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ABSTRACT

In 1495, the Venetian teacher-turned-printer Aldo Manuzio (c. 1445-1515) published the Greek grammar of Constantine Lascaris, the Ἑρωτήματα, or Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν ὀκτὼ λόγων μερών. It was the first book issued from Aldus’s newly founded, independent press, and it launched his ambitious publishing program of Greek classics. But the edition is more than Lascaris’s grammar. It contains an additional seven distinct texts, known as the Aldine Appendix: the treatise of Tryphon, De passionibus dictionum; Aldus’s own abecedarium and his treatise on abbreviations; primer material including the Lord’s Prayer, the Salve Regina, the Apostles’ Creed, and a short selection from the Gospel of Saint John; the Carmina aurea of pseudo-Pythagoras; the Versús of pseudo-Phocylides; and a selection from Moschopulus on Greek grammar.

This dissertation argues that the Aldine Lascaris should be understood not as an aggregate of texts, but as a single textual entity, assembled and marketed by a publisher with the express purpose of presenting a complete course, real or ideal, in ancient Greek. Aldus was a teacher-turned-printer, and he exploited the technology of the printing press to offer late Quattrocento Hellenists new means of learning Greek. In other words, the Aldine Lascaris is a textbook, and textbooks, as such, are inexorably attached to the advent of print and the rise of print culture.

The INTRODUCTION explores the intersection of codicology, bibliography and classical studies. CHAPTER 1 reviews the history of Greek language instruction and its place in the studia humanitatis. CHAPTER 2 presents the actors and instruments involved in the production of the Aldine Lascaris. CHAPTER 3 treats the book-copies themselves, detailing the actual content and its arrangement. CHAPTER 4 presents the textbook in its environment, exploring the relationship of the parts to the whole and the use of the book in Quattrocento Greek pedagogy.
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**Methodology**

The purpose of this dissertation is to recover an aspect of Greek language studies around the year 1500 through a careful study of one set of artifacts in particular: the *Ἑπιτομή* of Constantine Lascaris as printed by Aldus Manutius in 1495, which, it will be argued, belongs to the genre of *publisher’s textbook*, a kind of book inevitably linked to the advent of print and its effect on humanism and book production. Studying the book will be a three-step process. First, it will be necessary to identify the book’s salient, bibliographical attributes. This is a process of descriptive bibliography. Second, the attributes will be classified according to their significance and their potential to reveal likeness and difference with the printed and manuscript books that both precede and follow. This is an archaeological process. Finally, the likenesses and differences will be grouped according to their relation to print, giving us a notion of what about this book, exactly, is special to print versus what, exactly, is general to Greek-language pedagogical books. The dissertation will argue that the *Aldine Lascaris* betrays attributes associated solely with print that are essential to a new genre in foreign-language pedagogy: the publisher’s textbook. It is important, at this stage, to reiterate the methodological priority of the book-copies belonging to the edition. This priority makes the dissertation essentially codicological/bibliographical in principle and book-historical in objective.¹

¹ The growth and methodological coherence of the history of the book, as an academic discipline, have an inverse relationship: as the discipline expands, its methodology dissipates. That the methods of analytical bibliography are not necessarily those of book-history has been the cause of much discussion. See, in particular, Darnton 1979: 17: “Step
The basis of the argument will be the significant copy or copies, in this case those copies that can be assigned to Aldus’s 1495 edition of Lascaris’s * weiber.* This project is not directly concerned with Lascaris’s career, teaching, or text per se. Each of these has been covered.²

Although Lascaris will act in cameos, this project is concerned primarily with a Greek-language textbook that incidentally (but not accidentally) contains his grammar. It is fundamental to this dissertation to posit that Lascaris is not, strictly speaking, the author of the Aldine Lascaris; instead, we should understand this book as a publisher’s textbook, and its author to be Aldus, or perhaps the Aldine press. In arguing for a re-interpretation of the status of this book, this dissertation is, in the end, arguing for re-definition via identifiable attributes. What has traditionally been an a priori classification of this edition as a grammar can be improved by reference to its intended or actual function as represented by its form, both of which can be inexorably associated with the technology of print and its effect on language-learning texts. Furthermore, its intended or actual function will lead to a fuller understanding of its historical context: Greek-language education in the Italian Renaissance.

