quotation consists of a simple word, as in Letter 366, 8: "Et profecto ni lynceos aliquunde compararet oculos..." where "lynceos" is an oblique quotation from Horace, Satires 1, 2, 90, "Lyncei contemplere oculos."

Most of Guarino's quotations are, indeed, oblique. Generally the change is slight, as in Letter 278, 20: "cum faciam in patriam reducem," which is clearly an adaptation of Terence, Hoauton timoroumenos II, 4, 18: "tum nunc sola reducem me in patriam facis."

Similarly, Letter 119, 50-1: "Romae Tibur amat, confestim Tibure Romam" is recognizably close to Horace, Epistles 1, 8, 12: "Romae Tibur amem ventosus, Tibure Romam." On occasion, however, a citation might more aptly be termed an echo or a reminiscence; for example, Letter 304, 14-15: "Suetonium mitto,
cui parum mederi potui, cum nulli adsint Graeci
characteres, in quibus Oedipus esse possem" is
an echo of Terence, *Andria* 1, 2, 23: "Davos sum,
non Oedipus". The preponderance of oblique quo-
tations and reminiscences is not surprising when
we consider that in most cases Guarino would rely
on his memory, (which could account for minor
inaccuracies), and that in an inflected language
like Latin it is easy and natural to adapt the
case endings etc. of an original quotation to the
grammatical requirements of the passage into
which it is introduced.

One may perhaps legitimately criticize Guarino
for intermingling prose and verse to an extent
that was out of sympathy with the opinions and practice
of at least two of the most prestigious authors of
antiquity, Cicero and Quintilian. The latter
entirely rejected the habit, in his *De institutione
oratoria* 9, 4, 72: "versum in oratione fieri
multo foedissimum est, totum; sed etiam in parte,
deforme." Cicero, it is true, used a moderate
number of poetical quotations in his private letters,
and quoted extensively from the Latin dramatists
in his philosophical works, having found a precedent
in the practice of Stoic and Academic philosophers
at Athens of studding their lectures with poetry
(Tusculans II, 26: "versus ab eis admisceri orationi"), but as a rule he avoided the device in his public speeches; in the Pro Sestio 55, for instance, he apologized for a coming series of quotations: "Et quaeso hoc loco, iudices, ne qua levitate me ductum ad insolitum genus dicendi labi putetis, si de poetis, de histrionibus, de ludis in iudicio loquar". After Cicero in his philosophic works, Lactantius was the first author to make any great use of poetry in prose and he was followed by Augustine and Jerome, all favourite authors with Guarino. It was probably from Jerome that Guarino took his lead in this matter, since Jerome's works are replete with citations from the poets, as Guarino pointed out to Giovanni da Prato (Letter 823). Even if Guarino knew Quintilian's opinion, the chances are that he considered it of little weight compared to the practice of a saint and master of style like Jerome; and there was enough verse in Cicero's letters to encourage Guarino to introduce citations from poetry into his own. Whether one finds Guarino's excess in this respect ostentatious and distasteful or lively and colourful is a matter of personal preference: I myself dislike it.

As far as quotation from the Greek poets is concerned, Guarino very rarely uses the original language, but follows the usual humanistic practice
of translating it into Latin. In Letter 25, 155-7, for instance, he translates Sophocles, Ajax 125-6 as "nos quicunque vitam ducimus, nihil aliud quam simulacra umbramque levem esse cerno", and in lines 161-4 he turns Homer, Iliad VI, 145-9 into Latin hexameters:

Quid genus aut stirpem, Tydide o maxime, quaeris?
Tale viris genus est, quale alta ex arbore frondi;
Namque aliae ad terram vento spirante feruntur,
Silva virens alias sub vernam parturit horam:
Sic hominum stirps* una perit, simul altera frondet.

Guarino need not have turned the Greek into Latin here, since he was writing to John Chrysoloras; he was simply being consistent to his usual practice.

It should be added that Guarino draws upon many prose writers also. As with the poets, sometimes he quotes literally, sometimes "obliquely", and sometimes in mere paraphrase. It is difficult to determine whether he hoped that his borrowings would be recognized or would pass as his own work; but in either case Guarino would probably not have been embarrassed by the charge of plagiarism.

Originality in expression was not as highly valued in his time as it is in ours; the production of echoes from great writers of the past was considered

*"Stirps" is a poor translation of , since it means "lineage" in the vertical rather than the horizontal sense ("generation").
en elegance in antiquity, and in the Renaissance imitation—even to the point of literal quotation—tended to be considered a virtue. We must remember that humanistic Latin was in some respects like a jigsaw, in which pieces had been picked from the classical auctores and fitted together painstakingly to form an organic whole.

In orthography, which was treated as separate from grammar by the humanists, Guarino rejected the medieval habits of writing i for e (as in quatinus = quatenus), t for d (aput = apud), ph for f (nephandus = nefandus), th for t (orathorium = oratorium), u for ū (diabulus = diabolus), ch (with the sound of k) for h internally (nichil for nihil), ci for ti (nacio, pronounced natsio = natio), the intrusive p in such words as hiemps = hiems, and above all, e for the diphtong ae and oe.* He is consistent in his classical usages, in contrast to Poggio, for example, who varied, as Ullman had pointed out, between writing the diphthongs ae and oe, and the medieval e. Bruni's usages were classical, except for his insistence upon michi for mihi, and nichil for nihil, spellings he defended vigorously in 1437 (cf. Sabbadini, Storia del ciceronianismo p. 100) even after the dissemination in 1418 of Barzizza's

fundamental Orthographia, in which the spellings mihi and nihil were accepted, and such questions as whether quom or quum should be written had been discussed (Quintilian had, of course, raised the latter question in his Institutio oratoria 1, 7, 5). Most of the humanists were on Barzizza's side, including Guarino, but the two most important scholars to discuss orthography after Barzizza were Lorenzo Valla, with his Adnotationes in Raudensem of 1442 (published Cologne, 1522), and Tortelli with his important Orthographia, which appeared shortly before 1450.

Guarino himself took no active part in the controversies over orthography, although he did translate, as educational material, Manuel Chrysoloras' treatise on the Greek aspirates (a pendant to his translation of Chrysolovas' Eνοτεματα) and composed two short pieces on Latin orthography: the first consists of 26 mnemonics in crude hexameters, concerning the assimilation of prepositions in compound words, which was frequently published in the various editions of his Regulæ and even dignified with a commentary in the sixteenth century; the second was his rather more significant treatise De diphthongis, which he composed in one "hectic" night and sent to Floro Valerio (Letter 29 of about 1415). It begins with a definition of a
diphthong, and goes on to give a series of examples of words containing them, with rather jejune comments here and there. To my mind it seems more of a list than a proper treatise. It is, nevertheless, interesting to recall that it seems to have appeared before Barzizza's far more comprehensive work, and that in dedicating it to Floro Valerio Guarino claimed two sources of knowledge about the diphthongs, his own recollection and therefore observation of what he had himself found in Latin manuscripts, and also what he had learned from his Greek tutor, Chrysoloras. (It is, however, possible that for reasons of piety he gave the latter rather too great credit for teaching him about Latin diphthongs). Sabbadini (La scuola e gli studi p. 49) thinks that Guarino had taken little interest in the diphthongs during his Florentine period (1410-1414), for in Letter 17 he sneered at Niccoli's pre-occupation with such minutiae, and that it was only after he went to Venice and came in touch with Barzizza, Cristoforo Scarpa and Vittorino da Feltre, all of whom wrote works on orthography (Vittorino's is preserved in Codex 1291 of the University of Padua), that he began to treat the matter as important. But Letter 17 is an attack on Niccoli's approach to study, rather than on the studies themselves, and the fact that in 1415 Guarino wrote a short
informative letter about the diphthongs to a friend who had requested help does not prove that he had suddenly seen a new significance in the question. He did not mention his work on the diphthongs again until January, 1428 (Letter 437; 50); which suggests that he did not consider it very important. Guarino was no pedant, and in general disliked squabbles over the minutiae of scholarship. Sometime before 1415 he had learned--how or from whom one cannot say for certain--what the classical usages were in orthography and style, and he quietly stuck to them for the rest of his life. There is, however, one peculiarity about his orthography: he persistently writes n instead of m before -qua, as in nanque (= namque) and nunquam (= numquam).

The total effect of Guarino's Latin is extremely favourable, even if we judge it (as Guarino himself was unwilling to do) against a strict Ciceronian canon. It is possible to pick out un-classical words, an occasional usage that Cicero might have avoided (the only two of any consequence being ne with the imperative for a prohibition instead of noli or nolite with the infinitive, and the use of ut instead of quo to introduce a subordinate clause of purpose containing a comparative) and Guarino's over-developed tendency to adorn his letters with poetical quotations; but against this
must be set the fact that Guarino cultivated his own style, even if it was accomplished *ductu et auspicio Ciceronis*, and the result should be judged with that in mind. He is nearly always clear, unlaboured, and virile, and challenges comparison with the best of the humanists.
Guarino's contemporaries thought highly of his skill in Greek. For example, Antonio Baratella in his Polydoreia, 41-42, describes him as a great poet and orator:

"Qui nostra vitute sapit, qui graeca latinis
Miscet et est Latio famosus utrisque sophiis".

Again, Giorgio Valagussa, one of his pupils, describes Guarino as "alterum latinae graecaque iubar". Another pupil, Lodovico Carbone, paid his dead master the compliment: "Tanta erat in eo graecarum litterarum cognitio, ut mediis natus Athenis credi posset." Examples of such praise could be multiplied.

Although he had not begun to study Greek until the age of twenty-nine, during the five years he spent in Constantinople he must have acquired great fluency in the spoken language. Some of that time he had studied under Manuel and John Chrysoloras, and moved in the cultured milieu of the imperial court. He therefore had ample opportunities of mastering both the spoken demotic and the literary language. How much he used the spoken language after his return to Italy in 1408 is impossible to say. Possibly he conversed in a limited way with his more advanced students. He was considered fluent enough, however, to act as an interpreter at the Council of Ferrara in 1438, and there is no indication that he found it difficult to converse with the Greek delegates there. Certainly, his studies in the written language did not languish after 1408, for he read, taught, and translated Greek throughout his professional life.
One is therefore struck by the fact that, in comparison with over seven hundred extant Latin letters, only three written by Guarino in Greek have survived. Sabbadini published two of these (1 and 829); and the third is known only from Bodleian MS Bywater 38. The bare text of this letter was published by E. Lobel, in the Bodleian Quarterly Record V, (1926-29) p. 43.

Letter 1 was composed at Constantinople, about 1404-1405, when Guarino was a tiro in Greek. Letter 829 was written, probably in 1450, at Ferrara, when he was seventy-six, and long established as a professor "utriusque linguae." The Bywater MS. letter (56A in Summaries) was written at Padua, 1st August, 1416, to Leonardo Ciustinian (my arguments for this last statement are in Summaries 56A, note 1). So we have the interesting case of having one letter from his student days, another from his forty-second year, and a third from his old age.

Why have only those three letters come down to us? A clue comes from R. R. Bolgar's Classical Heritage and its beneficiaries p. 280: "The scholars who could understand their Homer or their Plato in the original were a small and select body; and it would be fair to say that no Greek work found a wide circle of readers until a translation had been prepared. But the majority of the translations date ... from the second half of the century." This is true; and it implies that there were few scholars in the early Renaissance who could have corresponded in Greek. This narrows down the number of Greek letters that Guarino had occasion to write.
Besides, Latin was the natural and conventional vehicle of expression amongst educated Italians. Vittorino, for one, could have written in Greek, had he wanted to; but even the Latin letters that passed between him and Guarino were few, and he shows no desire to parade his erudition anyway. Even Aurispa, a Greek speaker, wrote all his letters to Guarino in Latin. The majority, indeed, of Guarino's colleagues -- Barzizza is a notable example -- did not have enough Greek, or sufficient confidence in what little they had, to hazard more than the odd quotation or phrase, thus achieving the dual advantage of giving their writing an erudite flavour, without exposing themselves at any length to the critical eye of posterity. Apart from Guarino, and discounting the few colonized Greeks, Francesco Filelfo was the best Greek scholar in Italy. Filelfo did write to Guarino (and quite a few others) in Greek, probably as a form of panache, typical of the man (Letter 434, also published by Klette in "Beiträge zur Gesch. und Litteratur der ital. Gelehrtenrenaissance", III, p. 96). We do not, however, possess any Greek letters from Guarino to Filelfo. Others who wrote in Greek to Guarino were the Emperor Manuel Palaiologos (155), Manuel Chrysoloras (9 and 11), and Niccolò Guarino. Although we do not have Niccolò's letter, we have his father's reply, in Greek (829). It is likely that he wrote more than three letters in Greek during such a long life, but not, I believe, a great many more (P.C. Decembrio mentions one, now lost, in Letter 714). The text of Letter 1 suggests that he corresponded with other students at Constantinople "exercitii causa"; and from what we know of his later
teaching methods, he would certainly have written model letters in Greek for his students at Verona and Ferrara: but they all seem to have perished. Nugatory exercises and instructional material do not usually survive as prized possessions.

It would appear, then, that for the ordinary purposes of real correspondence, Guarino always used Latin, even where Greek would have been entirely suitable -- for example, in addressing Manuel Chrysoloras. Letter 7, to Chrysoloras, is in Latin, and the reply (Letter 9) is in Greek. The only phrase in Chrysoloras' letter which just might be taken to refer to compositions by Guarino in Greek (ἐνεκτονὶ ὁ χρυσολαὸς σύνεσθαι εἶδενα τὴν σην περὶ λόγους δύναμιν καὶ ὁδὸν ὡς ἐν τῇ τῶν ἱταλῶν φώνῃ, ταύτῃ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν προσέθηκας)

is more likely to mean Guarino's enthusiastic propaganda on behalf of Chrysoloras and Greek studies by his dissemination in Italy of Chrysoloras' Ἑὐγκρισὶς τῆς παλαιάς καὶ νέας Ρώμης. It would be unusual, but no breach of courtesy in the Renaissance, to write in Latin to a Greek speaker, if he were a student of Latin. Quite the opposite. It would flatter Chrysoloras to be addressed in Latin, just as it would please Guarino to be addressed in Greek. It was a complimentary gesture, tacitly implying that the one had confidence in the other's genius. By almost the same token, Guarino saw fit to answer his son in the same language in which he had been addressed (Letter 829): ἀναγνόντε μοι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν σου Ἑλληνιστὶ γεγραμμένην. This was a graceful gesture. Either that, or it was intended to show his son that the old man still had his wits about him! Perhaps, even, it was a device to keep family business from prying eyes -- instances of the use of
Greek words, phrases, and sentences for the sake of privacy are found in many of the letters (767, 843, 911, etc.).

It is unfortunate that we have only three written documents by which to judge Guarino's competence in Greek composition, but a critical examination of these is interesting, the more so since the first is a product of his student days, the second of his maturity, the third of venerable old age.

The earliest letter, written about 1404 or 1405, is an autograph preserved in cod. Vallicell. gr. CXLII f. 35. Since it bears traces of illumination, it seems to have been considered a success in elegant composition. It is addressed to a certain Marcellus, "long versed" in Greek. On behalf of himself and another resident Italian student, Carlo Lottino, Guarino invites Marcellus to exchange letters with them daily. They are "like men walking on thorns and going with difficulty on tip-toe" and hope by corresponding with Marcellus to improve their knowledge of the language. Guarino was later to use this same technique with his own students (Letters 164-166). It is interesting to note, incidentally, that the presence of two Italians besides Guarino at Constantinople shows that he was not alone in desiring to drink Greek at its source (Geanakoplos in Greek scholars in Venice p. 16-17 says that Venetian traders in the Middle Ages sometimes gleaned some demotic, but this is different from going to Constantinople as a student).

There are no fewer than four proverbial expressions
swept into the syntax of the letter (lines 1-2, δικτύω
ἀνέμους θυράν πειρῶμαι καὶ εἰς τὰν γλυκὸν ἀπείρος πόλεμον ἔρχοντον
ὡς διώκατοι καθίσαμει; and lines 16-17, Λύδιον όποιον εἰς πεδίον τὸ τοῦ
λόγου προκολούμενος καὶ ἀλπτεκίζων πρὸς ἐτέραν ἀλτύτεκα). These pro-
verbs are listed in Diogbannianus, whose collection was probably
the source used by Guarino. There are also quotations from
Lucian, Plutarch and Libanius. The liberal sprinkling of quo-
tations, plus what seem to me to be obvious attempts to weave
"good idioms" into the text (e.g. ἰδοὺ τὸλυν γέλωτικ ὀφλισκάνοιν·
ἀνόητος μὴ καὶ παρακράνα εἰκότας αὐν φανείν: ἤπαθομένον ἄνδρα καὶ τὰ
πρῶτα τῶν πεπιδιεμένων ὀντκ, etc.) tell us something about
the methods Guarino was using to learn the language. I suggest
that he was already using note-books to jot down felicitous
phrases, useful idioms and rare words (e.g. ὑποτονθορίζειν, which
should be ὑποτονθορίζειν) as they occurred in his read-
ing of the classics. Whether he divided his material further
into "historice" and "methodice" is unascertainable; but it is
likely that he did, because he was a pupil of Chrysoloras, and
Chrysoloras is known to have taught along these lines (See
Letter 679). At any rate, it is clear to me that he was ab-
sorbing Greek by poring over note books, as a fascinated collec-
tor pores over his albums of rare butterflies.

The total effect of the letter, however, is neither pleas.
ing nor impressive. It smells heavily of the lamp and does not
read like natural Greek. It could never be confused with the
work of Plutarch or Lucian, far less with that of Demosthenes
or Plato. It suffers from the writer's anxiety to "load every
rift with ore," and there is a smugness about the whole thing. It could, perhaps, be compared with a tolerable Honours prose by a modern student. There is a "Latinizing" tendency here and there (e.g. θεὼκεῖται), and there are a few unpleasing errors and omissions. The iota subscripts are invariably left out, although Sabbadini prints them in his actual text. We also find two incorrect breathings, ἐκὼν for ἐκὼν, and ἡρέμου for ἡρέμου. Again, the phrases τὸ μου γράμματα and τοῖς σου ἐτκύροις are incorrect, and should be τὸ ἐμὲ γράμματα or τὰ γράμματα μου, and τοῖς σοῖς ἐτκύροις or τοῖς ἐτκύροις σου, respectively; for a pronoun denoting possession cannot, in literary Greek, stand within the articular complex (I am not denying that Guarino could have heard τὸ μου γράμματα in the back-streets of Constantinople). Further, there is an awkward sentence, of which I cannot make good sense, as it stands: ἐὰν διὰ αὐτοῦ σοὶ φιλιῶθείς, τοῦτο μὲν τῷ ἀντεπειτέλλειν καὶ τῇ καθημερινῇ συνομιλίᾳ ἐκτέρων ἦμῶν ἐλληνικῷ λαλοῦντων, τοῦτο δὲ τῷ δακτύλῳ τῶν ἐλληνικῶν ἀλλήλων μετακινάπτει, τί τῶν καλῶν κακῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ ὀφεληθείην. The general sense is clear enough: "So that through him I should become your friend...(and) might be helped by you in some degree with regard to the good and beautiful." If this is the sense, τί, without an accent, would be an indefinite pronoun, attached to a verb, as in: ἡ ῥά τι μοι κεκολόσχει . Il. 5. 421. 
πρεθέκετο τί κατοίς . Χ Η. 6. 4. 7. etc. (See L.S.J. under τίς, II, 11, e). Better Greek would have been ἐὰν . . . . πρὸς τὰ καλὰ κακὰ τί ὑπὸ σοῦ ὀφεληθείην. Perhaps a peri has drop-
ped out before καλῶν καγωδών: which would account for the genitive. Alternatively, if we omit the comma, and transpose τῶν ἔλληνικῶν, we get μεταδίδονι τι τῶν ἔλληνικῶν τῶν καλῶν καγωδών, i.e. "by giving each other, daily, something of Greek, that is, of the good and beautiful." But this seems to break the rhythm of the sentence, and the transposition of τῶν ἔλληνικῶν is awkward. It seems easier to assume that Guarino was using a construction he did not fully understand. Finally, towards the end of the letter, there is another sentence, which cannot be translated, so far as I can see, without emendation. In Sabbadini's text, it runs: βοηθεὶ οὖν καὶ ἐπικούρει πρὸς λογίου τοῦ θέου εὐγνωτίκας ἐφόρου. There is a difficulty about the use of πρὸς here; and whether λογίου is from λόγιος = eloquent or from λόγιον = a saying. The only feasible solution is to take πρὸς in a semi-exclamatory sense, similar to the usage in πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, and to change λογίου to λογίου (a regular epithet of Hermes). The sentence then translates something like this: "Rally, then, to our aid, in the name of the Eloquent One, who in the guardian of good speech."

Turning to the second letter (56A) one might confidently expect a considerable improvement, since Guarino wrote it at the age of forty-two, and presumably at his intellectual zenith. The text of it was unknown to Sabbadini, and it is found only in a manuscript once the property of Francesco Barbaro and now in the Bodleian. Lobel published the text exactly as I give it at the end of this chapter. It is obviously in an unsatisfactory state. The iota subscripts are again omitted,
and there are certain minor errors, corrected in the text I give in *Summariae* 56A. For convenience, the changes are noted there in an apparatus criticus. The errors, however, are minor, and need not detain us. They are no elementary that we cannot, in charity, blame Guarino for them. *συγγνώμων* for *συγγνώμον* is probably a slip of Barbaro's in transcription, and the same may be said of *συγγνώσεις* for *συγγνώσει*, though not, perhaps, with so much conviction.

It is grammatically Greek, but stylistically Latin. It lacks the authentic ring of, say, Letter II, by Chrysoloras. There are places where a connecting, particle seems called for, but none appears (line 10, ἡρτί παρά σοι; line 15, νῦν δοξηρονω νῦν ἀγανακτῶ etc.) In fact, there is a plentiful lack of particles of any kind. It reads like a series of loosely-connected snippets, such as one writes in a hastily-composed letter. It is, of course, conceivable that this was a hurried note. It is short, and wastes no time over the usual rhetorical candy-floss of compliment. It ends rather abruptly, with greetings to Marco Giustinian, and regards from Barbaro. It does not read like a show-piece; nor can we assume it was meant to be one, simply because Barbaro liked it enough to acquire it, or a copy of it, from Giustinian, and preserve it. Anything the Veronese master wrote was to Barbaro an ᾧτός ἐφι. It was written in Greek, I suspect, only to keep the contents private. Guarino does not say he has left his house empty—no one wants to advertise that! And since it was written to a very close friend, Guarino would not have felt constrained to trouble over—much about ele-
rance. If it had been written to Bruni, who is the addressee named in the Bodleian typescript description, we may be sure that the rough edges would have been ironed out for the benefit of that redoubtable Florentine. But even assuming that the letter is carelessly written, I feel Guarino should have made a better job of it. It is competent, but nothing like Attic Greek. One cannot doubt that Guarino knew his formal grammar, but I doubt if he ever could rid himself of the rhythms and habits of Latin enough to catch the real genius of Greek. There is the point, too, that even for his Byzantine masters, classical Greek would be a learned tongue. How much harder must it have been for an Italian to write Attic Greek?

The third letter was written in 1451, when Guarino was seventy-six. The long habit of excellence had ensured that time did not diminish the splendour of his Latin; but in Greek, never so fully natural to him, he may have been showing signs of defective memory. In Letter 883, for instance, he writes in a Greek snippet: "Cum ἔκ τῶν φίλῶν κοινὰ δόξα", which is an almost inconceivable error.

The letter does, indeed, start with some vigorous, fluent Greek, quite classical in flavour, except for ὑπ' όνομας, and the superfluous, poetical and un-Attic phrase καὶ μεγάλως γνώμη. Most disappointingly, however, both style and grammatical deteriorate as the letter progresses. True, there is no longer any obvious or oppressive striving after effect; but the rhythm becomes unpleasingly staccato in places, there is again a marked Latinizing tendency, and, finally, the text is co-inquinated by two grammatical errors.
The first of these may be charitably disposed of as a slip of Guarino's pen. As it reads in Sabbadini's text, the phrase καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ κακῷ τῷ ἔν αὐτῶι (i.e., γεγομένου = literature) προσκόψει makes no conceivable sense. προσκόπτειν means "to strike (something) against (something else)." What Guarino wrote, or should have written, was προκόψει, i.e., "to make progress".

The second error is a gross one. Sabbadini gives τοῖαν ἥπερ τετευχῶς ὀνομάτος, where the sense should be "having come by such a name". But τευχεῖν cannot be used in this sense. I would therefore suggest τετευχῆς, from τευχάινειν, which would give the desired sense. If τετευχῶς is a corruption, it is not easy to explain it, and it may be that Guarino made a downright mistake. Despite the praise lavished on his powers of memory by Timotheo Maffei and others (Rosmini, Vita e disciplina di Guarino II pp. 122, 192 n. 243) the advancing years may have been telling, at least on the accuracy of his Greek. It is not particularly lucid, either. For example, Διονυσίακας ἡμέρας προσφέρει is obscure. Does he mean, as Sabbadini suggests in his apparatus, "days of festivity"? Another sentence in the same letter — ἐντεῦθεν τῷ πρὸς τῷ ἐνδοξον γῆς οἰκείον εὐτυχῆς βολλεται μόλιστα — is intelligible enough, but not easy, and it has no connecting particle. No one could call it clean-cut Attic prose.
We may be sure, moreover, that he was trying to write Attic prose. True, there was no policy of Attic imitation, at least in Italy at that time, quite so well-defined as the love for Ciceronian Latin, which started with Guarino and others as sensible adaptation and degenerated with Berbo into slavish imitation. But Guarino had been the adoring pupil of Chrysoloras, and Chrysoloras was the culminating figure in a revival of Attic prose that began in Constantinople during the previous century (cf. Bolgar, *Classical Heritage* n. 82-87). It is therefore more than likely that Guarino would set up pure Attic prose as his ideal and object.

Despite this, his Greek has an eclectic flavour, with perhaps even a dash of Demotic (*τὰ μου γράμματα*). This may be due, in part, to the fact that he would have to master both Demotic and the neo-Attic; and therefore he brought back to Italy not one, but two languages. Attic and Demotic were virtually separate languages (Bolgar, *ibid.*) and it must have been a confusing business keeping them apart. A further complication was that there was no dominating figure for "Attic prose", such as Cicero was bound to be for Latin prose; and Greek, even Atticizing Greek, was still being written by the Byzantine scholars in a way in which classical Latin was not. It is therefore no cause for wonder if Guarino was confused about the nature of true Attic. In Letter 813, for instance, he makes some quite fatuous remarks on this subject to Leonello d'Este. There he claims that country people and women tend to preserve the ancient forms, and that they sound like Demosthenes, Isocrates, Xenophon and Plato in their pristine simplicity. He goes on to say that in his young days at Constantinople, he had heard "certain wo-
men and little children speaking. I used to be delighted and amazed at their fecundity of expression, the sweetness of their voices, their use of aspirates, their preservation of the accents, their changes of case and tense, their two and three-word compounds, which, though new, were astonishingly happy" etc. There was an idea, suggested also by Cicero, *De Orat.* III, 13; *Brut.* 210 and 258, 259, by Livy: VI. 1.2, and by Quintilian, I.1.6, that the pure stream of the language was likely to filter through the mouths of women, children and country bumpkins. Francesco Filelfo makes much the same remarks about the urchins and women in Constantinople. Of the women, he says "ob solitudinem observabat antiquitates incorruptas sermonis." One wonders if Filelfo really believed this; but at any rate it was to his advantage to promote the idea, since he learned much Greek from his Byzantine wife. Guarino seems to have accepted the idea uncritically. It seems clear, therefore, that he could not always recognize true Attic; nor is it surprising, since the Greek scholars in that early dawn had nothing like the battery of dictionaries, texts and critical editions, which are the glory and plague of modern scholarship, nor the razor-edge tools which we use in grammatical, syntactical and stylistic analysis. Nor indeed, had they developed a real critical sense based on scientific thinking. Finally, it may be conjectured that Guarino did not feel bound to eschew everything not found in Plato, Demosthenes and the other strictly classical stalwarts, and that he introduced or invented phrases that suited himself, rather than any tyrannical canon of elegance, like Politian in his famous riposte: "I am not Cicero. What I really express is myself" (Emo. VIII, 16)
Other extenuating circumstances weigh in Guarino's favour, lest we consign him too hastily to the limbo of noble failures. The first letter is a piece of student exhibitionism—brash, brilliant, but unsuccessful. The second, I have argued, shows signs of haste—and how many of us would care to have our hurried letters dissected after five hundred years? And the third suggests the hand of an old man, despite Timotheo Maffei and despite Carbone ("in extremo vitae temporum dulcius moriente cygno canere visus est")

If then, these three samples—almost the only direct evidence we have in assessing his skill*—seem like the work of an amateur, compared with, say, the Greek letters of Filelfo, we shall do well to recall that three letters, written under special circumstances, stand little chance when pitted against the hundred and ten of Filelfo (E. Legrand, Cent-dix lettres grecques de François Filelfe, 1892). Only a captious critic and a bad statistician would praise or damn forever on such a basis. It is unhappy that Guarino's three letters disappoint our expectation. If more turn up in "pecuniosa America," as Sabbadini hoped, I suspect a critical examination of these would do much to justify Guarino's pre-eminent reputation in his own day.

*Except perhaps for a longish snippet in Letter 911: ἦς ἔφημεν καὶ λίγα εὐχόμενοι καθάνεσθαι σε τινὰ εὑρόντα διδάσκαλον περὶ τὰ λογικὰ καὶ δικλειτικὰ καὶ περὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν. οὕτος γενομένου μαντεύωμα τις ἐτέρων ἤλεος ἐστεθα. πείθου μοι πείθου, πῶς φίλτρετε --which is workman-like and unexceptionable.
Γονάρινος Μαρκελλός εὐ πράττειν

Δίκτυων ἀνέμισθεν θηρὰν πειρᾶμα καὶ εἰς τὸν ὑλικὸν ἀπείροις πόλεον ἐμαυτὸν ὑπὸ φασὶ καθήμενος. Βουλόμενος γὰρ καθὼς τὸν λόγον τοῦ ὑπερθέμενου μὴ ἀπολείψθηναι, ἔδωκεν πολὺν γέλω τα ὀφλισκόνων σοὶ τοῖς τοῖς εἰς τὶς σοῦ ἐπείροις ἐμαυτὸν ἐκὼν εἰς καταγόλιν περέσχησα. οὐ μὲν γὰρ ἀποβλέψεις καὶ ἀναγνώζε τῷ μου γράμματι πολλὴς τῆς ἀρχαίας καὶ σκωπῶτας ἀνομέστις, τί ἢν ἀλλο κατὰ σωτὴν ἦρμην ὑποτυπωρίζον λέξεις, ἥ αὐτῶν ἐμὲ τολμηρότατον εἶναι καὶ φανερὸν ὑποκρίτην. Ὅσα μόνος τοῦ ἐλληνισμοῦ ἀκρίσας φυσὶ δοκτύλοις εἰσαφύσειν, τὸν πέρι τὰ ἐλληνικὰ μαθήματα πόλεν ἡγή σφεν κοπημένον ἅγιως καὶ τῷ πρῶτῳ τῶν πεπεδευμενῶν οὕτως οὐ μόνον ἐν τοῖς τῇ πόλει ἐκκλησίας ἐν πικῆς τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, σοῦς ἀπονενομένως εἰς τὸ ἐπιστέλλειν προκαλέσθω τολμᾶν. οὐδένος τούτων ἐνεκά, ὁ Μαρκελλός, ἡ Δίκτυ ἐπιστέλλας τὸν ἀνόητον γὰρ καὶ παράφροιν εἰκότως ἢν φανείν, λύδιον ἑπιτείνει εἰς πέδιον τὸ τοῦ λόγου προκαλοῦμενος καὶ ὑλικῆς πρὸς ἐτέραν ἐδικά καὶ ὑδατοῦ ἐν τοῖς τοῖς ἀλλήλων ἤποιον, ὁ δεικατε, πρὸς τὸ γράφειν ἐμὲ προτεραθεῖν, ὅλλα δυὸ μόνον, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἵνα τῇ καταλύσει, ἢ ἄντι ὑπερθέν δικαφαίσαμεῖν. εἰτα δὲ ἐν ἑλ逃生 σοὶ φιλιωθεῖς; τοῦτο οὖν τῷ καταπτησθεὶν καὶ τῇ καθημερίᾳ συνομελῶς ἐκκληρον ἡμῶν ἐλληνιστὶ λαλοῦντων, τοῦτο δὲ τῷ ὀσμερκῷ.
Τῶν ἐλληνικῶν ἂνθρώπων μεταδιδόμαι, τί τῶν καλῶν καγώδων ὑπὸ σοῦ ὑφελήθεισιν ὕπατον ὕπερ περὶ τὰ τοιοῦτα πάνυ ἀπολοί καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἄκουσάν ἐπιβιβάσθησαν ἐξίκομεν· οἵτινες ἀκροποδῆτι μολὸς βαδίζουσι· βοηθεῖ οὖν καὶ ἐπικοινώνει πρὸς λογίαν τοῦ τῆς εὐγλατίας ἐφόρου· ἵνα διὰ σοῦ βεβαιοτέρους καὶ ἀσχετότερους τῶν ποδῶς περὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον βάλεισι κτησώμεθα. Ἐρρωσο.

---

Text of Letter 56A, as printed by Label.

Γουρίνος ὁ Οὐερονώιος τῷ πεπιστευμένῳ κ(ὦ) πρασίστῳ λεοντρῶν χαῖρειν

εἰ εὔ ἔχεις καλῶς ἔχει. καὶ ἐγὼ ὡσκύτως ἔχω. εἰ μή σε κ(ὦ) συγγνώμων καὶ φιλῶν(θεοπον) ἐγίγνωσκον, τὰς σεις φοβούμην ἂν, πρὸς ἐμὲ λοιποῖς τε καὶ ἐλέγχους. ὃν ἔξου με οὐνοίδικ

ΠΥΒΑ σοι, τοσοῦτον ἐν τῷ ἐπιστελλεῖν σοι βραδύνας χρόνον. ἐν ὦ [μάλιστα] μυρίας ἔδεισε τὸ περ’, ἐμοῦ λυβεῖν ἐπιστολάς. καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀνάπληρωσεν ἀποστολὰκ κ(ὦ) τὴν ἐἰ δεῖκεςκεν προκατήχειν ὁμιλίαν. καὶ ἡδιστησίαν συνήθειαν. ἐγὼ μὲν βεβᾶς πεφυκῶς τῇ φύτει μοῦ
ἐχρησάμην. οὔ δὲ πρῶς τῇ οὐ χρήση. κ(αί) ἐμοὶ δογματίζεσιν. Τὴν ἄξιον ἐνθεομένῳ δοῦναι δίκην. ἄρτι πώρα σου μαφωτὸς ὁ καλὸς τῆς τοῦ πλατωνὸς πολιτείας ὕππησεν. ἐγὼ δὲ πάντα ἐκεῖνος τὰ ἐνταῦθα βιβλία αὐτὴν οὐκ ἐπισκόπηκα. διὸ ἐν ταῖς οὐνεντεῖσι αὐτὴν καταλείπειν ἐγών. οὐ γὰρ πάσοις ἐμοὶ βίβλους ἐκεῖθεν ἡγεγένη. τίνι δὲ πε(ρί) αὐτῆς γράψω, οὐκ οἶδα καλῶς. τὴν οἰκίαν ἐρημοῦν καταλείψας. νῦν ὑπερευθένων νῦν ἰασονικὴν νῦν βαρέως φέρω αὐτὴν οὐ κομίσω δεύρω. ὅτι τὸ φιλτάτω μου κ(αί) χαριστάτω λεονάρδῳ εὐχαριστεῖν οὐκ ἔστησι. οὐ τοῖνυν πρῶς τὴν ἀδυναμίαν μου πρὸς τὸ παρὸν φέρε. εὐτύχει πολυχρόνιος ἄνερ ἄριστος. κ(αί) με τῷ φρονίμωτά τω κ(αί) βελτίστῳ μάρκῳ. ἱδελφῳ παρόδος. ὁ φιλτάτως οἰ βασιλεὺς πλεῖστα σε χαίρειν εὐχεται

ἐκ τοῦ πτυμβίου τῇ τοῦ ὕπογοντου πρώτη

Text of Letter 829

Γουρίνος ὁ Οὐρωνώτιος τῷ Νικόλαῳ τῇ υἱῷ μου ἀγαπητῷ χαίρειν.

Ἀναγένιτι μοι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν σου ἐλληνιστὶ.
γεγομένην, τοσότητη ἐνέφυ χαρά, ὡστε
συμβήναι μοι τὸ Ἀριστοφάνειον ἐκείνον βοῶν
ὡς ἦδομαι ὡς τέρπομαι καὶ βούλομαι χορεῦσον.
δρίνω γὰρ τὴν σπουδὴν σου πρὸς τὰ γραμματα
καὶ ἐν ὅλῃν κυρίῳ τὸσο έν αὐτοῖς προσκόψι, ὡς καὶ γράφειν πεπίδευμενώς δύνασθαι,
ἐπειδὴ σὲ καὶ συγχωρῶ τὸν σφόδρα καὶ
τοῖσον παίδωποισι σὲ εὐφραίνομαι καὶ
μεγάλοις γάνναις. τῶν γὰρ πατέρων εὐκλεία
ἡ τῶν παῖδων καλοκαγαθίᾳ καὶ ἡρετή ἐντεῦθεν
τὸ πρὸς τὸ ἔνδοξον γῆρας θεμέλιον εὐτυχώς
βάλλεται μελίσσα. τοῖσον τετευχὸς δυνάτος
οὐκ ἐν δύνασι μὴ τοὺς ἡλικιῶτας ὑπερβαλέν
καὶ τοὺς λαϊκοὺς νικῶν τοῦτο γὰρ οἰκεῖν 
τῶν Νικόλαου πρὸσηγορεῖ. ἀκολούθει τοῖσι καὶ
τοσοτῇ ἰερῷ βέλτιον τέλος πρόσβαλλε καὶ
τὸ ἐμθέν. Νῦν οὐκ ὀκουν, ὃ οἰκεῖ 
τοῖσιν δὲ μοι Διονυσιακάς ἡμέρας πρόσφερε.

"Ερευσο καὶ σπουδάζων ἐπίδος. περὶ τῆς
δυρχεὶς πλευρῆς ἐχὼ σοι χάριν, ἐς οὐκ ἄλλην
πέμψῃ χαρεστέραν δύνασθ ἂν. χαῖρε πάλιν.
ἐπιμελεῖ μοι τῶν χρημάτων κατὰ δύναμιν ἡ
ἀκέφαλο νιβέρα εὐχάριστει τοι περὶ τῶν ποικίλων
πινακίδων, ἄς αὕτη ἐστελεὶς ἐλευθερίως. λέγω
τοι ὑ θ Γεωργίου "* * * * **.
Guarino's knowledge of, and attitude to history and historiography

Guarino's letters show that he had read much history. Up to 1446, the date of his only important pronouncement on historiography, they contain no fewer than 34 separate quotations or reminiscences of Suetonius, 15 of Sallust, 35 of Valerius Maximus, 11 of Livy, and 43 of Plutarch's Lives. Recurring quotations or reminiscences of complete chapters are as follows: Suetonius, *Augustus* 88 three times, *Titus* 8 eight times, *Julius* 1 twice, *Julius* 5 twice; Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 3.2 three times, 20.4 three times; Livy *XXX.* 30.7 twice; Plutarch *Alexander* 9.3 three times, *Solon* 31 twice, *Caesar* 1 twice, *Cae- sar* 15 twice; Valerius Maximus *V.* 10. ext. 3 three times, *V.* 10 ext. 1 twice, *IV.* 1. ext. 2 twice, and "mea parvitas" of the preface in Guarino's form "pro mea parvitate" three times.

