Rerum vulgarium fragmenta: From Manuscript to Print

Robert M. Durling, Professor Emeritus, University of California, Santa Cruz

Abstract: After describing the close relation between Petrarch's and Dante's conceptions of canzone form, this article explores the formats followed by Petrarch and his scribe Giovanni Malpaghini in their transcriptions in Vat. Lat. 3195. Giovanni's traditional horizontal format allows for certain striking effects of collocation (as of 125-126) and for minimal page turns in canzoni; however, the vertical format of the sestinas and the vertical alignment of even-numbered verses in Petrarch's own transcriptions of sonnets and canzoni suggest a gradually increasing sense of the possibilities of vertical format.

The inauguration of the digital age of Petrarch studies represents the confluence of at least three currents: first, the notable upsurge of critical studies of Petrarch's themes, methods, and influence in connexion with the centennial of the poet's birth; second, not unconnected with the centennial, the recent renewal of study of Petrarch's poetic manuscripts; and finally, the dawning realization of the varied, even unpredictable possibilities (most of them, but not all, positive) of applying computerized tools to the study of Petrarch's poetry, including hypertext.[1] What most strikes me at this stage of our enterprise is the really new facility of studying a whole world of documents that in the very recent past have been accessible only at great expense of time and money. The *Oregon Petrarch Open Book* will make available for consultation photographs of manuscripts, diplomatic editions, no doubt several more conventional modern editions and translations into various languages, and a number of Renaissance editions and commentaries, as well as many poetic examples of the far-reaching influence of the poet.

In the digital age, of course, printed books are not likely to become obsolete. Furthermore, the question of the most appropriate modern visual version of Petrarch's poems will always be before us. What should a modern edition of Petrarch's *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* (*RVF*) look like? This is my topic. And hence my title: for "print," I mean any visual representation of text. My central point will be that, in addition to accuracy, the clarity and ease of comprehension of Petrarch's stanza forms and the rhetorical, semantic, and syntactic structures of his poems should be leading principles.

We owe a great debt to Stefano Zamponi and his three collaborators (Belloni et al. 2004, hereinafter *Commentario*), as well as to Laura Paolino, Livio Petrucci, and Giuseppe Savoca, for their long and painstaking explorations of Vat. Lat. 3195 and 3196 (the so-called *Codice degli abbozzi*). The ongoing clarification of these unique monuments is precious and all the more precious in raising many new questions and many old questions in new forms. Savoca's radical challenge to the traditional text of the *RVF* is bound to stir up controversy, and that in itself is a great service. The beautiful color facsimile of Vat. Lat. 3195, with its

companion volume of detailed commentary and the facsimile of Modigliani's diplomatic edition is already an extraordinarily useful tool of study, as will be clear from this essay, and so will Wayne Storey's diplomatic edition, now in preparation, particularly when it is available online, as I rejoice to understand it will be.

I think Wayne Storey has been right in his long insistence that we must take seriously Petrarch's conception of the appropriate format for his lyric poetry, for there is much to be learned from it. The task of understanding Petrarch's formatting will be greatly facilitated by these new publications. But it does not necessarily follow that a modern edition meeting the needs of serious students and of the larger reading public should follow Petrarch's format. When students reach the stage of desiring to understand the issues involved in format, the facsimiles and diplomatic editions will be there to respond to their probings; advanced students should of course familiarize themselves with both types of format. I know of no one who would today advocate printing the *RVF* in its original horizontal format, except in diplomatic editions, whose importance, I think, will increase. But the question is a genuine one: how much should be retained in a modern edition, for as wide a readership as the great poet deserves, of the special features of 3195? Issues, and by no means simple ones, arise in connexion with: stanza form and format in general; punctuation, which includes the treatment of elaborate periodic sentences; and spelling, Latinate and otherwise, including the tricky matter of word identity, separation, and agglomeration.

In this short essay, I will discuss in detail one of the issues I have listed—the relation between Petrarch's format and our modern habits. To that I shall append a few remarks about punctuation. The last-mentioned issue, spelling, is particularly complex, especially in the wake of Livio Petrucci's work, and would require a much more detailed discussion.

Behind the subtlety and refinement of Petrarch's treatment of poetic forms lie several centuries of intensive cultivation and experimentation in Provençal and French, as well as in Italian, of which Petrarch was very much aware. The forms of the twenty-nine canzoni in the *Rime sparse* (thirty-eight, if we count the sestinas) constitute, in a sense, a little encyclopedia of the possibilities of the form that might have been designed in relation to Dante's discussion in the *De vulgari eloquentia* (1979 2.5-14)*. In book 2 of that work, Dante applied to the canzone the analogy of a bundle of sticks (the lines of verse, hendecasyllables or *settenari*, rarely *quinari*), bound together into unity by a cord or cords. Dante is vague and perhaps self-contradictory about the nature of the cords: they may be the unchanging repetition of the stanza form—and in the stanza the cord seems to be the rhyme scheme itself—but the treatise ends without completing the discussion of rhyme.[2] Dante's metaphors for the stanza (which he says contains all the elements of the craft of the canzone) are the terms *stantia* ("stanza" or "room"), *mansio* ("dwelling"), and *receptaculum* ("receptacle"): all are spatial terms.[3]

As is well known, Dante grants the fullest freedom to the competent poet. He distinguishes canzone stanzas: of a wide range of numbers of lines; composed exclusively of hendecasyllables or freely mixing line lengths; without rhyme (he so classes the sestina, no doubt disingenuously); with a single rhyme; with one or more lines rhyming only between

stanzas; with division or change (*diesis*) of what he calls the melody into two or more parts, in which the parts before and after *diesis* usually had different rhyme schemes, but he allows including rhymes from the part(s) before in the part(s) after *diesis.* Dante clearly regarded the question of repetition in both parts as important enough to require a special terminology for an undivided part before *diesis* (*fronte*) and a divided one (two or more identical *pedes*), as well as for an undivided part after *diesis* (*sirma, coda*) or divided (two or more identical *versus*). Dante approves of and practices what he calls "pulchra concatenatio" ("beautiful concatenation") (the term is a late descendant of Horace's "callida iunctura" ["clever joining"]), by which he means the joining of pre- and post-*diesis* parts by having the first line of the post-*diesis* part rhyme with the last line of the pre-*diesis* part (*De vulgari eloquentia* 1979 2.13.7).[4] He counsels frequent use of *rime baciate* in the *sirma* and even approves following multiple identical *versus* with a concluding couplet (practiced in one clear case, "Io sento sì d'Amor la gran possanza": *AbC.AbC:CDDE.CDDE.FF*).