² The former two by Martinez-Manzano (1994 and 1998); the latter by Förstel (1992), who produced a critical edition of Lascaris’s text from one manuscript (not a recension), namely
Three studies have informed the methodology of this dissertation. The first is the codicological examination of the holograph manuscript of Thomas à Kempis by L.M.J. Delaissé, subtitled, *Examen archéologique* (Paris, 1956). Delaissé examined the contents of the manuscript and their presentation, including the letterforms, supports, images, and their individual histories. He then contextualized these and offered “les conclusions de l’archéologique.” The second is Charlton Hinman's *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1963). Hinman's is a masterwork of analytical bibliography in the Greg-Bowers school. He introduced “needs, tools, and methods” ranging from types and type setting, order of forms, imposition, and orthographical/typographical variations and anomalies. The third is Erika Nuti's *Longa est via: Forme e contenuti dello studio grammaticale dalla Bisanzio paleologa al tardo Rinascimento veneziano* (Alessandria, 2014). Nuti takes as her starting point the study of significant copies of grammatical works—as opposed to texts. She then plots the vicissitudes of the study of Greek in the Renaissance from these discrete points. Nuti's is a model of book-archaeological writing.

Practically speaking, four copies of the 1495 *Aldine Lascaris* will be examined for this dissertation: one at the Walters Art Museum, one at the Bryn Mawr College Library, one at the Houghton Library at Harvard, and one at the Beinecke Library at Yale. Three have been examined via digital surrogate: two at Princeton (one each at Firestone and Scheide); the last is a digitized copy at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.

---

3 Delaissé's work, according to Gruijs, “must be regarded as one of the standard works in the archaeology of the book.” Gruijs 1972: 100.
The following introduction will provide an overview of the principles involved in this dissertation, namely those concerning the investigation of manuscript and printed books and their value as artifacts. The question will consistently return to the notions of continuity and change in book production and use—in technology and the response to technology. It is only by understanding the *Aldine Lascaris* as a transitional artifact that one can isolate instances of continuity and change and treat these instances as effects of which a particular technology is the cause. And this means treating the *Aldine Lascaris* with the principles of investigation that apply to artifacts on each side of the transition.
INTRODUCTION

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK, PRINT CULTURE, AND
CLASSICAL STUDIES

Knowledge of ancient Greek, as a foreign, book-learned language, never
disappeared entirely from Western Europe, although after antiquity it had
changed significantly in kind and quantity. It is the object of this dissertation to
contribute to the history of the study of ancient Greek as a foreign language in
Western Europe, specifically during a period of intense interest in the subject—
the Italian Renaissance. The parameters of this project are set by the artifacts in
question, in this case the edition, or discrete set of copies, known collectively as
the Ἑρωτήματα, or Ἐπίτομη τῶν ὀκτὼ λόγων μερῶν of Constantine Lascaris as
published in 1495 by Aldus Manutius. In the course of the following introduction
and four chapters, certain questions, germane to the history of Greek-language
education in the West, will be put to the artifacts. The most general of these is:
What was the effect of print on a Greek-language pedagogical text? In other
words, what aspects of a printed Greek grammar are peculiar and essential to
the artifact? Such a general line of inquiry naturally leads to more specific
questions. When considered as a whole, what exactly was this edition? How was
it made? What was it meant to accomplish? And what did it (or could it) actually
accomplish? Finally, what was its place in the Aldine publishing program and in
the culture of the studia humanitatis? The answers to all such questions lie in
the edition itself, the circumstances of its production, and the environment in which its copies were used.