The number of quotations from the above authors, compared with 2 from Xenophon's *Hellenica*, 4 from Herodotus, 2 from Florus, and 3 from Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*, seems to indicate that Guarino knew them best. But this is not an infallible guide. His two quotations from Justinus' *Epitome* (of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*) are in all probability no reflection of how well he knew this work, since we know that he went to considerable trouble to have a good MS. copy of it made. Again, preparation of a complete edition of Caesar, which he finished in 1432, must have made him very familiar with the text, yet he has only three quotations of Caesar (all from the
Bellum Gallicum) up to 1446. One suspects that although Caesar was a favourite character with Guarino, he was not necessarily a favourite author; the edition of Caesar was certainly undertaken at the behest of Leonello d'Este.

We may surmise that when Guarino quotes from an author he had read the particular passage in question. But even here extreme caution is necessary, for occasionally he quotes at what well may be second hand: for example, in Letter 25, 227 ff. he introduces the tale of Cleobis and Biton with the words, "Notum vulgo est auctore Herodoto", and what follows looks like a direct citation of Herodotus I.31. But it could also have come from Cicero Tusculans I. 113, where the same story is related and Herodotus is named as its source. Absolute certainty that quotations are first hand is impossible in such cases; but fortunately they are few. It is therefore reasonable to assume that frequency of quotation is a good index of Guarino's familiarity with an author, and that he knew Caesar, Justinus, Suetonius, Sallust, Valerius Maximus, Livy, and Plutarch well. By the same token he had some lesser acquaintance with Tacitus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Florus, Quintus Curtius Rufus, Flavius Josephus, the Bellum Alexandrinum attributed to Hirtius (Guarino names Hirtius or Oppius as the author in Letter 670,744), the Historia Augusta and possibly Sextus Aurelius Victor's Caesares*, not to mention such historically based poems as Lucan's Pharsalia and Silius Italicus' Punica.

*"Inauditum mihi antehac fuerat opus istud de Caesaribus; gratus fuerit aliquando coram ex te audire quidnam sit, quid de rebus
From Letter 46 (Barzizza to Guarino) we gather that around 1415 Guarino was translating a Greek historian — almost certainly Herodotus, for there is extant in Ravenna a MS (Sabbadini reported it as "cod. class. di Ravenna 203" in Epistolario III, p. 45) containing in two mutilated quaternions a Latin version of Herodotus I, 1-71, entitled: Καλείω Ήρωδετου ο γρεκο-λατινε conversum per cl. v. Guaranum Veronensem. This translation was published by R. Truffi, "Guarino traduttore di Erodoto", Studi ital. filol. class. X (1902) p. 77 ff. How far Guarino translated beyond I, 71 is impossible to say. Possibly that was as far as he went. Sabbadini believed that Guarino did not have a complete text of Herodotus in 1415, on the argument that when Beccadelli sent him one in 1427 (Letter 391) his joy was very great. But this is a feeble argument. Guarino's actual words are:

"I could not adequately express how delightful, how pleasant, how agreeable this kindness of yours was, inasmuch as under your guidance and auspices Herodotus and, to speak more accurately, his muses have winged their way here. You have illorum gestis exponat, an fumo dignae sint an luce" (Letter 238, 32-34 of summer 1423, to Flavio Biondo). Guarino does not refer to this work again, but the notice is important, since it cannot have been Suetonius' De vita Caesarum, which was already well-known. Probably it refers to the Caesares, covering the emperors from Augustus to Constantius, of Sextus Aurelius Victor, governor of Pannonia Secunda A.D. 361 and urban prefect in 389. The Caesares came out ca. A.D. 360 and is generally held to have influenced the Historia Augusta. It is known to us only from a fifteenth century MS discovered later in the century by Bessarion (Sabbadini, Scoperta[1914] p. 203). Could Bessarion's MS be the same one Biondo had in 1423? Guarino does not mention the author, but this does not mean that Biondo's MS did not bear the name of Aurelius Victor.
provided such a great and kindly guide to huge areas of the earth and to history (res gestas) that no pleasanter gift could have been given to me: I enjoy his words immensely, and it has been granted me to visit in his footsteps rivers, hills, seas, ports and cities, and, what is more wonderful, to converse with the dead and exchange living words with them! (Letter 391. 20-28) Such extravagance need not be taken too seriously, coming from a humanist. Besides, Guarino does not actually say that this copy of Herodotus was the first complete one he had seen. If it had been, would he not have said so, not in the middle of a letter of 51 lines, but right at the beginning? Further, there are 3 quotations of Herodotus in the letters before 1427 (I.31 in Letter 25; VIII. 33-36 in Letter 56; IV.46 in Letter 59). Admittedly, none of these is clearly a direct quotation, for the information they give could have come from Cicero Tusculans I.113 and Pliny N.H. VI.51 or Justinus II.2.3: but it is not necessary to assume this. Again, it is not known how many MSS. Guarino brought back from the East, but if he brought any back at all, surely Herodotus would have been one. If not, then surely he had seen and read a complete text in Constantinople. Finally, is it likely that he would have started to translate a work of which he had only a fragment? If it is admitted that Guarino had a complete Herodotus in 1415, Letter 46 is a valuable notice, because MSS of Herodotus were extremely scarce in the early Renaissance. Bolgar, Classical Heritage p. 476 mentions one of 1421, one of 1423, and one of 1425.
The latter is extant and was in the collection left by Guarino's friend Antonio Corbinelli. It is conceivable that Guarino was using Corbinelli's MS, or even that Corbinelli received it from Guarino. What is at least clear is that Guarino could have easily seen a complete Herodotus before 1427. It is possible, however, that the MS Beccadelli sent in 1427 was a better one than any he had previously seen.

Guarino also translated many of Plutarch's Lives - all of them, with the exception of Niæas and Crassus*, certainly before 1446. "Flaminius" was done about 1409 (see my Life of Guarino sec. 53), Marcellus, Alexander and Caesar, Coriolanus, Dion and Brutus by 1416 and probably in that order (See Letters 27 and 47, n. 2. But Sabbadini La scuola egli studi p. 130 suggests that Alexander, or one version of it, was done at Constantinople). Themistocles came out in 1417 (Letter 66) and Phocion, Eumenes, Pelopidas, and Philopoemen must have been done before 12th January 1418, since they are listed in Letter 95 of that date. Philopoemen, however, was not dedicated until 1427, when it was sent with Letter 377 to Mazo dei Mazi; and Phocion was formally dedicated to Francesco Barbaro in 1434 (Letter 651). Sulla and Lysander were

*Sabbadini, La scuola egli studi p. 131-2 claimed that on stylistic and other grounds not stated ("ometto le prove, che porterebbero troppo in lungo") he could assign to Guarino the Niæas and Crassus among the 11 lives by Plutarch which Bussi published, with much other material, in his Vitae ex versione variorum (Rome 1470).
presented to Leonello d'Este for his wedding in 1435 with Margherita Gonzaga (Letter 667). In 1435 also Guarino sent Leonello a corrected version of Sertorius ("Leonello Sertorium mitto emendatum"), but who the translator was is unknown. In the same year he also re-translated Caesar (Letter 668). In 1424 he dedicated to Giacomo Lavagnola a volume Breves clarorum hominum inter se contentiones (Letter 261), the first printing of which was at Brescia, 1485. This constitutes a complete list of Guarino's translations from Plutarch's Lives, but we may be sure that he knew the entire corpus well, since he has quotations passim from all of them.

The edition of everything attributed to Caesar was done in collaboration with Lamola and came out 4th July, 1432. The original MS containing Bellum Gallicum, Bellum Civile, Bellum Alexandrinum, Bellum Africum and Bellum Hispaniense is preserved in Ferrara as Codex Estensis VC2. Sabbadini examined this MS and his findings are as follows (La scuola e gli studi p. 120-1):

"The books are all numbered in order from 1 to 14; Guarino then divided the Bellum Alexandrinum in two, numbering up to 15. The general title and the titles of the first five books of the Bellum Gallicum are erased; that of Book VI is the original one and goes: "Gaii Iulii Caesaris hystorie belli gallici a se confecti liber sextus explicit. Incipit eiusdem liber septimus. Iulius Celsus Constantinus vir clarissimus legi". Book VIII of the Bellum Gallicum is attributed by the copyist to Suetonius, with the title: "Suetonii tranquilli viri clarissimi de gestis Cesaris in galliis prohemium in octavo libro incipit". A corrector drew a line under Suetonii tranquilli and noted in the margin: "Non Suetonii opus hoc sec iurii ut testatur idem Suetonius de XII cesaribus"; Guarino then substituted the name
hircii and corrected octavo libro to octavum librum. The remaining six books, however, are attributed to Suetonius; I report only one title since they are all identical except for the number: "Suetonii tranquilli viri clarissimi de bellis civilibus Gaii Iulii Cesaris liber decimus incipit"; of these titles that of Book IX (Bellum Civile I) was scored out, while the others were left standing. The erased titles of Bellum Gallicum I-V are also all identical, so it suffices to report only one of them: "Gaii Iulii Caesaris hystorie belli gallici a se confecti liber primus incipit. Iulius Celsus Constantinus vir clarissimus legi"; after this legi Guarino added emendavit and formulated his own title on the fly-leaf: "C. Iulii Caesaris de bello gallico liber primus incipit. Iulius Celsus Constantinus v. c. emendavit".

In these titles lies the entire story of the individual attributions in the body of Caesar's works. Bellum gallicum was interpreted as the Gallic war fought but not written by Caesar, and the author was sought in Suetonius, Caesar's biographer; Orosius had already attributed it to him. Others made its author Celsus, who in the titles is given as the editor. It was left to the humanists of the fifteenth century to put things right. Suetonius himself helped them (Caesar 56); he assigns the Bellum Gallicum I-VII and the Bellum Civile to Caesar, the Bellum Gallicum VIII to Hirtius, and the other three to Hirtius or Oppius. The credit for having been the first to establish this clearly seems due to Piercandido Decembrio, on the basis of what he says about it in a letter of 22nd October, 1423 (Sabbadini, Storia e critica p. 362); from then on, although traces of the old mistakes remained here and there, manuscripts and, later, the printed editions corrected the titles in the light of Suetonius' comments. 

One gathers that Guarino did not write out a complete new text, but simply made corrections in an older MS. Sabbadini says that Lamola did very little work on the actual text, and also that the MS upon which Guarino made his corrections was founded, at least for the first six books of the Bellum Gallicum, on a MS of the so-called B family of MSS of that work. Guarino, however, made his corrections in the Bellum Gallicum
Bellum Gallicum from an exemplar of the α family. Sabbadini also lists some of Guarino's emendations, some of which are obviously sound, e.g. cognoscerent for cognosceret at B.G.I. 21.1, and others ingenious, e.g. subductiores pauloque for subductionesque paulo at B.G.V.1.6. But some are arbitrarily made, e.g. publicis for annotinis* at B.G.V.8.6, which is palaeographically indefensible. It is quite likely that Guarino was attempting at all costs to produce a readable text for Leonello, and this led him to take more liberties with the text than he did, for example, in his editions of Pliny's Natural History, where rather than risk introducing further errors into the text, Guarino left many cruces untouched (cf. my Life of Guarino sec. 96). The edition of Caesar, then, was a practical one, intended for the student rather than the scholar. Nevertheless, we may be sure that Guarino knew his Caesar well and that he was no stranger to the problems facing the editor of a historical text.

He never turned his hand to writing a history of his own, although Letter 56 (the Turcomachia) and the Laudation of Carmagnola (1428) contain reports of historical events - set battle-pieces of the type popular in the Renaissance. But Guarino would not have considered these works historical, because their purpose was to give praise, and the picture he

*The MSS give cum annotinis privatisque at this point. The word annotinus = "of the previous year" would be known to Guarino, but perhaps not to Leonello. Could Guarino have substituted publicis purely for convenience?
presented was necessarily one-sided. In 1428 (Letter 436) Battista Bevilacqua pressed him to write a history of the war between Venice and Milan, but Guarino declined on the grounds that he would have to record the causes and events of the war impartially, and to do so would be invidious (Letter 439). He did confess, however, to an urge to write modern history. Could he have been thinking of the example set by his old mentor Marzagaia with the _De modernis gestis_?

His views on historiography are expressed in full in Letter 796 of summer 1446 (translated in _Summaries_), which he wrote to assist his ex-pupil, Tobia dal Borgo, who in 1445 or 1446 had been appointed historiographer of Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini. The Malatesta were noted patrons of literature (cf. P. J. Jones, "The end of Malatesta rule in Rimini", _Italian Renaissance Studies_ p. 243) and Sigismondo* attracted many fine scholars to Rimini (cf. Voigt _Wiederbelebung_ I. p. 575 ff). Tobia's history (_Rerum Italicarum Scriptores_ 2nd ed. vol. XVI. part 3, p. 85-92) ends in 1448 - perhaps mercifully, for it cannot be judged a success. Perhaps Sigismondo was also of this opinion, for the work is clearly unfinished. Tobia dal Borgo is described by Carbone as "a most charming poet, who wrote the deeds of the most illustrious Sigismondo Malatesta"; he was not a historian by inclination.

---

*Pius II stigmatized him in the _Commentaries_ as "faex Italiae", punned on his surname (mala testa = bad vessel) and recorded the ceremony in which he "canonized" Sigismondo to Hell in his lifetime. But Pius' hatred had a political basis and cannot be taken seriously.
Guarino's protreptic letter makes no claim to originality. Its salient points are:

(1) Historians can confer immortality on themselves and those whose deeds they celebrate.

(2) Historia deals properly with contemporary history, annales with events without the writer's generation.

(3) The writer should conceive his material first in the mind, then commit it to a rough draft.

(4) Events are of prime importance; praise of individuals should be restricted.

(5) Historians must be truthful and objective.

(6) Poetry may deal in fancy; history, "the light of truth", may not.

(7) The only purpose of history is to show us how best to act, by analogy with the past, and to inspire us to behave better.

(8) Individuals should not be flattered.

(9) First hand knowledge of military details is desirable.

(10) The writer must not allow emotion to sway his judgement.

(11) Bald statements of fact are inadequate; the causes of events must be explained.

(12) Introductions are necessary to secure attention and receptiveness; the reader's favour should not be prized (The reference here is to the rhetorical terms attentio, docilitas, and benevolentia).

(13) The writer should, by incidental comment, show of what he approves or disapproves.
(14) The lives and characters of outstanding individuals should not be neglected.

(15) In battle scenes more than one facet of the action should be described.

(16) A plain, dignified style should be used.

(17) In describing incredible events, the writer should record his own difficulty in believing them, but insist on their truth. Guarino calls this device praecoccupatio in Latin, prolepsis in Greek. Guarino admits that he had simply collected these precepts, but does not record their sources. The two main ones were Cicero's De oratore and Lucian's essay How to write history (πῶς δὲ ιστορίαν συγγράψῃν).

Lucian's work is considerably longer than Guarino's. It begins by attacking contemporary historians for their lies, flattery of patrons, and inattention to details, and proceeds with a great deal of racy side-comment to show what history is not, before turning in sec. 34 to positive recommendations, in particular calling for objectivity and truth. But Lucian, as more than one critic has pointed out, is very clearly entranced by style (cf. Francis G. Allison, Lucian [Marshall Jones Co., Boston, Mass., 1926] p. 115-116). He insists upon "political understanding" and "power of expression" as prime requisites; and although he admires the objectivity of Thucydides, he believes that the ideal historian must also possess the charm of Herodotus. The overwhelming impression one receives
from Lucian is that the historian must be an artist with words. In this respect he is very close to Cicero's dictum that history is primarily the business of an orator ("opus est unum hoc oratorium maxime", De legibus I.5).

Guarino changed Lucian's order of presentation, but reproduced all of his recommendations, sometimes in exact translation and using the same illustrative examples. In my translation of Letter 796 I have indicated in the right hand margin Guarino's parallels, not only with Lucian but other authors as well. It will be seen that the entire letter is an unoriginal patchwork. The material, however, is not unjudiciously chosen.

For example, in one point Guarino shows independence of Lucian and Cicero by making a distinction between historia and annales. Again, he does not name his source, but asserts that "most authorities" are agreed upon it. One possible source could be Aulus Gellius 5. 18 where Verrius Flaccus' definition of historia is given as "rerum cognitio praesentium" and history is said to differ from annals in that the former deals with events in which the narrator has participated. Guarino bolsters his point by claiming that ἴστορεῖν means videre ("to see") and that ἴστορία means spectaculum ("spectacle"). The verb ἴστορεῖν can mean "to observe" (e.g. Plutarch Theseus 30) but its normal meaning in ancient Greek is "to inquire into." Similarly, ἴστορία means "an inquiring into", hence "history" in the broad sense. Neither Liddell-Scott-Jones nor E. A. Sophocles' Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (New
York, 1887) lists the meaning "spectacle" for ἵστορια, and Sophocles does not record the meaning "to see" for ἴστορεῖν. Guarino's appeal to etymology seems at the best questionable; and the distinction he draws between historia and annales, although apparently not unsanctioned by ancient authority (see L.S.J.), is rather pedantic. His admission that other opinions are on record redeems him somewhat, and it must be admitted that the limitation of history to an account of events witnessed by the eye goes back to Thucydides and Herodotus. *

Guarino does display commendable discrimination, however, in devoting much less space to style than Lucian. His emphasis is, if anything, on the importance of truth. He calls upon Cicero's evidence that history is the "light of truth" (cf. De oratore 2.9.36: "lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis") and that its first law is to tell the truth without favour or malice (De oratore 2.15.62: "Nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat?...ne qua* suspicio gratiae sit in scribendo? ne qua simulatis?"). The need for veracity in writing history seems to have been a passionate conviction with Guarino since he makes this single point passim in the letters. He does not cite Cicero's remark that when an orator invokes history he may


**MSS vary between qua and quae. Guarino in his paraphrase of this passage uses quasi.
distort the truth to fortify his case. Nor does he mention, at least directly, Quintilian's famous definition of history (which Guarino must have known) as "the branch of literature nearest to poetry, a kind of prose poem written to tell a story, not to prove a case" (Institutio oratoria X.1.13). He does, however, make the point to Tobia, the "poeta lepidissimus" of Carbone, that poetry is far different from history, calling upon Vergil and Horace to show that poets may legitimately concoct fictions, and upon Cicero to prove that historians may not.

Lorenzo Valla makes the same point in the preface to his history De rebus a Ferdinando Aragoniae rege gestis libri tres (printed in Hispania illustrata 1603, I p. 727 ff.) which appeared about the same time as Guarino's letter. But Valla was more interested in which of the disciplines of history, philosophy, and poetry was the more rewarding; he gives the palm to history.

Guarino and Valla were not alone in exalting the importance of truth. It was, indeed, a traditional commonplace among ancient historians going back at least to Herodotus and Thucydides. Mediaeval histories also frequently claim to be giving the true account, and in the Renaissance the importance of truth was frequently asserted, although the descent of the commonplace to the humanists was through the Roman rather than the Greek writers. Sicco Polenton, for instance, in his Scriptorum illustrium Latinae Linguae Libri XVII (ed. B.L.)
Ullman] V. 43 had called upon the same passages from Cicero's De oratore that Guarino uses to emphasize that the historian has the responsibility of a sworn witness, and Leonardo Bruni, who has been called the first humanistic historian, made a conscientious effort in his History of the Florentine People to separate fact from fiction. But Flavio Biondo is the historian who is given most credit for taking objectivity seriously in his Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum imperii decades and Italia illustrata (Opera Omnia, Basle, 1531).

E. F. Jacob points out in Italian Renaissance Studies p. 38: "Biondo had learned from Guarino of Verona both relevance and extreme attention to accuracy, and if he did not follow Guarino's advice to the historian about beauty of form, he practises the detachment advocated by that teacher... Bruni, who was the leader of the rhetorical school, refused to admit him as an acquaintance. In a way, Biondo was a lonely figure".

On the other hand, Denys Hay in "Flavio Biondo and the Middle Ages" (Proceedings of the British Academy 1959) does not completely agree with Jacob concerning Bruni and Biondo. He shows (pp. 98-99) that certain modifications are necessary to the theory, originating in Burckhardt's Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy part III, ch. viii, and Fueter's interpretation of it, that there was a sharp distinction in the Renaissance between the "rhetorical" and "scholarly" schools of history; the first group, represented by Bruni, Poggio, Accolti, Sabellico, Pontano, Crivelli and Simonetta, aimed merely to exalt
their own states or patrons, the second group, represented by Biondo, Calchi, Lorenzo Valla, and Pomponio Leto, were "laborious disciples of erudition, of history for its own sake, whose scientific interests transcended loyalty to a state." Fueter believed that a concentration on style led to a "neglect of chronology, a distortion of institutional realities, and a perverse glorification of men and states". His picture is perhaps too extreme. Hay has shown by careful examination of Biondo's work that the latter cannot easily be classed rigidly as either "rhetorical" or "scholarly", because sometimes he is consciously rhetorical (Hay, Ibid., p. 113.) and more often merely reflects the carelessness of his mediaeval sources. His work might better be classed as a mixture of artistic and scientific history.

Bruni showed ability in sifting truth and falsehood from the material of legend and claimed to be presenting an accurate account of the rise of the Florentine city-state, but his history was really political propaganda showing how Florence had won popular liberty through the exercise of civic virtues. He presented this as eloquently as possible, and naturally his emotions were deeply engaged. Under such circumstances he could hardly be completely objective. Biondo, however, had no such political axe to grind, and his sympathies were really as wide as Italy itself. He was the first historian to be deeply conscious of Italy as a unit (cf. Denys Hay, Italian Renaissance in its
historical background pp. 35 and 37) even if his interests do become somewhat parochial when he discusses the rise of his own city, Forlí. One point worth noting is that Guarino in Letter 796 seems also conscious of the essential unity of Italy, for he deplores the internal squabbles which prevent her exercising her sword against her enemies—presumably the Turks, who in 1446 were poised to capture Constantinople. It is possible that Guarino had given Biondo this conception of a united Italy. But perhaps one can make too much of this, since they also had the conception from their reading of the classics. Biondo was never his pupil, but the two men were close friends from before 1422 when Biondo was 30, and must have discussed politics and history together more than once. Unfortunately, we have no letters between them that could shed any light on the extent of Guarino's influence on Biondo's methods of historiography; but at least Biondo is usually credited with having presented his facts in the spirit of Lucian's dictum, as translated by Guarino, that the historian should be "fearless and free from corruption, unimpeded, unrestrained and truthful, setting no store by love, hate, or pity, not bashful, but a fair critic, benevolent to all, a stranger to them in his books, enrolled in the ranks of no state, and living by his own laws". Biondo, however, went beyond Guarino and other humanists by refusing to allow stylistic graces to obfuscate unpleasant facts or vitiate the absolute objectivity at which he aimed.*

*On the other hand it is also possible to maintain that stylistic
Guarino's decision to avoid writing history may have been prompted by more than fear of offending powerful factions; perhaps he also realized that by temperament he was unable to practise what he preached. His emotions were easily stirred, and on occasion he reacted impulsively, even extravagantly. In 1416 he wrote his account of a Venetian victory over the Turks (Letter 56) without even a trace of detachment: the Venetians were the saviours of Christendom, the Turks a "cruel and audacious" race. The laudation of Carmagnola (1428) was also pure rhetoric: its only purpose was to extol the virtues of the count. The speech was an emotional reaction to the victory at Maclodio, which he might have been better to avoid writing, for it made him the object of Pier Candido Decembrio's vituperation (See Guarino as a figure in controversy). Perhaps Guarino had learned through experience to appreciate the limitations of his own nature.

It must be remembered, too, that Guarino's interests centred upon rhetoric and philology. This emerges in Letter 796 where Guarino praises the efficacy of literature as a preserver of men's deeds, and gives Tobia a number of useful hints for composing his work and making it rhetorically effective. In spite of Guarino's exaltation of truth, history was still for him essentially the work of an orator, as it was to Lucian and Biondo's composition is certainly uninspiring to many, and it may be that he could have achieved the same objectivity without sacrificing beauty of form, if he had been a better composer.
Cicero. There is no suggestion that he treated it as a separate discipline in his teaching at Ferrara. We know from Carbone and John of Pannonia that he lectured on historical texts, but he seems definitely to have treated them from a literary standpoint in the tradition of Quintilian and the Roman schools. Quintilian had regarded history as a convenient store-house of exempla for use in declamation. Similarly, Guarino used historical vignettes "to point a moral or adorn a tale", as his letters amply demonstrate. No doubt he supplied his students with enough historical background to facilitate understanding of the text, but it is highly doubtful that he ever discussed with them the reliability and use of evidence, the need for a critical evaluation of sources, or the causes of events in the light of personal motivations, economic factors, and so on. His over-riding interest in history was its value as moral edification. "How often", says Carbone, "would this great Christian interrupt a lecture to refute the mistaken beliefs of the ancients about the immortal gods!" One imagines that all Guarino's lectures were punctuated by such moralistic comments. Certainly in Letter 796 he says that the only aim of history is to show us how best to act. In this respect he is entirely mediaeval.* It is borne out by his obvious fondness

*Mediaeval literature has much to say on the need for salvation, and writers extracted morals from the most unpromising material. The Gesta Romanorum, a 13th century compilation of Greek, Roman, and Oriental tales, is full of moralitates or moralisationes, which explain the stories as allegories illustrating some moral truth. This led to a blurring of interest in whether the tales were actually true. Similarly the proliferation of romances
for Suetonius and his translations of so many of Plutarch’s Lives - all of them mines of illustrative anecdote. The tendency to treat history as a body of moral anecdotes may have been inherited partly from Chrysoloras, who had a partiality for Plutarch, and partly from Marzagaia, whose De modernis gestis was founded on Valerius Maximus. So strong was Guarino’s urge to point morals that even after insisting to Tobia dal Borgo on the need for objectivity he recommends that the historian should state from time to time of what he approves or disapproves. He seems unaware that a writer who does this cannot be completely objective. It is, however, only fair to remember that Guarino was a typical product of his time: one can hardly fault him for having lived before Vico.

If Guarino’s view of history as utilitas was entirely mediaeval,* he stands firmly with the fifteenth century humanists in their like the History of Apollonius of Tyre and the legends of Alexander the Great catered for the mediaeval craving for entertainment but also encouraged suspension of the critical faculty. In art, too, antiquarian details were less valued than the symbolic force of familiar things - hence the depiction of Herod in armour (a symbol of might) and Mary as a mediaeval queen etc. (This goes back a long way, through Ambrose to Philo and the Alexandrians.)

*The notion is not exclusively mediaeval. It persisted in the Renaissance and right up to modern times. Macaulay, for example, in his Essay on History writes: "No past event has any intrinsic importance. The knowledge of it is valuable only as it leads us to form just calculations with respect to the future". Benedetto Croce (d. 1952) maintained that history and philosophy are the same thing; a historical account will be philosophical, since it will be the present interpreting the past, and in so doing actually creating it. A description of past events therefore implies a value judgement in the present; each generation writes its own history.
conception of periodization.

Mediaeval writers such as Otto, bishop of Freising (d. 1158), in his *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus* realized that changes had taken place in human life and institutions, but their view of change was essentially cyclical: fortune distributed her favours to individuals and races in rotation. Otto quotes Job VII.3.4 as a symbolic illustration of this principle: "Noctem verterunt in diem et rursus post tenebras spero lucem" (*Chronica VI praef.*). The cyclical view is sometimes called "mediaeval historicism" - the principle that "history repeats itself" in accordance with unchanging ordinances of divine law. This is what Wallace Ferguson calls "theological world history" (See Jacob. *Ital. Ren. Studies* p. 31).

There could be no clear-cut periodization of history on secular grounds so long as men failed to realize that Rome had fallen. The "accidents" had perhaps changed, but the "substance" remained. Christ's kingdom had replaced Caesar's, and was now administered by the pope and his vassal the Holy Roman Emperor. The fact that emperors like Henry IV and Frederick II tried to reject their inferior role only points to an established theory of spiritual - specifically papal - supremacy. History was regarded as an essentially homogeneous tissue informed by perpetual doctrines, with no distinction between an "ancient" and "modern" period.

Jacob points out (p. 36) that the Florentine chronicle of

*Hofmeister: Scriptores rerum Germanicarum.*
Villani represents a transition from the mediaeval world-history outlook, but it was Petrarch who first divided history into "ancient", up to the Christianization of the Roman empire, and "modern" thereafter. To Petrarch the modern period was one of gloom and barbarism. History for him meant "laus Romae", an exaltation of the pagan past. In this respect he was far from being "the first modern man". Bruni deserves the title more for his recognition that Petrarch's "modern" period was a time of vigorous political growth with the rise of popular liberty in the city states. Bruni and Biondo both took an optimistic view of what are now called the Middle Ages. Guarino did not.

Guarino recognized a distinction between ancient and modern times, but his interests centered upon cultural history. The rise of city states meant nothing to him, since his sympathies were pro-monarchica]. In Letter 813 he discusses various stages in the development of the Latin language, the last being its corruption into the Romance languages—Guarino calls them all "Latin"—after the barbarian invasions. But he also believed in the emergence of a new age characterized by a profusion of eloquent men, enthusiasm for correct speech, and a flowering of culture restored after centuries of exile (Letter 796). This faith in his own generation is re-affirmed many times throughout the epistolary, and evident as early as 1410 when he expressed delight that patrons such as Carlo Malatesta could be found—a prince as cultured as the best of the Roman heroes and possibly surpassing them in physique. By 1446 his faith had increased:
Italy was producing not only fine writers but excellent commanders of her own.* But possibly the best commentary on Guarino's views on cultural history is Letter 823, where he very clearly delineates Manuel Chrysoloras as a colossus ushering in a new and better period in history. All through his life he fostered this idea, passing it on to hundreds of young men who could never have seen or met Chrysoloras. The importance of Guarino's constant proselytizing has never been sufficiently stressed.* Chrysoloras' Florentine students were wrapped up in the political glorification of their own city and its history, and, comparatively speaking, failed to perpetuate his memory. If it had not been for Guarino and the students he influenced the name of Chrysoloras would not figure so prominently in accounts of the early Renaissance written since the eighteenth century, when Guarino's letters began to be collected and published. To Guarino, then, history was essentially cultural history, marked off into three main divisions, the ancient period of pagan Rome, the intervening centuries of ignorance and barbarism, and a third age of which Chrysoloras was at once the symbol and initiator. In the latter belief he stands virtually alone among his humanistic brethren.

To sum up, Guarino's views on history were a mixture of mediaeval and humanistic notions. Jacob (p. 34) says: "if an

*Cf. Hay, Italian Renaissance in its historical background p. 37
*But see my article "Manuel Chrysoloras and the early Italian Renaissance", Journal of Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies vol. 7, no. 1.
Italian humanist like Tito Livio (Frulovisi) ... had been asked to justify his writing of history he might have replied that it is a form of literature highly regarded by the ancients and presenting admirable opportunities for the exercise of style: that it has great practical value for its inculcation of moral and political lessons and finally that in the historian history celebrated the past and present glories of the state to which he was dedicated'. No doubt Guarino would have agreed with this statement, except that he would have added that veracity was more important than serving the glory of any narrow, political faction, and that the moral truths that emerge from a dispassionate account of past and present events are what really matter.
GUARINO AND HUMOUR

It is difficult to find objective criteria for deciding what is "humorous" in Guarino's letters and what is not. What will amuse one person will seem merely foolish to another. Again, fashions change, and what may have seemed amusing to many people in the early Renaissance may find little general acceptance today.

The ancients devoted much attention to the problem of defining humour. Democritus said it was indefinable, but others, such as Cicero in De oratore 87-90 and 216-219 and De officiis I, 103-104, attempted to deal with the problem. Most useful, probably, is the so-called Coislinian Tractate, a First Century anonymous condensation of the ancient theory of comedy, which gives this list of the objects of universal laughter: ludicrous characterization, unexpected situations, mistaken identity, discernment of difficulty or clumsiness, relief from strain, the mechanical and the stupid, suggestiveness, loss of dignity, perception of incongruity, turning on masters, and mimicry. In this discussion, I have used that list as a guide, but in the end my choice of what is "humorous" must be subjective.

Burckhardt has an admirable section on Wit and Riddles in his Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy

*See M. Grant, The Ancient Rhetorical Theories of The Laughterable (Madison, 1924)
He begins by saying ridicule and wit were outcroppings of the cult of personal glory, and traces their development through Dante and Petrarch (who began the collection of witty sayings, after the manner of Plutarch's *Apophthegmata*), the novels of Sacchetti, and the appearance of the "Uomo piacevole" and the parasite. These last two amount to little more than the Renaissance equivalent of the mediaeval fool with his cap and bells, although, of course, their outward function was different; and they are not new types, since they abounded in Hellenistic and late Roman times.

Burckhardt seems, in a sense, to press his thesis too hard, since he gives the impression that wit and ridicule were somehow peculiar to the Renaissance. But the faculty of laughter has been denied to no age, even the harshest. Adversity sometimes even creates it. Did Thurber not define humour as "the little wheels of invention set in motion by the damp hand of melancholy"? It might seem needless to stress all this, were it not that we still find the notion that mediaeval man, for instance, went round swathed in cowls and unable to smile, for fear of hell-fire. One wonders if the writers of some school texts have ever read *The Miller's Tale*, or used their common-sense.

Yet Burckhardt is right in the vital point that the wit, the humour, and the ridicule of the Renaissance is different from that of Chaucer. It is something peculiar to the intellectual climate—the Zeitgeist, if you like. But how? Could men no longer find amusement in the unspeakable fate of Absalom
at the window? Was sheer slap-stick no longer appealing? Of course! The difference is something subtler.

One great way in which Renaissance men (or, should we say, scholars, which is really the heart of the matter) differed from their forebears, was in their adoption of certain attitudes to themselves, and to their purposes in life. As soon as writers begin to point differences between themselves and their immediate forebears, to outline programmes, to cultivate and discuss new tastes, then we may say an epoch is being born. Whether the writers shape the age, or simply reflect ideas over which they have no real control is not here relevant. What matters is that writers show clearly that changes have taken place.

"Wit" is now asserted to be a desirable tool for the promotion of personal ambition and glory. The assertion, it is true, comes more by implication, as Burckhardt saw, than in so many brute words. I know of no passage where the writer states that it pays to be witty; but the assertion is there, in the various collections of funny stories and anecdotes, and not least in the very frequent adjective of praise "facetus." Sacchetti relates tales about Dante, for instance, which culminate in some apt remark or witticism. Poggio's Facetiae is a collection of humorous stories, mainly obscene, and the counter-part of our joke-books for after-dinner speakers—perhaps even of How to win friends and influence people, although in a somewhat different sense.

Humanistic literature abounds in smutty stories, which have often little merit besides, smart punning, and lively anecdotes,
eloquently reeled off at the expense of others. Are we, then, to say that this constitutes typical Renaissance humour? The answer is yes and no. No, because it is only part of the picture. People do not change, basically, from century to century and what is likely to amuse or vex in one age will tend to produce the same effect in another. A good illustration of this principle is the selection in Dorothy Brooke's Private Letters, Christian and Pagan. What does change is the way that literary men write, and the things they emphasize. Unfortunately, time has swallowed up what Jack Straw said to Tom Tyler in 1420, and the unstudied pleasantaries between cardinals as they met in the Vatican privy. Instead, we have an overwhelming amount of what scholars, in their writings, saw fit to record as "humour," all too often depending for its point on verbal tricks, flashy eloquence and what Potter would call "one-upmanship." Even Piccolomini, who, of all the humanists, comes nearest to revealing a genuine and timeless sense of humour, spoils his racy tales of Vatican intrigue by the savage glee with which he mocks his opponents. One of the best stories in the Commentaries concerns a whore who has been shabbily treated by a cardinal, hated by Piccolomini. She retaliates by waiting until the cardinal is passing below in solemn procession, and by dropping a foul spit on his broad red hat. This is rich fun, no doubt, but it is spoiled by the excess of "Shadenfreude" with which it is relayed. One feels it puts Aeneas at least six up on the wretched cardinal (who "pretended not to notice") and this was exactly the point of the story. It is, perhaps, worth suggesting that the cult of "one-upmanship" accounts, in part, for the many invectives of the period.
Renaissance writers were nearly all scholars; and the humanists, in particular, present us with swatches of scholarly humour. They loved to manipulate words, especially for their own glory. To be "facetus" (vitty) was to be "facundus" (eloquent). A simple man like Will Rogers would hardly have amused Poggio Bracciolini. It is a pity we have so much of this learned jesting; for if we attempt to discern a warmer and more natural humour in many of the humanists, we must peer through a gauze of scholarly affectation.

How, then, do Guarino's letters measure up to the standards of his day in the matter of "wit" and "humour"?

His contemporaries certainly thought he was "facetus." The tributes are frequent in the letters he received from correspondents; but tributes in the Renaissance are often not worth quoting as evidence of anything but a desire to please. We must go direct to the letters of Guarino himself.

Most of them are in an amiable and optimistic vein, reflecting, in his earlier years, a sunny and loveable disposition, and in his later life, the quiet satisfaction of a man with a job he likes, a pleasant family, good health and an admiring public. Carbone is right when he says Guarino could scarcely fail to be happy.

Discounting the show pieces, like 25 and 56, and those written with a definite and simple purpose, the note of "gravitas" does not pervade throughout. Like Cicero's letters, Guarino's contain a farrago of news, gossip, courtesies, congratulations, lament, and requests for favours--the very topics listed by Erasmus, in his formulary De ratione conscribendi epistulas,
as proper to familiar letters. Erasmus also lists "mirth." If we subsume, under this head, the kind of things which passed with the humanists for humour, we can say there is a fair amount in Guarino's letters, and his reputation as a "homo facetissimus" is justified. Two passages are particularly revealing.

The first comes in a letter of December, 1415 (Letter 46) from Barzizza to Guarino. Barzizza was preparing for publication some examples of rhetorical usage, based on Cicero, but in his own words. "I have not troubled to have sent to you that section of the examples which concerns the way in which the tired minds of the jury are refreshed by hearing some joke (lusu) or in some other way—and I am such an idiot at telling jokes (ineplius ad facetias) that, slow-witted as I may be in other things, in this respect I'm simply a non-starter. So for my own sake, I've taken the wise precaution of not sending this one little section to a witty fellow like yourself, (ad te hominem facetissimum) lest, in my zeal to advise the future orator on the business of raising a laugh, I seem more to be laughed at myself." Barzizza defers to Guarino in the matter of wit. He feels inferior to the point of shyness; and shyness was not a humanistic trait. It does not read like an empty compliment.

The other passage is significant, because it is the only place where Guarino discusses himself as a humorist. It occurs in Letter 4 (June 1408), from Constantinople, to Francesco Barbaro. "Demum instanter oras ut meas he he ha ha, ridiculam! epistulas vel metro vel soluto sermone contextas tibi destinem, quibus delectaberis plurimum. Rides? hui mi: me rides. Au, lepidum mihi capitulum, non me rides, verum iocaris? bene est, placet hercule; nam familiarissimam id indicat amici-
tiam, cum in iocos audaciam praebet amor." (I take "ridiculum!" as an interjection of disavowal, although it could be a gloss). It seems clear that Barbaro knew Guarino had written amusing pieces, in prose and verse, cast in letter form. Guarino shrugs them off as nugatory diversions of his youth (he was then 34), declines to let Barbaro have any, and disclaims any reputation as a humorist: "Tu quoque, mi Francisci, cave ne dum aliqua mei duceris existimatione, quam tu tibi ringis, frustratus redeas. Quid me aridum imploras pro fonte rivulum? Ego, si qua olim condiderim, ut rudiusculum quandoque exerceam ingenium, non repono; sic informes adhuc liturae iacent et semilacerae hinc inde papyri sponte latent scombros timescentes ac thura? Desine igitur et dignas latebris nugas ne sub lucem retrahe." He obviously feels ashamed of those "he he he ha ha" letters; but one would give much to see them. Unfortunately, they seem to have perished during Guarino's life-time, perhaps by his own hand. In his early days, he seems to have been much given to the light touch. We know, for instance, that he translated Lucian's *Fly*, when he was at Constantinople: for he sent it to a friend many years after (Letter 771) But if he had any talent for irresponsible levity, he was generally careful, at least from the age of 31, (when his letters, as we have them, begin) to keep it from disfiguring even his most intimate letters. Instead, he fell a prey to the humanistic love of literary jesting, sanctioned as it was by Cicero and Pliny. It is well to recall that they were comparatively "new" authors, in the sense that their letters had been resuscitated as models of style. Guarino's letters are heavily laden with echoes of both authors,
whom he quotes or imitates very frequently (See Appendix on Guarino's reading for a frequency table) It is not, therefore, surprising that his letters make some play with this more elevated species of wit.