Dante was codifying traditional practice, and the rules he set forth (at times confusedly) were traditional. Although Petrarch's practice of the canzone, even more than Dante's, reflects a winnowing and limiting of the enormous variety of earlier lyric forms, almost all of the types of canzone stanza, with or without *diesis*, that Dante mentions were practiced by Petrarch; they are the greater part of his canzone output, and the overwhelming majority of them have divided first parts (*pedes*) but unified *sirma,* with concatenation and concluding couplet. There is a set of virtuoso display pieces: poem 105 (the "frottola") has *diesis* and obsessive internal rhymes but no *congedo*; poem 206 is built with only three rhymes and has *diesis* after a four-line *fronte* (one of only two in the *Rime sparse*), with retention of the *A* rhyme from the *fronte*. The stanzas rhyme in pairs, circling successively through the three rhymes (somewhat in the manner of Dante's "Amor, tu vedi ben che questa donna");[5] the five-line *congedo* has the *b* and *C* rhymes of the last two stanzas, but replaces the third *settenario* rhyme with *a,* which is then echoed in the last line in the sole internal rhyme in the poem. There is also a bravura sonnet: poem 18 has only rhyme words, two in the octave (*parte, luce*) and three in the sestet (*morte, desio, sole*), whose morphological ambiguities are skillfully exploited.

Without *diesis* we have of course poem 29 and the nine sestinas. It is striking, finally, that Petrarch's habitual practice of *sirma* design agrees with Dante's views on the desirability of concatenation and on ending the stanza with a hendecasyllabic couplet (almost two-thirds of Petrarch's stanzas so end).[6] Only two of the types of structures mentioned in the *De vulgari eloquentia* are not explored in the *Rime sparse*: stanzas with only one rhyme, and stanzas with *versus,* including, of course, stanzas with both *pedes* and *versus.*[7] Petrarch certainly knew most of Dante's lyric poetry, and his practice shows a clear intent to depart from Dante's example in certain respects. One might almost suppose that he had known Dante's treatise as well, but there is no external evidence that he had.[8]

Petrarch's canzoni represent a limited choice among the wider range of possibilities explored by Dante. Both Dante and Petrarch practiced two traditional versions of divided first parts, what we will call *pedes* type 1 (*ABC.ABC* and its expansions) and *pedes* type 2 (*ABC.BAC* and its expansions). Petrarch might have understood from *DVE* 2.9.2-5 that the

allotment of lines and line lengths as the "receptacle" of the sentenza of a canzone was ontologically prior to establishing rhyme schemes, and in the two types of *pedes* both poets conformed their syntax to the constraints of the mostly three- or four-line paired units. But Dante overwhelmingly favored *pedes* type 1 (all but four of his canzoni follow it) although he experimented with single examples of the more complicated type 2, as in "Doglia mi reca ne lo cor ardire," whose *pedes* show *AbbCd.AccBd*. Petrarch, on the other hand, followed type 2 in sixteen of his twenty-nine canzoni and type 1 in only eight.

It is worth pointing out that Petrarch designed a different stanza form for each of his canzoni, except for poems 71, 72, and 73, identical in stanza form though not in number of stanzas, the three "sorelle," as he termed them, on Laura's eyes. And closely related to that trio are the two complete poems that face each other in 3195 (on fol. 26v and 27r), poems 125 and 126, identical in form except that the stanza of 125 ends with a *settenario* and the stanza of 126 with a hendecasyllable, with stunning effect, especially as juxtaposed in the arrangement of 3195.

A number of quite interesting questions involving the planning and formatting of 3195 present themselves, for there are in fact three quite different conceptions of format at play in the manuscript.[9] At two extremes are the two types of format exemplified in Giovanni Malpaghini's transcriptions, and a third conception, followed by Petrarch in all but one of his transcriptions in 3195, is a kind of compromise between the first two.[10] These differences have of course occasioned considerable discussion, and my own, as will be evident, owes a great deal to those by Furio Brugnolo, Stefano Zamponi, and Wayne Storey (all in *Commentario*) and Livio Petrucci, although I think the evidence sometimes permits interpretations different from theirs.[11]

Presumably Giovanni was following Petrarch's instructions from the outset, and his primary format for sonnets and other forms was traditional.[12] Each line of the transcription contained two verses (often three, if one or more of the verses were *settenari*), separated by a fixed amount of space, approximately that required for three letters; only the first stanza was to be provided with a rubricated initial, and canzoni stanzas followed each without a blank line separation, but each stanza beginning was to be indicated by a marginal rubricated paraph sign.[13] There can be little doubt that Petrarch instructed Giovanni to follow these formats, or at least that he did not disapprove when they were proposed to him. The page width of 3195, as Zamponi points out, was wider than customary, designed to accommodate horizontal formats. Considering the fact that Petrarch's lyric output represents one of the summits of technical virtuosity in the Italian tradition and considering the self-consciousness with which, as I have suggested, Petrarch exploited one after another of the resources of canzone design and expected his readers to have a clear understanding of what he was doing, the degree to which the format of Vat. Lat. 3195 leaves it entirely to the reader to perceive the refinements of form that I have outlined is striking. The traditional paraph marks indicate canzone stanzas after the first; internal rhyme is indicated by a small mark. All verses begin with a capital letter (a feature essential to recognizing verses when more than one occurs per line, which is the rule). In other respects there is little help.