This dissertation will argue that the *Aldine Lascaris* should be understood not as a grammar, but as a publisher’s textbook, i.e. not an aggregate of texts, but a singular textual entity that was designed and produced by a publisher with the express purpose of marketing a complete course in ancient Greek.\(^4\) Furthermore, it will be argued that such an undertaking was inevitably linked to the advent of the printing press. As will be shown, Aldus’s goal in designing this textbook, and exploiting the new technology, was twofold. On the one hand, he needed to produce a book that would inaugurate his celebrated series, both by showcasing his innovations in book-design and, perhaps most importantly, by selling. On the other hand, he needed to produce a book that would work in the classroom or tutorial. After all, Aldus was a teacher, and he was committed to the promotion of Greek-language study as an aspect of the *studia*. We can therefore expect that the book reflects a curriculum, whether real or ideal. In both the commercial and academic senses, the *Aldine Lascaris* is the key to the Aldine publishing program.

\(^4\) The term *Aldine Lascaris* will be used in this dissertation to denote the entirety of the 1495 edition; the term *publisher*, following the *OED*, will denote “a person or company whose business is the preparation and issuing of printed or documentary material for distribution or sale, acting as the agent of an author or owner; a person or company that arranges the printing or manufacture of such items and their distribution to booksellers or the public” *OED*, 2.b, s.v. *publisher*; the term *textbook* is defined in greater detail below, pages 211ff.
This dissertation is an act of historical recovery and contextualization via artifacts. It is, in other words, an archaeology, and it assumes the following premises, neither of which is unproblematic, and both of which will be further explored in this introduction: first, the copies of the 1495 Lascaris exist as discrete, manufactured artifacts; second, artifacts, as such, are relevant to a precise social situation and a body of content; and the design of any given artifact reflects the concerns of its makers and the expectations of its users: in the present case, a Greek-language curriculum within the *studia humanitatis* and the grammatical texts that effected literacy in ancient Greek during the Quattrocento. The interrogation of artifacts is an archaeological process; and the archaeological process requires method. It is therefore necessary to introduce the methodology of this dissertation, making special note of the academic precedents for (and problems with) such an investigation.

The artifacts in question are incunabula.\(^5\) Although printed, incunabula are not yet wholly typographic; nor are they entirely written by hand.\(^6\) As they

---

\(^5\) Books printed with movable type prior to January 1\(^{st}\), 1501.

\(^6\) An important fact of the incunabular period. A book can be called *entirely typographic* only when every aspect of its pre-market manufacture is accomplished by the printing press. At precisely what point in the history of the printed book this occurred is still very much open to debate. But typographic completeness is certainly not a feature of books printed prior to 1501. Being transitional objects, incunabula retain the processes and expectations of the manuscript era: initials are left incomplete for readers’ rubrication; textblocks are printed continuously awaiting readers’ paratext (even printed pagination, foliation, or signatures are late and inconsistent in the fifteenth century); printers frequently invite readers to collate texts for accuracy; some text (often Greek text, for example) may be left out entirely, awaiting readers’ additions, etc. The reader was, in fact, “[…] responsible for a part of the book’s physical manufacture.” (McKitterick 2003: 132).
bridge the transition from written to printed books, so they must be treated as transitional artifacts. The following overview of objectives and principles will therefore begin with the ends and proceed to the means of the study of incunabula. This overview will necessarily embrace the study of the pre-typographical codex (codicology), proceed to the study of printed books (analytical bibliography), and finish with the dynamic discipline of book-history. It will then be necessary to examine a concept, not uncontroversial, that is particularly relevant to the current project, namely print culture, the notional environment both affected and effected by the printing press. The introduction will conclude with a proposed methodology for the investigation of a particular incunabulum and the effects of print on a foreign-language text.
What is a book? Why study a book? And how? None of these questions is quite as straightforward as it seems. Making no attempt to problematize, and with no prior knowledge of the vast theoretical literature, the study of books is simply less direct than one might expect. There are two fundamental problems: one has to do with terminology, the other with method; the former with what we are studying and why (the objectives of the discipline), the latter with how we study it (the principles).