The pun, or play on words, is common enough to be noticeable. Puns, of course, have always proved attractive to clever writers; but the humanists sometimes went too far. The explanation may be that they were acutely word-conscious, and every smart turn of phrase or cheap trick tended to lead them on like a marshlight. Everyone was competing with his neighbour to catch the polish of classical Latin, and virtually acquiring a new language. Naturally, they focussed on simple words and even syllables with interest; and for evidence we need look no further than the controversy which arose over orthography, and in which Guarino appeared as one of the champions of the diphthongs (Letter 29, and cf. also B. Ullman. The Origins and Development of Humanistic script, passim) Revelling like children with a new toy, they inevitably favoured the pun. Here are some examples from Guarino. Letter 12: "Habeo de luliario Caesare, ut ipse iactat, sed potius Oleario Cicere, lepidissimam narrationem." Olearius = oily; cicer = chickpea. The play between Cicero, representing excellence, and cicer, representing tawdriness, occurs often. Letter 17: "Inscribitur autem orthographia, cum versus orthographia possit appellari." This is a slur on Niccolò Niccoli's supposed book on orthography. 'Orthographia' is a wretched hybrid meaning "a work barren of style." Letter 20: "Dissimulare nequis immensa canitatem, hui, caritatem volui dicere, quam erga me geris." Caritas = affection; canitas =
currishness. The device of pretending to slip up and hastily correcting oneself is borrowed from Cicero, Pro Caelio 32, where it has real point. Guarino seems to have liked it, for he uses it more than once.

Letter 30: "Ciceronem ipsum, Lentulum ac Fabium, Macrobiurn, Boetium prorsus abhorreo: insulsi enim auctores sunt. Studio-rium meorum principes sequor imperatorem primarium Vitellium, Gallum, Alexandri socium Perdiciam, Cybelis sacerdotes et non-nunquam Carneadem, sed iuniorem." This is elaborate. The cicer - Cicero pun appears again. Fabium is a play on Fabius and faba = a broad bean. "Lentulus" is a pun on lens= lentils, and there may also be a secondary play on lentulus"= rather slow. Capionem of the mss. would have to be connected with a man's name, Capio, and the verb capio - I take. But Capio does not appear in Pauly-Wissowa or any other work I have consulted, and the usual verb for taking food is sumo. Hence the reading should probably be Caepionem, referring to Quintus Servilius Caepio, consul in 106 B.C., who was defeated by the Cimbri in 105 B.C. Caepionem would then be a pun on caena = an onion. Boetium would appear to be a play on Bous = an ox, and the name of Boethius, the man who transmitted so much of ancient learning to the world of the middle ages. The spelling "Boetium" is found in Latin (cf. art. in Thesaurus Linguarum Latinarum). On the other hand, it may be that "Boetium" conceals "Boeotium", the Boeotian, that is, Plutarch. "Boetium" would then be a copyist's correction of the recondite "Boeotium" to the more familiar "Boetium" i.e. Boethius. I incline to this view, because Plutarch was a favorite author
of Guarino's, and he had been working with translations from Plutarch at this time. Also, there are only two citations of Boethius in all the letters, the first in 133, as against one hundred and ten of Plutarch. It was of Plutarch, rather than Boethius, that Guarino would naturally think, if, indeed, he had come into contact with Boethius as early as 1415, which is the date of Letter 30. *Vitellus* = calf. *Perdiccas* is a pun on *perdix* - a partridge. *Macrobius* (acc.) is here connected with *macer* - scrawny, and *bios* - life; hence it represents something like "a lean existence." The philosopher Carneades represents *caro* - meat, but Guarino playfully specifies the Younger Carneades, meaning tender, young meat. *Gallum* (acc.) is here connected with *fallus* - a fowl, and the "priests of Cybele" is another reference to fowls, for Cybele's priests were the *Galli*.

These tiresome, though ingenious puns are marshalled rather often, and Guarino was still using them as late as Letters 721 and 913. Punning on names was no new thing. "Nomen omen" was a jingle dear to the ancients, and passages such as that above were modelled on e.g. Suetonius, *Tiberius XLII*, "in castris tiro etiam tum propter nimiam vini aviditatem pro Tiberio Biberius, pro Claudio Caldius, pro Nerone Mero vocabatur."*

---

*Pier Candido Decembrio uses similar puns in his invective against Panormita (1433): "Epicurum, metrodomorum et Pollionum magnos viros te observare credideram; Pythagore quoque precepta didicisse, qui Fabios et Lentulos omneque meritorie coquine apparatum perbelle calles, qui alios Ciceronem in ore gestitare, te autem Carneadem in podicem glorieris admittere .... Nunc Fabiorum et Lentuli spreta militia, Cepionem et Alienum fortes milites repetundarum accusasti, Perdiccam sectaris et Lopidos; Cybelis vero sacerdotes dic contemni a te quis non miretur?" Decembrio refers to Panormita's supposed love for Venus Aversa.*
Letter 314: "Litteras tuas accepi et scriptore et forma flavas et non tam barbaras quam χρυσός idest graves." Flavio Biondo was Barbaro's secretary at this time, and had written to Barbaro's dictation. Flavus = golden. The play on Barbaro's name is made again in Letter 64. The other play with χρυσός is frigid. Also in 314 is sella cululis = seat of the pants, or something equally undignified, contrasted with 'sella curulis' = seat of office. Culus = buttocks.

Letter 71: "epistulam in qua perlingenda, hui, perlegenda volui dicere." Perlegere = to read through. Perlingere seems to be an ad hoc coinage of Guarino's, meaning "to drool over." (The word does not appear in L. and S., Georges, Benoist-Goelzer, Forcellini, the Thesaurus Latinae Linguae, or the Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis) Guarino seemed partial to it and uses it even as late as 913.

As the years passed, he became less enamoured of the ornament, as this frequency table shows.


Another type of literary jesting features manuscripts talked of as though they were people, or dead authors as if they were alive. The best example of the latter is Letter 2, where Guarino excuses the deficiencies of his translation of Isocrates' ἵππος ἰπποκλέκ, by pretending that the orator himself had done the translation, and must be allowed a few slips, since he has learned Latin in extreme old age. For the former, we have examples in 577, and 64. He uses the device when sending some translation
or lending manuscripts, the authors becoming "guests" of the borrower. It was no new trope to talk of books as though they were alive; for we have an example in Martial, IV. LXXXIX, at the end of the book, "ohe, iam satis est, ohe libelle". Richard of Bury has a famous passage in his Philobiblion (tr. E.C. Thomas, London, 1888, c. 4, p. 171) in which books complain of the neglect they suffer. But perhaps the idea of making the ancients talk was borrowed from Petrarch, who affected to address the ancients as though they were living and personal friends. Once a large volume of Cicero fell on his foot, and he complained that Cicero had done him an injury. He also wrote letters to the ancients (For the trope in Petrarch, cf. Wilkins, Life of Petrarch. U.C. Press, 1961, p. 20-21, 52, 114, 208.) But what was still fresh and charming with Petrarch, is pretty stale in Guarino.*

This is wearisome to us, but to Guarino and his friends it probably seemed to be the soul of wit. "Haec quidem ioco" and similar phrases occur, all too often, after a mere parade of learning or verbal juggling. There are many passages where he seems positively to identify humour with smartness. In 472, he praises "conditam comitate ac facetiis gravitatem," an echo, of course, of Cicero in De Senectute: "erat in eo comitate condita gravitas," but only half-understood. The writer's "gravitas" sent Guarino into "such gales of laughter" that by-standers began to think he was crazy. In 700, he applauds a letter as

*Angelo Maria Querini in Diatriba ad Francisci Barbari Epistulas 1741, p. 8, tells us that Cencio, Foggio's companion on the expedition to St. Gallen in 1416, was moved to see manuscripts lying neglected there, and declares that if they could speak they would say: "0 you, who love the Latin tongue, do not allow us to perish here; free us from our prison."
humorous (prae se ferant... facetias) which is really only smartly written (699). In 562, he presents, as the ideal, one who was "jocular in severity, and severe in jocularity" and goes on to emulate him with some pretty heavy stuff. I think he means by "iocis ipsis mixta severitas" not a mixture of grave and gay, which is the natural meaning, but, more often than not, this high-brow humour. Likewise, I also believe that he means by "facetias" and "sales" little more than cleverness (See, for example, 507, 729, 743). In 503, he is afraid he will appear "ineptus" when he is making some "jokes;" which shows he was trying very hard to be diverting, meaning smart. Pier Candido Decembrio, in a letter to Guarino in 1437, lets slip a clue: "Inexhaustum mihi riserunt epistole tue ita facetiis partim fortituis referete, partim a te lepide conscriptis" (Decembrio cites Plato on laughter, Rep., III, 388F) Decembrio thus distinguishes between unintentional wit, which is probably what we would call real humour, and the self-conscious variety; and "lepide," the Latin adverb, par excellence, for "smartly," appears to clinch the argument.

When Guarino writes more naturally, he is at his best; and the letters are by no means lacking in warmer touches.

There is, for instance, an amusing vignette of canvassers at a Florentine election (8), who stand nicket at the door and variously cajole or browbeat the voters; his reference to himself as a bigger gossip than jackdaws (509); bantering remarks about Tadea’s midwife (551) a dear soul much devoted to St. Martin but who couldn’t drink the local water (one almost hears her strings of personal biography); his complaints about the house at San Biagio (557) which was so small and chaotic (Tadea was
pregnant) that ink-well, salt cellar, ladle and chamber-pot are all jockeying for position, and the pen keeps being dipped in the vinegar bottle. One sympathizes easily. In 562, he cannot concentrate for the children bawling. In 544, he wishes soulfully that he had learned midwifery. He tells (432) how he has to handle Mariotto very tactfully, and his remarks on the copyist's temperamental ways are not without humour; how his geese must surely have gobbled up a certain ship's skipper, since they are so partial to vegetables (644); and there is a delightful remark in 174 about the time women take to apply their make-up -- "dum comuntur dum conantur annus est." This is perhaps spoiled by being a direct quotation from Terence, _Heaut. II, 2, 11._ These little touches, however, show that he could see the funny side of an awkward situation, that he could laugh at his own predicaments, and that he had an eye for the homely and amusing detail. It is a pity that we do not have more of this quiet humour.

He is perhaps at his best in the letters which describe the arrangements for his wedding with Tadea Zendrata. For long he had evaded the net of matrimony, and in Letter 59 had even said: "The only wives I like are other people's." But finally his mother, supported by relatives, forced his hand (120). There is no doubt that he was both brow-beaten and amused at his own helplessness: "When I was at Verona, friends and relations and, above all, my dearest mother, swooped on me from all sides, and bombarded me with arguments for getting married, nay, goaded me into it. I couldn't fight against them, so I left..... Why say more? In coming back here I threw in the sponge, as they say: and every day I expect a message that the business is completed
and I am ensnared in the chains of matrimony. When you arrive, you will find that it has happened." In Letter 122, he more or less tells his lawyer, Mazo dei Mazi, that the matter is out of his hands and that he will accept whatever arrangements are made for him. It was fortunate indeed that his mother's choice turned out to be such a happy one.

The letters from Trent are also amusing, although spoiled somewhat by the superior attitude he adopts, no doubt for the benefit of his Venetian correspondents, towards the locals. Driven into the mountains in 1424, for fear of plague in Verona, he likes the village in which he settles (270) and even claims that its name is healthy. He derives Perzen (the modern Pergine) from "περί ξένον", or "per ξένον." But soon (277) he finds the interminable drinking of the locals boorish, their speech uncouth, and their thick, beery necks repulsive. The yokels "drink a life" by draining a horn at one draught—a good omen; they chose their priests by the thickness of their necks; they call him "the Crane" because he has a slender neck; they keep a perpetual feast to Bacchus, and this lone, abstemious Italian is afraid to say them nay, lest he is told to drink up or get out (277. "Aut bibes, aut abi," a quotation from Cicero, Tusc. III,118). These people were Germans, of course, a race noted ever for their bibulous propensities. It is interesting to observe that even today, "saufr oder lauf" appears sometimes on the walls of German beer-houses, often written backwards to look like Latin: "fual redo fua." All that Guarino took away from Trent was a hideous memory and a smattering of German (cf. Life of Guarino, but at least he faced these difficult months
with humour.

In his younger days, he betrays a taste for bedroom humour. For instance, he teases his friend Andrea Zulian (192) on his energy in copying out all the speeches of Cicero in one year, and producing an heir too! In 407, he declines an invitation to a friend's wedding, slyly claiming that he would not fit in with those rowdy young guests who make surprise visits on newlyweds in the middle of the night. It is a new custom, and he is too old-fashioned to cope. The real joke is left unstated. He has implanted an uneasiness in the groom's mind that some firebrand will follow the new trend in chamberings. The very next letter to Zulian (408) proves that Guarino, although "born in the previous century," is no dullard in matters of sex: "Just as you are known to your clients as a good lawyer, so must you appear no spineless fighter to your Penelope." Zulian must show prowess on the bed as well as on the bench. There is also a spicy pun on *culare* and *curare*. Guarino is very selective with those to whom he shows this side of his nature; but when he shows it, he does not merely touch the bone, but saws right through it, as in 356, on a strumpet, who is also a bibliophile: "Quid sibi cum Cornelio Celso, nisi ut quae tot pones insatiata deglutit et hunc ipsum improbaba devoraret?" There is a play on the name "Celsus" and the adjective *celsus* = high, in this case *alte succinctus*. Sabbadini makes no comment.

He could be quite savage, too, when he was roused, and is sometimes given to the "one-upmanship" type of humour I discussed with reference to Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini. He dismisses his enemy, George of Trebizond, as "non tam summus quam simius
doctor: est autem aratori quam oratori prontior" (245); and he
tells a Piccolomini-like tale (221) of a "beastly" fellow who
burst into the Veronese council house and gave a long spiel
to the effect that Guarino's salary was an expensive luxury,
and useless, and should be docked. Guarino paints a picture
of his unattractive appearance and relates, with relish, that
"multis eiectus conviciis explosus exibilatus erupit elinguis."
Again, in 614, he tells how an impostor, claiming to be Panor-
mita, was exposed, and how some people want to punish him by
doing to him what farmers do to fields, to make the crops grow
-- "is enim clunibus eius debitur honos." Not quite so savage
is the reference to someone as "Scaramella" (196) a popular
type of clown--the first reference, it seems, of "Scaramouche"
in European literature--or the jocular description (316) of
the bishop's cook, Chichibio, who cleans the plates so well,
that if rags cannot polish them enough, he uses his tongue or
breeches. This Chichibio may be a real person, or a borrowing
from the Decameron (VI. 4). Alternatively, "Chichibio" may
have been a Venetian nick-name for the type of the lazy, incom-
petent cook. The name, alas, is not enough evidence to prove
Guarino had read Boccaccio; and I rather fear he had not.

As the years passed, I think he became progressively more
religious and serious. His humour never left him, but it takes
on a kindlier touch, already obvious in 417, where his little
son Girolamo made up a vermicular banquet for his pet jay,
much to everyone's amusement. At the age of 76, for instance,
he is invited by John of Pannonia (835) to a dinner with the
students. He declines charmingly, telling them to have a good
party, but he would be just a wet blanket:
"et iocus et ludus cum seniore tangent."

The students will have none of it, and reply to the effect that they are rebelling from his hard driving and must have a party. But it won't be complete without Guarino! No students would dare to say that, or insist on his presence, without knowing he could take a joke, and produce a few himself. One hopes he went to the party.

On the question of levity in class, 831A shows that Guarino was tolerant, but a responsible teacher. Some young student had found fault with a distich of Panormita, brightly pointing out that Panormita's "Titus" should be Titus," and making a silly pun that the Sicilian poet was "non siculus sed suculus" (gales of laughter). Guarino turns a "torvum voltum" (grim look) on the class for laughing at such a man as Panormita, but is inwardly convulsed himself. Anyone who has taught young people will appreciate this. The sainted Vittorino could not have done more.

Then there is the business of Panormita's theft of Guarino's precious Plautus. Whereas shabby treatment in his young days evoked invectives like that in 1414 against Niccoli, when he returned the Plautus, after keeping it for eleven years. Guarino was quick to forgive Panormita.

He seems to have become a little impatient with levity and mockery, although he still looks forward to humorous conversation (729). In 771 he advises his son to talk on subjects grave or gay, but always with honour and without obscenity.

His evaluation of Bruni's letters is interesting (762): "est sane in illis facilitas ingenii, splendor orationis, sententiarum
gravitas et quod in primis maximi facio, rerum de quibus ad amisos seribitur diguitas." There is no mention of Erasmus' "mirth."

In a sense, he develops a philosophy of the function of humour. It is a purgative, or catharsis, enabling us to refresh our minds and get back to work, which, after all, is what life is all about (612, 633). In 612, he says Leonello will work all the better for a little relaxation:

"Dulcior interea gnavus pia cura parentis
Sit Leonellus ovans saltibus atque ioco
Promptior ut 'usas ac Pallada deinde revisat.
Intermissus enim fit labor ipse levis."

He was predominantly a serious man, a hard worker and a responsible teacher, who knew the value of a joke for himself and his pupils, a good-natured soul, whose natural humour glints out, though too frequently clouded by humanistic elegances.

GUARINO AS A FIGURE IN CONTROVERSY

Most of the important humanists were involved at some time in controversy. Sometimes they were merely mouth-pieces for their current employer, with whose opinions and interests they would have been foolish not to identify themselves. In this respect, they were like the military condottieri, whose talents were at the service of the highest bidder. There did not, however, exist between humanists quite the same freemasonry as made it possible for mercenary commanders to exchange gifts, release prisoners by mutual arrangement, and bear no personal animosity towards their rivals. The humanists sometimes forgot the basically meretricious nature of their verbal campaigns, and allowed personal rancour to accumulate and fester into a private vendetta. Guarino so far preserved his integrity that only on the occasion of the polemic with Poggio over the relative merits of Scipio and Caesar was he drawn into battle to please an employer; and then it was his good fortune to believe in his cause. It is further to Guarino's credit that he rarely allowed vehemence to destroy his judgment and sense of fair play, or sour his personal relationship with his opponent.

Animosities between humanists also sprang from jealousy and peevishness. Francesco Filalfo, for
example, rarely praised anyone, although his admiration for Guarino was constant and sincere, especially after 1427, when Guarino engineered his appointment to the chair of Greek at Bologna (see *Life of Guarino* sec 155). One recurrent story about Filelfo is worth repeating as an example of humanistic vituperation at its worst; namely, that at Constantinople he had seduced the wife of John Chrysoloras and violated her daughter. Poggio's version comes in an invective against Filelfo: "Illne adolescentum (sic) corruptor, miliuerum stuprator, furunculus impudens, voluptatem nominat, cum sciat se pessimum proditorem Iohannis Chrysolorae, hospitis sui, primum uxorem adulterio violasse, deinde virginem filian, quam posteua uxorem duxit, per summum dedecus corruptuisse?" (E. Walser Poggius Florentinus. p. 467). That Guarino always believed this story (which may be true) emerges from Ambrogio Traversari, *Epist.* VIII, 9, in which a letter of Guarino's (now lost) is mentioned, where the latter had inveighed against Filelfo's morals and those of Chrysoloras' wife: "queriturque (i.e. Guarino) substomachans uxorem Chrysolorae venalem habuisse pudicitiam mecumque antea habuisse quam socerum (Sic)." Traversari should have written "generum," for Filelfo became her son-in-law.

It is clear, even to a cursory reader of humanistic literature, that such giants as Poggio, Bruni, Lorenzo
Valla and Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini indulged freely in personalities and sometimes showed how spite had consumed their very vitals. This may have been an out-cropping of the competition for prestige, which in turn, meant money and promotion. Guarino was as ambitious as any, but he is remarkable, in that his personal feuds were so few. I discount petty lawsuits and the occasional expressions of disgust with individuals of no historical importance, who make only a fleeting appearance in the Letters. Guarino's nature was easy-going, but not facile. He tried to see the good in people, but was not afraid to re-act vigorously when their worst was forced upon him.

The first personal feud of which we have record is his attack on Niccolo Niccoli in 1413. It has been found more convenient to discuss this in the notes to Letter 17 in Summaries, where the entire invective is translated, and in my Life of Guarino sec. 61. The point here is that it was the only occasion, in all life of eighty-six years, when Guarino made a lengthy, public attack against a private person for personal reasons. On other occasions when he felt offended, his method was to write a calm letter clarifying his position, either to the person most concerned, or to friends, who would act as interlocutors. For example, in 1416 Caronda had spread a lie that Guarino had collected the
errors made by various translators from Greek works; and Leonardo Bruni appears to have been upset by the rumour. Guarino healed matters by writing to Bartolommeo da Montepulciano (Letter 47), who was Bruni's friend in the Curia, and denying the charge as a ridiculous fabrication. The same is true of his famous letter to Giovanni Lamoila, retracting earlier opinions about the Hermaphroditus of Antonio Baccadelli, which will shortly be discussed: but since this letter forms part of a large controversy between the defenders of pagan literature and the Christian zealots who wished to ban it, it should be classed with Guarino's less personal conflicts.

Far different was the animosity that seems definitely to have existed between Guarino and George of Trebizond. It is difficult to assess the rights and wrongs of this dispute, because we have only George's side of the matter, expressed mainly in a letter of 1437 (Letter 707) written about nineteen years after the start of the trouble. Apart from two vague remarks, in Letters 197 and 245, which may refer to George, Guarino seems to have ignored his existence. It is possible, of course, that letters passed between them that are now lost.

According to George, in Letter 707, when he was in Venice from 1417-18, he was short of money, and copied Greek manuscripts for Francesco Barbaro, who promised him instruction in Latin (of which he knew little, despite a
spell with Filelfo in 1416 at Padua). Guarino was teaching Greek to a variety of pupils, among them Barbaro himself, and Vittorino da Feltre (see Letter 55). Obviously, Barbaro had passed George's instruction in Latin over to Guarino, and George claimed that he had been given only two months' sporadic teaching, and then only a confused smattering of the basic essentials ("primorum elementorum confusa cognitio"). In despair, he left Barbaro and took service with Niccolò Leonardi, changing, as he tells us, both his residence and his teacher ("Ut domum, ita doctorem mutavi"). He credits Vittorino, whom he ranks next to a god, with having taught him all the Latin he knows. The latter point is probably true, because Guarino was very busy with his Greek students, and one cannot visualize him having much enthusiasm for teaching elementary Latin to a copyist, as a favour for Barbaro. Vittorino, no doubt, received help from George with his Greek composition for Guarino. It is unfortunate that we have no statement from Guarino about the events of the academic year 1417-1418. It is, however, likely that certain aspects of George's character did not appeal to him, and that his distaste began in those early days in Venice. To understand why, we must revert to George's explosive letter of 1437.

It had been sparked off by a letter from one "Andrea Agasone" of 15th March 1437, to Paolo Regino, a pupil of
Guarino's. This "Agasone" had visited Venice early in the year and read George's five impressive volumes on rhetoric, which had come out in 1434. (Rhetoricorum Libri V printed Basle, 1522). Book V of the fourth edition contains a critique of certain passages in Guarino's Laudation of Carnaginola of 1428, in which defects of style were pointed out. "Agasone", who was probably a pupil of Guarino, defended his master hotly and attacked George for his presumption. George assumed that "Agasone" was a pseudonym for Guarino, and therefore issued the defence of his Rhetoricorum Libri, which Sabbadini has printed as letter 707. The name "Agasone" means something like "horse-driver," from Latin "agaso, agasonis (gen.)." As such, it suggests a pseudonym, and one can hardly blame George for jumping to that conclusion, especially since in 1435 (as he tells us in Letter 707), he had sent a copy of his newly-published book to Ferrara via his pupil, Domenico da Lucca, who was fleeing to that city to escape the plague at Venice. George claims that Guarino

*One might, very tentatively, suggest another reason why George identified Guarino with "Agasone." In Letter 196, of 1420, Guarino had ridiculed a certain foolish fellow, unidentified, who was at that time in the house of Gian Nicola Salerno at Siena. He calls him "Scaramellinus" (i.e. It. "Scaramella, Fr. "Scaramouche" -- a type of popular clown) and recommends that he be beaten, starved and hard worked, the treatment given to their beasts by "Agasones." Unfortunately, there is no record of where George of Trebizond was living at this particular time.
kept the books for four months, then denied all knowledge of them. There is little doubt in my mind that George did not send the book as a friendly gesture but as a deliberate means of vexing Guarino.

The letter of "Agasone" had a wide circulation, but most scholars did not believe that Guarino was the author. Poggio wrote from Bologna on the 22nd of September 1437 to Cristoforo Cocco: "I should definitely say that the letter ascribed to Guarino is not by him. I know his style quite well, the way his mind works, his eloquence, his learning and his way of putting things. So there is nothing in it that smacks in any way of Guarino." George was unconvinced, however, and sent another attack on Guarino to the latter's pupil, Leonello d'Este. He seemed bent on malice, while Guarino seems to have preserved a lordly and irritating silence.

What grounds, apart from the circumstantial ones just listed, could Guarino have had for disliking George? Letter 197 provides one clue. It is addressed to Niccolò Dotto, a citizen of Vicenza, and dated 3rd January. The year is omitted in the manuscripts, but it was probably 1421, because of a reference to Pietro Tommasi, who is known to have been in Vicenza at that time. Guarino expresses delight at the success of some of his pupils, and goes on to predict further progress for them, if they can avoid "monsters" who "spend years on end over figures
of speech, cases and gerunds and other nonsense of this kind" and "leave pupils more stupid than they found them." Since George had gone to Vicenza in 1420 to replace Filelfo as public professor, this sneer could well have been directed at him. The only other teacher of note in Vicenza was Cristoforo Parma, for whom Guarino had nothing but respect. Besides, George seems to have been fascinated by the pedantic trappings of scholarship, which Guarino eschewed, and no doubt his cast of mind was already obvious in 1417-1418 at Venice. In Letter 707, George also claims that his lack of success at Vicenza (from which he admits to having been "hissed out" in 1426) was caused by Guarino's maledictions. This may or may not be true.

The second clue is provided by Letter 245, in which Guarino refers to an un-named scholar as "non tam summus quam simius doctor." The letter, written in 1423, was to Girolamo Cualdo, a native of Vicenza, who had written giving news of this unfortunate teacher, whom Guarino describes as perhaps able to show a lot of eloquence, but no wisdom.

George's only other letter to Guarino came in 1450 (Letter 840). It begins by regretting the "controversy" between them long ago, suggests that they put aside the squabbles of their younger days, and invites Guarino to correspond as a friend. He confesses that he could not be allayed in Florence; from which it is clear that in
1438, when the two men were there for the Church Council, Guarino had been weary of the whole dispute and asked George to end his childish nonsense. Of course, we have no way of knowing what tones Guarino used, and perhaps time had softened the rough edges of Guarino's tongue for George. There is no indication that Guarino welcomed the olive branch that was proffered in 1450. All in all, Guarino seems to come out in rather the worse light; but the evidence is too tenuous for one to pronounce a final verdict. If he did maintain a life-long distaste for George, and one could go so far as to call it a vendetta, it was the only one he allowed himself. Even with Niccoli, he sought reconciliation, and maintained at least a surface courtesy towards him.

Of much greater importance was the part Guarino played in two major issues of the century; first, the defence of pagan literature against those who desired to ban it; and second, that of the relative merits of "tyranny" and popular government.

The first was a continuation of a fundamental struggle that had been going on since the advent of the Christian era. It had been of urgent importance to the early Church Fathers; then, after a few centuries of comparative dormancy, became a burning question with the resurgence of interest in the classics in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. The paradox to which Augustine, Lactantius,
Jerome and others had to find a solution was that while the service of Christ seemed to call for a total renunciation of earthly vanities and delights, yet the Christian who sought to defend, explain, or even adequately understand the Faith could not afford to neglect education; and education could be obtained only from "sinful" pagan writings. Such is the burden of Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* IV, 2.3, to name but one famous passage. The issue was further bedevilled by the still vibrant spirit of Antiquity. The Roman world was nominally Christian, but it was permeated with pagan ideals and ways of thinking, that not even the most zealous Christian could completely efface. The allurements of Cicero and Vergil tortured the faithful with an intensity that is hard for us to appreciate. A passage in Jerome (Epist. XXII, 30, 1-6) has become almost the "locus communis" for this intense dread of reading the classics. Christ had appeared to Jerome in a dream and accused him in words that have thundered down the centuries, and certainly frightened many people in the early Middle Ages: "You are no Christian! you are a Ciceronian!" It is noteworthy that in the letters written shortly afterwards, reminiscences of Cicero continued to appear (Cf. H. Hagendahl: *Latin Fathers and the Classics* Göteborg 1958 p. 103-104). If Cicero and other prose writers were held suspect by the zealots, the pagan poets were considered to be co-inquinated with deeper sin, for the charms of
verse would seduce men into reading of the debaucherries of gods, fix their minds on the things of this world and above all, excite prurience. Such solutions as were found were ingenious, but never wholly satisfactory and always uneasy. But they were good enough to salve many a stricken conscience among the early Christians, and virile enough to be reproduced, in only slightly different dress, during the early Renaissance. At that time, it was generally the poets of antiquity who were attacked; but "poetry" really came to mean Liberal Studies of the humanistic variety. The word "poeta" itself sometimes meant no more than "scholar," specifically one devoted to the new "studia humanitatis." For example, one version of Guarino's inventive against Niccoli was entitled De Auripello poeta, yet there is no mention in it, or elsewhere, of Niccoli being a poet, in the modern sense. The word "poeta" connoted a love of the active, worldly life, as opposed to the contemplative, spiritual one, a critical outlook, and even, in the minds of religious extremists, gross immorality.

Nearly every important scholar, from Petrarch on, had something to say on the matter. Petrarch himself was tortured from time to time by his addiction to classical writers, but he never came near to rejecting them. Boccaccio, however, became so depressed over the pagan love stories of his youth that he seriously contemplated burning his works and entering a monastery. Scholars of the next
generation were less regenerate, and their arguments became stereotyped. Antonio Stäubte in his article "Francesco da Fiano in difesa della Poesia" in *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* (Librairie Droz, Geneva 1964) Tome XXVI. p. 256-7, has neatly summarized those arguments as follows: i) Poetry has a divine origin, ii) The Scriptures themselves are allegorical and sometimes introduce scenes of vice, iii) Poets were honoured in times past as educators, iv) Various Church Fathers studied the pagan poets with understanding, and found them helpful. Stäubte also lists, in a footnote, some of the defenders of "poetry" and their opponents.

Perhaps the liveliest champion of the new "studia humanitatis" was Coluccio Salutati, who entered the lists with three opponents, Giuliano Zonarini, Chancellor of Bologna, and the pietistic monks, Giovanni da San Miniato and Giovanni Dominici.

Zonarini had been rather shocked by a request from Salutati for a copy of Vergil, to be sent on to Florence. He wrote back and questioned, as a simple Christian, the wisdom of dabbling with pagan authors. Salutati responded with two letters (Novati: *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati* I, 300 of 25th October, 1378, and I, 321 of 5th May, 1397). The main points he makes are, that Vergil helps Christians to a deeper appreciation of their faith, that the plain man should be glad of the "stars of poetry" to lighten his darkness, and that Augustine and Jerome had advocated
drawing only what was salutary from the pagans and discarding the rest. The tone and argumentation of these two letters are rather superficial, one feels, and Salutati possibly knew that they were. It is hard to believe, for instance, that he really thought the Fourth Eclogue of Vergil, which he cites as an adumbration of a New Earth, was enough to justify reading the whole of Vergil. Wisely, he does not attempt to prove that it was a prophecy of Christ's coming. An even more flagrant example of special pleading is his finding fault with the word "mentificus," apparently a coinage of Zonarini's, used by him to mean "deceitful" as applied to Vergil. Salutati insists that such a word can mean only "mind-making" and scores a neat point for himself and the new philology. But this brow-beating method was effective only against simple men.

There were other critics of the new learning, whose attacks were more dangerous, in that they were abreast of all the latest ideas in scholarship and understood the humanists' aims and affections thoroughly. When challenged, they could produce a plethora of quotations from the Bible, the Church Fathers, or the classics. Such men were mainly monks, of which there were two educated classes. The more liberal ones, exemplified by Ambrogio Traversari and Guarino's pupils, Bernardino da Siena and Alberto da Sarzana, were ready to base education on a close study of pagan authors, and saw no contradiction between continuing to read them and living a full Christian life. The other
type were men like Giovanni da San Miniato and Giovanni Dominici, whose contention was that to use the pagans as a basis for education would undermine and eventually destroy Christian life. Dominici wrote a treatise, in forty-seven chapters,* called the *Lucula Noctis* ("Glow-worm") which was edited by R. Coulon (Paris 1908) and more recently by E. Hunt (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1940). In it, all the usual humanistic arguments are anticipated and dealt with. The first twelve chapters admit the value of classical studies, but the remainder are devoted to insisting that they are no basis for a child's education. This basis should be uncompromisingly Christian; and only when those in charge of the student were sure that his soul was beyond the possibility of corruption should pagan authors be selectively introduced. The contest was not one of literary appreciation, but of educational method.

Salutati was not a teacher, and his letters to the two pietist monks do not really hit the mark as a defense of "studia humanitatis" as the best basis for a complete education. He attempts to show that the Trivium (grammar, rhetoric and logic) and Quadrivium*-

*Their initial letters form an acrostic of John 1,5: "Lux in tenebris lucet, (ot) tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt."

**The subjects of the Trivium and Quadrivium are variously listed in conveniently vague terms. "Grammar" included the study of morphology and syntax as well as literary appreciation. "Rhetoric" involved learning how to manipulate language effectively, and "logic" might include the blending of pagan and Christian philosophy. "Geometry" included what we now call "geometry," while arithmetic was the study of numbers, especially their mystical significances. "Music" consisted of relating musical intervals and the length of vibrations of sound to number theory. The best discussions of the Trivium and Quadrivium are in Louis J. Pastow, *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities* (Champaign, Illinois, 1919) and Paul Abelson: *The Seven Liberal Arts* (1906, but reprinted 1966, Russell & Russell, N. Y.)
(geometry, arithmetic, music and astronomy) cannot be tackled without a grounding in the Classics. Then he treats of poetry as such, claiming that it has both a surface and an allegorical meaning. This viewpoint, of course, was nothing new. In fact, it was the most popular argument in favour of reading the pagans, and had been for centuries. Once admitted, practically any literature may be pronounced fit for reading. The only drawback is that young students do not always search for the sublime meaning in passages that are, on the surface at least, corrosive to morals. It is hard to believe that Salutati was not well aware of this; but he had a case to make and he did the best he could, even although his arguments must have seemed shallow to hard thinkers like Dominici. What is interesting about Salutati's letters in defense of "pagan literature," which may without violence be substituted for "pagan poetry," was that it is the first humanistic statement on the subject of the classics and education, where the writer was obviously under real pressure. Admittedly, Petrarch had said much the same things, but it was not until the beginning of the Fifteenth Century that anyone seriously wanted to change the whole basis of education. The publication of Vergerio's De Ingenuis Moribus in 1404 was only another harbinger of
a new educational concept which had been gaining ground and worrying Christian educationalists of the old stamp.

Since Guarino had dedicated most of his adult life to following out Vergerio's recommendations and teaching the classics to even very young students, it is not surprising that he had something to say in his own defense. Implicit in all his writings is a conviction that no educated person can, or should ignore the classics. As early as 1408, he wrote Francesco Barbaro, urging him to ignore those who would deter him from a study of the ancient languages and literature under the humanist Darzizza. Barbaro had a religious bent, as is well known, and seems to have wondered if such studies were fitting for a Christian gentleman. After 1408, Guarino's letters are full of lively encouragement for all manner of men who showed any interest in the new approach to study; and he never hesitates over recommending parents to send their children to teachers of his own persuasions. He believed that humane studies would produce men who were not merely learned--indeed, that was a secondary consideration--but good.

What is, perhaps, surprising is that he did not produce a definitive statement of his views until the 7th April, 1450. It comes in Letter 823, which I have translated in *Summaries*. On the 5th of the month, Giovanni da Prato had

---

*Giovanni Lamola was only 9 when we first hear of him as a student of Guarino; and Guarino educated all his own children from their earliest years.*
preached an Easter sermon in Ferrara, in which he saw fit to attack the reading of pagan authors, particularly Terence. Giovanni seems to have given vent to a Saronarolan outburst that all those who bought, possessed or had truck with copies of this poet in particular should be burned. The suggestion was inflammatory, indeed, for Guarino was at that very time lecturing on Terence. This we know from a letter of Giovanni's to Guarino, written sometime later (Letter 824 l. 47: "co sancto tempore quadragesimo cum hunc Terentium adulascantulis lectitareo"). In addition to preaching a sermon, Giovanni appears to have sent Guarino a strong letter in advance, for Guarino's Letter 823 opens with an acknowledgment of some such tirade. After the usual disarming compliments, he hints that, at first, he intended to ignore the attack, since he had no wish to squabble. This is a typical remark; but Guarino had been touched on the raw, by being called what was tantamount to the devil's advocate in Ferrara. Nor should we forget that his livelihood, and even his life, might have gone up in smoke, if the people had suddenly gone hysterical and staged a burning of the vanities. It is a tribute to Guarino's prestige in Ferrara that the whole incident seems to have passed off quietly. It says something, also, for Guarino's common sense that he quickly composed a moderate statement of his own reactions.
It is well to ask what manner of opponent this Giovanni da Prato was. Three priests of that name are known to have been active in the first half of the Fifteenth Century (See. R. Sabbadini, Rendiconti della Accademia dei Lincoli xx, 1911, p. 27-29). The Giovanni in question had been sent by the Pope to preach at Easter in Ferrara. He was no ignoramus, and indeed seems to have been a priest like Giovanni Dominici: for in Letter 824 he quotes intelligently from Aristotle, Terence, Virgil, Caesar, Livy and Sallust, as well as from Cicero's Pro Archia and Tusculan Disputations, Cyprian, Lactantius, Augustine, Jerome and Basil's homily Ad Iuvenes. He also shows a familiarity with Leonardo Bruni's work as a translator from the Greek, and cites Vergelio's De Invenitis Moribus.

Guarino's defense is eloquent and spirited, but, in actual content, disappointing. There are signs of hasty composition. One feels his evidence could have been better arranged and he contradicts himself at one point (Summaries 023, footnote). His citations from the Church Fathers are not always accurately quoted, and were probably done from memory. Nor is the Latin its usual limpid self. One can, of course, be over-critical. Allowance must be made for the fact that the letter was composed in only two days, no easy task for a man of seventy-six. And if we had the text of Giovanni's sermon before us, or his words still fresh
in our minds, it would be easier to follow Guarino's train of thought.