How did anyone learn to read the canzone forms of 3195 produced by Giovanni? Like the prose formats in Boccaccio's transcriptions, the horizontal format of Giovanni's sonnets and especially canzoni in 3195 is strongly counterintuitive.[14] Boccaccio of course knew that the canzoni he transcribed as prose were not in fact prose, and it is clear he knew how to read them aloud and how to appreciate their poetic rhetoric. This must also have been true of the audience Petrarch had in mind for 3195.[15] First of all, Petrarch's audience was mostly highly trained men, connoisseurs of poetry: highly placed clergymen, some princes, a number of lawyers (notaries) and scribes. These men knew the tradition and its modes of writing and, when they encountered written canzoni, they knew how to read them appreciatively. They would know at a glance what the stanza form of a canzone in 3195 was, where the *diesis* and concatenation were, if any, and whether any of the rhymes in the *pedes* recurred in the *sirma*. They could concentrate simultaneously on both form and theme. To put the matter succinctly, Petrarch knew that his audience had the mental habits required to read canzoni appreciatively in the horizontal format, and this must have been a major factor in his planning.

Giovanni's second format, without doubt imposed on him by Petrarch, was the form chosen for the nine sestinas. At the other extreme from his treatment of sonnets, canzoni, madrigals, and ballate, the sestinas without exception follow a strict vertical format with only one verse per line, a format that necessitates a two-column sequence (all but two of the sestinas are complete on one page: only poem 142 requires a page turn, since the double sestina, 332, is complete in four columns across a verso and a recto). Furio Brugnolo (120) offers three reasons for the different format: (1) Petrarch wished "to emphasize the particular poetic structure of the composition . . . the text is presented graphically in such a way that its characteristics [the use of rhyme-words and their changing order] are visible at a glance"; (2) to guarantee that the reader would immediately see the distinction between the sestinas and the other forms, "in accord with the tendency of Petrarch and the entire later tradition to grant the sestina the status of an independent lyric genre"; (3) to make the sestinas stand out as a kind of microcosm of the entire first part, across which, Brugnolo says, they are fairly evenly spaced. The first two of these explanations are certainly correct, but the third is more questionable.[16] In any case, the reason the form of the sestina needed to be made particularly clear must have been its novelty and its particular kind of virtuosity, for why did not Petrarch's more complicated stanzas require a different format to be made plain? The answer must be because Petrarch's readers were already skilled in deciphering the traditional structures in the horizontal format. The sestinas, then, are presented on the page in modern format and for a modern reason.

The third type of format—that of Petrarch's own transcriptions—seems to have been a kind of compromise. All of Petrarch's transcriptions, with one exception (poem 360), involved horizontal format with two or three verses per line, but instead of the meandering (Brugnolo calls it a "serpentine intercolumn"), fixed-size space at the end of the odd verse, followed by the beginning of the even verse, each even-numbered verse began in strict vertical sequence beneath the preceding even verse.[17] Here (in modern printed form) is Giovanni's format of a sonnet he transcribed:

> Erano i capei d'oro a l'aura sparsi,   Che 'n mille dolci nodi gli avolgea,
> E 'l vago lume oltre misura ardea   Di quei begli occhi, ch'or ne son sì scarsi,
> E 'l viso di pietosi color farsi,   Non so se vero o falso, mi parea.
> I' che l'esca amorosa al petto avea,   Qual maraviglia se di subito arsi.
> Non era l'andar suo cosa mortale   Ma d'angelica forma, et le parole
> Sonavan altro che pur voce umana: Uno spirto celeste, un vivo sole
> Fu quel ch'io vidi, et se or non fosse tale,   Piaga per allentar d'arco non sana.

And here is the format Petrarch followed in every sonnet (and, *mutatis mutandis,* every poem) that he transcribed:

> Erano i capei d'oro a l'aura sparsi,   Che 'n mille dolci nodi gli avolgea,
> E 'l vago lume oltre misura ardea   Di quei begli occhi, ch'or ne son sì scarsi,
> E 'l viso di pietosi color farsi,   Non so se vero o falso, mi parea:
> I' che l'esca amorosa al petto avea,   Qual maraviglia se di subito arsi.
> Non era l'andar suo cosa mortale   Ma d'angelica forma, et le parole
> Sonavan altro che pur voce umana: Uno spirto celeste, un vivo sole
> Fu quel ch'io vidi, et se or non fosse tale,   Piaga per allentar d'arco non sana.

In 3195 he followed this format also in the other canzoni he transcribed (in poems 207, 323, 325, 331, 359, 366). Here is the first stanza of "Vergine bella" (poem 366), as Petrarch's transcription formats it:

> Vergine bella, che di sol vestita,   Coronata di stelle, al sommo Sole
> Piacesti si', che 'n te sua luce ascose: Amor mi spinge a dir di te parole,
> Ma non so 'ncominciar senza tu' aita   Et di colui ch'amando in te si pose.
> Invoco lei che ben sempre rispose,   Chi la chiamò con fede.
> Vergine, s'a mercede   Miseria estrema de l'humane cose
> Già mai ti volse, al mio prego t'inchina: Socorri a la mia guerra,
> Ben ch'i' sia terra,   et tu del Ciel regina.