The trouble with terminology lies in the term most taken for granted: *book*. A book is simultaneously an artifact, a material object that one can hold and touch and a concept, an abstract idea. When you are asked, *is that a good book?*, does the question pertain to the particular book you are holding with its unique characteristics and history, or does it pertain to the whole set of objects that carry the same text? The *Oxford English Dictionary* has it both ways. Definition 1a is *A portable volume consisting of a series of written, printed, or illustrated pages bound together for ease of reading*; 1b is *A written composition*

[7] [They (readers and listeners) are in fact never faced with abstract texts, ideal, detached from materiality: they handle and perceive objects and forms, structures and modalities, which govern reading (or listening).] Chartier 1992: 15. Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.
long enough to fill one or more such volumes. This terminological problem not only popular, it is also prevalent in academic, specialized circles, in which scholars grasp for more precise ways to signify the book-as-artifact. Codex is one, or volume, the book, The Book, Book, or book-copy. The struggle is clear in one of the most important of the scholarly books on books: Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin’s L’apparition du livre, translated into English as The Coming of the Book. Febvre and Martin resorted to every typographical alternative to describe their object of study: le livre, Le Livre, Des Livres, etc. In the end, attempts to use book as a term of art are frustrated by the word’s inherent versatility. It remains for the author of a study to define the term as it will be used, being careful to set criteria for inclusion and exclusion. Therefore, in the following dissertation, the term book will denote the artifact, the material object that can be handled, and has a unique history. A book can be produced by any means or combination of means: by hand, by block, plate, or moveable type. Moreover, a book is a medium. It carries a message—a text or picture—through time and space.

Once the term is defined, the questions are posed. If a book is an artifact, why would one want to know anything about it, what can one know about it, and

---

8 OED, s.v. book.

9 The equivocal nature of the term book is made more problematic by the nature of the term print, which can mean a technique for multiplying images or verbal texts (if, that is, one makes the distinction). See Needham (2009), who explores the ambiguity further exacerbated by the phrase print culture: “One wonders what proportion of a crosssection of American humanities professors today, if presented with the bare title The Renaissance Print, 1470-1$50, would recognize immediately that its subject is prints and not printing.” (Needham 2009: 39).
how does one ask? These are historical problems, and they have been resolved into disciplines developed by historians of texts, art, and artifacts—philologists, art historians, and archaeologists. The following dissertation pertains only incidentally to texts. Its focus is the objects per se and their implications. The objects in question, a set of incunabula, are clearly artifacts and most certainly art. The principles governing their study will therefore be the methods of the art historian and archaeologist. So with the thing defined and the questions in place, it is necessary to set up the principles.

The principles, as they pertain to the book, are *codicology* and *bibliography*. The former traditionally concerns itself with the manuscript or pre-typographical book, the latter with the typographical or printed book. Because *incunabula* are transitional objects, their study should be guided by the methods of both disciplines, and the origin and development of both disciplines should be briefly examined. They are, along with many another *Hilfswissenschaft*, embraced by the much broader lines of inquiry that pass under the names *book history, history of the book, publishing history*, and the like. These, and their relationship to classical studies, will be explored in the section following codicology and bibliography.
[I.2] Codicology and Bibliography

La codicologie est l’archéologie des monuments les plus précieux civilization: de ses livres.\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{quote}
~ François Masai
This, I take it, is just what is meant by calling bibliography the grammar of literary investigation: it is the fundamental instrument of research, or, if your will, the key to the fundamental problem.\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

~ Walter Greg

The study of manuscripts as physical objects, with histories relevant to the texts they carry and their places of manufacture and use, is not new, even if it is not ancient. The systematic use of the characteristics of manuscripts, and the determination of the relevance of those characteristics, began with Angelo Poliziano in the fifteenth century. As private and institutional collections grew, previously unknown books came to light, and the public and scholarly appetite for texts developed, the discipline of textual criticism began to take shape. Over the course of a career spent sorting books, Poliziano refined a method of assessing the value of texts based on their media—the books that bore them. His objective was to attain the best (most accurate) state of a given text; his method was characterized by principles that, more or less, still characterize textual criticism:

1.) “a dedication to the principle that the physical manuscript was the measure of a text;

\textsuperscript{10} [Codicology is the archaeology of the most precious monuments of civilization: its books.]
Masai 1950: 279.