Following the introduction, he begins by wondering why Giovanni did not condemn Vergil also, and defends the latter as a potent force in the education of the very young. Then he attacks philosophers who assert the Universe is eternal, and agrees that "certain books" should not be made available to young men. The aim of education is the love of God, and Theology is admitted to be the queen of disciplines. It is difficult to say whether Guarino really believed this mediaeval notion or was just throwing a sop to the good preacher. He studied the Church Fathers intensely and was very devout; but his whole record suggests that he considered a training in classics just as important as Theology. In his old age, he seems, however, to have inclined more and more towards traditional piety, and was probably more than half sincere in giving Theology the palm. He goes on to say that those who aspire to scale its heights must be fortified with a knowledge of minute details in all the other arts and sciences. In support, he calls upon his three favourites, Basil, Augustine, and Jerome. For Basil, he quotes extensively from the funeral oration written by the Greek theologian, Gregory of
Basil's conversion is there attributed to the "all round education" he received. This is a reference to the so-called ἐγκυκλίας παιδεία of later Greek education. Basil's education, however, was certainly dominated by the "rhetorical" tradition founded by Isocrates, since he became a rhetorician in Caesarea: which is not to say that he did not also taste the "philosophical" tradition founded by Plato and Aristotle. The University at Athens developed out of a combination of the two streams. Basil's own statement is that one should be steeped first in "extraneous" disciplines, by which is meant a study of the poets, orators and historians, before going on to "sacred and abstruse matters." The poets, orators and historians are naturally assumed to be the source of all useful knowledge, including what we now call "scientific" facts. Basil, however, recommends that they should be read with discrimination:

"When they fall to talking about scoundrels, we must avoid

*Gregory (c. 329-c. 390 A.D.) was born at Arianzus in Cappadocia, near Nanzianzus, where his father was bishop. Authorities are divided about the exact site of Nanzianzus some identifying it with the village of Himisu in S.W. Cappadocia, others with the modern Euran Shenar (Smith’s Dictionary of Greek and Latin topography (London, 1857) Vol. II). Gregory studied at Caesarea, Athens, and Alexandria, and finally became Bishop of Constantinople, from which post he resigned in 381 A.D. and retired to Arianzus. He befriended Jerome about 381 A.D. on the latter's journey westward. In theology, he closely followed his friend, Basil the Great (See Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church under "Gregory of Nanzianzus").
imitating them, and close our ears." Guarino agrees, fulminates a little against the acting profession (a dead classical reminiscence, surely) and concludes that the authors must be read as we pluck roses, "with the thorns left out." He skims over the real point, however, by simply asserting that no average, healthy-minded person would care to read tales of wickedness and debauchery. This is begging the question; for Guarino assumes that any reader is healthy minded, with the hidden premise that the classics have made him so.

Jerome is now cited, and after a rather needless display of erudition, in which, at one point, Guarino seems to agree with Jerome that the pagan gods were really demons, and at another, advances the Euhemeristic view that they had once been real mortals,* he goes on to show that Jerome is so

---

*The view that the gods were really demons in the Christian cosmogony was an old one, and has been remarkably persistent. John of Salisbury advanced it in the Middle Ages (Migne: Patrologia latina CLXXVIII col. 1180-1) and Milton used it in Paradise Lost. John of Salisbury also quotes the opposing view that they were mortals whose fame had immortalized them (Policraticus tr. J. Dickinson, New York 1927, p. 246). First advanced by Euhemeros, a Greek of the CIV B.C., it passed into Latin via Ennius, and was used especially by the Christians Lactantius and Augustine. It was popular in the Middle Ages. For example, Abelard (following Augustine) made Mercury the first philosopher (Migne: Patrologia latina CLXXVIII col. 1009). Walter Map said Jupiter was an earthly king, immortalized for his "wonderful prowess of body and incomparable distinction of mind" (De nügis curialium tr. M. R. James Cymmrodorion record series London 1923, p. 163). Examples of both views could be multiplied.
full of echoes from pagan literature that he is incomprehensible to any but the classically educated reader. He makes the point by showing, for example, that a passage in Jerome (Epist. XXVII, 3, 1) presupposes an acquaintance with Horace (Ars Poetica 1. 20-21 "... amphora coepit/Institui, currente rota cur urceus exit?")*, that another requires an understanding of Persius I, 58-60, a favourite piece of obfuscation, which Guarino had used to good effect in the invective against Niccoli (see. Letter 17 in Summaries).

Slipped into these citations is the statement that Jerome explains the voyage of Aeneas as an allegory of earthly life; but Guarino makes nothing of it in this letter.**

*Cf. H. Hagendahl: Latin Fathers and the Classics p. 91-92, where it is stated that A. S. Pease found 284 reminiscences of the classics in 1,223 pages of Jerome, or an average of 1 in 4.3 pages. It is also pointed out that Jerome's quotations from the Bible are far more numerous (Hagendahl estimates that Hilberg indicated no fewer than 450 Biblical texts in 100 pages of the letters) Hagendahl finds fault with Pease's deductions, but the impressive number of classical citations is all that need concern us here.

**Guarino followed the allegorical method (cf. Letter 25, 1. 127 and John of Pannonia: Sylva Panegyrica ad Guarinum 1. 520-546--Sabbadini's reference in Guarino Epistolario III p. 420 is wrong). But these passages concern the symbolism of individual myths and characters in the Aeneid and we cannot tell how Guarino interpreted the poem as a whole. Typical of attempts to extract an allegory of earthly life is John of Salisbury's analysis: "The first book of the Aeneid, then, under the figure of a shipwreck, sets forth the manifest tribulations of childhood, which is shaken by its own tempests; and at the termination of the period, the abundance of food and drink of manhood is in evidence at the gaiety of the banquet. On the confines of boyhood, conversation facilitates the interchange of ideas, and its freedom from restraint leads to the narration of stories and the mingling of the true and the false, for the reason that a multitude of words cannot want sin. The third book sings of the varied errors of youth, which, as it were, belong to it, because that age knows nothing but error." (Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers, Being a Translation of the First, Second and Third Books and Selections from the Seventh and Eighth Books of the "Policraticus" of John of Salisbury tr. Joseph B. Pike Minneapolis. 1938 p. 402-404)
This brings us back, however, to the same old argument advanced by Salutati and so many others, that all poetry may be treated allegorically, with the hidden assumption that the poet intended it to be so.

Guarino then comes to what is obviously the kernel of his letter, a defense of Terence as a teacher of rhetoric and morals. His quotations are from The Woman of Andros; so it is a fair assumption that this was the play on which he was currently lecturing. He shows that, in the opening dialogue between Simo and Sosia, certain rhetorical recommendations of Cicero (De Inventione 1, 33) are exemplified. Terence's Latin is also pure: so on both counts, he is useful for education. The same idea about Terence had been put forward by Guiniforte Barzizza in his course on that poet at Novara in 1431; but Guarino seems to have believed it all his teaching life. Nevertheless, one might wonder what the fact that "the old man in the Woman of Andros makes an excellent partition," and so on, has to do with the love of God. On the charge that Terence excites prurience, Guarino quotes a few passages to prove that they were intended to inculcate sound morals. It is, of course, true that old men in Terence voice sententious precepts from time to time, and that Latin comedy was theoretically intended to improve manners: but it is highly likely that Roman audiences were not forever looking for moral edification; and it would take an obelisk of virtue, in any century,
to read Terence (let alone Plautus) in this cramped spirit. Guarino, one feels, was blessed with a broader outlook. There are indications of it in his letters, and he was fond of Plautus. When he lectured, however, he chose Terence, who is certainly tamer and better adapted to the teaching of morality. Guarino appeals to the doctrine of poetic "propriety," by which the writer is not condemned, but any wickedness he describes must be. For example, when the evangelist condemns Judas and describes his sin, we condemn Judas but not the evangelist. The same principle should apply to Terence and others like him.

Guarino also cites Jerome's most famous statement of all about the reading of pagan literature, that "the captive wench's head should be shaved, her eyebrows and all the hair on her body plucked, and her nails pared." Jerome's actual words in Epistle XXI, 13, 5 sq. are: Haec si secundam litteram intellegimis, nonne ridicula sunt? Atqui et nos hoc facere solemus, quando philosophos legimus, quando in manus nostras libri veniunt sapientiae saecularis: si quid in eis utile repperimus, ad nostrum dogma convertimus, si quid vero superfluum, de idolis, de amore, de cura saecularium rerum, haec radimus, his calvitium indicimus, haec in unguium morem ferro acutissimo desecamus". The passage so interpreted was found by Jerome in Deuteronomy 21,10: "When you go forth to war... and see among the captives a beautiful woman... then you shall bring her home to your
house, and she shall shave her head and pare her nails."

By this is meant that we should make use of the legacy of the ancients, but make bowdlerisations of any elements with a tendency to deprave and corrupt. Guarino also quotes the equally famous passage from Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana II, 61, in which Lactantius and other converts are likened to Israelites leaving Egypt, laden with precious trinkets. The Egyptians represent the pagans, the Israelites the Christians, and the trinkets pagan literature. It is now up to the "Israelites" to put these gifts, which God has arranged for them to have, to a nobler use.

The substance of Guarino's defense of Liberal Studies can therefore, be reduced to the general proposition he advances that descriptions of immoral conduct should be heard with deaf ears and read with blind eyes. Authors must not be rejected because doubtful passages occur in them. The complete text must be available, otherwise discrimination is impossible. The state of mind with which one approaches the classics is important. If one's purpose is to enjoy pornography or seek out "magical spells or dainty recipes," the preceptor should forbid such sinful fodder. Consistent with his statement at the beginning of the letter, that there were "books in existence, both ancient and modern, that I would not even allow young men to touch," Guarino also seems to have excluded Ovid's Ars Amatoria from his classroom, for he proscribes books "de arte amandi."
Mediaeval literature cannot be said to have been short of books on this subject, but it was almost certainly Ovid that was intended. Guarino had read it as early as 1408, for there is a quotation from it in Letter 4.

It cannot be said that Guarino made any worthwhile contribution to this controversy. The paradox that tortured Petrarch is still unsolved: but Guarino, whose talents were philological rather than philosophical, does not see any paradox. In a sense, he aligns himself with men like Dominici and Giovanni da Prato in proscribing certain books, but he will go no further than rejecting plain pornography or heresy, and he believes that the classics should be made available to students from the beginning. It is, moreover, only fair to admit that he seems to have insisted on the reading of Christian authors as a necessary supplement. Lodovico Carbone tells us in the funeral speech of 1460: "Guarino realized that we who are Christians must have a range of reading different from that of the pagans, who did not know God," and: "How often did he interrupt his lectures to refute the errors of pagans about the immortal gods!" Carbone, for reasons of piety, may have exaggerated the Christian content of Guarino's teaching, but it is certain that Guarino did not neglect religion, especially towards the end of his life, when it is obvious from his correspondence that he was becoming increasingly more pious.
In the light of the pronouncements about obscenity in literature, it is interesting to see what he had said, some twenty-four years earlier, about Antonio Beccadelli's ill-starred *Hermaphroditus*. This work came out at Bologna in September 1425, and Giovanni Lamola sent a copy of it to Guarino at Verona. In March 1426, he took another copy of it to Rome and gave it to Antonio Losco and Poggio Bracciolini. The latter wrote on the 3rd of April 1426 (Epist. II. 40) to Beccadelli: "Giovanni Lamola...brought us a little book of your poem, which you entitle *Hermaphroditus*, a pleasant work, full of delight. Antonio Losco read it first and lavished praise on the brilliance and ease of your style, for the book is very charming. Then he sent it for me to read." Guarino's reaction was similarly favorable, but he admitted in a short letter (346) to Lamola that the subject was a bit doubtful, "cum locos, lasciviam et petulcam aliquid sapiat." The *Hermaphroditus* was dedicated to Cosimo dei Medici, grandfather of Lorenzo "Il Magnifico," and it was entirely pagan in style and subject. Despite its title, it was not a defense of homosexuality, although there are overtones of this nature. Guarino was not, however, interested in the subject matter so much as the style. Having glanced over Beccadelli's work, he wrote what was probably a hasty letter, not intended for publication and therefore more nearly representative of his mood at the time, although we must allow for the fact
that Lamola would expect him to praise the book and would have been offended by a detailed criticism or a cool reaction. The result was that Guarino lightly excuses the wanton character of the verses by quoting from Catullus, 16, 5-9: "For it becomes the true poet to be himself chaste, but it is not at all necessary that his verses should be so. In fact, the very thing that gives them zest and charm is that they may be a trifle voluptuous and naughty, and able to excite prurience." This concentration upon style rather than content was a typically humanistic trait, and Guarino expressed himself in similar terms more than once about it, even in public. For example, we have his reply to a speech made about this time by his pupil, Bernardo Giustinian. It was published by K. Müllner in Wiener Studien XVIII, 1897, p. 294. Guarino cites Lucan, IV, 589 sq., Ovid, Metamorphoses IV, 55 sq. and some Christian authors, including Zeno, who is referred to thus: "... eruditissimum et illustriissimum Veronensem episcopum Zenonem animadvertite. Num ipsius scripta non dicam Virgilium coterosque gravissimos poetas, sed etiam lascivos comicos et procaces satyros still suavitate et orationis decore redolent et mirum in modum effingunt?" The comic poets may be wanton (lascivos) and the satirists pert (procaces) but their style is smooth and brilliant, and these qualities are the ones obviously admired. Consequently, Guarino would give little thought to what he was writing to Lamola and was simply repeating a commonplace he had read in Catullus, and probably
also in Ovid and Martial. To back himself up, he also quoted Jerome on the subject of a harlot: "Quo cum recedentibus cunctis meretrix speciosa venisset, coepit delicatis stringere colla complexibus, et quod dictu quoque scelus est, manibus attrectare virilia, ut corpore in libidinem concitato se victrix impudica superiaceret." Guarino asks: "What wanton whoremonger ever used filthier language?" But after all, Jerome had to use the words, since the subject called for them. The implication is that Beccadelli may be excused for the same reason. The letter ends by promising to let Lamola know what "nostri" think of the poem. By "nostri" Guarino almost certainly means "our fellow students."

If he could have foreseen the trouble this letter was to cause him, he would certainly have chosen his words more carefully. Although one cannot prove it, there is a feeling of good-natured flippancy about the letter and Guarino seems almost to relish quoting the highly prurient passage from Jerome. This is, however, only a subjective impression: but I mention it because those who read the letter may have had similar reactions.

At the end of February 1426 (Letter 350) Guarino wrote to Aurispa again praising the antique flavour, learning and charm of Beccadelli's work, but adds a caution: "Watch that you tell no-one, unless you are sure of him, what I think about this man or my affection for him, in case Antonio and I are pestered by those who want to excel all men,
but don't." A lacuna then appears in the manuscript (lacunae are always suspicious, because they may indicate a deliberate erasure) and then the words: "even though Codrus bursts a gut out of vexation and envy for another's glory." It is apparent, then, that the poems and their author were exciting comment, and that Guarino was becoming shy of being too widely associated with a favourable opinion of Beccadelli and his work. Perhaps he had heard rumors that Beccadelli was a homosexual -- a charge he seems to have believed by 1427 (Letters 431, 432 in Summaries and note to 431. Also Letter 30, note 2). Perhaps he sensed that the moral die-hards were arming, and had decided on discretion. But at any rate, the Hermaphroditus did become the object of bitter attack, especially from the extreme clergy headed by Antonio da Rho at Milan ('See. Barozzi-Sabbadini, Studi sul Panormita e sul Valla p. 2-15 and Cinquini and R. Valentini: Poesie latine inedite di Antonio Beccadelli p. 51-57).

Guarino does not seem to have suffered repercussions until 1434. The first we hear of them is in Letter 666 to Giovanni Lamola, of 1st February 1435. It is a complete retraction of the earlier letter of 1426, occasioned, as Guarino says, by there coming into his hands (exactly when he does not say) of a copy of the Hermaphroditus prefaced by his letter of 1426. Lamola in that year had been engaged in distributing and popularizing Beccadelli's work and had without permission (according to Guarino) used his old
teacher's letter as a testimonial, prefixing copies of it to all the manuscripts of the Hermaphroditus. The text of the letter found in these manuscripts is still extant, and there is an impressive number of them (See Guarino, Epistolario Vol. I, p. 505). It is the text published by Sabbadini as Letter 346.

In Letter 666, Guarino claims that this text, both in words and arrangement, is a travesty of what he had actually written in 1426, and "a cause of no little shame and reproach." He says he must disown it, to avoid insult from "ignorant people or those who do not use their brains over much" and to set right the bad opinion conceived of him by "good men, whose opinion of me I value." In brief, Guarino claims that he never did approve of Beccadelli or his lewd poems, although he admits the man has talent, takes Lamola to task for mutilating the text of his letter and disseminating it without permission, and asks him either to destroy any copies of it he finds or at least append a copy of the retraction to them. If Letter 346 really was a garbled version of what Guarino wrote, then he had every right to be annoyed. At this point an awkward complication arises.

There is extant, in one manuscript, an alternative version of Letter 346. Sabbadini prints it in Vol. I, p. 702 of the Letters. It shows some minor additions to the text, and a longer addition of some fourteen lines near the end. The only significant additions are 1. 15-16: "Ego medius fidius hominem ut scriptorem probo" (the qualification "ut
"scriptorem" does not appear in Letter 346) and the fourteen lines near the end: "Ceterum animadvertes, Iohannes optime; ne-ideo me vel auctore vel exhortatore materiam ipsam et carminis argumentum probari putes, sicuti carmen ipsum pro decoro laudaverim. Magis autem magisque velim ut ad res viro dignas et virtutis opera stilus ipse vertatur et quasi relictis nucibus sumpta virili toga dignitati laudi et honori serviat, vel Catullo praeceptore: Nam castum esse decet pium poetam ipsum. Haec aetas alios exigit mores; tempus fuit iocandi, tempus instat seria loquendi serioque vivendi. Suade amico utrique communi ut Virgilianum iam servet illud: Claudite iam rivos pueri, sat prata biberunt; et qui inscribit ad Cosmam, cosmi idest ornamenti rationem teneat. Nil nisi grande talis ingenii pollicetur acumen. Danda est opera ut quemadmodum scribendi praeceptio, sic et scriptoris mores vitaque probentur plusque poeta quam poema ad imitandum alliciat." Obviously, if this alternative version was the letter that Lamola mutilated, it would go some way towards re-habilitating Guarino.

Sabbidini admits it is difficult to tell whether we are here dealing with a "revised version" or an "interpolation" (See his notes to Letter 346). He argues that we cannot ascribe the changes to "interpolation" because of what he calls the "great extent of the changes" and the care with which they were made. The possibility that it was a revised edition, written by Guarino, is ruled out by the fact that both Letter 346 and the alternative version of it contain
the sentence: "Ego medius fidius hominem probo, ingenium
misor et ludente delector, flente rideo, lupanari medio
scortantem laudo versum." Sabbadini is certainly right
to make the restoration: "flento fleo, ridente rideo"
("I cry when he cries, laugh when he laughs"). He argues
that if Guarino had written the alternative version, as
a later revision, he would have made this obvious and necessary
textual correction. He concludes that the longer version
was the work of some student of Guarino's, written "per
esercizio." But this conclusion seems at least open to
question.

Why would any student wish to play around with the
text in this way, when he could more profitably have written
an original exercise? And why with this particular letter?
To have worked the text over, he would have had to have
access to a copy of Letter 346. This is unlikely, because
it presupposes that Guarino made, and kept, a copy of the
original: Yet this was not his normal practice, and, in
any case, both versions end with an apology from Guarino
for being too busy to write at great length: "Vale, mi
Ioannes, et litterarum meorum λακωνίσμι da veniam, hau
enim me sinunt occupationes μακρολογεῖν." Under such
circumstances, one cannot imagine Guarino going to the
trouble of making a copy. Again, if this putative student
was intelligent enough to make improvements in style, and
was going over the text scrupulously for that purpose, he
would surely have made the easy emendation "flente fleo,
Finally, it is hard to envisage the temerity of a pupil who would work over and "improve" his teacher's Latin style.

Who, then, wrote the longer version? The textual point seems to rule out the possibility that it was a later version by Guarino. Sabbadini is also right to rule out the chance of interpolation, if he means "accidental" interpolation, because of the careful nature of the "changes." But what if the longer version was really the original, and what is printed as Letter 346 was a mutilated version of it? Lanola would have been responsible for the deletions, since he was engaged in publicizing Beccadelli's work and was the one who prefixed Guarino's letter to the _Hermaphroditus_, without permission. When he received a letter in general terms of praise for Beccadelli, it would be a simple task to improve the testimonial by deleting one or two less complimentary remarks. Respect for his master's text would not restrain his hand, because texts were not regarded as sacrosanct then, as they are today. Besides, alterations in prefatory letters were common enough. For example, Beccadelli's letter to Guarino about the _Hermaphroditus_, which is Letter 347 of Guarino's epistolary, and appears in that form in editions of the _Hermaphroditus_, is considerably altered in the collected edition of Beccadelli's letters.

Even if Guarino did write the longer version, however, it would go only a little way towards rehabilitating him. It is still a rather hasty letter, it still has a flavour
of hedonism and even flippancy, despite the rather more sober caution of fourteen lines towards the end, and it would still have been open to harsh criticism. But in any case, it was the mutilated version printed as Letter 346 that the critics saw in their copies of the **Hermaphroditus**.

The person most responsible for Guarino's writing Letter 666 was Alberto da Sarzana, who had preached at Ferrara in 1434 (See Letter 644 1. 6). Either in his sermons, or in conversation, he had criticized Guarino for what was thought to be his favourable opinion of Beccadelli and the **Hermaphroditus**. In a letter of 18th May to Filippo Bendidio, Alberto recalled a discussion between himself, Francesco Marescalco and Guarino, in which the latter had promised to write a retraction. "You will remind Guarino from me," he says, "that what we once said about the **Hermaphroditus**, a book not only evil in its expressions but in bad taste, must be attended to, and urgently at that, if he wants to keep his reputation, which is getting a fair amount of criticism here from many real scholars, who are not to be despised, in my opinion" (Alberto da Sarzana, *Opera* [Rome, 1688] p. 30).

Guarino was now in a difficult position. He had not, probably, altered his opinion much from what it was in 1426; but he had to make it appear so, or at least emphasize that he did not countenance immorality. Letter 666 is a volte-face from Letter 346. Sabbadini thinks that it resulted from a profound religious experience, but I am more inclined
to think it was born of a prudent fear. He also calls it, in the notes to Letter 666, a "ritrattazione... di un' ingenuità puerile." One is inclined to agree. If Guarino really had said all he claims to have done in the earlier letter, it would never have been possible to apologize for its brevity. He says the earlier letter he wrote was "grandiuscula", but neither Letter 346 nor its alternative version (which, in my opinion, is the genuine original) could be called that. He either did not, or affected not to have the original text before him, because he was able to give only the gist of several passages left out by Lamola. He also refers to "vivus sermo" with Lamola, in which he had condemned the Hermaphroditus.

If we assume that Letter 346 had suffered a few mutilations, Letter 666 is not as dishonest as Sabbadini suggests. But even if it was half-honest, it was still dishonest. The really interesting point is that Guarino's opinions, in 1426, seem to have been milder and more tolerant than they were in 1450. Whereas in 1426 he had been prepared to let his students read the Hermaphroditus, one feels that, twenty-four years later, he would have placed it among those books which he would not allow young men to touch, let alone steep themselves in. The scare he had in 1434 may have helped to change his attitude; but moral rigidity is also consistent with advancing age and deepening piety. It is doubtful, however, if he ever plumbed the depths of cynicism reached by the later Renaissance scholar Muretus, who wrote:
Quisquis versibus exprimit Catullum
Raro moribus exprimit Catonem.

We must now deal with the part taken by Guarino in another major issue of the Fifteenth Century, that concerning the relative merits of "tyranny" and popular government. Those who wish a good modern account of the historical background, which is important, are referred to Denys Hay, *The Italian Renaissance in its Historical Background* (Cambridge U.P. 1961) p. 58-67. Only the briefest sketch of it can be attempted here.

By about the beginning of the Fifteenth Century, Italy had, in the broadest of terms, split into five major power blocks. To the North, power centered on Milan under the Visconti, and Venice, with lands in Dolmatia and two small areas north and south of the Laguna. Florence and Rome dominated the middle, and Naples the South. This is, of course an over-simplification. There was a whole profusion of feudal lords, city-states and church dignitaries, who fought constantly among themselves for local and temporary advantages. But the tendency was for the smaller powers to be swallowed up by the larger. Most of the weaker powers, however small or insignificant, found it convenient to depend upon a strong neighbour, or had been forced into submission.

The Italian communes were losing, or had lost, their republican character and independence, and were evolving semi-monarchical modes of government. This was almost
inevitable, for many of the communes had never been completely independent of some local territorial magnate. It often happened that popular government had proved unwieldy, faltering and inefficient in a crisis, when speedy decisions were needed. To some extent this problem was solved by the election of an outside official called the podestà ("praetor" in Latin). These men were professional civic leaders, appointed for six months or a year, and their powers were mainly judicial. Since it was an easy matter to find other posts elsewhere, the podestà did not usually try to prolong his power indefinitely in any one place. But the continuity of executive action provided by this means was not always enough, and strong men, permanently resident in the city or near it, were ever ready to step in and assume a kind of Periclean role of "first among equals." They were either single men or closely-knit groups, who secured for themselves, usually with, but sometimes without, public support, all the strings necessary to manipulate the government. Thus a "tyranny" was established, sometimes gradually, sometimes with dramatic speed and efficiency.

In Lombardy, for instance, the Visconti family set aside the old republican forms, and fanning out from Milan, gained control of most of the Po valley. Their greatest scion, Giangaleazzo Visconti, waded his way to power and a dukedom through murder, marriage alliances and intrigue, not to mention the help he received from a large stock of family wealth. On a smaller scale, Mastino Della Scala
became leading citizen in Verona after the death, in 1259, of Ezzelino da Romano. Hastino became "capitano del populo," and soon afterwards, an imperial vicar. The imperial vicariato was regarded, under the common law of the Holy Roman Empire, as essential for the legality of decisions reached by the popular assembly. Since Verona belonged, in theory, to the Emperor, being part of the "regnum Italian," the vesting of the title in the person of Hastino considerably enhanced his prestige. After Hastino, his brother and nephews consolidated the advantage, and the family remained in power for one hundred and twenty-eight years.*

Venice never fell under a "tyranny" of the Milanese variety, but she was ruled by a titular Dogo, and power was in the hands of a comparatively small number of merchant princes, who liked to call themselves "patricians." Venice was a republic only in name, however jealously guarded.

The Papal States were nominally a kingdom, but its ruler was an absentee, and his lands were administered, after a re-organization by Cardinal Albornoz from 1353-1363, by Papal "rectores." These men were, in effect, local tyrants, who sometimes abused their powers.

In Florence, democracy had been established in 1293. The noble families were excluded from the government; and

except for the year 1342-43, the form of the constitution was republican. It did not always function smoothly. In 1378, for instance, the so-called "Ciompi" revolution* aimed at establishing a truly proletarian government, and in 1393, Vieri dei Medici could have yielded to pressure from one faction to make himself "principe." Being "buono" ("patriotic") however, he refused to do so, and offered his advice to the established government. Such, at any rate, was Vieri's action according to Machiavelli, *Storie Fiorentine Bk III, Ch. 25. We must remember, of course, that Machiavelli's patrons were the Medici and he would, naturally, colour his account in their favour.

It is a tribute to the cool efficiency of the permanent civil servants at Florence that the cog-wheels of government continued to turn through each and every civil fracas. Coluccio Salutati was one of those civil servants under the socially conservative and politically liberal oligarchy** that effectively took charge after 1378. He became Chancellor of the Republic and its chief spokesman in 1375 and remained in office until his death in 1406.

*The "Ciompi" were artisans of the wool industry, led by Michele di Lando.

**Cf. Denys Hay, op. cit. p. 88-89: "A dominant class of rich merchants having excluded from power the nobility, governed the city with the smaller merchants and wealthier craftsmen as junior partners, and the lower orders (were?) entirely excluded from participation in government."
In 1400, he wrote a treatise on tyranny, which is published by F. Ercole, Tractatus de tryanno von C. Salutâti (Berlin 1914) and translated, with notes, by Ephraim Emerton; Humanism and Tyranny (Harvard U. P. 1925) p. 25-116. John of Salisbury's Policraticus had been the first real discussion of the subject in the Middle Ages. He had pictured the ruler as the recipient of a divine mandate. Bad rule, therefore, is a violation of God's law, and the people would be entitled to kill such a tyrant. In the Thirteenth Century, Thomas Aquinas expressed dislike for bad rulers, in the De Regimine Principum, but was against their removal except by due process of human law. He did not, however, define the process. A survival of this Mediaeval view that tyrannicide is lawful in the case of bad rulers, or at least that their removal is justifiable, can be seen in the case pleaded by the lawyer, Jean Petit for the Duke of Burgundy who murdered the Duke of Orleans on November 23rd, 1407. Petit submitted that the defendant was innocent, because he had rid France of a tyrant. A Paris court upheld the plea, but efforts were made at the Council of Constance (1414-1418) to rescind the verdict and condemn Jean Petit.

Salutati begins his treatise with a definition of "tyrant." After a display of erudition he concludes that it means an illegal usurper of government, or an unjust ruler. In the second chapter, he finds fault with John
of Salisbury's justification of tyrannicide. In the third chapter, he examines the political record of Julius Caesar and concludes that he was not a tyrant, although he had seized power by force. Salutati admires Caesar because he was a benevolent despot. In preferring him to Pompey, he was in the main stream of Mediaeval thinking. Dante had consigned Brutus to the lowest Hell (Inferno XXIV, 65) and Petrarch had defended Caesar.* But Dante and Petrarch clung to the hope that the Holy Roman Empire might become a practical reality, and Julius Caesar symbolized the benevolent despot, the adumbration of the ideal future Emperor to be based in Rome. By Salutati's time, the Emperor meant nothing in terms of practical Italian politics; so that when he voiced approval of Caesar, he probably had in mind the strong man—perhaps a professional civil servant like himself—who, in moments of crisis, had the vigour to make decisions and the power to effect them.

This mood, however, took a drastic change in the years 1402-3, when, as Hans Baron has convincingly argued,* the

---

*C f. Denys Hay op. cit. p. 97-98.

*Baron's two main books, The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance (2 vols. Princeton 1955) and Humanistic and Political Literature in Florence and Venice at the beginning of the Quattrocento (Cambridge, Mass., 1955) are likely to remain fundamental reading for some time. For the works mentioned in the paragraph above, I have adopted Baron's revised chronology. For a summary of his conclusions about this chronology, see Humanistic and Political Literature p. 163-165.
tide of Florentine patriotism and republican sentiment reached its high water mark. During the war with Giangaleazzo Visconti, from 1398-1402, the feeling was gradually crystallizing at Florence that "tyranny", whatever the nature of the tyrant, was in itself undesirable and ininical to liberty. The Florentines began to talk of themselves as the champions of popular liberty in Italy. The traditional "Guelphism" of Florence—which in earlier times had implied support for the Papacy against the Emperor—had been transmuted into opposition to any form of imperialism on the part of a "tyrant." The first spokesmen of this sentimental, but fierce republicanism were Cino Rinucci and Salutati. The latter wrote an anti-Visconti invective in 1402-3, in which the mood of the De Tyranno of 1400 had evaporated. Leonardo Bruni, between the summer of 1403 and spring of 1406, produced his Laudatio Florentinae Urbis and Dialogus II ad Petrum Paulum Histrum. In the latter work, Bruni showed hostility to Caesar, who, by then, stood for the rule of any one man.

Giangaleazzo had died in 1402, but a new danger appeared in Ladislas of Naples, who, from 1404-1414, wreaked havoc in the Papal States and posed a threat to Florence. Meanwhile, Filippo Maria Visconti began in 1412 to re-consolidate Visconti power. By 1422 he was lord of Genoa, and then began to turn his attentions to Emilia. In 1425, Venice and Florence were finally forced to join forces against him.
Such is the general background to the controversy between the defenders of republican sentiment and their literary opponents, which flared up again in 1435. The first hint of it in Guarino’s correspondence comes in Letter 666, written about March of that year. Guarino congratulates his pupil on a recent defense of Caesar, the nature of which is not specified. This defense, one surmises, had been occasioned by word reaching Ferrara of a debate at Florence over "great men and their deeds," as Guarino puts it. When the Papal Court had moved there in 1434, the resident humanists inevitably sharpened their wits against the scholars in the Pope’s service. The debate in 1435 about the relative merits of ancient generals was only one of a series. Leonello’s admiration for Caesar was great, almost certainly as a result of Guarino’s influence, and he rose to the bait. Guarino offers in Letter 660 to help his pupil with quotations and other verbal ammunition to fight "those who want an argument" ("altercationis cupidos"). As yet, however, no opponents are mentioned by name. All we know is that Caesar had been impugned.

---

The other that year concerned the nature of the Latin language. The Curia was in Florence in 1434, 1436, 1439 and 1443. Between 1439 and 1443, the major talking points were the relative merits of Latin and Italian, and Latin and Greek.
It is worth noting that in 1433 (See. Letter 620) Leonello had delivered an oration before the Emperor Sigismund, in the course of which he had made a slighting reference to Julius Caesar: "Alexander the Macedonian ranged over the whole of Asia to bring war and destruction upon Darius, king of the Persians. What lands have you not visited, to give their peoples peace and tranquillity! With what bloodshed and slaughter of Gauls, Germans and Britons did Julius Caesar invade Gaul and the seas, attacking the liberty of others! But you, most courageous Caesar, range in peace through so many ports, provinces and peoples, with the object of laying the squabbles of Italy to rest, to take thought for Christ's people and root out all their internal conflicts!" Too much could be made of this, however. The contrast between the two Caesars makes such a neat rhetorical point that few could have resisted making it. It is unthinkable that Guarino would not have checked over the text of his pupil's important speech beforehand. Even he, therefore, must have allowed Leonello to sacrifice his integrity for the sake of a rhetorical flourish. This seems more likely than that Leonello disliked Caesar in 1433, only to become his champion in 1435. Already by 1432, Guarino and Giovanni Lamola had collaborated in producing an edition of everything attributed to Caesar, both genuine and spurious. The manuscript of this edition is now the Codex Estensis VC2 in the Vatican and is subscribed:
"Emendavit Guarinus Veronensis adiuvante Io. Lamola cive bononiensi anno Christi MCCCCCXXXII. IIII nonas iulias Ferrariae" (See Sabbadini; La Scuola e gli Studi di Guarino p. 119-23). Leonello was almost certainly given this as a text book. His genuine love for Caesar cannot be questioned. In Letter 683 of 1435 he begins with an affectionate reference to the Commentaries of "our Caesar," and he seems to have been genuinely vexed by Caesar's detractors. We must not, however, underestimate Guarino's influence on Leonello's thinking. He was in charge of his pupil's intellectual training, and part of that was to prepare him to rule the marquisate of Ferrara. We know, for instance, that Guarino translated two speeches of Isocrates for Leonello's use, the one on the duties of a ruler to his people, the other on the duties of the people to their ruler. It would have been no less than his duty, as the employee of Niccolò d'Este, to confirm Leonello in a belief that tyranny was morally justifiable, and the best form of government. He was fortunate in that duty and inclination were one.

He had always admired Caesar. As early as 1415 (Letter 47) he had translated Plutarch's Life of Caesar into Latin; and in Venice he appears to have praised the Roman dictator frequently. Pietro del Monte records that when he studied under Guarino at Venice he was often irritated by his master's "fanaticism" for Caesar (Walser. Poggius Florentinus p. 172, n. 2). Guarino would not have been open with these views
at Florence from 1410-1414, where there is reason to believe he was most unhappy in the contentious atmosphere of a democracy (Cf. my Life of Guarino sec. 58). There is little doubt that he preferred life under a despot. It was, therefore, natural that when he heard of attacks on Caesar emanating from Florence he should be prepared to meet the challenge with Leonello.

In April 1435, Leonello visited Florence to see the Pope (Letter 670) and no doubt heard more about the controversy. Poggio had by this time emerged as the champion of Scipio. He wrote on the 10th of April to Scipione Mainente, saying that Scipio was superior to Caesar in virtue, and at least his equal in generalship. Apart from pleasing Mainente, whose admiration for Scipio probably originated from nothing more than his having the same first name, Poggio was really striking a passing blow for republicanism of the old, romantic stamp. Two knights, probably Feltrino Boiardo and Alberto della Sale, brought Poggio's letter to Ferrara (See Letter 670), where Guarino must have seen it. He responded with a short note to Leonello (Letter 669) promising to combat the "scourge of Caesar" ("Caesaromastix") and pointing out that it is the duty of princes to safeguard other princes. Leonello himself probably felt unequal to tackling Poggio in public, and passed the task on to Guarino. There is no evidence to prove this, but it is a fair supposition. The result was Letter 670 of June 1435, which is rather fully paraphrased in Summaries.
The tone throughout is friendly, but firm. The Latin is markedly Ciceronian, and reaches splendour in places. Its lucid arrangement compares favourably with the more hurried letter to Giovanni da Prato, already discussed. In his citation of authorities, Guarino displays a devastating erudition. These qualities are best illustrated by a perusal of the text itself: but a few comments seem called for. Guarino relies heavily on Suetonius' life of Caesar in the De Vita Caesarum, from which he picks snippets to show that Caesar was a great general, magnanimous and the right man for that moment in Roman history. At one point (Summaries sec. 7) he slyly digs at Poggio, an Apostolic secretary, by reminding him that not all of the Popes have been as good as Peter, and at another (Summaries sec. 14) he passes off Caesar's use of bribery by pointing to the current financial corruption endorsed by the Papacy in the sale of Church appointments.

Caesar's moral lapses prove an awkward point; and here Guarino selects from Suetonius only what suits him. He neglects the opprobrious passages in which Caesar is called "The Queen of Bithynia" (Ch. 49) and "each man's woman and each woman's man" (Ch. 52) and concentrates on his amour with Cleopatra. The excuse offered is that love is a fault we more or less have to expect and condone. But to make sure of a point, Guarino points out that Caesar at least loved a queen, whereas Scipio was enamoured of a serving wench.
Most of the letter is devoted to praising Caesar's virtues and accomplishments, and comparatively little is said about Scipio. Further, the political overtones are left for the discerning eye to find. One, however, is rather clearer than the others, partly because it stands out as a seeming digression of some 64 lines (Summaries sec 17). It is a bitter attack on Poggio's "holy Cato." The reason is surely political, because Cato, like Scipio, was a stereotype of republican virtue. By showing what a blackguard Cato really was, Guarino was surely hinting that the Florentines were hypocrites and poseurs, out of touch with the realities of politics in Italy, and troublemakers for everyone. The fact that Guarino had already shown a distaste for Cato in 1425 (Letter 300 and Life of Guarino sec. 126) is a further indication that he had long entertained anti-republican sentiments.

It may be objected that this is reading too much into Guarino's words. But we must remember that his earliest years had been spent in a city which was traditionally Ghibelline in its sympathies. It had been regarded as the Italian metropolis of the German emperors, and the capital of their imperial vicars. Only when her days of splendour were over did she become a provincial town, subservient to Venice. Even as late as 1509 Verona showed that her Ghibelline tradition was still alive, for on May 30th of that year the Emperor Maximilian was unanimously welcomed as lord of the
city, which he entered in October clad in cloth of gold and, according to the Venetian chronicler, Sanudo, looking like "a Caesar of the days of old" (Alethea Wiel: The Story of Verona p. 108-109). From 1374-1378 Guarino lived under the della Scala family and from then until 1402, Verona was under Visconti rule. Admittedly, Guarino spent some time in Venice and made many friends there, but the majority of his early life was passed under despots. From 1403-1408 he lived at Constantinople, so that when he returned to his native city, by then part of the Venetian republic, he had passed something like 32 of his 34 years under despots. There is also some indication that he was at least privy to a plot in 1412 to restore the della Scala dynasty in the person of Brunoro della Scala (See: Life of Guarino sec. 63). At one point in Letter 670 (l. 1017-1020) he comes right out with a conviction that the rule of a single man is the best form of government. He does not, however, advance arguments for it, but calls upon the vague authority of "philosophers" to prove its superiority: "Non adducam hunc in locum monarchiae commendationem, clarissimorum virorum et doctissimorum philosophorum disputationibus et auctoritate ceteris administrandae civitatis rationibus antelatam." Lodovico Carbone, in the funeral oration, credits Guarino with a marked preference for the rule of a single man, "which the Greeks call monarchy." It is possible that Carbone was echoing the passage in Letter 670, but no doubt he had also heard Guarino voice the sentiment
in class. But surely the best indication of Guarino's feeling about "tyranny" is the fact that for thirty years until his death in 1460, he served successively under Niccolò III, Leonello, and Borso d'Este. Letter 670 should therefore be regarded as his most important public pronouncement on the subject of tyranny and popular government, veiled though it may have been in the disguise of a defense of Caesar against Scipio.