There are two problems here. First, why did Petrarch prefer this form to the traditional one? Second, given his preference, why did he not impose this format on Giovanni's transcriptions? Wayne Storey accurately identifies the most important difference between this format and Giovanni's (*"*All'interno" 164-65), but he seems to regard it as a relatively unimportant variant of the horizontal format (he mentions the clarity of its representation of the rhymes almost as an afterthought). He is right that the "hybrid" format isolates the odd and even verses from each other and gives each a certain autonomy within its own space.[18] In fact this quality of the format makes it easy to understand why Petrarch had almost always followed it, at least so far as we can ascertain, in his working papers, as Vat. Lat. 3196 testifies.[19] In setting forth the form clearly, it would probably be a great aid to revision.

Both Furio Brugnolo and Livio Petrucci acknowledge the second of the problems mentioned above, but they seem to take Petrarch's use of the hybrid format for granted, and neither considers the reasons for Petrarch's clear preference for it. They also seem to assume that Petrarch knew from the outset that he preferred the hybrid form.[20] But there is another possibility, and it seems to me to be more probable. Perhaps Petrarch's realization that he

preferred the hybrid form, not only as an aid to revision but absolutely, had been growing gradually (in the stages I have outlined: accepting at first the traditional model; then making the decision about the sestinas, without fully appreciating its implications; then renewed work on the leaves of 3196 and its predecessors; and finally the crisis with Giovanni) and Giovanni's departure crystallized it. We do not really know why Giovanni wanted to leave. It has been suggested that he objected to transcribing love poems in the vernacular (he was apparently content to switch to transcribing Pilato's Latin Homer for a while), but if it was the vernacular or love poems he objected to, why did it take him so long to say so? It is quite possible that the addition of Petrarch's hybrid format to 3195, even in a single poem (would there be more erasures and substitutions?), transformed his dissatisfaction into rebellion because it raised the prospect of destruction of the homogeneity and harmony of his entire contribution. If so, he had a point. There are unanswerable questions here, but there are extremely strong suggestions of a growing awareness on Petrarch's part of the usefulness of vertical format in calling attention to form, and with the sestinas and his hybrid form of sonnets and canzoni he can be called, paradoxically enough, the father of vertical alignment.

In any case, in all the sonnets and all the canzoni but the sestinas, the choice of horizontal format, even in Petrarch's hybrid format, means that as the eye moves down the page in consecutive reading, it never substantially reverses its pattern of descent, as continuous reading of two columns imposes, but, except when rereading, it is governed steadily by its one general direction, leaving stanzas behind as it progresses. One notes that (probably by careful design) almost half the canzoni (thirteen of them) end on an open pair of pages; that is, they begin on a recto and come to conclusion on the next recto, so that after a first page turn the eye finds all the rest of the poem, more than half of it, spread out on the open pages before it.[21] With the four canzoni complete on a single page, the total becomes well more than half (at seventeen), and with eight sestinas complete on a single page or an open pair (only poem 142 requires a page turn), the total is twenty-five out of an aggregate of thirty-eight canzoni.[22] Add the other canzoni that begin on a recto and end on the next verso and the grand total is the overwhelming majority of Petrarch's canzoni.[23]

There can be little doubt that these phenomena reveal a continuous concern for slow and uninterrupted reading, minimizing the frequency of page turns. We are, I think, in the presence of an application of the metaphor inherent in the word *stanza*. The eye must stroll about in the figurative room or dwelling until it has grasped its shape, and then it moves on to the next. And it may well be that Petrarch's preciosity found the horizontal format preferable for canzoni precisely because of this added labyrinthine quality with its challenge to the reader, although his hybrid format certainly facilitates the close examination of the stanza.

The metaphor of the path through or across a landscape is of course fundamental in Petrarch's figurative system. He continually appeals to spatial metaphors to express the passage of time: one thinks of the passage in the dedicatory letter of the *Epistolae Familiares*, in which he looks over the disordered heaps of letters before him and compares them to a mountain range he has walked through,[24] or of the passage in the ascent of Mount

Ventoux, a very similar *mise en scène* in which he views the landscape of his past—southern France, especially Montpellier, and northern Italy—from that high vantage point, and where his and his brother's paths toward the summit symbolize the differing directions of their lives.[25] The metaphor of the path is an important one in the *Rime sparse* as well, often governing the semiology of entire poems, often in tension with Dante's thematic and formal development of the idea of the single path. In the *Rime sparse,* each pathway of a reader's eye traces steps taken within the labyrinth of Petrarch's obsessive circling, both thematic and formal. All indications are that Petrarch was sharply aware of the richness of the analogies between the themes and forms of his lyric poems and the activities of their readers, who must retrace their paths. "Sì traviato è il folle mi' desio in seguitar costei . . . sol per venire al lauro . . ."; "Di pensier in pensier, di monte in monte / mi guida Amor . . ."; and, of course, in Petrarch's format:

Solo e pensoso i più deserti campi	Vo mesurando con passi tardi e lenti,
Et gli occhi porto per fuggire intenti	Ove vestigio uman l'arena stampi.
Altro schermo non trovo che mi scampi	Dal manifesto accorger de le genti,
Perché negli atti d'allegrezza spenti	Di fuor si legge com' io dentro avampi,
Sì ch' io mi credo omai che monti et piagge	Et fiumi et selve sappian di che tempre
Sia la mia vita ch' è celata altrui.	Ma pur sì aspre vie né sì selvagge
Cercar non so, ch'Amor non venga sempre	Ragionando con meco et io co llui.

> Alone and filled with care, I go measuring
> the most deserted fields with late, slow steps,
> and I keep my eyes intent to flee
> where human footprints may mark the ground.
> No other shield do I find to protect me
> from people's open knowing,
> for in my bearing, where all gladness is spent,
> from without can be read how within I am aflame,
> so that I am sure by now that mountains and slopes
> and rivers and forests know of what temper
> my life is, which is hidden from others.
> But still I cannot seek out paths
> so harsh and so savage that Love does not always come
> discoursing with me, and I with him.[26]

The point of view swings from the observations of the speaker (*mesurando, gli occhi porto intenti*) to those of others (*l'accorger de le genti, di fuor si legge*). Suddenly, in the sestet all nature is said to have been observing the speaker all along, and the marvelous enjambment between lines 9 and 10 opens up an entire landscape (much vaster and more varied than the earlier "deserted fields"). In the last three lines the point of view is again the speaker's and the last enjambment, between lines 13 and 14, definitively closes the solitude in around him and his broodings. It is true that all the enjambments in this poem (I count eight) are particularly evident in the horizontal format, but they are hardly invisible in the

vertical. The extraordinary subtlety of this structure cannot be entirely reflected in any single format.