\textsuperscript{11} Greg 1966: 239.
2.) use of manuscripts’ relative ages to weight their credibility as textual witnesses;  
3.) reliance on manuscript features to edit texts;  
4.) use of palaeographical features to evaluate their status as valuable manuscripts;  
5.) ultimately, application of these features, along with stemmatic methodology, to reconstruct corrupted texts.”

The governing principle is *eliminatio codicum descriptorum*—the elimination of derivative manuscripts. And this principle, though text-critical in its objectives, nonetheless assumes the importance of the characteristics of manuscripts and can be considered the first steps toward the modern discipline of codicology.

The term *codicology* first appeared in French in the 1940s, coined by Alphonse Dain, a professor of Greek in the Sciences historiques et philologiques section of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes in Paris. Dain was an admirer of the German palaeographer Ludwig Traube, who, earlier in the twentieth century, had expanded the study of manuscript books to include their attributes inclusively, not only their handwriting. Traube called this study “angewandte oder historische Paläographie” [applied or historical palaeography], which he subsumed under the broader approach to the historical study of manuscripts,

---

12 The list is borrowed from Cottrell 1997: 111.  
13 On Poliziano’s practice of the principle, see especially Grafton (1977); Reeve (1996); Timpanaro (2005).  
14 As *codicologie* in Dain’s *Les Manuscrits* (Paris: 1947), chapter two, “Les manuscrits et le problem de la paléographie et de la codicologie.” Interestingly, in the 1930s, the term was codicographie. See Grujs 1972: 94.  
15 Traube’s seminal papers are collected in Traube (1909).
“Handschriftenkunde” [the study of scripts]. Traube had done much to develop the objectives and principles of the study of scripts. In particular, he followed Mabillon in treating the medieval manuscript as more than a support for letterforms. Mabillon had cautioned,

\[\textit{non ex sola scriptura, neque ex uno characterismo sed ex omnibus simul de vetustis chartis pronuntiandum.}\]

[Not from the script alone, nor from any other single characteristic, should a judgment about an ancient document follow, but from everything taken together.]

Thus Traube extended palaeography to embrace the histories of individual documents, as well as their associated libraries, collections, and manufacture. For some time prior to the Second World War, French scholars had used the term \textit{science des manuscrits} to translate Traube’s approach. But it was not until Dain’s 1947 book that \textit{codicologie} gained currency. But Dain, as Traube, considered the discipline ancillary to further historical-philological studies. It was not until the work of the Belgian scholar François Masai that the term came to signify a line of inquiry independent of textual criticism.

---

16 Brown 1963: 364.
17 Jean Mabillon (1632-1707) had effectively founded the study of palaeography with the publication of his \textit{De re diplomatica} (Paris, 1681). The term palaeography was coined by Bernard de Montfaucon in 1708.
18 Mabillon 1681: 241; quoted by Traube 1909: 23.
In an article entitled “Paléographie et codicologie,” published in the 1950 *Scriptorium*, Masai argued for the independence of the discipline of codicology and of the realignment of its principles to match those of archaeology.

Les livres de l’antiquité et du moyen âge ne valent-ils pas qu’on les étudie d’abord pour eux-mêmes, comme tous les autres vestiges des civilisations passées? C’est même cette conviction qui fut à l’origine de notre entreprise. Nous croyons en effet à *Scriptorium* que l’archéologie des mss doit se constituer en discipline indépendante.19

[Are books from the ancient word and the Middle Ages not worth studying in their own right, like other vestiges of past civilizations? This is the conviction behind our undertaking. We, the editors of *Scriptorium*, believe that the archaeology of manuscripts must become an independent discipline.]