Poggio did not leave the matter there, but wrote to Francesco Barbaro, asking him to judge the dispute. He also sent Leonello d'Este a copy of his counter-blast. Poggio's reply is moderate. He claims surprise that Guarino should have made such a fuss over an academic question, but answers his points one by one. The lack of rancour in Poggio, and Barbaro's tactful intervention, ended the matter there, so far as Guarino was concerned. In 1436 Ciriaco d'Ancona again defended Caesar against Poggio, and in 1440, Pietro del Monte was added to the list of Caesar's champions. But that was the last that came of the issue (See Walser, Poggius Florentinus p. 168-173 and 137-38).

Another dispute with political overtones in which Guarino found himself embroiled was aroused by the appearance in 1428 of his most famous oration, that on Count Carmagnola, the condottiere of Venice. It is extant in many manuscripts and was published by A. Battistella, Il Conte di Carmagnola (Genoa, 1889). Sabbadini wrote the history of the polemic in an article "Guarino Veronese e la polemica sul Carmagnola" in Nuovo Archivio Veneto XI, 1896. p. 327-61.
In Letter 424, Guarino tells us how, on the evening of the 14th October 1427, he had seen torches blazing in Verona from his villa at Val Policello. Upon inquiry, passers-by told him of Piccinino's defeat by Carmagnola two days before. The event, certainly a splendid feat of arms for the Venetian army over the Milanese, roused even his normally pacific nature to enthusiasm, and he conceived the idea of writing a laudation of the Count. In Letter 437 of 27th January 1428, he wrote Martino Rizzon to say that, in addition to his many other scholarly domestic labours, he had undertaken a speech in praise of a single man and was completely absorbed in it, to the exclusion of food and sleep. By 17th February he was able to announce to his soldier friend, Battista Bevilacqua, that it was finished (Letter 430).

In this letter, he thanked Bevilacqua, who had served under Carmagnola, for encouraging him and supplying material for his use. Battista had, indeed, written an account of the battle to his brother Giorgio, a student under Guarino at Verona, and then another one, in beautifully vigorous Latin, to Guarino, on the 18th of January (Letter 436). Guarino was able to make use of Bevilacqua's detailed account when he wrote the laudation. Bevilacqua wanted Guarino to write a history of the entire war; but the task was too great, as Guarino pointed out in Letter 439 l. 35-47: "For I would not decline the task, if only for the sake of exercising my mind or doing service to the glory of many people, or so that
I should not allow, so far as it lies within my humble abilities, the memory of deeds done in this age to vanish. But it is a difficult business, and one worthy of shoulders that are not weak, to write fittingly of a memorable war, of mighty and affluent states, and gigantic equipment, and to capture, in suitably dignified terms, the naval and land forces, heroic leaders, and distinguished soldiers. Add to that the fact that since history ought to be 'the light of truth' and 'will explain nothing for the sake of merely pleasing or giving offence,' it eschews both flattery and offence; and you will judge for yourself how safe that principle is. The reasons for the war must be explained, and character, loyalty, honour and virtue, and their opposites have to be revealed and put on public display. At one time these were odious subjects, but today they are a capital risk." It is clear, then, that Guarino had no real political axe to grind, except perhaps to defend Carmagnola, whose success had aroused some envy in Venice. That was risk enough; but to have written a complete history of the war would have involved him in endless trouble, as he could see.

The oration begins by exulting that the age of great commanders is not yet over (a sentiment later echoed in Letter 796, in which Guarino also says more about his attitude towards writing history) and claiming that it is only just to honour them. A life of Carmagnola follows, then assessments of his virtues in war and peace. With commendable objectivity,
Guarino instances, as a peace-time virtue, the Count's success as governor of Genoa for the Visconti; and for his prowess in war, the victory at Maclodio--this time at the Duke of Milan's expense. The oration ends with praise for Venice and a plea that she should honour the Count. This praise of Venice was probably sincere enough, for her yoke had proved light for Verona; but it was also a politic necessity if the plea for Carmagnola were to succeed. Besides, it would do Guarino no harm to show he was a loyal subject of the Republic.

The oration gained a wide circulation: and the Venetians were pleased with it. But the reaction in Lombardy was unfavourable, at least in official circles. After Guarino went to Ferrara, Antonio Beccadelli sent a copy of the speech to Cambio Zambeccari, who liked it, probably because he was a friend of Guarino's. But then Zambeccari passed it on to Pier Candido Decembrio, who was a ducal secretary. The result was a letter to Zambeccari in 1430 refuting Guarino's points one by one, and two invectives, against Beccadelli and Guarino, the one in 1431, the other in 1432. Decembrio had been an admirer of Guarino in 1425, when he had unsuccessfully tried to visit him in Verona (Letter 341) and, except for the Carmagnola incident, remained on good terms with him (See, for example, Letters 712 l. 40 and Letter 714). One cannot blame him for attacking Guarino's speech on Carmagnola. He was a loyal supporter, as his father before him had been, of the Visconti. When war broke out again in 1431, bitterness and a sense of duty made him break out into formal invective.
Guarino did nothing to defend himself. Sabbadini says in his *Vita di Guarino* sec. 250 that he later wrote a letter or some verses in praise of the Visconti to show that in praising Carmagnola he was not taking sides; but I have been unable to find the evidence for this. At any rate, the indications are that the speech on Carmagnola was not intended to be a political pamphlet. That it was interpreted as such was not Guarino's fault. It might also be suggested that one reason he did not reply to Decembrio was that he really did have something in his own past to hide—perhaps complicity in the plot of 1412 to make Brunoro della Scala lord of Verona. If this skeleton really was in the cupboard, it would have been prudent to minimize the risk of someone rattling the bones.

Finally, we must now consider Guarino's contribution to the controversy over the nature of the Latin language. This controversy had begun in 1435 at Florence, the chief participants being Flavio Biondo, Antonio Losco, Cencio Rustici, Andrea Fiocco and Poggio Bracciolini. Biondo and Poggio maintained that, in ancient Rome, both the educated and illiterate classes spoke essentially the same language. Rustici and Losco believed that there were two languages, widely different from each other. Leonardo Bruni ranged himself on the side of Rustici and Losco. Biondo, on the 1st April, 1435 wrote Bruni a letter (publ. by G. Mignini in *Propugnatore* 1890 III part 1, p. 144) in which he reviewed the entire dispute and answered the various
arguments produced in conversation by Rustici, Losco and Bruni. Calling upon the testimony of Cicero, Biondo argued that everyone in Rome spoke essentially the same language, but that there were differences that could be accounted for by variations in education and intellectual competence. Grammatically, however, everyone spoke the same language, with changes of case, variations of tense and mood, and so on.

Bruni replied on the 7th of May (Epistolario ed. Mehus, VI, 10) to the effect that the lettered and unlettered classes spoke two different tongues, the vulgar tongue being uninflected and essentially the same as the Italian of Bruni's day. This idea had already been advanced by Dante in his De vulgari eloquentia I, 1 and 9. Bruni answered only two of Biondo's arguments. First, he maintained that the Latin spoken by senators and judges was literary and could not be understood by the mob. When orators addressed the people, they used the vulgar tongue; but when they published their speeches for posterity, they used the other language. Secondly, he maintained that the numbers of common people who attended the theatre did not mean that they understood what was being said. They went simply to enjoy the scenery and acting. This seems a childish argument; but Bruni could not bring himself to believe that that Latin upon which he had himself expended so much study could have come naturally to every unlettered person in Rome.

Guarino entered the debate, or rather, stated the position he favoured, in Letter 813 of 28th July 1449. He had, however,
discussed the matter before with his pupil, Leonello d'Este, for he refers to the debate they had once had over the nature of Latin. Unfortunately, he does not say exactly when this discussion took place; but the point was first mooted before 1441, when Leonello became marquis, because there is a reference to it in Angelo Camillo Decembrio's book *De Politia Litteraria* (Augsburg 1540) p. 40. This work purports to describe scenes from the literary life of Ferrara in the last years of Niccolò III's reign, with the young prince Leonello as the central figure in various informal discussions, in which Guarino also plays a prominent part. In the passage referred to, Leonello is represented as denying that there was one language for all in the cities of ancient Italy, namely the literary language of Latin. His reason is that at Rome there were masters and schools and therefore Latin had to be taught. Hence it could not have come naturally to everyone. Those who supported Leonello were Decembrio himself, Feltrino Boiardo and Niccolò Pirondolo.

Probably the matter was re-debated from time to time, but Guarino did not state his position fully until 1449.

---

*Its full title is Politiae Litterariae Angeli Decembrii Modiolanensis, Oratoris Clarissimi, ad summum Pontificem Pium II, libri septem. The first edition at Basle 1527 is very rare. Originally written in honour of Leonello d'Este, it was dedicated by Decembrio, after Leonello's death in 1450, to Pius II.*
He does not treat the matter as of any great importance, but simply as something to write about in an idle hour. He knew, of course, that Leonello supported Bruni, and that he had the latter in mind is obvious from 1. 26-32 of his letter: "reliqui contradicunt nec assentiri ullo pacto possunt, cum credibile non esse dicant, ut quae tantis salariis laboribus vigiliis atque praeeptis discitur oratio, solisque nunc eruditis intellecta, ea tunc rusticis operariis militibus at mulierculis gratis et sensin cognita innataque fuisset dicatur."

Despite its comparative brevity, Letter 813 contains a mass of compressed erudition and argument, backed up by references to ancient authors. Guarino does not, of course, quote chapter and verse, for the simple reason that he did not have the benefit of our modern pagination and systems of reference: but there is no doubt that he could have found the passages in question quite readily in his own manuscripts (They are listed in brackets in Letter 813 Summaries).

Like Biondo, and the other opponents of Bruni, Guarino does not deny that there were differences between educated and vulgar speech, but insists that they did not amount to a difference in language. Everyone spoke Latin, although some more educated individuals had a wider vocabulary and more refined modes of expression. Education, however, had little to do with the speaking of "good" Latin.
Indeed, Guarino goes so far as to repeat Cicero's statement in the *Brutus* 210 that Curio spoke good Latin because he was uneducated, and attributes the pure speech of the Gracchi to the uncorrupted Latinity they heard from their mother, Cornelia. (C.f. Quintilian Bk 1.6). This curious idea that the pure stream of a language is best preserved by women and rustics, because of their isolation from scholars, had first been advanced by Cicero (*De Oratore* 45) and Quintilian, although the latter was aware that not all women spoke this pure tongue, for he warned against exposing children to the faulty speech of nurses. It is clear enough that Guarino was aware that solecisms could occur even in ancient Rome, but he was concerned with the broad picture of a Rome in which everyone understood one language, although with varying degrees of mastery.

It is interesting to note his division of Latin into four periods, the first being that of Janus, Saturn, Picus and Faunus.* Once again, here is evidence that Guarino held to the Euhemeristic view that the gods were deified mortals. The second period is that of King Latinus. According to Guarino, the Latin of this age was that spoken by Menenius Agrippa on the *Hons Sacer* and that in which the laws of the Twelve Tables were written. It is highly

---

doubtful if Guarino had ever seen any specimens of early Latin; and he seems here to be merely playing with names he had read in books. The third period is that of Plautus, Naevius, Ennius, Cicero, Vergil and Ovid, who are all lumped together, the only differences allowed between them being degrees of eloquence. This is, at first sight, rather disturbing, because it looks as if Guarino was unaware of the differences between Plautus, for instance, and Ovid. We should, however, regard him as talking in broad terms. That he had a fair acumen in distinguishing between different kinds of Latin is suggested by a letter of Pontano to Antonio Beccadelli (See my Life of Guarino sec. 96). It would, perhaps, be uncharitable to pick fault with his listing of Plautus with Ovid. The fourth period listed is that of the barbarian invasions, to which he attributes the corruption of Latin, as had Biondo before him.

There is, indeed, nothing in Guarino's letter which had not already been stated in essence by Biondo, except the original observation that Spanish is derived from Latin, an idea he had held since at least 1442, for in Letter 779, l. 98 he had told King Alfonso that the Latin language still existed in Spain. Guarino seems to have been the first to recognize this. Even that great linguist, Lorenzo Valla, believed that Spanish was derived from Italian, for he says in his Elegantiae linguae latinae (1440) I. 22: ". . . hispano, quod ex italico oriundum est. . . ." In Letter 813, Guarino also gives four samples of Fifteenth
Century Spanish, which he had picked up from contact with Spanish pupils at Ferrara. Without doubt, he had a keen ear for languages, and did not altogether despise the vernaculars, as is evidenced by his knowledge of German (See Life of Guarino sec. 119). But he almost certainly regarded them as harmless bagatelles, unworthy of any serious consideration, in contrast to Leonello d'Este who, encouraged by Leon Battista Alberti, wrote sonnets in Italian, two of which have survived, and admired Dante's Divina Commedia.

Interesting, also, is Guarino's remark in 1.196-7: "hebraicam suis constare litteris accipio." This indicates that, although he knew Greek and Latin and accepted Hebrew as their equal in importance, he had never learned the third tongue, for he is only passing on information that he has heard from others.

Towards the end of the letter, there is a useful list of abbreviations used by scribes in taking down the text of speeches verbatim. Although they are introduced as a proof that this shorthand would never have been used if it had not been understood by transliterators, the list seems dragged in as a display of erudition, perhaps to fill up a

*Cf. Angelo Decembrio, De Politia Litteraria I, 6, where Leonello is shown to favour treating Italian as a respectable language in its own right. His admiration of Dante was not shared by others in his circle, for Tito Strozzi, in the same passage from Decembrio, is represented as plucking Guarino by the sleeve and saying in an undertone that Dante was not comparable to Vergil. Elsewhere (V, 64) Guarino expresses the opinion that Dante neither understood nor imitated Vergil successfully.
space in Guarino's parchment. They were drawn, as Guarino says, from some "commentarioli" discovered by Poggio at the time of the Council of Constance.

Letter 813, then, is an erudite and interesting document, but it cannot be said to contribute anything of value to what had already been said about the nature of the Latin language. Guarino was not a major figure in the debate, but his ideas were in accord with the best brains of his time, with the notable exception of Bruni. At Florence, Marsuppini and Leon Battista Alberti also opposed Bruni, and at Rome, Poggio, with his Disceptationes convivales (1450-51) and Valla with his Libellus secundus in Poggium (1452) also asserted that everyone in Rome had spoken the same language. In 1451 and 1473, Filelfo added the weight of his learning against Bruni's opinions.

Having surveyed Guarino's total contributions to the major controversies of his day, one is left with, perhaps, three overwhelming impressions. First, there is his enormous erudition, shown by numerous quotations from a wide range of authors. His cases are argued almost exclusively from an appeal to authorities, although he shows discrimination and judgment in using them. This ties up with the second impression, which is that of unoriginality. Guarino had a highly receptive intelligence and he retained what he had read; but he was much too conservative and cautious to produce any startlingly new ideas. Lastly, one feels that
he had no real zest for controversy. With the exception of the early invective against Niccoli, he avoids writing with rancour. On the occasions when he made his views public, he always had a good reason for doing so, and in this respect compares favourably with other humanists who sometimes seem to have taken up their pens for the sheer lust of battle. Guarino is nearly always moderate, sensible and benevolent in his outlook.
GUARINO AND HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

Under this head I shall discuss six main topics: (1) the status of teachers during the early Renaissance, and the circumstances under which Guarino became a teacher; (2) Guarino's teaching career before 1403 and the major influences that moulded his early ideas on education; (3) the evidence for what we know of his educational methods; (4) his actual practice as a teacher at Florence, Venice, Verona, and Ferrara; (5) a comparison between Guarino and Vittorino as teachers; (6) his success as a teacher as evidenced by the subsequent careers of some of his pupils.

(1) The status of teachers during the early Renaissance

W. H. Woodward says in Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance p. 26: "Guarino's was that covetable fortune to experience no divorce, rather the most intimate union between his strongest and finest interests and his professional occupations." So far as the phrase "professional occupations" refers to teaching, this statement is strictly true only for the years after 1419, when Guarino had renounced all aspirations to a career in the papal curia (Life of Guarino secs. 83-84) and reconciled himself to the profession once stigmatized by Petrarch as fit only for those who could do nothing better: "Pueros doceant qui maiora non possunt" (Epistulae de rebus familiaribus et variae ed. I. Fracasetti, XII. 3).
Petrarch, of course, was not thinking of teachers at the university level, many of whom enjoyed reasonable incomes and a high measure of public regard, but of the average magister puerorum (elementary schoolmaster) of the fourteenth century. Admittedly, certain private masters such as Guarino’s earliest mentor, Marzagala, and Donato degli Albanzani, the teacher at Ravenna of both Giovanni di Conversino and Giovanni dei Malpaghini (Life of Guarino sec. 14), achieved high standing in their communities, but these men were above the average as scholars and teachers, and had won their reputations by sheer professional competence. Too often, however, their humbler colleagues were inferior scholars or unimaginative martinet’s who compensated for their lack of pedagogic skill by liberal applications of the rod. Giovanni di Conversino has left in his autobiographical Rationarium vitae a shocking picture of the sadism and incompetence displayed by a grammar school teacher of his youth (not Donato degli Albanzani). There is some reason to believe this conduct was typical (cf. Bolgar, Classical Heritage p. 257). Occasionally, too, teachers of boys were men of questionable morals, or were at least open to the suspicion of moral turpitude (cf. Life of Guarino sec. 79). On the whole, therefore, they did not generally enjoy a savoury reputation or an enviable lot.

*Andrea Gloria, Monumenti della Universita di Padova 1318-1405 (Padua, 1888) I p. 86 refers to certain privileges enjoyed by university professors at Padua, Bologna, and Ferrara, including exemption from military service. Ibid. p. 86-87 (sec. 210) he gives some typical salaries paid to professors at Padua, e.g. Rainiero Arsendi in 1344 received 600 ducats, which Gloria calculates as representing a good income in modern currency. In addition, certain professors were allowed to supplement their incomes with fees from private pupils (p. 87, footnote 1).
Part of the trouble lay in the fact that education was not as yet a state concern—a situation which Vergerio deplored in his *De ingenuiis moribus* (1404). There were therefore no regulations governing entry to the profession of elementary or grammar school teacher, so that anyone could set himself up as a private teacher.

The situation was different with university teachers, entry to whose ranks was jealously guarded. Acquisition of the doctoral degree was tantamount to joining an exclusive academic guild, the members of which had no urge to see their jobs taken by men without a degree. So stringent were the regulations that a doctorate from one university did not always qualify its holder to teach at another. Padua, for example, would recognize only its own doctors or those from Paris or Bologna (Gloria, *Monumenti* I p. 86).

Admittedly, certain scholars of outstanding ability seem to have become university teachers without the formality of a degree. Giovanni di Conversino, who had only a notarial qualification from Bologna (1362) but became professor of Rhetoric at Padua (1392) is a case in point. Guarino is another, for he had no university degree of any kind, yet he was appointed in 1413 to lecture on Greek by the University of Florence. But such cases were exceptional.

*Certain municipalities provided public professors, whose salaries were paid by the state, but this was far from a comprehensive system of state education.*
By about 1420 the status of private masters was gradually improving as a result of the success of men like Giovanni di Conversino and Gasparino Bartizza, who in addition to holding university appointments accepted private students in their own homes. These scholars owed their prestige more to their university professorships than to their activities as private teachers. It seems reasonable to suggest that private teaching at all levels began to acquire respectability when certain teachers who were also first-rate scholars were compelled by the esoteric nature of their specialties to open schools independent of the universities. Biagio Pelicani, for instance, was highly regarded as a private master at Padua until 1411, but his specialty, mathematics, was not accommodated by the university. Similarly, Guarino and Vittorino more or less had to found institutions of their own before they could teach Greek or classical Latin. The fact that Vittorino in particular had no aversion to taking very young students probably lent reflected prestige to his humbler brethren among private schoolmasters. The humanist movement in education, with its lively interest in problems of method and its paedocentric attitude, also did much to raise the status of the non-university teacher.

In 1419, however, humanistic education was still in its infancy, and Guarino, although his reputation as a scholar was considerable, was far from enjoying the prestige as a teacher
which was afterwards his. It need therefore occasion little surprise that he may have felt that the role of schoolmaster was beneath him. At the age of 45 he was only beginning to make a real success of a profession into which he had drifted more by circumstances than choice; he could not have guessed that he would live another 41 years, or that the work for which his name is today chiefly honoured lay ahead.

(2) Teaching career before 1403 and early influences

There are only two pieces of evidence that Guarino was a schoolmaster before 1403. The first is his recorded presence as a teacher at Venice in August, 1403 (Life sec. 25). The second is Letter 16, from which it emerges that Guglielmo della Pigna, a native of Verona, had once been his pupil. This must have been before 1403. (Life sec. 24). The nature of the instruction Guglielmo received is a matter of conjecture, but the humanistic flavour of his Latin style suggests that Guarino had introduced him to the study of classical models. This would square with the strong probability that Guarino attended the school of Giovanni di Conversino at Padua c. 1392-1394, that is, between the ages of 18 and 20, by which time he was scarcely old enough to have been a teacher. He must therefore have instructed Guglielmo after he had come under the influence of Giovanni di Conversino, who is known to have maintained a strong personal interest in humane studies.
Guarino probably settled in Venice long before 1403 (Life sec. 25). The Anonymous Panegyrist says that he sought the company of "wise men" who encouraged him to study the Latin poets, orators, and historians, and inspired in him an ambition to learn Greek. These wise men could hardly have been other than a small group of scholars at Padua, including Giovanni de Conversino, Pier Paolo Vergerio, and Paolo Veneto, who had kept alive the humanistic tradition founded there by Petrarch. It would be an easy matter for Guarino to meet them, since Padua is only 19 miles from Venice.

The actual extent of the influence of these men upon his is difficult to determine, since Guarino's letters contain no reference to it. Certainly none of these Paduan scholars was a professional humanist in the sense that he taught Latin from a more or less prescriptively Ciceronian standpoint or otherwise made his living from an ability to write classical Latin. As yet, there was no market for such skills, for none of the regular professions called for them. Classical Latin was an esoteric study which could be pursued only by wealthy amateurs, such as Francesco Barbaro and Niccolò Niccoli, or by scholars who were willing to give their free time to it, although they were obliged for economic reasons to earn their living otherwise. Giovanni di Conversino, for example, drew part of his income from a school in which he trained notaries or prepared students who intended to go on to study law at the university. He must therefore have spent much of his time teaching legalistic Latin.
Guarino went further than any of his Paduan mentors by totally repudiating the training which would have equipped him, like them, to earn a living in one of the regular professions. John of Pannonia (Sylva panegyrica 53-57) reports that none of the established disciplines of law, medicine, or logic appealed to Guarino:

Post ubi creverunt sensus crescentibus annis,  
Non medicina tibi, scitu pulcherrima quanque,  
Actu foeda taren, logicae aut placuere protervae  
Iurgia inexplicitos frustra nectentia gryphos,  
Nec verbosarium discors concordia legum:  
Rhetoris et vatis studio compleritis omni.

Nor should we forget that Guarino had the unparalleled courage to undertake a journey to Constantinople to learn Greek. All of this argues in him a profound and reasoned criticism of mediaeval disciplines, and a determination to commit his future entirely to studies which seemed to offer little financial reward. Letter 4, written in 1408 from the East to bolster Francesco Barbaro's resolution to pursue humane studies, is really a defence of the bold step Guarino had himself taken. If more such documents had survived, they might have shown what one is bound to suspect, that Guarino had made a shrewd appreciation of the coming trends in education. He may have received encouragement from his friends at Padua, but the final decision to embrace humanism entirely was his.

More specifically, he may have learned from Giovanni di Conversino certain educational principles evident in the latter's writings: that good education begins in the home,
that encouragement and love are more effective in teaching than severe chastisement, and that intelligent comprehension of ideas is superior to mere rote learning (Cosenza, Dictionary of the Italian humanists' V under "Johannes de Ravenna"). How Guarino applied these principles will be discussed later.

Far greater was the debt he owed to Vergerio, and this merits discussion at some length.

Very probably it was Vergerio who first inspired him with a thirst to learn Greek, for he had resigned his professorship of logic at Padua to attend the classes in Greek given by Manuel Chrysoloras 1397-1400 at Florence, and doubtless when he returned to Padua he had voiced the praises of the Byzantine teacher and forecast that a knowledge of Greek would soon be required of every truly educated man.

While Guarino was absent from Italy (1403-08) Vergerio published his famous treatise De ingenuis moribus, which keyed noted the ideals of humanistic education and prepared the way for practical teachers such as Guarino, Barzizza, and Vittorino to follow. It is extant in many MSS of the fifteenth century, and before 1500 ran through at least 20 printed editions (Woodward, Vittorino p. 95). At least another 20 came out in the sixteenth century, by which time it had become a standard text book in schools, according to Paolo Giovio, Elogia veris clarorum virorum imaginibus apposita (Venice, 1546) p. 68.

*Reference throughout is to the 1963 edition (Teachers College, Columbia University, New York).
Vergerio's material was not in itself original, since he drew upon Cicero's *De officiis*, Plato's *Gorgias*, *Republic* and *Laws*, Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics*, Plutarch *passim*, and Quintilian's *Institutiones oratoriae*, although the last was available to him only in the mediaeval vulgate text, of which he had already made a *compendiolum* (C. A. Combi, *Epistole di P. P. Vergerio* [Venice, 1887] p. xxi). On the other hand, Vergerio's apparent first-hand acquaintance with his sources—one may presume this, since he knew Greek by 1404—is refreshing, and his skill in marshalling so much material from the educational tradition of the ancients is remarkable.

The treatise was revolutionary in three main respects: its re-arranged hierarchy of intellectual disciplines; the value Vergerio placed upon physical development as a harmonious complement to intellectual training; and the assertion that good morals is the chief end of all education.

The intellectual disciplines he proposed as worthy of the attention of a free man were grammar, syntax, rhetoric, poetry, history, logic, arithmetic, history, medicine, ethics, law, astronomy, geometry, music, natural history, ethics, theology, the study of the weights of bodies, and "perspective." He mentions drawing as a subject taught in Greek schools (Aristotle, *Politics* VIII. 3) but dismisses it as unnecessary for students of his own day, doubtless because artists were still thought of as mere craftsmen, and drawing, since it was pursued for economic reasons, qualified as an "illiberal" rather than a "liberal" art. Similarly, he follows Martianus Capella, through
whom the concept of Seven Liberal Arts had passed into medi-
aeval education, in excluding medicine from the strictly
liberal arts on the grounds that it is really a technical
skill. He does not, however, discount it as a possible study
for a free man. He also deplores the fact that law in his
day is practised as a trade and too little appreciated as the
practical application of moral philosophy (ethics). Theology
he respects as the purely intellectual examination of divine
mysteries, but in his scheme it is obviously far from being
the queen of the sciences. He therefore plays down the impor-
tance of what had been the three disciplines most respected
in the Middle Ages.

Among the "liberal" arts which "ennoble and beautify" life
he gives first place to history, partly because it is an
intensely pleasant study and partly because it provides con-
tact examples of the teachings of moral philosophy. The
latter is placed second and described as "the secret of true
freedom" in that it shows men how to act rightly. Eloquence,
since it persuades men to believe the teachings of moral
philosophy and history, is placed third in importance. The
hierachical arrangement of the remaining disciplines is not so
clearly defined. Grammar and syntax are valued as the founda-
tion of literacy. Logic is praised as the art of valid argu-
mentation and an indispensable tool for carrying forward a
clear and connected argument, but Vergerio totally rejects the
scholastic view of logic as an intricate examination of validity.
conducted schematically as a game for pedants who had no
regard for the value of the arguments themselves. This is
interesting since his own specialty was logic. Poetry is
thought of as an enjoyable fiction best suited to moments of
relaxation. Music is valued as an "aid to the inner harmony
of the soul" and should be studied in both its practical and
theoretical aspects, that is, both as musica practica (compo-
sition and performance) and musica speculativa (theory of
music, treated as a branch of mathematics and medicine*).

By arithmetic Vergerio means the study of the properties of
numbers, rather than mechanical calculation, and by geometry
the properties of lines, dimensions, surfaces, and solid
bodies. Both studies are valued mainly for their "element
of epistemological certitude." Astronomy is defined as the
study of fixed stars and planetary motions. Natural History
as the study of the properties and causes of animate and
inanimate natural phenomena, although in practice this probably
meant no more than a knowledge of the curiosities, real and
fictional of external nature—the strange animals found in

*See Nan Cooke Carpenter, Music in the Mediaeval and Renais-
sance Universities (Norman, 1930) p. 41, where she stresses the
importance of musica speculativa at Padua and cites the work of
Pietro d'Albano, on record as a professor at Padua in 1315, who
translated the pseudo-Aristotelian Problematum, which includes a
discussion of music as a mathematical study. In Pietro's medi-
cal work, Conciiliator (1303), he treated at one point the ques-
tion of whether there is "musical consonance" in the human
pulse. See also L. Thorndike, "Peter of Albano" Annual Report
of the American Historical Association I (1919) pp. 319, 325.
mediaeval bestiaries, the properties of plants and rare stones, and natural exotica of all kinds. None of these subjects, however, is fully defined or described, and the last two—the study of the weights of bodies and the mathematical science of "perspective"—are merely mentioned.

It is important to note that Vergerio says that no one can be expected to pursue all the studies he has listed but that a specialized choice must be made in the light of individual tastes and aptitudes. But by exalting history, moral philosophy, and eloquence he made it clear what subjects he considered most important. Since his emphasis is upon literary studies, he is really affirming the primacy of what had roughly been the mediaeval trivium, and correspondingly down-grading the scientific disciplines of what had been the quadrivium. This was a reversal of the usual attitude among scholars of his time.

The exaltation of moral philosophy was also consistent with Vergerio's theme that education should aim at moral excellence. No doubt mediaeval teachers would have agreed with this in principle, but in practice they tended to leave the moral development of their students to spiritual confessors. Vergerio, however, placed responsibility for the student's conduct, manners, and

*Antonio Favoro, "Intorno alla vita ed alle opere di Prosdocimo de' Beldimandi, matematico padovano del secolo XV" Bulletin di bibliografia e di storia delle Scienze matematiche e fisiche XII (1879) p. 19 quotes the writer of the Vita Sancti Meinwerci (1616) as saying about scholarly writers of the fourteenth century: "Magni olim aestimati qui Trivium in literis consecrant; pluris, qui Quadrivium."
and character squarely upon the teacher's shoulders.

Just as revolutionary was his recommendation that physical education should complement intellectual disciplines. Young aristocrats of the type Vörgorio had in mind had, of course, long practised hunting, hawking and martial exercises, but they had neglected the cultivation of the mind. Vörgorio proposed a return to the Greek concept of education as a balance between mousiké (intellectual training) and gymnastiké (physical training) intended to produce the whole man and perfect citizen.

Admittedly, Vörgorio's treatise is deficient as a practical handbook of education; it gives no details as to how any of the subjects should be studied, or in what order, or for how long. But it contains a great deal of wise advice, most of which was taken by the great educators of the fifteenth century. A list of Vörgorio's main points will be found convenient for comparison with Guarino's methods, to be discussed later:

(1) A man of humble origins can attain dignity through learning

(2) Reason is the best spur to merit, but praise is an acceptable substitute in less mature years

(3) The bent of a pupil's character is early recognisable

(4) Examples of good conduct, especially in living men, should constantly be set before the young

(5) Character traits should not be allowed to run to extremes
(6) Boasting, lies, and loose talk must be discouraged, and loquaciousness curbed.

(7) The education of children should be the concern of the state.

(8) Youth must be guarded from the company of women, the allurements of dancing and other temptations of the flesh.

(9) Tutors and comrades should be chosen carefully, and only the best books and teachers should be given to children.

(10) Excess in eating, sleeping, and drinking must be checked.

(11) Respect for divine ordinances must be inculcated early, but without undue coercion.

(12) Profane language is an abominable sin.

(13) Parents, elders, and guests deserve respect.

(14) Children of high social standing should be educated away from their native city.

(15) Children should be inured to hard work and exposed to wisdom as early as possible.

(16) Some students require more attention than others.

(17) Education is for older men as well as youths.

(18) The master must judiciously use rewards, encouragement, and the natural spirit of emulation to stimulate progress. Extremes of severity or leniency are self-defeating.

(19) Books, being permanent friends, should be preserved or rescued from oblivion.

(20) Too much in any subject should not be attempted too soon.
(21) Too many subjects should not be attempted; individual abilities should determine the subjects pursued.

(22) Literature is the supreme art

(23) A quick brain often has poor powers of retention; this can be remedied by a nightly review of everything accomplished during the day.

(24) Leisure should not be wasted on aimless games; but ball games, hunting, hawking, fishing, gentle riding, and pleasant walks are recommended.

(25) Discuss studies with a friend

(26) Erudition should not be displayed; be skeptical of one's own powers, and this will promote thoroughness.

(27) A fixed time should be set for study every day

(28) The library should be used for study only

(29) Training in arms should precede intellectual training, but exercise in sword-play, the handling of shield and mace, swimming, running, jumping, wrestling, boxing, archery, javelin and heavy arms drill, and horsemanship are at all times important.

(30) A prince must be instructed in generalship

(31) Wit and humour, music and song have their place in life

(32) It is undignified to accompany oneself on an instrument, dance alone, or watch dancing girls

(33) Dice is to be condemned, but games involving skill are permissible

(34) At times it is permissible to do nothing; a thread drawn too tight will snap
Good grooming is essential. A certain vanity of appearance may be forgiven in the young, but it should vanish with maturity.

It is unlikely that a copy of De ingenuis moribus filtered through to Guarino at Constantinople, but it was such an important treatise that one may reasonably suppose that he read it soon after his return to Italy. The first reference to it occurs as late as 1429 (Letter 570), in which year Guarino lectured on it. Only the introductory lecture is extant under the title "Oratiuncula Guarini Veronensis pro libello de ingenuis moribus incoliando" (Epistolario III, p. 268). But that the work had long been used at Guarino's school is strongly suggested by the contents of Codex Marcianus Latinus L 498 (in the Marcian Library at Venice) which has, together with copies of Guarino's Latin versions of Lucian's Calumnia and Plutarch's De liberis educandis, one of the De ingenuis moribus subscribed: "Patavii die 17 aprilis scriptum fuit praesens opusculum per me Antonium G. Brixensem." The date of this MS is 1425, in which year Antonio da Brescia was Guarino's assistant. It seems likely that Antonio would not have transcribed this work unless there was a use for it in Guarino's school. Perhaps the exemplar he used had been frayed by constant use. It seems reasonable to suppose that from around 1410 at least Guarino had known and appreciated Vergerio's De ingenuis moribus.
Bolgar in *Classical Heritage* p. 258 says of Vergerio that "we may reasonably assume that he was putting on paper the principles which had guided him throughout his career". But it can also be argued that *De ingenuis moribus* is best understood as Vergerio's reaction to the protreptic force of Chrysoloras' personality and teaching, especially since he shows familiarity with Greek sources and a deeper understanding of the ideals of ancient education than any of his fourteenth century predecessors. Such insight could only have come from Chrysoloras.

But the latter's particular importance lies in his having introduced to Italy certain pedagogic techniques, the widespread dissemination of which, according to Bolgar (*Classical Heritage* p. 268), marked the essential difference between the age of Petrarch and that of Guarino. Undoubtedly, he used these techniques at Florence, but they might have remained the preserve of the elite few who were his students there, if they had not been passed on by Guarino to his own students, many of whom, like Vittorino, became teachers themselves and so
continued the tradition. The importance of Guarino's service to humanistic education in this matter can hardly be exaggerated. The first detailed exposition of Chrysoloras' "precepts for learning" in all humanist literature occurs in Guarino's Letter 679 of 1434, where Chrysoloras is specifically named as their source. The fact that Battista Guarino repeats them in his De modo et ordine docendi ac studendi (1459) is additional evidence that they were central to Guarino's teaching methods at Ferrara. But it is safe to assume that he had used them ever since his student days at Constantinople, and therefore throughout his entire life as a teacher. They are as follows:

(1) Pronounce in a clear voice, and avoid mumbling into the teeth (Guarino and Battista believed that sounds impinging upon the ear set thoughts in motion; the clearer the sound, the clearer the thought. They also believed, following Plutarch and Pliny the Elder, that using the voice aids digestion)

(2) Try to form a complete mental picture of the structure and meaning of a Greek and Latin period. If words and meaning do not rise together, go over the sentence as a unit until they do (This presupposes some knowledge of grammar and syntax, and could not work with immature students)

(3) At the end of a passage mull over its contents and master them thoroughly before moving on (This advice became
basic to humanistic method; cf. the very full treatment
given to it by Erasmus in his De ratione studii and De
conscribendis epistolis, alluded to by Woodward, Desiderius
Erasmus concerning the aim and method of study [Columbia

(4) Note down striking phrases and important facts (This
recommendation is also made by Bruni in his De studiis et
litteris. It was a most important precept, since by this
means the humanists were able to organize and learn the gram-
mar, syntax, and thoughts of classical authors. Guarino says
nothing about a classification of material under the much
bruited rubrics of methodice and historice. Battista simply
states that notes of this kind should be "duly ordered": but
following Quintilian, Institutio oratoria I. 9. 1, where
methodice means ratio loquendi, the theory of speaking, and
historice means enarratio auctorum, the interpretation of
authors, he defines the first as "the rules that govern the
different parts of speech" and the second as "the study of
continuous prose authors, more particularly historians."
These terms denoted consecutive parts of Guarino's grammatical
or intermediate course, which will be discussed later, rather
than rubrics for the classification of notes. But it is
easy to see how students using double columns in taking
notes from a particular author would label one column methodice
for grammatical, syntactical and rhetorical material, and
the other *historico for what we should call background material*

(5) At the end of every month review what has been learned  
(Battista recommends a nightly review also, said to have been a practice of the Pythagoreans; cf. *Vergerio* 23*).

(6) Find some kindred spirit with whom to discuss your work  
(Battista recommends that students study in pairs for mutual stimulation; cf. *Vergerio* 25).

Those "learning precepts" are all psychologically sound, although the need for their rigorous application has been diminished by the abundance of texts and reference books available in our libraries. Students in Guarino's day had no comparable aids and were compelled to rely upon their memory. Thoroughness was not merely a virtue but a necessity, and the keynote of Guarino's teaching, as is evidenced by John of Pannonia (*Sylva* 511-513):

Nil indiscussum penitus dubium vo reliquis,
Syllaba vel nullum ut tensus vel littera fallat,
Qui structurae ordo, quae sit sententia vocum.

John also praises Guarino's insistence upon giving extra tuition to slower pupils, so that no detail would be unmastered before proceeding.

---

*Reference is to point 23 in the list of contents of Vergerio's *De ingenuis moribus*.
If Chrysoloras had impressed no more than these precepts upon Guarino, one would have to admit that his influence was immense; but just as important was the example he provided of the ideal teacher -- courteous, sympathetic, amiable, possessed of a sweet voice, commanding appearance, great learning, and conspicuously moral character. The extent to which Guarino succeeded in exemplifying those qualities in himself may best be judged by the manifold tributes of his pupils and friends, whose praises of Guarino read almost like carbon copies of Guarino's of Chrysoloras. Admittedly, amid the welter of laudation prevalent in the Renaissance it is often hard to separate the wheat from the chaff, but the praises of Guarino for Chrysoloras and those of his pupils for Guarino seem to be stamped at every point with sincerity. Guarino saw Chrysoloras as the man to emulate, and he probably surpassed him both as scholar and teacher. The only respects in which he seems to have been inferior are personal magnetism and grasp of the natural sciences.*

To sum up, it can fairly be asserted that Guarino's early ideas on education were formed by his humanistic mentors at Padua, Vergerio, and Chrysoloras.