From a perspective that is attentive to and respectful of Petrarch's *mise en page* but also of the vertical format, it is clear that both have their suggestiveness and their advantages. Wayne Storey has written subtly and eloquently on the emphases encountered by the eye when strolling in the stanzas of both sonnets and canzoni ("All'interno della poetica grafico-visiva dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*"). But certain aspects of the canzone, and fundamental ones, are placed in much clearer evidence by the vertical arrangement, when carefully used. Certainly divided and undivided rhyme schemes, the presence or absence of *diesis* and concatenation, mixed forms like that of poem 135, in which *diesis* introduces new rhymes but keeps some from the *fronte*, the presence or absence of *pedes*, not to speak of Petrarch's elaborate hypotactic rhetorical structures, so skillfully correlated with the divisions of the stanza forms—such refinements are much easier to follow in the vertical format.

From these considerations, I advocate a careful imposition of the vertical format for sonnets and canzoni, marking the importance—formal, syntactic, and logical—of the subdivisions, indicating *fronti*, when they occur, by not indenting them, but indicating *diesis* with a larger indentation, *pedes* with smaller ones.

A Note on Punctuation

Closely related to reflecting the stanza form and rhyme scheme in the overall format of the stanzas is the need to aid the reader in following the structure of Petrarch's periodic sentences by appropriately punctuating them. As Gianfranco Contini pointed out many years ago,[27] Petrarch's rhetorical punctuation, if it does indeed stem from him (and as opposed to his editorial markups), is not at all consistent; in my opinion it still has not really been understood. Petrarch seems to have been negligent in punctuating, just as he seems to have been inconsistent in supervising Giovanni's transcriptions.

There are many signs of inattention in the punctuation of the parts of 3195 transcribed by the two men. In 3195 poems and cola often end without punctuation, and the *punto* is often used as we would use a comma. In both Giovanni's and Petrarch's portions of the manuscript, punctuation marks are always in lighter ink and seem to have been added with a very narrow pen or brush, naturally after the drying of the transcribed text (but there is no way to know how long after it). One reads through Savoca's discussion of Petrarch's punctuation signs and becomes convinced that their ambiguity is such that a great deal of room is left for individual, subjective interpretation (*Canzoniere* 153-54). I do agree with Savoca on the desirability of reducing the heavy punctuation traditional in Italian editions.

The importance of careful logical punctuation can perhaps best be clarified by an example. An instructive one is found in poem 102, again in Petrarch's format:

Cesare, poi che 'l traditor d'Egitto	Li fece il don de l'onorata testa,
Celando l'allegrezza manifesta	Pianse per il occhi fuor, sì come è scritto;
Et Anibàl, quando a l'imperio afflitto	Vide farsi Fortuna sì molesta,

Rise fra gente lagrimosa e mesta   Per isfogare il suo acerbo despitto.
Et così aven che l'animo ciascuna   Sua passion sotto 'l contrario manto
Ricopre co la vista or chiara or bruna: Però s'alcuna   volta io rido o canto,
Facciol perché i' non ò se non quest'una   Via da celare il mio angoscioso pianto.

    Caesar, when the Egyptian traitor
made him the gift of that honored head,
concealing the outward show of gladness,
wept through his eyes externally, as it is written;
    and Hannibal, when he saw Fortune become
so hostile to the afflicted empire
laughed amid his tearful, sad people
to give vent to his bitter chagrin.
    And so it comes about that the spirit its every
passion covers over beneath the opposite cloak
with an appearance now bright, now dark:
    Thus if at some time I laugh or sing,
I do it because I have none except this one
way to conceal my anguished weeping.

This sonnet exemplifies the subtle logical structure so frequent in Petrarch, once again exploring the theme of hiding inner reality. It has a winding structure of two contrary individual examples (Caesar and Hannibal), both calling attention to a certain isolation of each historical figure. In the sestet, the first tercet rises to a generalization, somewhat leveling what has preceded: though contrary, both examples illustrate the common need to hide inner feelings. Finally comes the application of the general rule. But the poet is more than a mere instance of a general principle, his suffering is the climax of the entire poem, and his rhetoric almost persuades us that it is unique. This effect is partly achieved by the contrast between the two examples: Caesar has joy to conceal as opposed to anguish, and his "*celando*" is echoed in line 14; and Hannibal is not hiding his rage and despair, he is giving them vent, something the speaker cannot achieve. Contini's pointing, which I have followed, is here functional and intelligent: the semicolon ending line 4 associates the two examples, which are followed by the closure of a period. The generalization begins a new sentence in line 9, and a colon after line 11 signals the move to the final conclusion.

To conclude, the technique of appreciatively reading formats like Boccaccio's prose for canzoni or Petrarch's horizontal ones was a matter of converting the counterintuitive letters on the page into an imagined recitation. It required a special mental adjustment to convert the writing simultaneously into the rhythmic sounds and the delicate details of thematic poetic rhetoric and tone of voice.[28] This technique has been lost; no member of contemporary printed culture really possesses it, except in relation to the modern vertical format, which is immeasurably more intuitive than Giovanni Malpaghini's canzone format. It is undeniably the case, as Wayne Storey 's essay "All'interno della poetica grafico-visiva dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*" maintains, that the dominance of the modern vertical

format has interfered with an adequate appreciation of what Petrarch intended with his horizontal formats, but on the whole, vertical format is no disaster but a great step forward in the representation of what we now call "micropoetic" textures. What is accessible to the modern eye in 3195 is mainly the "macropoetic" dimension (the system of relations among the separate poems), which is admittedly very important and which in the modern format no longer finds intuitive spatial representation, having been in fact transferred to the temporal and comparative dimensions of reading poetic collections.