Masai’s belief in the relative independence of codicology from literary studies and textual criticism freed it from the ranks and constraints of the *Hilfswissenschaften*. And, in regarding the results of codicological research as equivalent to, not ancillary to, historical facts, Masai anticipated the later twentieth-century liberation of descriptive and analytical bibliography from literary studies detailed below. Moreover, Masai’s alignment of the study of

---

19 Masai 1950: 290.
manuscripts with the study of artifacts—of codicology with archaeology—stuck. The latter is now generally defined without reference to textual criticism.\(^{20}\)

But what does codicology offer the present dissertation? Two points of relevance: one pertaining to the incunabulum as manuscript; the other pertaining to the incunabulum as archaeological object.

Because incunabula are, as such, partially typographical, they are therefore partially manuscript. And it stands to reason that transitional artifacts should not be examined exclusively with tools relevant to their descendants, but also with those relevant to their antecedents. As partially manuscript artifacts, incunabula are, if such a phrase be allowed, more unique than later printed books. In other words, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the printing industry had not yet advanced to the level of mass production and industrial design that characterizes books of the seventeenth century to the present. Printers left books incomplete—ready for rubrication, illumination, binding, etc. Incunabula are therefore akin to manuscripts in their individuality; they admit a greater difference between copies in an edition than books of a later period.\(^{21}\)

Determining likenesses and differences among objects in a set is an aspect of contextualization, and it implies a cladistic approach, in which generic

\(^{20}\) For instance by Derek Pearsall in *The Oxford Companion to the Book*: “The codicologist examines every feature of the book in order to draw out whatever information may be useful for elucidating that book’s history, the circumstances of its production, and the purposes for which it was made.” 618.

\(^{21}\) Bühler 1949: 4: “It must always be borne in mind that incunabula represent the bridge between manuscripts and the printed books of the sixteenth century—and as they thus stand between the hand-written book and the modern printed volume, they partake in the problems of both.”
likenesses are properties shared by multiple objects without a priori assumptions as to their grouping.\textsuperscript{22} Objects possessing only generic likenesses are identical, and they are distinct only insofar as they are separate instances of the same genus (quantitatively distinct). Such objects can be show thus:

Property $p = \text{property } q$ if and only if:

$p$ inheres in $x$, $q$ inheres in $y$, and $x = y$

$p$ is instantiated in location $s$, $q$ is instantiated in location $w$, and $s = w$

$p$ and $q$ share the same determinate values and necessities.\textsuperscript{23}

Differentia mitigate absolute likeness by qualifying the conditions stated above. And in this sense differentia are methodologically more important in the process of determining context—conditions of production and use.\textsuperscript{24} In the manuscript era, even with a text-reproducing system in place—the \textit{pecia} system, for instance\textsuperscript{25}—manuscript books have a greater number of differentia than printed books. And in the era of the printed book, the closer one comes to the advent of the printing press, the more differences one will find between any two copies of

\textsuperscript{22} Hennig 1950: 5.

\textsuperscript{23} Modified from Funkhouser 2014: 52.

\textsuperscript{24} W.W. Greg’s \textit{Calculus of Variants} states the principles with regards to manuscripts: “The process of determining the relationship of the manuscripts consists in inferring from the variational the corresponding genetic groups” Greg 1927: 13.

\textsuperscript{25} On the \textit{pecia} system, see Destrez (1935) and Pollard (1978).
the same edition. Likenesses and differentia are modal insofar as they assert or preclude the possibility of grouping,\(^{26}\) and both likenesses and differentia should a.) be verifiable and b.) be relationship-revealing.\(^{27}\)

In addition to their nature as intermediate objects, sharing the characteristics of manuscript and printed books, incunabula are archaeological artifacts. Therefore codicology as the archaeology of the book offers a framework for treating an incunabulum as an historical artifact.