The evidence for what we know of his actual teaching practices

Unfortunately, Guarino himself wrote no treatise on education. Immersed in the "endless labours" of practical teaching -- a

*Cf. John of Pannonia (137-139) referring to Chrysoloras:

... sec solis ille parentum
Claris erat studiis, sed rerum protinus omnem
Naturam magna complexus mente tenabant.
recurrent phrase in his letters -- he may have lacked the impulse
to expatiate on its theory. This seems also to have been true
of Vittorino, who "felt no call to add to the bulk of written
matter" (Woodward, Vittorino p. 80). It may be significant that
of the four humanists up to 1450 who wrote on education* only
Vergerio was a practising teacher, and even he never taught
the curriculum he advocated.

Even in his letters, Guarino is comparatively silent about
his curriculum and teaching methods, perhaps because such matters

*(1) Vergerio De ingenuis moribus et liberalibus studiis
adolescentiae (1404). The dating was fixed by Sabbadini, Giornale
storico di letteratura italiana XIII p. 297 ff. The best modern
edition is by A. Gnesotto in Atti e Memorie della Reale
Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti N. S. XXIV (1916)

(2) Francesco Barbaro, De liberorum educatione, actually the
contents of his De re uxoria II. 9 (1416)

(3) Leonardo Bruni, De studiis et litteris (ca. 1425) ed.
H. Baron in Leonardo Aretinos humanistische und philosophische
Schriften (Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte der Mittelalter und der
Renaissance) I (Leipzig, 1928) p. 5-19. English translation in
Woodward, Vittorino, p. 125-135

(4) Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, De liberorum educatione
(1450) ed. R. Volkan in Fontes Erum Austricarum. Diplomatia
at Acta LXVII (Vienna, 1912) p. 103-158. English translation
in Woodward, Vittorino p. 136-158. All the fifteenth century
writers on education are listed in Woodward, Vittorino p. 180-161.
The works not listed above are: Naffeo Vegio, De educatione
liberorum claris quo eorum moribus (ca. 1460); Jacopo Porcia, De
generosa liberorum educatione (ca. 1470); Gianozzo Memetti, De
liberis educandis; Sicco Polentone, De ratione studendi; Niccolò
Porotti, De puerorum eruditione; Pier Candido Decembrio, De studiis
puerorum. The last 4 are not extant.
seemed too trivial for polite correspondence and too routine for familiar letters. Those few letters in which he does touch upon practical education are therefore extremely important and are obviously our best evidence for his methods. The most important are Letters 340 and 679.

There are five other sources: the speech in 1424 of the Anonymous Panegyrist (Appendix B); Angelo Decembrio's Politia literaria (ca. 1450); John of Pannonia's Sylva panegyrica ad Guarinum (1453); Lodovico Carbore's funeral speech of 1460 (Appendix A); and Battista Guarino's treatise De modo et ordine docendi ac studendi.*

These five sources vary in value. Battista's treatise may have been composed at his father's request to perpetuate the tradition of his school, but neither Guarino nor his son say so. The latter admits, however, that his work is mainly a summation of his father's methods, and since Guarino read and approved its contents in 1459 (Letter 911) one may assume that it contains his own last word on education. It is by far the most explicit of all the sources.

The Anonymous Panegyrist affords glimpses of the public and private teaching of Guarino at Verona in 1424, but since his

speech was a defence of his master against charges of incompetence and favouritism, it is necessarily one-sided.

Decembrio's *Politica literaria,* originally intended as an offering to Leonello d'Este, was dedicated after his death in 1450 to Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II. This work contains a series of vignettes from court life at Ferrara in the last years of Marquis Niccolò III (d. 1441). The hero is the vivacious young prince, Leonello. Guarino appears only incidentally as his tutor and friend, and emerges as a lovable, but somewhat drab pedant with illiberal views about vernacular literature.

John of Pannonia's long poem is full of interest and has long been regarded as a prime source of information on Guarino's methods. Rosmini (Guarino I p. 78 ff.) drew heavily upon it for his description of Guarino's actual practice at Ferrara, and Woodward claims (Vittorino p. 206) that this account has not been superseded by the work of Sabbadini. But considerable allowance should, I think, be made for John's poetic imagination, particularly when he describes events of which he could have had no direct experience. For instance, he gives this highly rhetorical and inaccurate account of Guarino's return to Italy in 1408:

*Copies of the 1st edition (Basle, 1527) are to the best of my knowledge, unobtainable. My references are to the Augsburg edition of 1540.*
Vix tactum bene litus erat, vix ianua ludi
Mandatis adaptata dei, vagus omnia rumor
Gymnasia Italiae contento murmure complet
Affulsisse virum, gemina qui Pallade solus
Pellcat . . . (Sylva panegyrica 315-319)

The same strictures must apply to Carbone, whose speech is full of rhetorical flourishes and exaggerations. Evidence drawn from either invective or laudation is prima facie suspect.

It should finally be noted that four of those five sources reflect the period at Ferrara when Guarino was internationally famous. The system of education they describe had been refined by long experience. It would be unsafe to infer solely by analogy that Guarino’s practices had always been as they were at Ferrara. Allowance should accordingly be made for this in discussing his career at Florence (1410-14), Venice (1414-19), and Verona (1419-29).

(4) Guarino’s career as a teacher at Florence, Venice, Verona and Ferrara

For at least the first two years of Guarino’s stay at Florence he worked probably as a secretary or copyist for Niccolò Niccoli, although he also appears to have helped Antonio Corbinelli with his studies (Life secs. 55-56). His real teaching career did not commence until September, 1413, when he was appointed for the academic year to lecture on Greek at the university. His tenure of this post seems, however, to have been unremarkable. (Life, sec. 65).
The period is chiefly important for his translation in 1411 of Plutarch’s treatise περί παιδῶν ἀγωγῆς, usually referred to by its Latin title De liberis educandis ("On the education of children"). The interest in education generated by Vergerio ensured the favourable reception of this work. Ostensibly, it was intended to assist Angelo Corbinelli in bringing up his own sons at home. In his dedication (Letter 5) Guarino praises Angelo’s antique spirit both in discharging his civic obligations as a magistrate and in educating his own children like a paterfamilias of Roman times. He singles out for particular praise Angelo’s wisdom in fostering "virtue and honourable ways from early childhood" and in "not pushing the children beyond the capacities of their years."

The first point was altogether in the spirit of Vergerio, while the second provides an interesting glimpse into Guarino’s appreciation of the need, especially in the case of children, for a graduated distribution of material. Unfortunately, since the sources deal almost exclusively with adult education, we know comparatively little about how Guarino introduced very young children to their first studies. Perhaps the question is merely academic, however, since he never seems to have taught any* with the exception of his own sons, whom Carbone informs us Guarino

*The youngest seem to have been Giovanni Lamola and Ernellao Barbaro who were 9 and 15 respectively when they came to Guarino -- both already child prodigies. Paolo and Bonaventura Zillioli were also young, but their ages are not known.
educated from childhood to maturity. The only exception seems to have been Gregorio, who studied for a time under Vittorino (Woodward, Vittorino p. 86).

Other teachers started with "reading, taught by moveable letters, arithmetic, taught by games, writing and drawing; the Psalms, Creed, Lord's Prayer, and hymn to the Virgin, learnt by heart; Latin, acquired in conversation, with the first rudiments of accidence as contained in a metrical form, with a vocabulary or phrase book in Italian and Latin" (Woodward, Vittorino p. 200). We hear nothing of this from Guarino or the other sources. This does not mean, however, that he did not teach his sons these early lessons; but as to his actual methods or curriculum we are entirely in the dark. The only reference to the bringing up of very young children occurs in Letter 231, where baby Esopo Agostino is talked of as being exposed to sun and wind to harden his body. There is no need to regard this as an anticipation of Rousseau's plans for Emile; it probably means only that Guarino did not believe in coddling infants.

Dominant ideas in Plutarch's treatise, which Guarino calls "almost divinely inspired" are that parents must select tutors with the utmost discrimination, that education begins at home with parents, whose good example will inculcate discipline and morality more effectively than corporal punishment, that memory training is essential, and that love is the most potent factor in disposing a child to learn willingly and well. Like Quintilian's Institutio
oratoria, a work composed about the same time, Plutarch's Do liberis educandis proved very influential in European education. Piccolomini's Do liberorum educatione contains part of it as well as of Quintilian's first book; Elyot translated it into English before 1540; it appears in John Lyly's Eupheus (1579) under the title Eupheus and his Euphoebus; Philemon Holland included it in his translations from Plutarch (1603); Montaigne's essays are replete with echoes from it, particularly important being his idea that mental and moral education should be given equal attention in early childhood; Locke's proposal to discard corporal punishment in favour of a judicious use of praise and blame must owe something to Plutarch; and the paedocentric educational thinking of today surely has its roots in Quintilian and Plutarch. But to Guarino belongs the honour of having been the first to realize the value of translating Plutarch's useful work. His version was copied many times during his lifetime and ran through many editions after his death.

He also put many of its recommendations into practice, adapting them for the most part to the needs of older students. For example, he was later to warn Giacomo Zilioli against hiring a morally questionable tutor for Meliaduce d'Este (Letters 431, 432). Battista Guarino also insists upon the need for care in selecting a teacher (Woodward, Vittorino p. 162: cf. also similar remarks by Porcia, Vegio, and Piccolomini, ibid. pp. 110, 220, 137).

Again, the importance of memory training was at all times fundamental to his own methods of study and teaching. This will be discussed later in more detail.
Probably the most important ideas Guarino took over from Plutarch were those on discipline and the relationship between parent and child, which he extended to include that between master and pupil. This was to prove the sovereign key to the best humanistic education as exemplified by Vittorino at Mantua (1423-1446) and Guarino at Verona and Ferrara. Discussion of this may also be deferred, since the first solid evidence for Guarino's having applied Plutarch's principles does not occur before Letter 340 of 1425. It is safe to assume, however, that from at least 1411 he had been mulling over the contents of the De liberis educandis, and ideas of how the precepts of Plutarch could be imaginatively applied had been progressively developing in his mind.

The first two years at Venice were spent in teaching Greek to several patricians of the city, including Leonardo Giustinian and Francesco Barbaro; the latter being his host and chief patron. Their progress was rapid. Barbaro produced Latin translations of Plutarch's Aristides and Cato, Giustinian versions of Cimon, Lucullus, and Phocion. Exactly how Guarino achieved such spectacular results we do not know. He seems, however, always to have been a good instructor in Greek. Battista tells us (Woodward, p. 167): "I have myself known not a few pupils of my father...who after gaining a thorough mastery of Latin, could then in a single year make such progress with Greek that they translated accurately entire works of ordinary difficulty from that language into good readable Latin at sight." Barbaro and Giustinian were already accomplished Latinists. Moreover they had the leisure and motivation
necessary to benefit from intensive instruction. Guarino, a fluent Greek speaker, probably gave them practice in conversation, for in 1424 both men addressed the Emperor John Palaeologus in set speeches in Greek, and Barbaro then conversed with him (Appendix D, sec. 6).

At this time the only Greek grammar available in Italy was Chrysoloras' *Erotemata*, which dealt with the inflexions by the method of question and answer popular in the Middle Ages as a means of imparting and testing knowledge.* Barbaro and Giustinian almost certainly used this book, which was still being recommended by Battista Guarino in 1459. The first printed Greek grammar in Italy was the *Erotemata* of Constantine Lascaris (Milan, 1476). Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* was first printed in 1484. Other grammars were Theodore Gaza's *Eisagoge* (1495 and 1512) and Urbano Valeriano Balzanio's *Institutiones* (1497). But Chrysoloras' *Erotemata* remained the most popular Greek grammar in Italy until well into the sixteenth century (Geanakoplos, *Greek scholars in Venice* p. 286) while Linacre at Oxford and Erasmus at Cambridge also used it (Adamson, *A short history of education* Cambridge, 1930, p. 90). Guarino abridged it about 1417 (Life sec. 01) probably as a result

* A good example is the Disputatio regalis et nobilissimi iuvencis Pippini cum Albino scholastico in Wilmann's *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterum* XIV, p. 544. In most medieval works of this type the pupil asks questions and the teacher replies, a reversed catechism that arose out of a confusion of the letters D and M, which really stood for the Greek words *didaskalos* (teacher) and *mathetes* (student) but were mistaken for the Latin *discipulus* and *magister*. 
of his experience in using it with Barbaro and Giustinian, and the simplified compendium was just as popular as the grammar in its original form. Once his pupils had worked through the Erotemata, Guarino gave them additional rules, as is testified by Pier Candido Decembrio in a letter still unpublished: "Scio Guarinum eiusque sequaces amplioribus uti regulis" (Guarino, Epistolario III p. 76-77). No doubt Guarino gave his participants at Venice considerably more material than was in Chrysoloras.

One fruitful means of instruction was already in existence—the use of bi-lingual texts.* Maximus Planudes, for example, had translated into Greek a mediæval abridgement of the Ars minor of Donatus called the Ianua.** Ambrogio Traversari is said to have learned Greek by comparing Latin versions of the scriptures with the Greek originals. Lorenzo Valla later in the century benefited from the comparative method, and in 1495 Aldo Manuzio wrote to Alberto Pio: "Sic graeco didicit Hierolaus Barbarus, sic Picus Mirandula, sic Hieronymus Donatus, sic Angelus Politianus".

* For most of what follows about the teaching of Greek, see Sabbadini, Il metodo degli umanisti Chapter 2.

** So called from its opening couplet:
Ianua sum rudibus primum cupientibus artem;
Nec sine me quisquam rite peribus exit
("I am the door for the untrained who desire the basic grammar; without me no-one will be properly skilled")
Guarino knew the comparative method at least as early as his stay in Florence, for in Letter 34 he records that someone in that city had asked him to translate some Greek verses, and that when he had done so literally, the man wrote the Latin equivalent of each Greek word immediately above it. Unfortunately, the crude ad verbum rendering was subsequently passed around as a sample of Guarino's own work. He therefore asked his friends to burn any copies of this translation they came across.

He may have allowed his students to use the interlinear method, for there is extant a collection by Leonardo Botta of Greek verses of a sententious nature culled from Homer, Hesiod, and pseudo-Phocylides. They are adorned with a pronunciation guide and literal translation above the Greek text, with a brief explanation of each maxim below. Two examples are:

1. Manum cadenti da

Chira posondi didu

\[
\chiειρα \ πεσοντι \ διδου
\]

Solebant veteres graeci, qui gravi aliqua calamitate vel morbo premorentur, cum diu opem efflagitassent, id tandem quasi ultimum miserabiliter proferre.

2. Confidere oportet

Tharsin chri

\[
\Thetaχροσιν \ Χρη'
\]

Ex hoc veteri greco proverbio intelligimus in communi vita non modo fidem adhiberi oportere, sed et sperandum atque audendum esse.
This collection, entitled *Ex variis doctissimi viri Guarini Veronensis lectionibus tum sermonibus lecta* was also transmitted in a MS of Guarino's pupil, Pandolfo Collenucio, which exhibits only minor variations. Sabbadini believed that this constitutes proof that Guarino favoured this method at his school, but I would suggest that while he did not actually prohibit it, he regarded it as more suitable for those who did not have the benefit of a teacher. Battista lends support to this contention, since he recommends that a student "in the absence of a teacher" should select an author whose works have been accurately rendered into Latin and make a careful word by word comparison of the translation and the original (Woodward, *Vittorino*, p. 173-174).

Although Greek was Guarino's main interest at Venice (and remained so, I believe, until he left) he may also have taught some advanced Latin composition, for Barbaro's funeral oration on Gianmio Corradini, laudation of Perugio Guidaloti, and *De re uxoria* (1416) contain stylistic traits redolent of Guarino, as does the funeral speech on Chrysoloras by Andrea Zulian, another of his students. These stylistic similarities may, however, be fortuitous, and nothing solid can be made of them.

In 1416 he opened a boarding school modelled upon that of Bazizza at Padua (*Life* secs. 68-69). This was his first experiment in communal living with fee-paying students known as "socii" or "contubernales", and it is a pity that we know comparatively little about it; the Anonymous Panegyrist deals
with the "contubernium" at Verona and John of Pannonia mainly with that at Ferrara. It was a difficult period; he seems to have had more students than he could adequately cope with by himself (Life sec. 87) and the onset of plague in June, 1416, broke up his school almost before it had begun (Life sec. 77). After a few months of depression and inactivity in Padua, he re-opened his school in Venice at the end of the year and taught without noticeable fervour until he moved to Verona early in 1419 (Life sec. 89). This was a time of restlessness and indecision for Guarino, marked by efforts to leave teaching altogether.

But the entire period at Venice, although best understood as one of experimentation and adjustment, was nevertheless vital for his development as an educator. One indication of experimentation was the number of books he wrote between 1415 and 1419 as aids to instruction: a treatise on the diphthongs, a lexicon to Servius' commentaries on Vergil, the compendium of Chrysoloras' Protomena and a translation of the section on the breathings, and a Latin grammar.

The treatise De diphthongis was composed about 1415 for Floro Valerio (Life sec. 92 and Guarino's Latin style and orthography). It is extant in many MSS, but is not so much a scholarly disquisition as some general rules supported by alphabetical lists of words containing diphthongs. In a sense it was an early example of tuition by post, in which direction Guarino, with such letters as 156, 166, etc. to absent pupils, was something of a pioneer. One notes Guarino's didactic
impulse throughout his entire epistolary, but his lack of oppressive pedantry makes letters such as 756 and 813 interesting to read; he instructs almost by stealth.

The lexicon to Servius, composed about 1416, is found in two redactions in many MSS of the fifteenth century. Decembrio in his Politia literaria p. 300 ff. has an abridgement of it and Carbone refers to a "recent" composition of what must have been the revised version. In all MSS there are numerous additions and corrections, which show that many students and copyists used it. It provided an example to Guarino's students, who were encouraged to practice lexicography for themselves in the form of excerpts from ancient authors, particularly the polymaths Aulus Cellius, Macrobius, Pliny the Elder, and Augustine (Woodward, Vittorio p. 173). This is not, of course, true lexicography, which arranges alphabetically. The idea was not new, since works like Mugutius' Liber derivationium had been common enough in the Middle Ages; but Guarino and subsequent humanists improved upon these earlier compilations.

The compendium of Chrysoloras' Erotemata was made as early as 1417 (Life sec. 91). The section on the breathings, which Chrysoloras had written in 1398 at Salutati's suggestion, is first mentioned in Letter 195 of 1420, a dedication of Guarino's translation of it to Francesco Barbaro. It may, however, have been done earlier, possibly in 1417.
The *Regulæ* is first mentioned in Letter 08 of January, 1418. It was a plain exposition of Latin grammar defining the four parts of grammar, the eight parts of speech (nouns, adjectives etc.), the five classes of verbs (active, passive, deponent, transitive, intransitive) and direct and indirect objects. It then deals with impersonal verbs; constructions involving the idea of place; supines; gerunds; participles; eight figures of speech considered grammatically (prolepsis, syllepsis, zeugma, synthesis, antiptosis, evocatio, apposito, and synedoche); the formation of patronymics; incohative, desiderative, conative and frequentative verbs; relative pronouns; quiś and uter and their compounds; heteroclite nouns, with a selection of mnemonicics; and an exposition of the verbs solvere, nubere, and latere. It was a simplified, practical book and a considerable improvement upon the mediaeval *artes*, which treated grammar as a branch of logic.

All of these works were intended as texts for his students. Clearly, he taught Latin to his "contubernales" in 1416, 1417, and 1418; otherwise there would have been no reason for composing these works. Besides, it was a bread-and-butter subject, without which he would not have attracted so many students, and he would certainly have conducted his lectures in Latin, a practice recommended by Battista also. I believe, however, that his chief enthusiasm was still for the teaching of Greek. It was, after all, a unique distinction to be the
only practicing teacher in Italy to offer this language at that time. Those who enrolled in his school were therefore enthusiasts who had come to believe, as Guarino and Battista did, that a proper understanding of Latin itself was impossible without a knowledge of Greek also, because of the vast numbers of derivatives or borrowings from the Greek and the orthographical and etymological questions that arise from them, not to mention the close dependence of Latin literature upon the Greek.

(cf. Woodward, *Vittorino* p. 166-167). One major reason why Guarino so often praises Chrysoloras not specifically as a teacher of Greek -- for which he is chiefly honoured in cultural history -- but as the true restorer of culture to Italy was precisely because by introducing Greek he had made Latin scholarship in its fullest sense possible. (cf. Letters 861, 862, 863). This doctrine was by no means widely acclaimed when Guarino first started teaching Greek, and even in 1459 Battista felt compelled to defend it vigorously. There were those, however, who kept their own counsel, and gathered to Guarino at Venice to perfect their studies by learning Greek. John of Pannonia's claim that professors left their chairs and sat in a mixed throng of young and old of both sexes at Guarino's feet is unsupported by any evidence. The numbers in his school are not known. Their ages were certainly mixed, however; Pietro del Monte describes himself as "paene puer" when he went to "learn the virtues" under Guarino
(Life: sec. 77) and Vittorino was 38 when he first enrolled in 1416.

The discoveries of Poggio in 1416 and 1417 of two complete texts of Quintilian interested Guarino immensely. Poggio announced the first find on December 15, 1416 (Letter 60) and by November, 1417, Guarino acknowledged receipt of a copy of it (Letter 83). It was a poor transcription, however, so he requested another copy, this time of the second Quintilian; it was to be sent as soon as possible, and Guarino was willing to pay any price Poggio asked. He had obviously received what he wanted before December, 1419, for in that month he requested Girolamo Gualdo to send back his "Quintilians", which he needed for a course on rhetoric (Letter 179). They arrived on December 28, 1419 (Letter 181). The copies in question may have been those of the two he received from Poggio, but more probably a series of transcriptions of the one found in 1417.

Quintilian had been known previously to Guarino, for he quotes from him in Letter 2 (ca. 1405), but his copy must have been the defective medieval one described by Poggio as "lacertus et circumcisus" (Epistulae ed. Tonellii I p. 25). Generally speaking, Quintilian had been appreciated more as a rhetorician and moralist than as an educator, although

---

* Woodward, Vittorino p. 18 gives 1415 and 1416 as the years of Vittorino's attendance, the first date being based on the erroneous assumption (p. 17) that Guarino opened his contubernium as soon as he arrived in Venice. 1416 is definitely fixed by the evidence of Letter 55.
Petrarch in his Letter to Quintilian recognized his "ability to ground and to mould great men" (W. M. Smail, Quintilian on education p. xlv). Later humanists continued to appreciate not only his rhetorical and moralistic uses, but also the same practicability of the complete education he expounded. Very soon after 1417 the Institutio oratoria joined the De ingenuis moribus and Guarino’s translation of Plutarch’s De liberis educandis as a fundamental guide book for humanistic education. As Woodward put it (Education during the Renaissance p. 26), Quintilian “appealed to the modelists from its insistence upon truthfulness as the foundation of education; to the man of learning from his demand that the auditor must be versed in the entire circle of available knowledge; to the man of affairs from the ultimate end he set for his pupils, that they should become competent as logical and persuasive speakers, to place both character and wisdom at the service of the community”.

Guarino does not seem to have followed Quintilian as faithfully as did Vittorino. It is odd, for example, that in his years at Venice and Verona he quotes Quintilian only 4 times (Letters 113, 229, 353, 499 quoting XI. 3. 6-8, VI. 3. 59, XI. 1. 22, and X. 1. 112 respectively). He nowhere names him as the perfect model either as a teacher or a guide to living; his heroes in those respects were Chrysoloras, Plutarch, and Cicero. Yet there was much in Quintilian that must have appealed to him: the notion that teachers and nurses must be well chosen (I. 1. 4 and 23); that corporal punishment is
degrading (I.3. 14-17); that every child is worthy of infinite care (I. 1. 24); that games have a place as a means to increased alertness (I. 3. 8-9); that the capacities of a child's mind should be considered in planning his instruction (I. 1. 20); that a teacher often reacts better to a large audience (I. 1. 29-31); and that the best incentives to learning are competition, interest in the subject, the proper use of praise, and affection for the teacher. The similarities at many points between Quintilian and Plutarch (who were almost contemporaries) must have struck Guarino, so that it would probably be truer to say that the Institutio oratoria represented for him not a new revelation but an eloquent confirmation of much that he had already learned from Plutarch and Chrysoloras or divined for himself.

He seems in fact to have valued Quintilian more as a commentary on Latin eloquence, although he did not accept everything he read in him. For instance, he wrote a verse tract De compositione (see Sabbadini, La scuola e gli studi di Guarino p. 228-30), in which composition, one of the three branches of elocution in the pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium, is divided into ordo, junctura, and numeros, as in Quintilian. But for his strictures on numeros he abandons Quintilian's treatment and uses an amalgam of Quintilian, Cicero, and Martianus Capella. And on the whole he admired Quintilian as a writer much less than Cicero, who was always the supreme master of style, as indeed he had been to Quintilian himself. In Letter 490 Guarino quotes with approval Quintilian's
judgement of Cicero: "hunc spectemus, hoc propositum nobis
sit exerplum; illo so profecisse sciat cui Cicero valde placebit"
(cf. Inst. orat. X. 1. 112). This was the usual humanistic
opinion; only Lorenzo Valla was perverse enough to prefer
Quintilian over Cicero as a stylist.

But by far the most important idea which Guarino borrowed
from Quintilian was his tripartite scheme of study, ascending
from the elementary and grammatical stages to the rhetorical.
He was the first humanist educator to stress the importance of
a planned course of study, with a gradual build up of material.
He appears to have been much more conscious of planning than
Vittorino, not only in mapping out a complete education, but
even the moments of every day to ensure thorough and cumulative
progress. As Battista says, "order and method are the secret
of success . . . Hence we see the crucial importance of system . . ." (Woodward, Vittorino p. 176). In this Guarino owed nothing
to the Paduan educators. Vergorio had been vague about the
order in which subjects were to be studied,
and even Barzizza was criticized by one of his own colleagues
for his inability to present his material according to the
requirements and capabilities of his students (Barzizzii Opera

It is hard to say when Guarino conceived and began to
implement his three-fold scheme of education, but it could
hardly have been before he studied Quintilian. Very probably
he began to operate it at Verona, for the elementary and grammatical stages seem implicit in Letter 340 of 1425. It was certainly in force at Ferrara, since John of Pannonia describes it piecemeal, and Battista in considerable detail. The grand plan may have been forming in Guarino's mind at Venice, but it would be rash to assume, merely by analogy with his later known practices, that he was already implementing it there.

Similarly, we do not know much of how he interpreted his role as head of the Venetian contubernium or how wide the curriculum was. His letters show an affectionate regard for his students, but he does not seem to have exercised a moral censorship over them. He mentions with approval such physical pursuits as fishing and country rambles, but he did not enforce or even strongly encourage them. It is safer to assume that since Guarino borrowed the idea of contubernium from Barzizza in 1416 and with it much practical advice as to how the system might operate — even the fee of 40 gold ducats was the same for both — his methods were similar. The idea of pupils living together under the direction of a master may have owed something to the Spartan system of communal living, but more probably it was an extension of the "universitates" or student groups at mediaeval universities, who hired their own teachers and owed

* This frequently throughout the epistolary. Letter 143, lines 32-34 are typical: "Quid tibi dicam venationes auctiae et cetera ruris invitamenta quibus distentus, fatcor, scribendis litteris adhibere animam non potui?"
them no spiritual obedience. Barzizza's prestige as the finest Ciceronian scholar of his generation no doubt made problems of discipline negligible, but in any case he seems to have been more of a remote intellectual, an expositor of Cicero, Quintilian, and Seneca as orators, than a father confessor to his students. Certainly he took no interest in physical education. His stylistic interests may have been humanistic, but his attitude to students was mediaeval. Guarino, whose reputation did not yet match Barzizza's, was proportionately closer to his students, but he probably attempted in all else to cast himself in Barzizza's mould, with the exception that his specialty was not Latin oratory but the teaching of Greek.

The turning point in Guarino's career seems to have come when the council of Verona on May 20, 1420, voted him a five year contract to lecture publicly on "rhetoric, the letters and speeches of Cicero, other subjects pertaining to eloquence, and such other things as will please the students and prove useful to the students as a whole." He was also permitted to take up to 12 private students as a means of supplementing his income; out of this developed his second and rather more successful contubernium. It was a convenient arrangement; the city saved money, while Guarino's public lectures on Cicero enhanced his own and the city's prestige without impairing his freedom to pursue any curriculum that suited him with his house students. He did not teach Greek publicly. The staid city fathers, whose prime concern seems to have been civic prestige
(which in dearth of a university they could achieve by a public professor) would hardly have seen the value of Greek, but Guarino pursued this esoteric study with his private pupils, notable among whom were Giovanni Lamola and Ermolao Barbaro, nephew of Francesco. The latter made such progress that by 1422 he had produced a Latin version of Aesop, which achieved some celebrity and is extant in many MSS.

Despite his continued interest in Greek, Guarino's Latin studies received a fresh impetus by his own discovery in 1419 of the Letters of Pliny (Life sec. 95) and that by Gerardo Landriani in early 1422 of the now lost Codex Laudensis containing Cicero's Orator, De oratore and Brutus (Life sec. 109). The earlier discoveries by Poggio of Quintilian and of eight speeches of Cicero at Landres and Cologne (Life secs. 94-95) were also beginning to have an impact upon scholars. Add to that minor discoveries by other scholars (Life sec. 92) and the necessity he was under to lecture daily upon Latin authors, and it is easy to see why he gathered fresh impetus after 1420.

Another factor was the support he received from his amenable, unobtrusive, but entirely efficient wife Tadea in running his household. She was the perfect house mother, just as Guarino now begins to figure conspicuously as a father to his students. He refers to them as "our family" or "our sons"; and in writing to parents frequently affects the conceit that since friends have all things in common, a teacher shares paternity of a student entrusted to his care with his real father. His
concern for their well being was boundless. When Lavagnola fell ill in 1422 (Letter 220) Guarino expressed the utmost distress, as he did when Paolo Zilioli died from the plague in 1429 (Letter 508).

This concept of himself in loco parentis, implicit in many letters from Verona and Ferrara, is first clearly delineated in Letter 340 in the form of a series of recommendations to his ex-pupil, Martino Rizzon, on how best to achieve results in teaching the sons of Giovanni Tagiaci. It is virtually a compendium of Plutarch's ideas in the De liberis educandis, except that the teacher's authority is substituted for the father's over his young charges. The keynote is struck by Guarino in thanking Rizzon for the debt he acknowledges to his old master. He quotes Pliny's dictum from the preface to his Natural History, "Est vero benignum et plenum ingenui pudoris materi per quos profeccevis", thus touching upon a theme recurrent in his letters and exemplified in his relationships with all his students, the mutual respect which should exist between pupil and teacher. It is perhaps the most typically Greek element in humanistic education, since it is a transplant of the ideal relationship described by Plato in the Symposium and Phaedrus whereby lover and beloved would together aspire to a contemplation of the Good. Guarino adapted the idea to mean that the master was responsible for the moral and intellectual progress of his pupil, while the latter was answerable to his master for his conduct and scholarship. It was no mere rhetoric
that inspired Carbone in 1460 to call Guarino "our ancient
Socrates" and to quote the famous passage from Juvenal
(Satire VII, 208-11) which sums up the perfect relationship
of pietas between master and pupil.

Guarino warns Rizzon to set a good example, since children
are imitative and copy their teacher's conduct. Above all,
he must avoid angry threats and foul language. Carbone
testifies to Guarino's fine manners in front of students:
"No base word or insult unworthy of a scholar ever fell
from his lips."

Corporal punishment as a quick means of enforcing discipline
was also to be avoided. Battista Guarino says that flogging
carries with it an element of servitude (servile quiddam),
renders learning repulsive, and encourages unworthy evasions
on the part of timorous boys; yet he would not wholly rule it
out in the case of younger boys who had not yet reached an age
when a sense of shame could be counted on to maintain discipline.
One doubts if Guarino even beat his own children, since by
his own admission he was an indulgent father, but there is
no hint that they were ever recalcitrant. John of Pannonia
makes a point of his restraint with the rod:

"... nec verbere torvo
Aut ferula insanis" (Sylva panegyrica 377-79)
and maintains that he relied upon "malestate potenti" combined
with an even temper, lack of malice, cheerful disposition, and
an ability to turn an awkward situation aside with a kindly
joke (Ibid. 607-12). He insists, however, that Guarino
never lost control of his classes:

"Haud tamen idcirco tibi disciplina tuorum
Laxior . . ." (Ibid. 821-22)

Angelo Decembrio paints exactly the same picture of easy
familiarity tempered by mutual respect between Guarino and his
students. The favourite jest was always the pun, a weakness
of literary men to which Guarino was inordinately prone
(See Guarino and humour). Naturally his pupils imitated him.

John of Pannonia (Epigrammata I. 66. 87) wrote once to a student,
whose Latin name was Paulus, that it should be aspirated to
make the Greek $\varepsilon\lambda\gamma\omicron\nu$, meaning "poor" or inferior". But on the
whole Guarino discouraged any trace of disrespect. In Letter 831A
he presents us with a most instructive vignette from the
classroom at Ferrara: a student had just made a smart comment
on the style, and possibly the rumoured effeminacy of the
Sicilian poet, Antonio Beccadelli, calling him "non Siculus,
sed suculus", a pun which amused Guarino privately, but which
he could not allow to pass. He turned a grim countenance
("torvum vultum") on the class, and the laughter died away.
He seems to have maintained order without rigidity. Vittorino,
by contrast, seems to have been a more austere figure. But
in the methods of both men the importance of an atmosphere of
kindness and affection was paramount. A typically tender
expression of this comes in Letter 231 of 1423 where Guarino
says that just as some people devote infinite care and patience to training their pets, so should teachers exercise as much attention and sympathy in shaping the minds of their students.

The final recommendation Guarino makes to Rizzon is that he train his pupils’ memories by giving them passages, particularly from Vergil, to learn by heart. The accent, however, was to be upon frequency and thoroughness of repetition rather than more quantity (“locos... magis frequentes quam multos”), the object being to provide a stock of eloquent and wise precepts. He was aware that the repetition of excellence is a wonderfully potent method of breeding it -- an idea which he seems to have acquired from Chrysoloras, whose dictum μελέτη εἰς φύσιν καθόσιντω (“practice becomes second nature”) is quoted in Letter 264. For proof that Guarino practised this recommendation himself one need only point to the many quotations, particularly from Vergil, which adorn his letters, and the frequency with which choice passages recur. On a lower level, he favoured the use of mnemonics, many of which he composed himself, such as this rough pair of hexameters designed to help a student write a set piece (Letter 421):

Quattuor ista solent augere negotia cuncta:

Utile, iucundum, laudes, iungetur honestas.

Other examples are his mnemonic verses on the Seven Sages (Letter 830) and those on the names and functions of the Nine Muses (Letter 808). Typical verses from the latter poem are:
Instruit historiis mortales vivere Clio,
Tempora plantandi docuit legesque Thalia.

The technique was not new, but merely a continuation of mediaeval practice. Any student of formal logic will recall the nonsense verses whereby mediaeval students remembered the figures of the valid syllogisms:

"Barbara celarent darii ferioque prioris" etc.

So convenient did Guarino consider mnemonics that he recommended the use of the Doctrinale of Alexander de Villa Dei, described by Battista Guarino as "a manual of grammar . . . readily committed to memory on account of its metrical form" (Woodward, Vittorino p. 165).

Learning by heart served two purposes. First, it provided a convenient guide to correct grammar, syntax, and rhetorical devices. Second, the student thereby built up a familiar stock of moral precepts. Guarino would certainly have considered the second purpose the more important. Evidently, he succeeded in impressing this upon his students. John of Pannonia, for example, testifies (Sylva panegyrica 603-04) that he considered the moral training he received from Guarino more important than the intellectual:

Sed minus est cultas abs te quod discimus artes,
Plus quod virtutes . . .
This inevitably raises the question of the part played by Christianity in the conduct of Guarino's schools. To understand Guarino's religious attitudes it is necessary to go back to his childhood under Libera di Zanino, who brought him up after the death of her husband in 1386. She instilled into her son, according to Carbone, a respect for the Christian faith which he never lost. It was not perhaps a rigid Christian upbringing for Guarino had nothing of the ascetic or pietist in him. He even regarded the contemplative life of the cloister as a waste for a scholar (Letter 437) although he allowed one of his daughters to take the veil: and in Letter 346 he talked with contempt of those who are pleased only by "tears, fasting, and psalms".

This species of criticism, however, can come only from one whose faith in the traditional forms of worship is so well grounded and simple that he can afford to joke about them. He respected intense devotion in others, such as Bernardino da Siena and Alberto da Sarzana, both of whom were his pupils. His own piety deepened with age, a natural process that happily coincided with the concept first created by liberal Church Fathers, such as Jerome and Gregory of Nazianzenus, that one should first become expert in secular studies before passing in later life to the contemplation of things divine. Somewhere in Guarino's mind vibrated the medieval deference to Theology as queen of all the arts and sciences; he even admitted its
primacy in Letter 823. Both Guarino and Vittorino saw no
ccontradiction between the Christian life and the civic excellence
they hoped to produce. Rigid thinkers clearly saw the contra-
diction between the renunciation of the world, for which
strict Christianity seemed to call, and the life of active
participation in its affairs. This paradox was never satisfactorily
solved, but both Guarino and Vittorino achieved a working compromise
between the two extremes by adopting the Ciceronian view that
good qualities are useless so long as they remain inert, that
the life of contemplation or scholarship is justifiable only
as a preparation for the life of action. A favourite precept of
Vittorino was "Omnis virtutis laus in actione consistit." The
only real preparation for life in a civic community was, according
to the humanists, an education in the classics; no other books
were available. Guarino therefore felt that his instruction, so
far from corroding virtue, would actually enhance it. He did
not escape calumny, however, and was compelled on at least one
occasion to defend classical studies (see Guarino as a figure
in controversy).

Unlike Vittorino, who had a strong Christian bent -- he
had once contemplated priesthood -- Guarino did not deliver
special religious homilies to his students. He did, however,
set an example of devotion by daily attendance at Mass, as
John of Pannonia tells us (Sylva panegyrica 575):

'Mane salutatis petitur schola publica divis
His first concern was always for the traditional forms of worship (ibid. 800):

'Prima tibi est somper magnorum cura deorum:

John also mentions the virtuous atmosphere of Guarino's school (ibid. 604-5):

'. . . Procul hinc malesuada libido
Improba rixa procul.

He goes on to say that a quiet word from Guarino was invariably sufficient to make a student mend his ways. This may have been true, but a reader of Guarino's letters is left with the impression that he had rather too great faith in the essential goodness of others, perhaps because he was naturally a virtuous individual himself. In Letter 823, for example, he goes so far as to suggest that no average student would read lubricious passages in classical authors to delight in their prurience.

Carbone tells us that Guarino often "interrupted" a lecture to refute "foolish conceptions of the ancients about the immortal gods" and that he realized that Christians must have "a range of reading different from that of the pagans, who did not know God." Thus we may say that he used revealed Christian doctrine as a corrective of the moral content in ancient writers, and that he provided the necessary balance by recommending a study of the Church Fathers, the most favoured being Cyprian, Jerome, Lactantius and Augustine.
Battista Guarino does not even mention religious instruction, so we may conclude that no special effort was made in this direction by his father. But normal devotion was certainly encouraged.

The question of how wide the curriculum was at Verona is elusive. Even the works on which Guarino lectured are in most cases not recorded, and from his letters it is a tedious and virtually impossible task to construct a coherent and complete picture. In 1419 he used a commentary of Marius Victorinus to prepare for a course on Cicero. This could hardly have been the lost commentary on the Topica, so it must have been that upon the De inventione; he also seems to have been planning to read Terence (Life sec. 100). He also used Quintilian and Asconius Pedianus in his preparation (Life sec. 103). The work upon which he lectured, however, was the De officiis, the inaugural lecture to which has been preserved and is fully translated after Letter 179 in Summaries. This argues at least careful preparation. What play of Terence he read is not known. Again, in 1422 he must have read the Orator which Giovanni Arzignano brought back from Milan, but we do not know if he lectured upon it. In 1425 he lectured on the Pro Hurona (Letter 293). The evidence is all of this fragmentary nature (cf. Life sec. 111) and hardly repays the effort in collecting it. One caution, however, is necessary: although we hear a great deal about works in which Guarino was interested, this does not mean that he lectured on all of them.
Similarly, the actual subjects covered are hard to track down. Guarino's letters provide little help, but the Anonymous Panegyrist says that Guarino imparted a "full education" to many young men and sent them forth equipped for life. The reference here is more probably to Guarino's socii, with whom he was almost certainly following a wider curriculum than a merely prescriptive study of Latin and Greek grammar and syntax. But even in his public lectures Guarino would have missed no opportunity of pointing morals and touching incidentally upon all manner of antiquarian, historical, geographical, astronomical, and ethical lore. This must have been his basic approach to teaching, since the source material for all those "subjects" lay buried in the literary art of the ancient poets and prose writers. The traditional method was to tackle every facet of knowledge as it occurred in the reading of a classical author. Hence a "full education" could be gained piecemeal and cumulatively purely from reading literary texts.