I advocate, as I have said, a vertical format for Petrarch's sonnets and canzone stanzas, one that uses indentation to call attention to the hierarchy of subforms. I may add that internal rhymes, as in poems 102 or 105, should be indicated by the traditional extra spaces after them, but not by boldface, which I think distracts and disfigures. As to punctuation, the editor should punctuate sparingly but in a way to articulate Petrarch's subtle syntactic play. I hope I have persuaded you that there are still many interesting questions inherent in editing Petrarch's poetry that will live on in the digital age and provide much food for thought.

---

[1] To mention only a few in each category (see list of works cited): critical studies: Fenzi (2003), Feo (2003), Kuon (2004), Cervigni (2004), Calitti and Gigliuoli (2006), Barolini and Storey (2006), Barański and Cachey (2007), Lollini (2004 and 2006), Picone (2007); manuscript studies: Paolino (2000), Petrucci (2003), Savoca (2008), Belloni et al. (2003 and 2004); computerized studies: Petrucci (2003), Savoca (2008).

[2] *De vulgari eloquentia* (hereinafter *DVE*) 1979 2.5.50-55: "Nunc autem restat investigandum de constructionibus elatis et fastigiosis vocabulis; et demum, fustibus torquibusque paratis, promissum fascem, hoc est cantionem, quomodo viere quis debeat instruemus" ("Now it remains to consider the elevation of syntax and magnificent words; and finally, having prepared the sticks and cords, we will show how one should bind together the promised bundle, that is, the canzone"). The metaphor recurs in 2.8.1-2 and later.

[3] *DVE* 2.9.2: "Et circa hoc [i.e. the term *stantia*] sciendum est quod hoc vocabulum per solius artis respectum inventum est, videlicet ut in quo tota cantionis ars esset contenta, illud diceretur stantia, hoc est mansio capax sive receptaculum totius artis. Nam quemadmodum cantio est gremium totius sententie, sic stantia totem artem ingremiat" ("And here one must understand that this term *stanza* has been chosen for technical reasons exclusively, so that what contains the entire art of the canzone should be called a room, that is, a capacious dwelling or receptacle, for the entire craft of the canzone. For just as the canzone is the womb of the [poet's] entire thought, so the stanza enwombs the entire art of the canzone"). In Durling and Martinez *Time and the Crystal: Studies in Dante's "Rime petrose"* (27-30), I argued that Dante's emphasis on the spatial aspect of stanza form in this passage involves conscious echoes of Calcidius's translation of and commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* 50d, in which space is the "receptacle," metaphorically the "mother" or "womb," for the embodiments of form. The cosmological parallels are integral to Dante's intentions both in the *Petrose* and in the *Commedia*.

[4] See lines 46-47 of Horace's *Ars poetica*: "dixeris egregie notum si callida verbum / reddiderit iunctura novum" ("you will say 'excellent!' if a clever joining makes an old word

fresh"). Chrétien de Troyes' adaptation in the proem to his *Erec* was widely known in the Middle Ages and may have been Dante's source: "[Chrétien] tret d'un conte d'aventure / une molt bele conjointure" ("Chrétien draws from a tale of adventure a very lovely joining") (lines 13-14).

[5] "Amor, tu vedi ben che questa donna," the third of the *Petrose* (for a thorough analysis, see *Time and the Crystal*, chapter 4), is like his sestina in having only rhyme words, which do not, however, change position in the same way as in the sestina. The rhyme words are: *A: donna, B: tempo, C: luce, D: freddo; ABA.ACA:ADD.AEE*. The changing order circles through the five: stanza 2 has *EAE.EBE:ECC.EDD* and so forth; that is, each successive stanza takes its first rhyme word from the last line of the previous stanza, its second rhyme word from the first line of the previous. Thus in each stanza, one of the five rhyme words has gradually risen to dominance and in later stanzas diminishes in frequency, to great effect. The *congedo*, then, takes its first rhyme word from the last line of the last stanza, but reverses the order of the others and the D rhyme word ends its two central lines (AEDDCB), echoing metapoetically its dominance of the central stanza of the poem.

[6] *DVE* 2.3.8. Sixteen of Dante's canzoni end with a hendecasyllabic couplet (in Foster and Boyde's numbering, poems 9, 13, 25, 32, 33, 40, 46, 59, 61, 68, 69, 77, 80, 81, 83, 89); only three (22, 67, 70) with a hendecasyllable and a settenario in rhyme. Eighteen of Petrarch's canzoni end with a hendecasyllabic couplet (poems 23, 37, 53, 70, 71, 72, 73, 127, 129, 207, 264, 268, 270, 323, 325, 331, 359, 360); seven end with a hendecasyllable and a *settenario* in rhyme (poems 28, 29, 50, 105, 119, 126, 128); only one ends with two *settenari* in rhyme (125, in complex interplay with 126).

[7] Very few of Dante's canzoni have both pedes and versus. "Donne ch'avete intelletto d'amore" (*ABBC.ABBC:CDD.CEE*) and "Amor, tu vedi ben che questa donna" (see note 5 above) are bravura examples for special occasions.

[8] P. V. Mengaldo writes: "Nor is there evidence of Petrarch's knowing Dante's treatise … but I still ask myself if a systematic sifting would not reserve surprises" (*DVE* 1968, xviii).

[9] The physical design of this codex and the stages of its evolution have been exhaustively discussed by Stefano Zamponi.