For the archaeologist of the book, every mark on the object is potentially significant, as is the presentation of those marks. Every aspect of the object reveals process, expectation, and use. It therefore stands to reason that every aspect of the object in question warrants description, scrutiny, and understanding. In the case of an archaeology of codices, as opposed to a philological study, the objects examined are strictly corporeal. In other words, it is the copy, not the text.\(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) “Different variants will group the manuscripts in different ways.” Greg 1927: 11.

\(^{27}\) The concept of relationship-revealing variants as pertain to codicology is developed by Salemans (1996) as a corrective to the assumption that all variants are potentially genealogically valid. Salemans’s essay is a revision of Lachmann’s stemmatological method, using the insights of biological systematics, principally cladistics. In particular, Salemans believes that stemmata can remain un-rooted, i.e. remain independent of a priori assumptions concerning the “direction” or variants. Salemans 1996: 45-51.

\(^{28}\) For the confusion inherent in the term book, see Dane 2012: 8 (“A book, as understood here, is always something that exists in immediate and direct relation to a material book-copy, and the distinction between the book and the book-copy is defined here as basic to any study of material books.”); Finkelstein and McCleery 2012: 3 (“Medium, as used here, is a generic term for the material form of a text. A book is a medium...”); Tanselle 2009: 7 (“Most people have had little occasion for thinking about the idea that books, like all other objects, must bear traces of the physical effort that went into their making, the culture that underlay
But assuming the reality of the object and its potential for historical recovery, the question of method remains: how exactly does the codicologist handle the object? And how does he or she use it to make reasonable inferences about the object’s context? Or, for that matter, how does he or she use context to make inferences about the object? To answer the questions, let us assume two archaeological premises. First, that an object has context; second, that context reveals meaning. It follows that the process of contextualizing the object will reveal its meaning. But lest they be unclear, the following terms should be defined: object, context, and meaning.

Let the term object be understood as a corporeal entity that has a particular, durable configuration and is submitted to scrutiny, i.e. it is the object of study. The term context should be understood to be the totality of the attendant situation or environment considered in its bearing upon any of its particulars. In other words, the objects are the values of the variables of the context. And meaning, for the present purpose, is significance relative to a specific inquiry, i.e. the answer to a question, which results in understanding. When one asks an object to reveal meaning through context, one asks not for their craftsmanship, and the treatment they have received since their creation.”); and Tanselle 1998: 10 (“How we define the word “book” is of no consequence; what matters is that we distinguish clearly, in some way, between the intangible work and the tangible text.”)

Much of the following has been adapted from recent work on the theory of archaeological methodology and information organization, principally Hodder (2012 and 2003), Johnson (2010), Brunt (2014), Ovenden (2010), and Svenonius (2000).

Following Hodder 2012: 7.

Paraphrase of Hodder 2003: 188.

explanation, which is abstract and causal, but for understanding, which is
relational. And when meaning is assumed to be relational, it will be clear that
the object belongs to a structured system of functional relationships that
involves actors at every step in its duration.

It follows that, assuming the potential significance of the object through
the process of contextualization, one must ask the right questions. As stated at
the outset, this dissertation will ask three related but distinct questions: How
was it made? What kind of object is this? And why (in both cases)? The object’s
context will inform both the questions and the answers; it will be both a means
and an end, both an objective and a principle of investigation.

Therefore, following Albert Gruijs, once chair of auxiliary historical
studies at the Radboud University in Nijmegen, the following archaeological
principles of codicology will apply to the present inquiry:

1.) “a highly detailed description of the physical aspects of the object
investigated;”

2.) a synthesis based on this description which outlines the material
evolution of the codex; and

3.) a confrontation of this evolution with the actual contents of the item in
question. The whole gives a picture of the static and dynamic structure of
the manuscript.”

Codicology, as it developed via Traube and Masai into an archaeological
discipline, thus provides a framework for the investigation of those aspects of an

---

33 Ibid. 162-63.
34 Gruijs 1972: 104.
incunabulum that refer to its antecedents and for the investigation of the object-in-context. But what of those aspects of an incunabulum that look forward in time, that pertain to the advent of a new medium? To treat these characteristics, one must look to bibliography.