It would be erroneous to imagine a school day split up into separate periods, each devoted to a single, water-tight "subject." Certain specialized books may, however, have been recommended to particular pupils.

Guarino knew the value of exercise. He took students with him on country walks and practised martial exercises and ball games (Letter 311). It was not until he went to Ferrara that he found the ideal conditions for a fuller programme of physical fitness.
As to his general competence as a teacher at Verona, we must set against the complimentary reminiscences of pupils the fact that in 1424 the council were hesitating over the desirability of re-appointing him, and did not do so until the last moment. It was this opposition that evoked the speech of the Panegyrist. The grounds may have been nebulous and born of parsimony or philistinism; but possibly there was some substance in the charge dealt with by the Panegyrist, himself a public school student, that Guarino had given too much attention to his private students, who by this time seem to have been rather numerous. In Letter 419 he says, "Such a huge throng of private pupils (contubernalium) surrounds me on every side that sometimes when we have to go out walking you would say that sparrows or locusts were migrating in swarms." This implies far more than the 12 socii permitted by the terms of his contract, which he had obviously flaunted, and it may well have been one source of the resentment against him in 1424. Be that as it may, I believe that the years 1419-1429 saw the crystallization of Guarino's views on the theory and practice of teaching. He had become famous enough to attract the attention of Niccoli III, Marquis of Ferrara, and to Guarino's activities in that city we must now turn.

He arrived there first in April, 1429 as a refugee from the plague. Finding Ferrara itself threatened, he wandered from district to district until September. Almost at once
he founded a school by invitation of the young men of the city. At the beginning of 1431 he was appointed private tutor to Leonello d'Este, a position which lasted until 1435 when Leonello married Margherita Gonzaga. After some negotiation, Ferrara hired him on March 1, 1436, and renewed his contract on May 22, 1441. In 1442 he inaugurated the 'studium generale' (university) reconstituted by Leonello, who had become marquis on Niccolo's death in December, 1441. Leonello died on October 1, 1450. Under his successor, Borso, Guarino initially felt less secure but continued his public and private lectures almost until his death on December 4, 1460.

The education of Leonello deserves special attention, since he was Guarino's most famous student and represents an example of the kind of man Guarino could produce, given sole charge of his education.

Woodward (Vittorino p. 244) rightly says that only at a court like that of Mantua or Ferrara could humanism exhibit its complete educational ideals, particularly in the matter of physical training, which had long been cultivated at courts. Humanists like Guarino and Vittorino merely gave the existing tradition the stamp of their approval. The only difference was that they saw exercise not primarily as a preparation for war or a delightful pastime but as a means to promote health and refresh the mind for further study. In his verse epistle Guarino encourages Leonello to engage in snowballing because...
he would return all the more eagerly to his studies:

Prigore ab hoc calidos capiet vos alta Minerva.

He approves of dancing for the same reason:

Dulcius interea gnatus, pia cura parentis,

Sit Leonellus ovans saltibus atque loco,

Promptior ut Musas ac Pallada deinde revisat

Intermissus enim fit labor ipse levis

Leonello frequently retired to the country for relaxation. Guarino defended this by finding classical parallels. Had not Scipio and the ancient heroes of Rome retired periodically to refresh their spirits and think out schemes for the betterment of their fellow citizens? Implicit here is the Ciceronian doctrine that otium (leisure) is merely a preparation for negotium (business) (cf. Letters 187, 142, 143). Similarly, horsemanship, jousting, wrestling, swimming, hawking, and hunting were all to be encouraged (Letters 685, 686, 688). Typically, he defended swimming on the grounds that it might one day save Leonello’s life, as it had saved Julius Caesar and Floratius Cocles; but the prince should recall the sad fate of Alexander the Great, who had perished from a chill caught by bathing in cold river water. Leonello responded by sending game almost every day to his tutor, frequently with a covering letter in elegant Latin to prove that he was mentally alert.

Leonello also loved music. After he became marquis, he decorated his chapel in the palace of Delfiore magnificently and imported a special choir from France to sing in it.
This we know from Johannes Ferrariensis' Excerpta ex Annalium Libris illustri Familiae Marchionum Estensi 1409-1454 (Muratori, R.I.S. vol. 20) col. 456. We hear nothing about this choir from Guarino, who must have heard it perform. One is almost forced to conclude from this and other indications that Guarino had a very limited appreciation of performed music (cf. Life sec. 148). He may have been interested, however, in the mathematical theory of music (musica speculativa), for in Letter 570 he refers to the "commentum in Speram Prosdocimi", that is, the commentary on the Sphaera of John of Holywood written by Prosdocimo di Beldomando, who from 1422 until his death in 1428 was public professor of astronomy and mathematics at Padua. This scholar wrote eight treatises on music, six of which are in print, in which he treated of music both as activa and speculativa (See A. Segarizzi, Antonio Baratella e i suoi corrispondenti Venice, 1916, p. 82). But the uniqueness of Guarino's reference suggests that he had had only a passing interest in Prosdocimo's writings; indeed it is not even clear that he wanted Prosdocimo's commentary for his own use. It seems safe to assert that music, either activa or speculativa, received no attention whatever in Guarino's school. In this respect he seems to have fallen short of Vittorino, who gave music some attention.
Similarly, it would be pleasant to think that Leonello's known passion for the visual and plastic arts was inspired or even encouraged by Guarino, but there is little convincing evidence for this. True, Guarino praised Pisanello, Leonello's favourite artist, in Letter 386, but one receives a powerful impression from this verse epistle that he did not appreciate the aesthetic aspect of painting. His attitude to it was essentially utilitarian and he certainly considered the visual arts as an inferior and less satisfying activity than literature (cf. Life sec. 147). Leonello patronized Pisanello, who painted him at least twice and in 1432 executed for Leonello a picture of the Virgin, which is now in the National Gallery of London. The same artist was also responsible for Leonello's coinage, the antique perfection of which pleased Flavio Biondo (Voigt, Wiederbelebung I, p. 562).

Again, Leonello was fond of architecture, although the only important buildings he erected in Ferrara were the Spedale di Santa Anna and the Palazzo Trotti, now known as the Seminario Arcivescovile. The Florentine architect, Leon Battista Alberti, who in 1436 had dedicated his Italian comedy Filodossio to Leonello (Opere volgari di L.B. Alberti ed. A Bonucci, vol. I p. cxx-cxxi) also wrote at his suggestion the three books De re aedificatoria for which he is chiefly known (See in general A.M. Mancini, Vita di Leon Battista Alberti, Florence, 1882, p. 188-197). But Leonello's contacts with Leon Battista are especially interesting because of their common interest.
in the Italian language as a vehicle for literature. This raises the question of Guarino's attitude to the vernacular.

Leon Battista, in the dedication of his *Teognio* (Opera volgari* vol. III p. 160), writes of his initial hesitation over addressing works in Italian to a Latin scholar like Leonello, and of his pleasure in finding the prince sympathetic. Leonello, indeed, wrote Italian sonnets in the Petrarchan manner, two of which are extant in *Rime scelte dei poeti ferraresi antichi e moderni* ed. G. Barnfaldi (Ferrara, 1713) p. 21. The better of the two challenges comparison with Petrarch himself.* But as a young man under the tutelage of Guarino he appears to have affected a certain scorn for vernacular writings, dismissing them as fit only for the entertainment of women and children on a winter's night (Docembrio, *Politia literaria* I. 6). In this he was almost certainly reflecting the opinions of Guarino himself, who thought so little of Danto, Petrarch and Boccaccio that one would never know from

---

*Latte il Cavallo su la balza alpina
E scaturir fa d'Helicona fonte,
Dove chi le man tagna, e chi la fronte,
Secondo che piú honore o Amor lo inchina.
Anch' io m'accento spesso alla divina
Acqua prodigiosa de quel monte:
Amor ne ride, che 'l sta il con pronte
Le suo sagitte in forma pellegrina;
E mentre il labbro a ber se avanza e stende
Elo coi il venen della puntura
Nacola l'onda e venenosa rende!
Sí che quell' acqua, che de sua natura
Renfrescar me dovrebbe, piú m'accendo,
E piú che bagno, piú cresce l'arsura.
his epistolary that they, or any other important writers of Italian, had even existed. He refers to Petrarch only once, and then as a writer of Latin. If we are to trust Decembrio, however, Guarino did not avoid discussing the merits of the vernacular with Leonello and his friends. In one such debate, Leonello held forth in praise of Dante’s Divina Commedia, going so far as to compare the Florentine poet with Vergil. The others do no oppose his views, no doubt out of respect for his rank, but after he has gone, Guarino, with the support of Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, denies that Dante is in the least comparable with Vergil. The Divina Commedia seemed to him no more than a poor imitation of Vergil and other classical authors, a patchwork of all-manner of antiquarian and theological lore, and at best a curiosity. (Politia literaria V. 64). The truth may be that Guarino had never read vernacular literature with any attention; his energies were too deeply absorbed by the study and interpretation of the classical authors. Nor should we discount a certain degree of literary and professorial snobbery which would at once more or less oblige him to champion the ancients on all counts and disincline him to give the modern vernacular writers the praise we now realize they deserved. Whatever Guarino may have felt about the vernacular in his more liberal moments, it is certain that he took no notice of its literature in his teaching at any time. Battista Guarino and all the other sources are likewise completely silent about it.
Leonello's education was therefore purely classical, and while he lived, the court and university of Ferrara became a mecca for humanists such as Giovanni Aurispa, who had preceded Guarino to Ferrara (by his recommendation) as tutor to Molinaduce, and Theodorus Gaza, who came in 1444 to teach Greek. In the years of his marquisate (1442-1450) he brought scholars of all kinds to the city and arranged for their stipends to be paid for by the city, as is recorded by the monk Johannes Ferrariensis, col. 457. (See also Voigt, Wiederbelobung I 563-564 and F.G. Borsetti, Historia Almi Ferrariae Gymnasia I p. 47-54). Guarino, however, remained the presiding academic deity and literary symposiarch under whom classicism was supreme. Only in the reign of Borso did vernacular literature come into prominence. He was a well-meaning, ostentatious ruler, but not blessed either with his brother Leonello's refinement or his knowledge of Latin. Classicism did not die out, for it remained vigorous as the language of the university, diplomacy, and courtly adulation; but Borso and his immediate staff spoke only Italian and favoured romances of chivalry both in the French originals and Italian translations (P. Rajna, Le fonti dell' Orlando Furioso Florence, 1900. Introduction). This latter taste, subliminally present under Niccolo and Leonello, now became a vogue and set the stage for the later glories of Ariosto, Boiardo, and Luigi Pulci. But it is a tribute to the pervasive power of Guarino that
before 1460 the two best poets in Ferrara -- John of Pannonia, a citizen of Csenicze in Hungary, and Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, a Ferrarese of Florentine extraction -- were both his students and wrote only in Latin.

Guarino, as tutor to Leonello, had been responsible for his entire training, both intellectual and moral. It must be admitted that Leonello was a gifted student and not devoid of Latin learning even before Guarino came to Ferrara, yet credit must go to the latter for producing a ruler whose humanity and talents were the admiration of all Italy. His Latin style is a somewhat paler version of Guarino's, although his tutor praised it highly, and even Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, frequently a harsh critic, compared his letters with those of Cicero (Ep. 105 in *Opera omnia*, Basle, 1551, p. 605).

He collected manuscripts -- among them the *codex Ursinianus* of Plautus, which he procured for Guarino -- and encouraged his tutor to edit the complete works of Julius Caesar. He is said to have composed *commentarii* of his own, but they have not survived any more than the treatise in which he is alleged to have proved as forgeries the letters between St. Paul and Seneca (*Decembrio, Politia literaria* I, 10). That he was no narrow classicist but also a writer of Italian sonnets and friend of such men as Leon Battista Alberti and the young Francesco Ariosto, may not be entirely due to Guarino, but at least one can say that his tutor did not attempt to stunt his natural enthusiasms.
The consensus of opinion among his contemporaries was that he was sweet, kind, and generous, the only black mark coming from Piccolomini, who in his *Historia rorum Frederici Tertii Imperatoris* (Strassburg, 1685) p. 95 accuses him of injustice towards his son, Niccolo, and cruelty and infidelity towards his first wife, Margherita Gonzaga. Voigt repeats the general accusation of tyranny and cruelty (*Wiederbelebung* I, p. 563). There is also a tale related by Paolo da Lignano in his *Cronica Estense* p. 287 in the unpublished Reale Archivio de Stato in Modena that Leonello as a boy seduced the daughter of his military tutor, Braccio da Montone. But none of this, even if it were true, would be unexpected in a prince of the Renaissance; indeed, Leonello's record of one illegitimate son and alleged indifference to his wife seem like examples of probity when set beside his father's innumerable bastards and the harsh execution of his wife, Parisina (*Life of Guarino sec. I*). It is also worth noting that Piccolomini, in his *De viris illustribus* (Stuttgart, 1843) p. 16 takes pains to defend Leonello's moral character.

The charge of cruelty is likewise nugatory. Despite the temptations to this vice and the political necessities which often forced despots into ruthless acts, Leonello's reign was singularly free of oppression. Some credit at least must go to Guarino, who in Letter 67 says that he has always striven to warn the prince against cruelty. Perhaps the best
example of Leonello's charitable, gracious disposition came in December, 1447, when Pier Candido Decembrio sent him a biography of Filippo Maria Visconti, who had died in August. Leonello's criticism was favourable, but he insisted on the deletion of a reference to the duke's homosexual inclinations on the grounds that it was a needless and gratuitous slander. (Rossini, Guarino I p. 109-110).

Finally, in politics he maintained Niccolo III's role as mediator in disputes between states, while contriving to keep Ferrara out of war. This love of peace, though implanted in him by Niccolo III, was fostered by Guarino. John of Pannonia's statement that Guarino was solely responsible for the pacific condition of Ferrara is plainly an exaggeration, but there may have been some truth in it. Leonello d'Este was therefore a fine example of Guarino's ability to produce an enlightened ruler and a man of true refinement, who challenges comparison with Lorenzo dei Medici.

It remains to discuss in detail the tripartite scheme of education which Guarino adapted from Quintilian, and which he was the first humanist educator to put into effect. The following account is based mainly on that of Battista Guarino.

In the "elementary" stage correct pronunciation was taught and reading aloud recommended. Then followed the regular Latin inflexions, beginning with nouns and verbs. Skills were tested vivavoce, by written examination and the correction
of erroneous forms purposely introduced by the teacher (The last method seems of doubtful value, since it is now regarded as poor psychology even to suggest an error to beginners). Battista specifies no manual of grammar, so the various declensions and conjugations were perhaps taught orally.

The students may, however, have possessed copies of the Ars minor, a compilation in question and answer form by the fourth century grammarian, Aelius Donatus. This had long been a popular primer; even as late as 1487 it was revised by Antonio Vancinelli and in that form it continued to be used until the end of the sixteenth century. Alternatively, Guarino's students may have used the Donatus minor (a medieval abridgement of the Ars minor), sometimes called the Ianua. The foundation of all Guarino's teaching was therefore a thorough knowledge of prescriptively classical Latin grammar. It will be noted that no mention is made of subjects such as arithmetic, reading, and writing. Guarino would assume these basic skills. Further, since any student who desired a specialized knowledge of such subjects as astronomy, mathematics, or music could not have gained it without a thorough knowledge of Latin. It was therefore logical of Guarino to start with a solid foundation in Latin grammar.

The intermediate or "grammatical" course is outlined by John of Pannonia (Sylva panegyrica 360-367):
Principio recte das fundamenta loquendi,
Recte scribendi compendia tradere calles,
Ne lingua accentu, calamo ne dextera peccet.
Nox argumento formatur epistola ficto.
Proxima volvendis annalibus ocia dantur,
Declamare dehinc et carmina fingere monstras,
Dum natura suam facundia crescat in artem
Per certos evecta gradus . . .

The order given above conflicts slightly with that of Battista Guarino.

Battista describes the successive stages as methodice and historice. In methodice Guarino explained the constructions and dealt with the irregular inflexions. The basic grammar was his own Regulae, but the Doctrinale of Alexander de Villa Dei, a twelfth century compilation in verse, was considered useful for learning the irregular inflexions and the basic rules of prosody and metre. Priscian was used only after the acquisition of the elements of Greek later in the course.

Battista says that Cicero's letters were to be memorized, but this probably means only selected letters and passages. The aim was to produce a pure prose style, the basis of which was Cicero, but one which was distinctively the student's own. Battista even calls upon the authority of Horace Ars Poetica 309 to emphasize the need for wide reading in many authors as a means to creating one's own style -- a doctrine which remained strong among the humanists until at least Angelo Poliziano.
Syntactical exercises were often done orally but students were also required to construct sentences of their own to illustrate the various constructions. Our method would be to translate from English into Latin, but Guarino used Latin in class as much as possible. No doubt he used Italian in the elementary stage and probably had to resort to it occasionally in the grammatical course. (It is a pity we do not know more about this; it is always possible that Guarino tried what has been called the "direct" method and spoke nothing but Latin until his students were forced to pick up simple instructions in that language.)

Longer written exercises, called *thematata* by Guarino (Letter 421) and *declamationes* by Battista, frequently took the form of model letters written either to the teacher or to other students. Battista says nothing about letters, but the practice of composing model letters had many precedents in antiquity, had been revived by Petrarch, recommended by Chrysoloras, and followed by Guarino himself as early as 1405 (Letter 1). Guarino assigned topics for students to put in epistolary form (Letter 421) and corrected the mistakes in letters he received from them (Letters 164, 165, 166). Letter 145 is an example of a model letter from his own pen.

Carbone refers to Guarino's invention of a "very easy method of writing letters", but gives no details. This can mean only a system for polite epistolography embracing the correct classical format and a stock of commonplaces to deal with recurrent situations -- asking favours, giving thanks, apologies.
for failing to write sooner, congratulation, consolation, declining unwanted tasks politely, and so on. Guarino's own letters provide the best illustrations of the devices he used. The art of letter writing culminated in Erasmus' De conscribendis epistulis, and it must be admitted that by the end of the fifteenth century the multiplicity of epistolary rules and conventions had stifled freshness of approach and rendered many humanistic letters agglomerations of lifeless commonplaces. With Guarino, however, formalism was still in its infancy and had not yet destroyed the living interest of his letters. It seems necessary to emphasize this only because Woodward in Vittorino p. 57 indulges in the unfair comment: "Guarino was very prolific in letters. Voigt rightly says that their formalism and want of living interest makes them a poor testimony to their writer's powers".

It may be added that Carbone says Guarino introduced a new "form of writing" to Ferrara. This may merely refer to style, but it could also mean the form of humanistic script Guarino himself used (For examples, see the autograph letters reproduced by Sabbadini in the Epistolario vol 3, after p. xxvii). He must have adopted it after 1414 for in Letter 17 he was contemptuous of Niccolo Niccoli's preoccupation with the invention of a new script.

If we are to believe John of Pannonia (Sylva panepyrlica 574: "Vergilius primum legitur"), Vergil was the first poet studied.
Battista also says that a thorough examination of the Vergilian hexameter introduced verse composition; only after its principles had been learned were other metres studied. Large selections of Vergil were committed to memory to fix metre, certain constructions, and a variety of excellent moral precepts in the students' minds. Versification was considered one of the distinctive accomplishments of an educated man. John of Pannonia (ibid. 5-6) acknowledges Guarino's teaching of the art:

. . .mea nec lyra dignius ullum
Ante sonet quam quo didicit crepitare magistro.

He also claims that Guarino, himself a poet, made poets of others (ibid. 24-27):

Quid de te censere licet? Qui totius nevi
Acta animo comprensae tenes, nec cudere solum
Ipse potes numeros, magni sed Appolinis instar
Nec alius praebes, et tot facies esse poetas.

The humanists had a rather elastic conception of the term "poeta". Usually it meant little more than "scholar", which in turn implied an ability to write metrically correct Latin verses. Guarino's own verse is metrically sound and often felicitous in sentiment and expression (e.g. Letter 599, which I have translated into English verse) but never inspired.

The same is true of John of Pannonia and the other "poets" Guarino trained, with the exception of Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, whose Latin poems, particularly his Elegies, have been much praised.
Leonello d'Este was a minor poet in the true sense, but his vernacular effusions probably owed nothing to Guarino's teaching.

In the stage known as *historice* continuous prose authors, particularly the historians, were studied. Justinus of Valerius Maximus were used to give a bird's eye view of the general history of the ancient world. Valerius Maximus -- a favourite of Guarino since his schooling under Marzagaia -- was considered particularly valuable for his moral content. Then, in chronological order, the other historians were studied to gain an understanding of the customs and laws of different states and to trace the vicissitudes of fortune as they befell individuals and states.

The purpose of studying history was predominantly utilitarian -- to provide virtuous precepts and to increase the ability to order one's present conduct in the light of the lessons of history (See Guarino's attitude to history and historiography).

Just as history was the "light of truth", so were the poets the source of imagination and mythology; they were regarded as a counterbalance to the historians. Vergil was supreme, followed by Statius' Thebais. Ovid's Metamorphoses and Fasti* were used as sources of mythology and antiquarian lore.

* Battista wrote a commentary on this work, as also upon Catullus, Juvenal, Lucan, and Cicero's Letters. He also prepared the first edition of Servius' commentaries on Vergil, using his father's emendations. His translations included an Italian version of Plutus' Menaechmi (Catalogus translationum et commentariorum ed. Kristeller, vol. 1. p. 214)
Seneca's tragedies were read for their moral gravity, Terence and Juvenal for their copious vocabulary of every-day words and sound moral teaching. Both of the last two authors were especial favourites of Guarino, who once, however, had to defend himself for lecturing on Terence's *Woman of Andros* (See Guarino as a figure in controversy). Similarly, the selection of Juvenal must have drawn occasional criticism, for Battista defends him on the grounds that his actual descriptions of vice are few.

He also appeals to the doctrine of *proprietas* which Guarino had used in his defence of Terence (Letter 823) whereby the impieties, cruelties, and horrors described by writers, particularly poets, should draw condemnation rather than the writers themselves. The reader should fix his attention and centre his criticism on the congruity of the vices to the characters described. This doctrine, however, could validly be applied only to a writer whose honest, artistic purposes made it necessary to describe vicious acts (Guarino had in Letter 823 cited Jerome's description of a harlot's blandishments). But authors whose plain and only purpose was pornography were excluded from the curriculum. Thus Ovid's *Ars amatoria* was banned, and his other works, save for the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, were held suspect.

Guarino made use of two other methods, not unrelated to that already described, whereby material potentially corrosive
of morals could be saved for the reader's eyes. The first involved a conscious effort by the reader not to enjoy prurient passages. The second was to treat anything embarrassing to Christian values as an allegory concealing a divine truth. John of Pannonia makes it clear that Guarino was much given to allegorizing, particularly in his expositions of Vergil. He says (Sylva panegyrica 544) that Guarino always showed in the verses "Qua pulchrum occulta condant sub imagine verum" and that he had no peer as an expositor of hidden sublimities (ibid. 527-529):

... nec te solertior edere quisquam
mystica secreto quid cael et fabula sensu.

Carbone says much the same thing of Guarino's interpretations of poets and prose writers. These methods may seem to modern taste dishonest, or at best extraordinarily naive subterfuges, but they were part of the traditional defence of pagan literature as a basis for education, and what had been good enough for Jerome and Augustino unquestionably salved Guarino's conscience. Battista also subscribed to them, but gives them so little prominence that one is inclined to suspect his belief in their ultimate validity. Certainly he nowhere suggests, as his father had done, that prurient passages can be read and then immediately unthought.

Perhaps also because Battista was a "second generation" humanist and less oppressed than his father with the need to defend the moral content of the ancients he was able to
recommend Plautus without reservation. He praises his eloquence and wit, and cites Macrobius' opinion that Cicero and Plautus were the supreme masters of the Latin tongue. Guarino also appreciated Plautus, but considered Terence a safer author to lecture on, and probably read Plautus only with mature students.

Persius and Juvenal were considered difficult authors, so Horace was used as an introduction to satire. He was also valued as a literary critic. Guarino quotes the Ars poetica frequently in his letters. Little if any attention seems to have been paid to the Odes and Epistles. The fact that Battista does not mention them, however, need not imply they were never studied.

Battista recommends an occasional perusal of writers on astronomy and geography, such as Porponius Mela, Solinus, and Strabo. Ptolemaic geography was considered a useful study, but mainly as an aid to understanding history.

The teaching of Greek was introduced as part of methodica and continued as part of historica, the sequence of instruction being similar to that used for Latin -- a good grounding in grammar (from Chrysoloras' Erotemata or Guarino's compendium of it) followed by the reading of simple prose authors. Homer was the first poet to be studied, and after him came other heroic poets and the dramatists. Battista claims that this would increase the student's vocabulary, and recommends the sedulous taking and learning of notes. The rules of accentuation were then to be mastered. At all times practice was given in the
use of Greek constructions by means of elementary composition from Latin into Greek. Finally, the student had to take a Latin author of ordinary difficulty and render a complete work into Greek so that the master could check that no delicate shade of meaning had been lost.

Neither Guarino or any other early humanist would have defended translation into Greek as an intellectual pastime. Much of what they did seems to have been art for art's sake, but they would not, and had not, consciously asserted this doctrine. Translation into Greek was regarded as a means to the obviously useful end of rendering Greek works accurately into Latin.

In translating, three methods were used: *conversio ad verbum* (literal translation), *translatio* ad sententiam (a faithful, yet stylistic rendering), and *inmutatio* (free translation). The first is exemplified in the earliest translations, such as the interlinear ad verbum renderings of the gospels, and Leontius Pilatus' version of Homer. *Inmutatio* was the common practice of Salutati, Francesco Barbaro, and Poggio, the last of whom squeezed the 8 books of Xenophon's *Cyropaideia* into 6, and expanded the first 5 of Diodorus Siculus into 6. A particularly flagrant example of *inmutatio* was Lorenzo Valla's astonishing

---

* A humanistic variant for the classical *conversio*. Brunf in 1400 was the first to use traducere = *convertere* and *translatio* = *conversio* (Sabbadini, *Rendiconti Instit. Lomb. di scienze e lettere* LXIX, 1916, p. 221-24), thus giving English the verb to translate, French *traduire*, and Italian *tradurre*.
expansion of the opening lines of the Iliad:

Scripturus ego quantam exercitibus Graillis cladem
excitaverit Achillis furens indignatio, ita ut passim
aves feraeque cadaveribus heroum ac principum
pascerentur, te, Calliopea, vosque aliae sorores,
sacer musarum chorus, quarum hoc munus est
proprium et quae vatibus praesidetis, moneo ut
haec me edoceatis, quae vox docere alios possim


Those who most conspicuously practised translatio ad sententiam were Bruni, Leonardo Giustinian, Jacopo Angoli da Scarperla, Filelfo, and Guarino (except in his version of Strabo, which seems, in about twenty passages selected by the present writer at random, to be rather bald and over literal). Guarino in following the intermediate method was apparently following the advice of Chrysoloras, who according to Cencio dei Rustici, "used to say that a literal translation was of little value, since it was not only absurd but sometimes even distorted the meaning of the Greek altogether. He used to assert that those who concern themselves with matters of this sort must translate the meaning without vitiating the accuracy of the Greek. If anyone changed the meaning of the original in order to speak more clearly to his own people, he was acting not as a translator, but as a commentator." (passage cited by Sabbadini, Il metodo degli umanisti Chap. 2). Chrysoloras
was therefore as much against a literal as a free translation.

With regard to the teaching of Greek, finally, it is noteworthy that neither Guarino nor Battista says much about the subject as literature, save for the usual complimentary epithets attached to the names of the greatest figures. On the whole one gets the impression that the humanists in general regarded Greek as ancillary only to the understanding of Latin language and literature. They seem to have had little appreciation of the true genius of Greek literature. Nothing could illustrate this better than their attitude to Homer, whom they praised, but placed lower than Vergil on account of the latter's "superior art". Hence in their translations of Homer they often could not resist the temptation to "improve" his style. The passage from Valla already quoted illustrates this principle, and Guarino himself in Letter 408 refers to a translation in Latin hexameters which he had made of part of Odyssey XXIII (probably lines 190-204 referring to the bed of Odysseus). Appealing to the example of Vergil, he says that he has omitted certain homely details, as happens, for example, in Vergil Aenid 1. 177, where "serantque arma" suffices for what in Homer would have evoked a precise enumeration of cooking utensils, resulting in boredom to the reader and a loss of heroic tone. Finally one could cite the preposterous idea advanced by Guarino in Letter 27 that Chrysoloras would have made a more fitting
hero for the Iliad than Achilles. This was no literary conceit, but evidence of a startling lack of comprehension of Homer's artistic aims.

Once Guarino's students had mastered the Latin and Greek languages, they were considered ready to tackle the third and highest course, described by Battista as the 'Rhetorical', consisting of instruction in the practical art of speaking and a study of the theory of oratory as set forth in the works of Cicero in particular. Guarino lectured first on the pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium, a work valued on account of its concise, comprehensive survey of the various rhetorical schemes (figures of arrangement) and tropes (figures of thought). Next came Cicero's works on rhetoric. Battista does not list them, but presumably he meant the three major ones, the De Oratore, Orator, and Brutus, all of which had been available since 1422. The principles laid down in these works were illustrated copiously from Cicero's forensic speeches. Quintilian, although not so highly regarded as Cicero, was also used as a supplementary commentary on Latin eloquence.

Battista also prescribes a study of Aristotle's Ethics and Plato's Dialogues, since both works are essential for a proper understanding of Cicero. He instances the close dependence, both for form and matter, of the Ciceronian dialogues upon the Platonic, and indicates a personal preference for the De officiis and Tusculan Disputations, the former because
it contains "a wealth of knowledge most useful -- both as to material and expression -- to every modern writer". To round out the course he suggests a study of Roman law and the elements of logic.

The course involved, in addition to a study of all the arts of expression, a confrontation at many points with ancient philosophy, but it is highly doubtful whether Guarino, whose talents were predominantly philological, gave any really comprehensive survey of the ancient systems. Towards the end of his life he seems to have felt himself deficient in the field of logic and philosophy, for he adds this postscript to Letter 911 to Battista: "I would particularly like to see that you had found yourself a teacher in logic or dialectic and in philosophy. If this happens, I forecast that you will be a second flower of Italy. Believe me, child, believe me". He would hardly have added this admonition if he had believed that his own instruction of Battista had in these respects been adequate. The truth may be that by 1459 Guarino was beginning to realize that a far more comprehensive treatment of ancient philosophers was desirable. The spread of Greek knowledge and the increased interest in Plato imported by Byzantine refugees had given rise to a demand for more detailed information about ancient philosophers. One need only instance the foundation of the Platonic Academy at Florence as an indication of the trend.
All his life, however, Guarino had followed the usual humanist attitude to ancient philosophy, which was to repudiate all metaphysical speculation as irrelevant to the needs of everyday life and to concentrate on an exposition of the moral platitudes found in ancient philosophers, particularly those with a Stoic flavour. Humanist educators aimed only to provide their students with a set of practical precepts to guide their lives and a stock of exempla to illustrate such straightforward virtues as truthfulness, modesty, courage, self-control, and indifference to the vicissitudes of fortune. Even the deeper questions of moral philosophy were evaded where they might have raised disturbing social problems. Guarino, for example, had undoubtedly read Plato's *Republic* and *Gorgias* in the original Greek, yet nowhere does he discuss such questions as the true nature of justice or rhetoric.

There seem to be two reasons for this shallow treatment of philosophy. First, the energies of the early humanists were absorbed in the resuscitation of classical language; there was a limit to what they could accomplish in understanding the more complex aspects of ancient civilization. Second, and more important, they had the comfort of revealed Christian truth, and could afford to neglect or summarily denounce everything which conflicted with Christian teaching. In his *Rhetorical* course, therefore, Guarino merely continued the practice he followed in the *Grammatical*, that of using revealed Christian morality as a corrective or confirmation of the moral teachings of the ancients.
5. The relative merits of Guarino and Vittorino as educators.

The name of Vittorino is so frequently coupled with that of Guarino that some discussion of their relative merits and achievements as educators seems desirable. The purpose of this discussion will be to show that Guarino has sometimes in the English-speaking world been rather underrated in comparison with Vittorino, to explore the reason for this, and to correct the imbalance.

But first it will be useful to give a summary of Vittorino's career based mainly upon Woodward's standard biography, Vittorino de Feltre and other humanist educators.*

Born in 1378 at Feltre in northern Italy, he enrolled in 1396 at the University of Padua, where he came under the humanistic influence of Giovanni di Conversino da Ravenna, then professor of Rhetoric. Woodward (Vittorino p. 6) asserts that he received a doctorate in Arts sometime before 1411. There is no official record, however, of his having received this or any other degree. Bruno Nardi in Contributo alla biografia di V. p. 8-9 has reviewed the evidence** and concluded that Vittorino probably did not complete

* Woodward's sources are listed p. xxvii-xxviii. Other bibliographical material on Vittorino is as follows: A. Gambare, Vittorino da Feltre (Turin, 1946); E. Garin L'Educazione umanistica in Italia (Earl, 1949); Il pensiero pedagogico dell' Umanesimo ed. E. Garin (Florence, 1958); B. Nardi, Contributo alla biografia di Vittorino (Società Cooperativa Tipografica, Padua, 1958).

** Francesco Prendilacqua, Commentariolus de vita Victorini Feltrensis (Padua, 1774) p. 39: "Nox Dialecticae ac Philosophiae egregiam operam dedit, iam inter primos illius professionis doctores iure ac merito honoribus, sicut ille, ut erat philosophus, abicta omni doctoratus pompa, nullos honores illi ordinis concessos petere voluit, neque ornatiore vesto, neque annulis aut aurea zona usus est."
the official requirements for his doctorate. We should therefore view with reserve Woodward's statement (Vittorino p. 7) that "it was characteristic of the man that he refused to wear either the ring or the gown which marked his academic rank." He does appear, however, to have attended lectures on Canon Law. Before 1411 also he studied Euclid privately under Biagio Pelicani, subsequently becoming himself a private teacher of grammar and mathematics in Padua. During his twenty year residence in that city (1396-1416) the two most powerful humanistic influences on his life were Vergorino and Barzizza. From 1416 to 1418 he studied Greek in Guarino's contubernium at Venice, and in 1419 or 1420 opened a private school in that city similar to those of Barzizza at Padua (1408-1421) and Guarino at Venice (1416-1418). In 1421 he succeeded Barzizza as professor of Rhetoric in the University of Padua, but resigned in 1422 to institute another contubernium at Venice. Finally in 1423, through the recommendation of Guarino, he secured the position of tutor to the children of Gianfrancesco I Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, at whose court he founded his third and most famous boarding school. He remained its principal until his death on February 2, 1446.

Originally intended only for the Gonzaga children, the school was gradually expanded to include up to 60 or 70 students of different ages and social conditions. All were treated alike, but Vittorino moderated his fees to suit the parents' means. Frequently he maintained promising but impecunious students at
his own expense -- as a result of which he is said to have died in debt -- and arranged for their parents to receive a compensatory income from state funds. The villa in which he and his students lived and worked had originally been named "La Gioiosa" (the Pleasure House), the connotations of which displeased his fastidious moral sense, so he had it changed to "La Giocosn" (the Pleasant House). Believing that surroundings can affect character and intellectual performance, he had the large, airy rooms decorated with frescoes of children at work and play to promote a cheerful atmosphere, but stripped of luxurious appointments to discourage self-indulgence and sloth. The diet was spartan, and artificial heating was disdained even in winter.

Basing his ideals on Vergerio's *De ingenibus moribus* and Plutarch's *De liberis educandis* and much of his teaching practice on Quintilian, whom, according to his biographer Platina, he regarded as the "best writer on light and education," Vittorino devised a balanced curriculum to produce a harmonious development of mind, body, and character. Platina says he frequently praised the *enkyklios paideia* of the Greeks and sought to impart an all-round education. The basis of the intellectual curriculum was a thorough training in Greek and Latin language and literature, with particular attention to the poets, orators, and historians, but separate attention was paid to logic, arithmetic, geometry, mensuration and surveying, astronomy, natural philosophy, natural history, drawing, and music, both as a performed skill and as a
branch of mathematics. Woodward also suggests that the elements of algebra were taught. Himself a good Latinist and mathematician, Vittorino hired collaborators such as the Greeks Theodore Gaza and George of Trebizond. Realizing the value of variety, he alternated the subjects of instruction and suited the pace and emphasis of his teaching to the interests and aptitudes of individual pupils. Complementing the intellectual curriculum were compulsory games and physical exercises devised in many cases to correct bodily defects in individual students. Dancing was allowed under supervision to promote graceful bearing, never as a frivolous pastime, and only to the accompaniment of the severe "Dorian mode." The company of females was forbidden. Above all, Vittorino saw himself as a father to his pupils and concerned himself with their moral welfare. He inculcated clean speech, clean living, and strict obedience to Christian principles by his own example of probity, study of the scriptures and patristic literature, and daily religious observances. Woodward and many after him have praised Vittorino as the first humanist teacher successfully to fuse the Christian spirit with the best elements of the classical tradition.

Such is more or less the canonical account, and there is no need to impugn its general accuracy, but two cautionary remarks are necessary.

First, Woodward's biography, excellent as it is in many respects, is really a protracted eulogy of Vittorino, around whom he casts
something like an aura of sainthood. At various points, and for reasons which may be ascribed to his English nineteenth-century background, he makes either directly or by implication certain invidious comparisons with Guarino, the total effect of which is a subtle, but definite exaltation of Vittorino over him.

Second, the fact that Woodward's biography is the only one written in English has lent it considerable prestige and popularity in Britain and America. Its general conclusions have therefore been tralatitiously adopted into many of the popular accounts of humanistic education which have appeared in English. Regrettably, Guarino's image has suffered a little in the process. Three typical examples will perhaps suffice to illustrate this. In Curtis and Boulwood's Short History of Educational Ideas (London, 1953) over two pages are devoted to Vittorino as opposed to about half a page of largely inaccurate information about Guarino -- a good measure not merely of their relative importance in the eyes of the authors, but of how little the authors knew about Guarino. Again, the 1964 edition of the Encyclopedia Americana contains a good article on Vittorino, but a very inadequate one on Guarino, which does not even comment on him as an educator. Finally, the 1967 edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica has an article on Vittorino, but none on Guarino da Verona.

By contrast, Guarino has been better served on the continent of Europe, particularly in Italy, where Rosmini, Cittadella, Sabbadini, Bertoni, and most recently Eugenio Garin have fully
recognized his importance. Sabbadini, for instance, in La Scuola e gli Studi di Guarino (Bottega d'Erasmo, Torino, 1964) p. 37 uncompromisingly says: "A ragione pertanto possiamo chiamare Guarino il più grande maestro del suo secolo," and Garin in L’Educazione in Europa 1400-1600 p. 148 pays him this superb compliment: "E forse nessuno come Guarino realizzo l’immagine esemplare del professore laico." On a lower note -- but perhaps a significant one, since the symbols people choose, or have chosen for them, reflect popular predilections -- we find Guarino appearing as an archetype of culture in a catalogue issued by Studio Antenore, the largest booksellers in Padua, under the rubric Guarinus.