[10] As has long been understood, Giovanni Malpaghini copied (in part 1) poems 1-190 (except for poems 121 and 179) and (in part 2) poems 264-318; Petrarch copied (in part 1) poems 121, 179, 191-263 and (in part 2) poems 319-66.

[11] Petrucci, Livio, "La lettera dell'originale dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*," is a pioneering (and computer-aided) study of the separation and agglomeration of words in the differing scribal practice of Petrarch and Giovannni Malpaghini, raising important questions about the closeness of Petrarch's supervision of Giovanni's transcriptions. I owe this reference to the kindness of Johannes Bartuschat.

[12] In his discussion of these decisions Furio Brugnolo argues that Petrarch adopted the format of the Tuscan sonnet collections because of their prestige (especially 119-23).

[13] This pattern was carried out in the rubrication performed in Milan in 1368, in part 1 poems 1-193, in part 2 poems 264-321; presumably it stopped at the point where additional poems had not yet been chosen (for these complexities see Zamponi, 30-32).

[14] As is well known, in his collection of Dante's and Petrarch's poetry (MS. Chigi L. V. 176), Boccaccio gave all the forms in prose format, with capitals to indicate stanza beginnings and

paraphs for sonnet tercets. This was the oldest and most traditional format for lyric poetry; see Brugnolo, 115-17 and his examples, plates 5, 6, 12.

[15] At various times after 1370, Petrarch allowed copies to be made from 3195; it would seem that when doing so he still considered the manuscript as a fair copy.

[16] This last is a brilliant if unexemplified suggestion, but it is difficult to correlate the sestinas with particular moments in their contexts; rather, it is the great groups of important canzoni (poems 22-23, 70-73, 125-29, 323-31, 360, 366) that have a clearly punctuating function and allow fuller development of the major themes of the collection. The distribution of the sestinas in part 1 of the *Rime sparse* is as follows: between 22 and 30, 397 lines in eight poems; between 30 and 66, 762 lines in thirty-six poems; between 66 and 80, 467 lines in fourteen poems; between 80 and 142, 1143 lines in sixty-two poems; between 142 and 214, 1417 lines in seventy-two poems; between 214 and 237, 308 lines in twenty-two poems; between 237 and 239, fourteen lines in one poem.

[17] As Zamponi observes, Petrarch copied poem 360 into a small space relative to its length (so as not to exceed a *duernion*); almost no space is left between verses on the same line, and there is a much higher percentage of abbreviations than elsewhere (37-39; cf. Brugnolo 114, Storey 162).

[18] However, Storey's speculations that Giovanni's format, unlike Petrarch's, gave special emphasis to the first line of sonnets, while Petrarch's gave special emphasis to the last two lines of sonnets are not persuasive because they are not based on rhetorical or thematic analysis of individual poems (the relative rhetorical or poetic weight of the different parts of a poem is not ascertainable a priori, although incipits were always regarded as the titles of lyric texts, as in Dante's citations of canzoni). As I have suggested, the particular attention given by Petrarch's first readers to such matters as the function of concatenations or the thematic interrelations of the forms of such poems as 125-26 is unrecoverable.

[19] See the facsimile edition, *Il codice Vaticano Latino 3196, riproduzione fotografica*, ed. Manfredo Porena (Roma: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1941). A cursory glance indicates that the sonnets in the old "serpentine" format in 3196 are mostly poems sent by others to Petrarch and copied to be answered.

[20] Livio Petrucci writes: "Gli elementi indiscutibili mi paiono tre: l'estrema attenzione riservata dal Petrarca all'organizzazione della pagina, la facilità con cui avrebbe potuto imporre al copista l'incolonnamento dei versi pari della riga, e il fatto che invece non glielo impose; la conclusione parrebbe essere una sola: il Petrarca trovò opportuno che il Malpaghini copiasse come ha copiato" (120-21).

[21] Poems 29, 72, 73, 105, 127, 128, 135, 264, 268, 270, 323, 360.

[22] Poems 125, 126, 206, 359.

[23] Poems 23, 50, 53, 70, 71, 119, 129, 207, 331, 366.

[24] *Epistolae Familiares* I.1 (ed. Rossi, 1.3-4). After Petrarch has emptied out his hoard of preserved letters and is surrounded by jumbled piles of them ("literarum cumulis et informi papiro obsitus"), he is at first tempted to burn them all. But "'Et quid,' inquam, 'prohibet, velut, e specula fessum longo itinere viatorem, in tergo respicere et gradatim curas adolescentie tue metientem recognoscere'" ("'And what prohibits you,' I say, 'like a traveler tired by his long journey, to look back as if from a high cliff, and step by step recall and measure the cares of your young manhood?'").

[25] *Epistolae Familiares* IV.1, *Ad Dyonisium de Burgo Sancti Sepulcri* (ed. Rossi, 1.153-61). In a paper delivered in Washington, DC, in 1974, Giles Constable made the acute observation that the lack of mention of Petrarch's brother in the narrative of the descent of the mountain suggests his remaining at the summit, symbolizing his joining of the Carthusian order (long after the fictitious date of the letter); see Durling, "Il Petrarca, il Ventoso e la possibilità dell'allegoria."

[26] This and the following sonnet are newly translated by Durling.

[27] "Nota," in the 1967 reprint of the Einaudi edition of the *Canzoniere*, XXXVIII.

[28] How did Petrarch's aristocratic friends acquire their skill? We can be sure it was a largely social acquisition. We know that Petrarch read parts of the *Africa* to King Robert of Naples in February 1341 (we can be sure the court gathered to hear him), to Barbato di Sulmona on the same visit, and poems to Boccaccio and other Florentine friends on his first visit to Florence, and no doubt on other occasions (like the readings in Naples, these may have been poems in Latin). But the reading or recitation of poetry in Italian to small or large groups must have been at least as much a part of the cult of poetry in Petrarch's day as in our own. We know that poets discussed details of their craft with each other; Dante relates that Gotto of Mantua used to call a canzone verse not rhymed within the stanza but instead across stanzas a "*chiave*" (*DVE* 2.13.5.). The awareness of the nature of poetic forms like the canzone was an integral part of high culture, and there are many reasons to believe that there was lively appreciation and animated discussion at gatherings to which poetry was read aloud or recited. One should not suppose that the only or even the principal use of a manuscript like 3195 would be that of silent reading in solitude. The Rime sparse in fact begins by invoking a situation of public recitation: "Voi che ascoltate in rime sparse il suono / di quei sospiri ond' io nudriva il core …"

Works Cited

Alighieri, Dante. *De vulgari eloquentia* (*DVE*). Ed. Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo. In *Opere minori, Tomo II*. Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 1979. 3-237. Print.

---. *De vulgari eloquentia.* Ed. Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo. Padova: Antenore, 1968. Print.

Barański, Zygmunt G., and Theodore J. Cachey, eds., *Petrarch and Dante: Anti-Dantism, Metamorphosis, Tradition.* Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2007. Print.

Barolini, Teodolinda, and H. Wayne Storey, eds. *Petrarch and the Textual Origins of Interpretation*. Leiden: Brill, 2006. Print.

Belloni, Gino, Furio Brugnolo, H. Wayne Storey, and Stefano Zamponi, eds. *Francesco Petrarca, Rerum vulgarium fragmenta. Edizione integrale in fac-simile del manoscritto Vat. Lat. 3195.* Roma-Padova: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana-Antenore, 2003. Print.

---. *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta. Codice Vat. Lat. 3195. Commentario all'edizione in fac-simile.* Padova: Antenore, 2004. Print. [Hereinafter *Commentario*.]

Brugnolo, Furio. "Libro d'autore e forma-canzoniere. Implicazioni grafico-visive nell'Originale dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*." *Commentario* 105-29.

Calitti, Floriana, and Roberto Gigliuoli. eds. *Il Petrarchismo: Un modello per l'Europa.* 2 vol. Roma: Bulzoni, 2006. Print.

Cervigni, Dino S., ed. *Francis Petrarch and the European Lyric Tradition (Annali d'italianistica*, vol 22). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2004. Print.

Chrétien de Troyes. *Erec et Enide*. Ed. Mario Roques. Paris: Champion, 1955. Print.

Durling, Robert. "Il Petrarca, il Ventoso e la possibilità dell'allegoria," *Revue des études augustiniennes* 23 (1977): 304-22. Print.

Durling, Robert, and Ronald Martinez. *Time and the Crystal: Studies in Dante's "Rime petrose."* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990. Print.

Fenzi, Enrico. *Saggi petrarcheschi*. Fiesole: Cadmo, 2003. Print.

Feo, Michele, ed. *Petrarca nel tempo. Tradizione, lettori, e immagini delle opere.* Catalogo della mostra. Comitato nazionale per le celebrazioni del VII centennio della nascita di Francesco Petrarca. Pontedera: Bandecchi e Vivaldi, 2003. Print.

Horace. *Ars poetica.* Eds. Edward C. Wickham and H. W. Garrod. Oxford: Clarendon, 1905. Print.

Kuon, Peter. *L'aura dantesca: Metamorfosi intertestuali nei "Rerum vulgarium fragmenta."* Firenze: Cesati, 2004. Print.

Lollini, Massimo. "'Padre mite e despotico': Riflessioni sull'eredità culturale e poetica del Petrarca," *Annali d'italianistica* 22 (2004): 321-36. Print.

---. "Amore e soggetto lirico in Petrarca e nel petrarchismo," in Calitti and Gigliuoli. 2, 63-79. Print.

Modigliani, Ettore, ed. *Il Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca riprodotto letteralmente dal Cod. Vat. Lat. 3195 con tre fotoincisioni* (Roma: Società Filologica Romana, 1904). Reprinted in facsimile *Commentario* 175-384; available in the University of Oregon Digital Collection. Web. 7 Jan. 2011. <http://boundless.uoregon.edu/cdm4/document.php?CISOROOT=/misc&CISOPTR=415&CISOSHOW=210>.

Paolino, Laura, ed. *Francesco Petrarca, Il codice degli abbozzi. Edizioni e storia del manoscritto Vaticano latino 3196*. Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 2000. Print.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Canzoniere*. Ed. Gianfranco Contini. Torino: Einaudi, 1967.

---. *Epistolae Familiares*. Eds. V. Rossi and U. Bosco. Florence: Sansoni, 1933-42. Print.

---. *Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta.* Edizione critica curata da Giuseppe Savoca. Firenze: Olschki, 2008. Print.

Petrucci, Livio, "La lettera dell'originale dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*," *Per leggere. I generi della letteratura* 3 (2003): 67-134. Print.

Picone, Michelangelo, ed. *Il Canzoniere. Lettura micro- e macrotestuale. Lectura Petrarchae Turicensis*. Ravenna: Longo, 2007. Print.

Savoca, Giuseppe. *Il Canzoniere del Petrarca tra codicologia e ecdotica*. Firenze: Olschki, 2008. Print.

Storey, H. Wayne. "All'interno della poetica grafico-visiva dei *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta.*" *Commentario* 131-71.

---. "Doubting Petrarca's Last Words: Erasure in MS Vaticano Latino 3195." *Petrarch and the Textual Origins of Interpretation*. Eds. T. Barolini and H.W.Storey. Leiden—Boston: Brill, 2007. 67-91. Print.

 ---. "L'edizione diplomatica di Ettore Modigliani." *Commentario* 385-94.

---. *Transcription and Visual Poetics in the Early Italian Lyric*. New York: Garland, 1993. Print.

Zamponi, Stefano. "Il libro del Canzoniere: Modelli, struttura, funzioni." *Commentario* 13-66.