The fact that some of their better scholars chose to write extensively about Guarino has much to do with his comparatively high reputation in Italy, but there are three aspects of his personality which have also drawn Italians to him. First his simple, sincere Christianity was tinged with no asceticism. Second, he had great rhetorical flair and the impulse to express himself at length -- qualities more readily appreciated by Italians than the reserve and reticence of Vittorino, who wrote sparingly and unwillingly. Third, his lack of interest in science and total commitment to literature makes him a more typical representative of what the Italians generally understand by "umanesimo". In this connection it is worth quoting part of Monique Sprout’s introduction to Carnis Markham’s English translation (1608) of Ariosto’s Sixth Satire (in Umanesimo vol. 7, no. 3, 1967, p. 60-70): “The work (Ariosto’s Sixth Satire) is in fact the most genuine expression of humanistic writing. It is
more so since the poet does not aim at writing a treatise with the pretense of being complete and encompassing all aspects of education. Vergerio, Sadoleto had to refer to scientific training as something important at least in an elementary stage. They could not ignore other aspects. Ariosto had only to speak of what he wanted a proctor to give his own son. He expressed what was really important to him: no science; no Aristotelian thinking or study of metaphysics; no practical training; no absorption into the divine; just goodness and "studio umano", that is moral values fused with Christian religion classical training not for the purpose of erudition and learning, but because classicism is the basis of religion and humanity."

Similarly, Woodward's admiration for Vittorino can be explained partly because he saw in the ideals and curriculum of the Mantuan school the preeminent adumbration of "modern education," as conceived at the end of the nineteenth century. He even calls Vittorino "the first modern schoolmaster" (Vittorino p. 92), not merely because he was one of the founders of our modern notions of what constitutes a liberal education, but also because Vittorino made a more obvious attempt than any other humanist teacher to impart a really balanced education, including what we should call "scientific" subjects. It should not be forgotten that the publication in 1859 of Darwin's Origin of Species and the ideas of Herbert Spencer (1830-1903), the prophet of "self-help" and the virtues of a scientific outlook, had caused many educationalists to revaluate the traditional curriculum in English schools. Although science was not accepted as a vital part of education until well into the twentieth century, there were many in the nineteenth century who were sufficiently influenced by
Spencer to consider the inclusion of scientific subjects in the curriculum desirable. It is a pity Woodward does not discuss this matter in his introduction or elsewhere, but I submit that one may reasonably assume that the belief in science had to some extent impinged upon his thinking and shaped his prejudices.

It must also be admitted, however, and even emphasized, that Woodward conceived of the classics as the foundation of education, and wholeheartedly endorsed what he called the "educational practice of a period whose originating impulse is still, within that sphere, powerfully operative among us" (cf. Eugene F. Rice's foreword to the 1963 edition of Vittorino p. xvi). Further, the best in classical education during the nineteenth century found its symbol in Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), the famous headmaster of Rugby whose aim was to turn out Christian gentlemen schooled in Latin and Greek. In reading Woodward's account of Vittorino one can hardly escape feeling that subconsciously he admired the Mantuan master because he corresponded so closely to the Arnold image, with its allied mystique of segregation of the sexes, compulsory games, the benefits of cold, and a rigid, yet kindly Christian discipline.*

The above explanation for Woodward's personal bias towards Vittorino is admittedly speculative. But that such a bias did exist is capable of specific demonstration. In what follows a selection of Woodward's statements in Vittorino will be examined and assessed.

* Cf. Bolgar, Classical Heritage p. 332: "It was Vittorino who... laid a great emphasis on the training of character... and had a nineteenth-century respect for the virtues of cold air and games."
On p. 64 we find: "Professor Sabbadini thinks that he (Vittorino) learned not a little from Guarino. It is difficult to find evidence for this latter opinion; for in all that is truly characteristic of Vittorino, Guarino falls distinctly below him."

There are, however, several indications that Vittorino did learn something from Guarino. As Bolgar says in Classical Heritage p. 332: "But in the literary field there was little to choose between the methods of the two teachers. Vittorino had been Guarino's pupil for more than a year and had learnt a great many of his techniques."

Bolgar then lists a number of similarities in method, which may or may not be significant. But in one point Vittorino almost certainly followed Guarino -- the key technique of using notebooks, which had ultimately been derived from Chrysoloras and was transmitted through his pupil Guarino to practical educators in the West. Again, there is a strong probability that since Vittorino learned Greek from Guarino he also learned something about how to teach it. He probably also learned from Guarino the paternal attitude towards students which characterized both teachers. Finally, although the idea of contubernium was originally Barzizza's, Vittorino undeniably must have seen from his personal experience at Venice 1416-18 how such an establishment could be operated, and it may be significant that he did not open a contubernium of his own until just after he had been Guarino's pupil.

As for the "truly characteristic" aspects of Vittorino in which Guarino fell so distinctly beneath him, they are best examined in the light of further examples of unfairness to Guarino.

On p. 36-37 we find: "As compared with the other great school-master of the time, Guarino da Verona, we may say that whilst Guarino,
the better Greek scholar and more laborious reader, bent his
efforts rather to turning out clever and eloquent scholars, Vittorino
aimed at sending forth young men who should serve God in Church and
state in whatever capacity they might be called upon to occupy."
In a footnote (p. 37) Woodward cites the concurring opinions of
Voigt and Burckhardt. Indeed, the idea has been remarkably tenacious.
Folgar, for example, says in Classical Heritage p. 332: "Guarino
was first and last a teacher of classics. His purpose was to form
scholars capable of construing a difficult passage or writing a
handsome oration. It was Vittorino who introduced that all-round
education which we regard as typically Humanist" -- a statement which
may owe something to Woodward's (p. 24) that Vittorino "established the
first great school of the Renaissance. It was indeed the great typical
school of the Humanities." Two points requiring qualification arise
from these statements.

First, Vittorino's school was surely, if anything, atypical of
humanistic institutions, if he really did make a serious attempt to
give instruction in non-literary subjects. In reading humanistic
treatises on education, and the views of humanistic education evinced
by laymen such as Ariosto in his Sixth Satire, one is struck by their
perfunctory treatment of non-literary subjects. To that extent, then,
Gaurino's school more readily deserves to be called the "great typical
school of the Humanities."

Second, it is unfair to call Gaurino nothing but a classics
master or trainer of rhetoricians. True, he paid no apparent heed
to vocational training in the sense that he taught students to be
surveyors, astronomers, musicians, and so on, but he would have believed
that he was making it possible for any student to take up these specialized studies, because the material for them lay embedded in texts written in Greek or Latin. Besides, we may be sure that following time-honoured tradition, Guarino commented incidentally on scientific matters as they cropped up in his reading of literary texts. The students would therefore have some basic material from which to start if they wished to take up specialized studies. Vittorino's treatment of non-literary subjects seems to have been more systematic, and for this he deserves credit, but perhaps too much has been made of this aspect of his teaching, because his actual results in terms of men prepared "to serve God in church and state" have never been shown to be noticeably superior to Guarino's. Woodward (p. 86-88) lists as Vittorino's best students George of Trebizond, Lorenzo Valla, Niccolò Perotti, Antonio Beccaria, Ognibene da Lonigo, Sassuolo da Prato, and Giovanni Andrea, Bishop of Aleria, but all of these men were noted for their literary endeavours. Others mentioned by Gambara in his article on Vittorino in the Enciclopedia Italiana are: the Gonzaga children and Federico da Montefeltro as heads of state; the condottiere, Giberto da Correggio; and the humanists Gregorio Corrarolo and Platina. But against these names one could cite from among Guarino's students such statesmen and men of action as Leonello d'Este, Francesco Barbaro, Leonardo Giustinian, Gian Salerno, and John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester; such churchmen as Bernardino da Siena, Alberto da Sarzana, Jean Jouffroy, Bartolomeo Roverella, John

* Woodward (p. xxvii) asserts that Platina was never Vittorino's pupil.
Free, John G. Gunthorpe, Robert Fleming and William Gray: the astrologer-
humanist, Lodovico Carbonio, and Guarino's own sons, whom Carbonio
says Guarino educated from childhood to maturity, making a physician
of Gregorio, a merchant and palace steward of Agostino, a notary of
Leonello, and a scholar of Battista. On the available evidence,
therefore, it would seem that Guarino was at least as successful as
Vittorino in producing men who could hold "whatever position they
might be called upon to occupy."

Referring to the teaching of Greek at Mantua, Woodward says (p.
54): "It may be safely affirmed that nowhere else in Italy was Greek
so thoroughly and systematically taught, certainly not at Bologna,
at Padua, or until Gaza himself went there, at Ferrara." Elsewhere
(p. 160, footnote 2) he admits that this is only an opinion: "... I
believe that, in reality, at the Mantuan school far more weight was
attached to Greek than at the school of Guarino at Ferrara." Later
however, he again asserts his opinion as established fact (p. 244):
"The elder Guarino laid less stress upon Greek than did Vittorino."-
Nowhere is evidence for this systematically displayed. A careful
search reveals only two possible shreds. First, Vittorino hired
George of Trebizond in 1430 and Theodore Gaza in 1441, both native
Greek speakers and good scholars, as collaborators, thus showing
his anxiety to provide the finest instruction available. Second,
Frendilacqua in Intorno alla vita di Vittorino (ed. G. Brambilla,
Como, 1871) p. 45 states that Alessandro Gonzaga was nourished in
his boyhood by Greek, in his adolescence by Latin, and in his

* See Appendix A, note 2.
maturity by sacred studies." The first point, however, proves only that Vittorino, who, as Woodward admits (p. 52) was inferior in Greek learning to Guarino, and whom Aurispa described as "Victorinus quidam litteras graeicas mediocris eruditus" (p. 51), could not himself provide adequate teaching in Greek. The presence of native Greek speakers at Mantua does not in itself guarantee that the subject was any better taught there, since thorough and systematic teaching is not necessarily a function of the teacher's personal skill in any subject. The second point is likewise nugatory, proving only that in one case Vittorino had followed Quintilian's hint (Institutio oratoria I. 1. 12) about starting with Greek instead of Latin -- an idea rejected by Battista Guarino on the grounds that while it might be feasible for Romans who already knew some Latin before they began a serious study of language, it was pointless for Italians of the fifteenth century to whom Greek was necessarily a learned language best approached from a good grounding in Latin.

If anything may be "safely asserted" it is that Guarino, who acted as interpreter at the Council of Ferrara in 1438, was outstanding as a Greek speaker and scholar, and as a teacher in general. There is therefore no reason to assert that Greek was any worse taught at Ferrara than at Mantua, or, to judge from Battista's laudation of the subject, any less valued. Finally, if Vittorino's school had been any stronger in Greek, one might have expected it to produce a crop of outstanding Greek scholars. Probably Perotti, who translated Polybius, was Vittorino's best student in Greek, but even he is primarily noted for his great Latin grammar; and Lorenzo Valla himself was predominantly a Latinist. Woodward's contention that Greek was
better taught and more highly valued at Mantua is therefore at best suspect, and should probably be rejected.

In the matter of Latin scholarship, Woodward is again unfair to Guarino. On p. 13, for example, he writes: "Indeed it is not too much too affirm that after the death of this great scholar (Barzizza) Vittorino was the foremost representative of the best type of Latin learning -- the rational Ciceronian". If by "rational Ciceronian" is meant one who takes Cicero as a guide to rational living, then Guarino has as much claim to the title as Vittorino, for his letters are full of praises of Cicero as the best guide to the good and blessed life. If, however, it means, or includes, skill in Ciceronian scholarship, then one must wonder upon what Woodward based his judgement. When Barzizza died in 1431, Guarino was far better known as a scholar than Vittorino, if only because he already had a vast scholarly output to his name. Even by 1446, when Vittorino died, he had written only a treatise on orthography and a few letters, only five of which have survived.*

Possibly Woodward meant that Vittorino's teaching of Ciceronian prose was so good that in a sense he founded the cult of Ciceronianism so prominent later in the century, for on p. 56

---

* His De orthographia was published by A. Casacci, "Un trattatello di V. da F." in Atti del Reale Instituto Veneto LXXXVI (1926-27) p. 911 ff. The five surviving letters were published by A. Luzio in Archivio Veneto N.S. XXXVII (1888) p. 239 ff.
he writes: "George of Trebizond became one of the first
Ciceronians of the century, an admitted superior to Guarino."
This statement should be taken in conjunction with that on
p. 86: "George of Trebizond was in Latin learning a typical
product of Vittorino, and we may confidently say that he was
an abler scholar than Guarino". It is true that George's
Rhetoricorum Libri V helped to establish the cult of
Ciceronianism in Italy, but this was not necessarily a virtue,
nor does it make him in the absolute sense a better scholar
than Guarino. In fact, the latter regarded George and his work
on rhetoric as prime examples of illiberal pedantry (See
Guarino as a figure in controversy). Most scholars both during
and since the fifteenth century would, I imagine, place Guarino
higher than George of Trebizond, but in any case their relative
merits is a matter of opinion. What is objectionable in
Woodward's remarks is the off-hand manner with which he deals
with Guarino and the implication that George's "superior"
Latin scholarship was due in some way to Vittorino's "superiority"
as a Latinist over Guarino.

Finally on this matter, one finds on p. 18: "We are told
that Guarino taught Vittorino Greek in return for instruction
in Latin. This may imply a joint conduct of the school which
Guarino had opened in Venice, but it most probably means merely
that the latter recognized the finer Latin scholarship of
Vittorino and gladly availed himself of the chance of improving
his own". Woodward must here be referring to Platina's story
about the exchange of teaching. But Guarino nowhere mentions Vittorino as a collaborator, although this extract from Letter 256 of 1424 to Lodovico Gonzaga makes it clear that he admired him: "Vittorino, a very fine man and most learned teacher whom I admit I greatly love and praise. But my love and praise proceed from judgement. As for his praising me highly, as you write, and calling me his teacher, this comes from his surpassing sense of honour and gratitude. Like the splendid fellow he is, he talks of me as being the kind of man he would wish me to be. If he received anything from me -- and I know how little that was -- the magnificence of his words blows it up to such an extent that he makes a god out of a cipher (doum ex larva) and an altar out of a sewer (aram ex cloaca)." But in all the letters 1416-1418 Guarino refers only once to Vittorino (Letter 55) and then as owing him money, probably tuition fees. To explain Platina's story I offer the suggestion that he had received garbled information about the tuition in Latin which George of Trebizond received at Venice 1417-1418 from Vittorino after Guarino had failed to meet his expectations as a teacher (Letter 707). Guarino detested George and had agreed to give him instruction in Latin only as a favour to Francesco Barbaro.

* Compare this nearly literal rendering with that of Woodward (p. 85, note 4): "If he calls me his master, it is more than I have a right to and it proceeds from the goodness and gratitude of his nature. I taught him but little, though he loves to dwell upon the service I rendered him."
What may really have happened is that Guarino passed George over to Vittorino in part commutation of the latter's fees, a task which the chronically impecunious Vittorino would have been glad to perform. It is difficult to believe that he would have taught George for nothing, or been able to spare the time from his own studies in Greek, except for some inducement. Vittorino may therefore have taught Latin for Guarino, but not to him. In any case, it is very unlikely that Guarino, whom no less a judge than Barzizza in a letter of 1418 (Life of Guarino, sec. 66) called "the best scholar in Latin and Greek in this generation", would have needed help with his Latin from Vittorino. The latter's "finer Latin scholarship" is unsubstantiated by any evidence, and seems a mere figment of Woodward's wishful thinking.

Again, on p. 57 Woodward says in a footnote: "Guarino was very prolific in letters. Voigt rightly says that their formalism and want of living interest makes many of them a poor testimony to their writer's powers. Vittorino's letters to Ambrogio (Traversari) are lost; they were apparently of real personal interest." Voigt's judgement seems unduly harsh, and Woodward's concurrence with it disappointing, since Guarino's epistolary constitutes one of the liveliest and most interesting documents of the Renaissance. But what is really objectionable is Woodward's extraordinary logic in appealing to the evidence of a batch of lost letters to suggest that Vittorino was somehow less pedantic, more vital as a correspondent than Guarino. One can only conclude that in his conscious
or unconscious anxiety to score another point for Vittorino he has again underrated Guarino.

Another invidious comparison appears on p. 58 with reference to Vittorino's "ability to select, from an intense and living religious conviction, truth and beauty in example or in style from pagan not less than Christian writers with a sorcery confidence that seems never to have been seriously embarrassed." Woodward appends a footnote: "Guarino's experience at Ferrara was different; but then he was a man of far less sensitiveness in such matters than Vittorino and could even commend L'Ermaphrodito of Beccadelli." The fact is, however, that only on two occasions was Guarino's taste called in question by moralists, and on each he was the victim of purblind bigotry (See Guarino as a figure in controversy). Woodward also omits to say that Guarino had the grace, or commonsense, to retract his earlier, hasty commendation of the Hermaphroditus. In any case, one peccadillo is hardly grounds for saying that Guarino was far less sensitive in matters of morality than Vittorino. One could even defend him on the grounds that he treated his students like adults, not little boys to be protected at every turn from the snares of wickedness. It seems indeed that Woodward could not escape a certain Victorian religiosity and prudery, which led him to make his disparaging remark.

Bolgar in Classical Heritage p. 447 goes so far as to say: "Woodward lays rather too much emphasis on the Christian elements in Vittorino's teaching, whose efficacy is somewhat belied by the later career of the Humanist's pupils". On p. 332 he talks about
"Vittorino's failure to implant Christian principles into many of his prominent pupils". And on p. 332 he even compares Guarino's results favourably with Vittorino's: "Yet such is the vanity of educational aspirations that while Guarino's intellectuals proved themselves in later life men of probity and honour, the favourite pupils of Vittorino included Valla, the future prophet of Hedonism, Beccadelli, the future author of the Hermaphroditus, and the dubious Platina, two of whom never quite cleared themselves of the suspicion of homosexuality."

This, however, is an extremely flimsy statement. What on p. 333 Bolgar calls "many" of Vittorino's prominent pupils had numbered only three on p. 332, and of these only Valla was ever Vittorino's pupil. Further, Valla was not a hedonist in anything but the minds of ignorant detractors.*

Although Bolgar does not attempt to prove anything about the quality of the moral instruction of Guarino and Vittorino from the later careers of their pupils, the suggestion lingers that this can be done. Such a line of inquiry, however, seems improfitable for two reasons: first, not nearly enough is known about the morals of all of Guarino's and Vittorino's pupils to make any conclusion reliable; second, it is unfair to blame any teacher for a failure to communicate his personal sanctity to his students.

* His De voluptate was really only an exposition of the ancient philosophical theories of pleasure, but the title alone earned for him the reputation of a voluptuary, just as his attack on the Donation of Constantine led to his banishment from Rome and his association in the popular mind with atheism.
One can, however, agree with Bolgar insofar as Woodward --
influenced perhaps by what I have called the Arnold image --
dwells rather too lyrically on the Christian atmosphere of "La
Giocosa", and ascribes too much success to Vittorino in reconciling
Christian and classical ideals. The best he could have achieved
was a working compromise, and to this distinction Guarino has
an equal claim.

The way should now be clearer to a more balanced general
assessment of Guarino and Vittorino as educators. With some
justice -- especially from the modern standpoint which lays such
stress on a balanced education -- Vittorino may be termed superior
in providing more systematic instruction in mathematics and the
natural sciences. Guarino, however, did not wholly neglect
non-literary matters, although he approached them indirectly
through incidental comment on literary texts. In physical
education, again, Vittorino seems the more systematic and
imaginative teacher; but it is doubtful whether his rigid enforce-
ment of games and exercises was in the end more effective than
Guarino's protreptic and more permissive approach. Similarly,
Vittorino's philanthropy in establishing state scholarships at
Mantua and providing for needy students out of his own pocket
is admirable. No such scholarships existed at Ferrara, but it
must be remembered that, according to Carbone, Guarino frequently
helped students in financial difficulties -- all the more laudable
in his case since, unlike Vittorino, he had a large family of
his own to support. Both men were attentive to the needs of slower
students and poured untiring zeal into their teaching. That Guarino found time to produce an enormous body of literary work besides does not mean that he neglected his main work. In Greek and Latin scholarship Guarino emerges as the superior, although in their teaching of these basic subjects there was probably little to choose between the two men. In personal character and the ability to inspire devotion in students both were exemplary. In planning and implementing a complete intellectual education, Guarino seems rather the more efficient with his tripartite scheme of elementary, grammatical, and rhetorical stages.

It must finally be considered which of the two teachers was the more influential. Here objective criteria are difficult to find.

The fact that Cosenza's Dictionary of the Italian Humanists lists only 59 students of Vittorino as opposed to 142 of Guarino is not necessarily a reliable index, since both men must have had many pupils whose names have not survived or have been overlooked. But since Cosenza's lists were compiled from what one must presume to have been a wide survey of ordinarily accessible humanist sources, the greater number of Guarino's pupils whose names have survived suggests that his influence was proportionately wider. Further, since Vittorino taught at Mantua for 26 years and never allowed the total of his students to exceed about 70 at the one time, the most he could have taught in all could not have exceeded about 1,800; probably the tally should be much lower since the school was only gradually expanded and many students seem to have
stayed for far longer than one year. Guarino, on the other hand, taught both publicly and privately at Verona and Ferrara for 41 years, and the evidence of his own letters, Carbone, and John of Pannonia suggests that he always attracted large audiences. It seems safe to assume that Guarino reached far more students than Vittorino.

The mere number of a teacher's students, however, is less important than the quality and breadth of their contribution to cultural history. Vittorino's most influential students were probably Lorenzo Valla, Niccolò Perotti, George of Trebizond, Theodore Gaza, and Giovanni Andrea, Bishop of Aleria. Valla was the finest grammarian and textual critic of the century, aptly termed by John of Pannonia "Corrector veterrum, contemtor Valla novorum."

George of Trebizond's minute analyses of rhetoric and Perotti's Latin grammar contributed much to Ciceronianism; Gaza's Greek grammar has been called the best of its kind; and to Giovanni Andrea fell the unique distinction of having prepared for the Roman Press the first editions in 1469 of Caesar, Aulus Gellius, Livy, Lucan, and Vergil, and in 1470 of Ovid, the Epistles of Cicero, and a volume of his Orations. Too much, however, can be made of the achievements of these scholars. Valla excepted, for there were many Ciceronians at works besides George of Trebizond, other grammars besides those of Gaza and Perotti, and Giovanni Andrea had many manuscript editions available of the texts he prepared for the printers. It cannot be denied, however, that Vittorino
produced a fine crop of scholars, others of note being Antonio Boccaria, Federico da Montefeltro, Ognibene da Lonigo, Gregorio Corraro, Sassuolo da Prato, Basinio da Parma, and Francesco Calcignano. Note, however, that the last three were also pupils of Guarino, and that only Boccaria, who entered the service of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, sought his fortune outside Italy.

By contrast, Guarino trained not only a large group of excellent humanists whose influence was confined more or less to Italy -- one thinks of his son Battista, Jacopo Ammanati, Francesco Barbaro, Leonardo Giustiniani, Bartolomeo Facio, Pandolfo Celleruccio, Basinio, Giovanni Lamola, and Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, to name but a few -- but many foreigners as well. The latter point is extremely significant.

The Accademia Romana, Ficino's Accademia Platonica at Florence, and the Accademia Pontaniana at Naples did not become established centers of humanism until the latter half of the Fifteenth Century; Florence, always a hub of humanist scholars, nevertheless had a poor university and no long-resident great teacher since Guarino turned his back on the city in 1414; and Vittorino's school at Mantua, taking only a limited number of students, had a comparatively localized and special fame. The nature of Vittorino's curriculum, atypical as it was of the usual humanist aspirations, could have had only a limited appeal, and although his experiments were doubtless fairly well known within the teaching profession, there are indications that he did not court publicity outside it (his unwillingness to write letters, the usual method of advertisement,
must have restricted his fame; one notes in Letter 511 of 1429 that Guarino seems to have felt it necessary to explain to Giacomo Zilioli, referendarius of the Marquis of Ferrara, exactly who Vittorino was and what his duty was at Mantua. On the other hand, as Roberto Weiss says in Italian Renaissance Studies (1960) p. 71 the University of Ferrara was "a humanist base and remained so even after Guarino's death." One could go further and say that during his lifetime Guarino made Ferrara the most important and best known training centre for humanists in Europe. Further, by the mid 1440's, when foreigners began to trickle into Italy in search of the new philology, Ferrara was almost the only centre to which they could profitably gravitate, since the other centres of culture had no humanist teacher whose reputation matched Guarino's, and no humanist university equal to that founded by Leonello d'Este. Vittorino himself had died in 1446 and although his school continued for a few years more it was a shadow of its former self with the master spirit gone. Ferrara, therefore, became a rallying point for foreigners with humanist aspirations, so much so that Carbone was perhaps not exaggerating when he said that many scholars travelling from distant parts turned back home when they heard of Guarino's death.

Guarino's reputation abroad stemmed from his fame in Italy, carefully fostered over the years by a stream of scholarly works and his unrelenting correspondence, the lack of which two factors kept Vittorino in comparative obscurity. Since the papal secretariat, even the papacy itself in the person of Nicholas V, was in
humanist hands, papal diplomats and curial correspondence helped
to make Guarino's name heard abroad. Again, when Italian humanists
sought their fortunes abroad, they naturally conjured with the
names of humanist luminaries in Italy, especially those who had
been their teachers, the promulgation of whose \textit{fama} was not merely
a matter of \textit{pietas} but of presenting one's scholarly credentials
and promoting one's new career. For example, as Weiss points out
in \textit{Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century} p. 107 (footnote
7), Pietro del Monte and Tito Livio Frulovisi, both pupils of Guarino,
must have fostered his \textit{fama} in England. It is certainly true that
before the middle of the century, Guarino's writings were sought
there; and in Letter 908 of 145 John Free mentions Guarino's high
reputation in England. Finally, many foreign emissaries, pilgrims,
and scholars who visited Italy for purposes other than to seek
humanistic training* found themselves interested in the humanistic
movement, heard about Guarino, and took the news home with them.
All of this created a demand in foreign lands for Guarino's writings
and a desire among certain scholars to study under him.

Guarino's foreign students (a list appears in Carbone) included
several from Spain, Valesius from Portugal, the brothers Podocateri

* William Grey, according to his biographer Vespasiano da
Bisticci, heard about Guarino while studying theology at Padua,
and after taking his doctorate (1445) enrolled at Ferrara
(1445-46). It is also possible, as Weiss suggests in \textit{Humanism
in England} p. 88 that before leaving England Grey had planned
to study under Guarino.
(Philippus, Ludovicus, Carolus) from Cyprus, Peter Luder
and the sons of Samuel Karoch from Germany, Nicholas Lassocky
from Poland, Jean Jouffroy from France, a contingent of Hungarians
headed by John of Pannonia and Elia Czepoz (see E. Abel, Ungarische
Revue [Budapest, 1883] p. 21-30) and the Englishmen William Grey,
Robert Flemmyng, John Gunthorpe, John Free, and John Tiptoft,
Earl of Worcester (see Weiss, Humanism in England p. 84-127).

Admittedly, none of these men initiated a humanistic revolution
in their own countries. In the melting pot of Italy medieaval
notions were being rapidly and consciously eliminated, whereas in
other lands they lingered obstinately. In England, for example,
as Weiss points out in his concluding chapter to Humanism in England
(p. 179-163), learning was the preserve of ecclesiastics who
occupied the higher posts of the civil service. These men saw no
conflict between scholasticism and humanism, and sought the new
philology predominantly to improve their theological pursuits or
promote their careers as diplomats, secretaries, or pamphleteers.
Lay scholars like Humphrey of Gloucester and John Tiptoft were
not so much active humanists as fashionable patrons of letters and
bibliophiles imitating the great nobles of Italy. What was true
of England was more or less true in other countries outside Italy.
But foreign students who visited Italy definitely took home the
seeds from which native forms of humanism were to develop; a
beginning had been made. As Weiss says in Italian Renaissance
Studies p. 78, "Now if Humphrey's household was the cradle of
English Humanism, the school of Guarino was certainly its preparatory
school. So much so that already in the fourteen-fifties William Grey, Bishop of Ely, and John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, could be found indulging in a patronage of scholars definitely on Italian lines, John Free was able to display a grasp of Latin and a knowledge of Greek not inferior to that of his best Italian contemporaries, while John Gunthorpe and Robert Flemming could be seen alternating their ecclesiastical and diplomatic duties with the pursuit of humanist activities on typically Italian lines.

Again, there is a wide distribution of Guariniana in fifteenth century MSS throughout the libraries of Europe, many of which we may confidently assume to have been taken home by Guarino's foreign students or to be copies of originals from Ferrara. It may therefore be said that Guarino directly and indirectly planted some of the seeds of the larger European Renaissance.

In conclusion, one may fairly claim that Guarino fully merits Sabbadini’s description of him as the greatest master of his century. Vittorino's school must always draw the admiration of historians of education, and in a sense it remains the exemplar of a particular species of excellence; but so also does Guarino’s, and preference for one or the other must in the end be subjective. Over the whole picture, however, one may legitimately challenge Woodward's exaltation of Vittorino, suggest that Guarino's intrinsic merits were at least as fine, and unequivocally state that his influence and importance were ultimately greater.
(6) An enumeration of Guarino's pupils with select short biographical and bibliographical information.

Pius II states in his Commentaries under the year 1459 that Guarino had been the teacher of almost everyone in his day who had achieved distinction in the humanities (Memoirs of a Renaissance Pope tr. F. A. Gragg and L. C. Gabel [1959] p. 115) and Carbone in his funeral speech on Guarino likens his school to the Trojan Horse from which poured forth men without number, concluding, "Dies mo deficeret, si cunctos Guarini discipulos percensero voluerim." Considerations of space preclude a full treatment of all of Guarino's pupils, but I have compiled as complete a list as possible from Cosenza's Dictionary of the Italian Humanists, the Enciclopedia Italiana, Carbone, and Guarino's Letters. Some names wrongly listed by Cosenza are omitted, others not listed there are added, and in cases where I have been unable adequately to verify a name as one of Guarino's pupils, it is queried in parenthesis. The names of foreigners are underlined and in some cases given in their Latinized form.

Roollo, Bartolomeo Roverella, Giovanni Gasparo della Sala, Gian
Nicola Salerno, Leonardo Sannuto, Sassuolo da Prato, Gaspar
Schmidhauser, Simon of Hungary, Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, Niccolò
Strozzi, Roberto Strozzi, Lorenzo Strozzi, Lolio Tedesco, Niccolò
Salimbeni da Siena, John Tiptoft, Tobia dal Borge, Giovanni
Francesco della Torre, Giacomo Totti, Giorgio Tommasi, Pietro
Tommasi, George of Trebizond, Giovanni Toscanella, Giorgio Valagussa,
Valesius (from Portugal), Bartolomeo Verita, Giacomo Verità,
Vittorino da Feltre, Fantino Zorzi, Raffaole Zovenzoni.

The short biographical and bibliographical material which
follows is not intended to be complete, but merely to provide a
cross sampling of the careers and literary achievements of a
representative selection of Guarino's pupils.

Jacopo Ammanati (1422-79), student at Ferrara; became secretary of
Domenico Capranica, Calixtus III, and Pius II, whose nephew he
was; Bishop of Pavia 1460, Cardinal of Pavia 1461 and of San
Crisogno 1462; wrote a continuation of Pius II's Commentaries
covering 1464-69, Legatio Cardinalis Firmani ad Genuenses pro pace
firmanda, De officio Summi Pontificis, Diario concistoriale,
various homilies, an epistolary, and a series of biographies of
the Popes, now lost. (See Cosenza).

Francesco Calcagnino (C15), pupil of Vittorino c. 1423-25; in
September 1425 he copied the Orator and Brutus from the Ciceronian
Codex Laudensis sent by Guarino to Mantua; student of Guarino
after 1425; became secretary of Gianfrancesco Gonzaga, after whose
death in 1444 he served Borso d'Este until 1471; was General of the Polessino at Rovigo; knighted by the Emperor Frederick III 1468; appears as one of the three interlocutors in Prondilacqua's biography of Vittorino. (See Letters 525, 526; Cosenza; Rosmini, Idea dell' ottimo procettoro p. 272-77; T. Stangl, Marci Tullii Cicoronis Brutus [Lipsiae, 1886] p. x, xix).

Francesco Ariosto (d. 1484), son of Princivalle Ariosto; pupil of Guarino 1429-31, after which he studied Canon Law at Bologna; podesta at Bagnacavallo 1446, at Castellarano 1460 and 1461, at Montecchio 1462, at Carpineto 1467-70; wrote Isis (a Plautine comedy), and a poem on Borso d'Este's journey to Rome 1471. (See Letters 525, 526; Cosenza; Carbone).

Filippo Bendidio (C15), pupil at Verona; helped Alberto da Sarzana persuade Guarino to retract his opinion of Beccadelli's Hermaphroditus; became secretary and notary of the Camera ducale at Ferrara (See Letters 525, 541, 526, 666; E. P. Vicini, I Podesta di Modena (1918) p. 147).

Francesco Barbaro (1390-1454), pupil 1416-18. His birth date is disputed, but 1390, the earliest variant, seems likeliest, since G. had already befriended him by 1403 and wrote to him as to an adult in 1408 (Letter 4). He became a Senator of Venice and Procurator of San Marco; welcomed the Greek emperor with a Greek speech at Venice 1423; was podesta of various Venetian cities, had an ambition to see the Eastern and Western Churches united; very well known in humanist circles; wrote De re uxoria (1416), orations,
and an epistolary; translated several Lives of Plutarch. G's letters
to him are 4, 21, 194, 195, 225, 239, 242, 292, 307, 308, 309, 314,
326, 328, 332, 334, 336, 338, 339, 651, 726, 763, 764, 841, 843, 845,
860, 869, 870. He is mentioned in Letters 8, 22, 24, 26, 33, 38,
45, 47, 49, 52, 53, 61, 62, 63, 66, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77, 80, 82, 86,
89, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 107, 109, 11, 112, 115, 116, 121, 125, 126,
129, 130, 186, 194, 206, 209, 221, 246, 254, 264, 283, 341, 342,
354, 363, 402, 439, 440, 442, 454, 455, 477, 622, 648, 649, 694,
707, 725, 667, 924.

Barbaro, Ermolao (1410-71), son of Zaccaria and nephew of Francesco
B., he should be distinguished from Ermolao Barbaro, Bishop of
Como (1453-93): pupil at Verona 1421-24, where he completed a
translation of Aesop; Bishop of Treviso and later of Verona; Doctor
of Canon and Civil Law; patron of letters, but wrote Oratio contra
poetas, an attack on the reading of pagan poets, which was answered
by Antonio Beccaria in his Orationes defensoriae tres. See Letters
200, 220, 316; Cosenza.

Basinio da Parma (1425-54), pupil of Vittorino, after which he
learned Greek at Ferrara 1447-50; taught Latin at Ferrara 1448-49;
became one of Sigismondo Malatesta's literary circle at Rimini
1450-57; was interested in mathematics, philosophy, but is known
chiefly as a poet; wrote Liber Isottaeus (on love of Malatesta
for his mistress Isotta), an Elegy in praise of Nicholas V,
Astronomicon, Molaeagris, Hesperis, Cyris, Argonautica, an invective
against John of Pamonia, Epistula de linguae Graecae laudibus et
necessitate (on the need for a Latin poet to know Greek) and other letters (See Carbone and F. Ferri, La giovinezza di un poeta. Basini Parmensis carmina [Rimini, 1914]).


Bernardino da Siena (1380-1444), pupil at Verona 1422, where, according to Carbone, Guarino taught him to preach artistically; his sermons throughout Italy caused great excitement and led to a religious revival; he became vicar-general of the Observantist branch of the Franciscans in 1437 (See Letters 239, 240, 650, 825; Carbone).


Lodovico Carbons (1435-1484), pupil at Ferrara; lectured on poetry at Guarino's school 1456-58; expected to succeed him, but did not; was corrector for the press of Christopher Valdarfer at Milan and Venice; Professor of Poetry and Rhetoric at Bologna 1465-66; student of astrology, Cicero, Pliny the Younger, Sallust, Servius, Alexander Strategicus and other Greek military writers; translated Bessarion's Epistulae et Orationes into Italian; wrote Oratio de artibus liberalibus
ad Leonellum Estensem, De Neapolitana perfectione, De felicitate
Ferrariae de quo optimo duci Herculis principatu, De amoenitate
utilitate magnificentiae Herculis Parci, Centrotrento novelle e
facetiae (of which Facetiae 65 reports a joke made by Guarino),
funeral orations on Guarino and Lodovico Casella, dialogues, epitaphs,
and orations (See Letter 667; Cosenza; John of Pannonia, Epigrammata
I, 90, 91).

Lodovico Casella (1406-1469), pupil at Ferrara; became referendarius
to Borso d'Este; received the dedication of Michele Savonarola's
De curn languoris anini ex morbo venientia; examined a MS of Ptolemy's
Cosmographia in 1466 at the request of Borso (See Letters 625, 831A;
Carbone; Cosenza).

Girolamo Castello (d. before 1485), pupil at Ferrara c. 1442:
lectured on natural philosophy at Bologna 1443-45; became Doctor
of Medicine at Ferrara 1445; taught in University of Ferrara
1446-82; friendly with Basilio 1447-50, who dedicated to him Books
I and II of his Melagrasis: was physician, poet, orator, philosopher,
thecologian and astrologer under Leonello and Borso d'Este; member
of the Accademia Bentia; one of the speakers in Francesco Ariosto's
De divina providentia (See Carbone; Letters 778A (poem to G.), 604,

Pandolfo Collenuccio (1444-1504), student at Ferrara c. 1456; studied
law at Padua; was judge in Bologna 1472-73 and served as a magistrate
at Pesaro, Florence, and Ferrara; served Giovanni Sforza, Giulio
Cesare da Varana, Lorenzo il Magnifico, Ercole d'Este; podesta at
Florence 1490; envoy of Ferrara to Maximilian of Austria 1494; Capitano di Giustizia in Ferrara 1500; was decapitated by order of Giovanni Sforza for having been a friend of Cesare Borgia; wrote Pliniana defensio adversus Nicolai Leoniceni accusationem (1494), Trattato dell' educazione usata dagli antichi, Compendio della storia del Regno di Napoli, Panegyrica Silva ad Florentiam urbis novem viros, Descriptio rerum Germanicarum, Apologi quattuor (the 4th being on the invention of gunpowder), Oratio ad Maximilianum Romanorum regem, Canzone alla morte, Commedia de Jacob et de Josef, La vita di Josef, De vipera libellus, Il Filotimo, letters, and poems (See Cosenza).

Cristoforo Garatoni (d. 1448), pupil at Verona 1422-23; Bishop of Corona 1437; frequent ambassador to Constantinople; apostolic secretary 1437 and 1439; in 1427 had Georgius Chrysococces transcribe at Constantinople a MS of Diodorus Siculus, and was the first to bring that author to Italy during the papacy of Eugenius IV (1431-47). (See Letter 274; Alberto da Sarzana, Epistulae 87; Ceccon, Studi storici sul Concilio di Firenze pp. CXXV, 62-85, 107-110, 170-71, 186-90; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte VII, pp. 590, 595, 626, 640, 649).

Facio, Bartolomeo (1400-57), pupil at Verona 1420-26; became tutor to children of Doge Francesco Foscari 1426-29; after a stay at Florence, tutored children of Raffaele Adorno, the future Doge of Genoa; ambassador of Genoa to Naples from 1443; wrote De viris illustribus (covering closing years of C14 to middle of C15), Rerum gestarum.
Alphonsi I Regis Neapolitani Libri X, a Life of Ferdinand the Just,
Do bello Veneto, Aliiud parvi temporis bellum Venetum, De origine
belli inter Gallos et Britannos historia; De excellentia et praestantia
hominis, Dialogus de summo bono vitaeque felicitate, Synonyma et
differentialia, Epistulae; revised for Alfonso the Latin translation
of Arrianus' Life of Alexander made by Vergerio; translated into
Latin Boccaccio's tale Ruggieri de' Figiovanni and Alfonso King
of Spain. (See Letters 252, 575, 847; Cosenza).