The term bibliography is, in everyday use, imprecise. As its etymology implies, a βιβλιογράφος is a scribe, a writer of books, rather than a writer about them. The Greek is post-classical and first appears in the Second Sophistic. We find Lucian using the word in his second-century diatribe against an ignorant man who buys too many books,35 Πρὸς τὸν ἀπαιδευτὸν καὶ πολλὰ βιβλία ὄνοιμενον, or Adversus indoctum et libros multos ementem.

Τὸ δ’ ὅλον ἄγνοείν μοι δοκεῖς ὅτι τὰς ἄγαθὰς ἔλπιδας ὑπάρχει, ἀλλὰ παρ’ αὐτὸν καὶ τοῦ καθ’ ἠμέραν βίου λαμβάνειν. οὐ δ’ οἱ συνήγοροι κοινὸν καὶ μάρτυρα ἔσεθαί σοι τὸν Ἀττικὸν καὶ Καλλίνον τοὺς βιβλιογράφους; οὐκ, ἀλλ’ ὁμοίως τινάς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιτρέψοντάς σε, ἢν ὁ θεός ἐθέλωσε, καὶ πρὸς ἑσχατὸν πενίας συνελάσοντας· δέον ἔτι νῦν σωφρονήσαντα ἁπαθοῦσα μὲν τινὶ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων τὰ βιβλία ταῦτα καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὴν νεόκτιστον ταύτην οἰκίαν, ἁπαθοῦνα δὲ τοῖς ἀνδραποδοκαπήλοις μέρος γοῦν ἀπὸ πολλῶν τῶν φειλομένων.36

[It seems to me you’re completely ignorant of the fact that you can’t seek good will from booksellers, but instead from yourself and your daily life.

35 One thinks of Sir Thomas Phillipps. See Barker (1967).
36 The text is that of Harmon, published in the Loeb Classical Library, 1921.
Do you think Atticus and Callinus, the scribes, will stand witness for you? No! They will grind you down, if the Gods wish, and reduce you to utter destitution. Now it’s necessary that you figure it out: on the one hand, sell these books and your new house to one of the scholars; on the other hand, pay the slave-traders part of all the money you owe them.] 37

For a time, the word preserved its Greek sense in English. In 1761, Daniel Fenning defined bibliographer as “one who writes or copies books.” 38 But by the early nineteenth century, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word bibliography was applied by Thomas Frognall Dibdin to the act of writing about books. 39

“The Study of Bibliography in this country is perhaps still in its infancy; but it is daily acquiring strength and extension.” 40

In stating the novelty of bibliography in England in the nineteenth century, Dibdin implied an antecedent tradition elsewhere. And indeed there was one. Bibliography came to mean writing about books in France a half-century earlier, when Guillaume-François de Bure published his Bibliographie instructive; ou

---

37 All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.
38 English Dictionary (1761), s.v. bibliographer.
39 OED s.v. bibliography.
40 Dibdin 1814: v.
traité de la connaissance des livres rares et singuliers.\textsuperscript{41} It was de Bure who first used the term bibliography to describe the objectives and principles of a systematic description of books.\textsuperscript{42} And it was this use of the term, de Bure’s use, that reached Dibdin. The “strength” that bibliography was daily acquiring was in its principles, the accuracy with which it recorded and classified its entities; the “extension” was in its objective: bibliography was coming into its own as a scholarly discipline, replete with its own set of means and ends. Dibdin stated his objective and principles as explicitly as allowed by the rhetoric of prefaces.

“Such a work, if executed with copiousness and precision, cannot fail to be interesting to the Bibliographer, to the Scholar, and to the Lover of ancient Literature and the Fine Arts. I have therefore endeavored to give a full and faithful description of each edition, according to its critical or bibliographical importance; and have not only consulted the principal

\textsuperscript{41} Published in nine volumes in Paris from 1763-1769.

\textsuperscript{42} It is a curiosity of history that bibliology has not been used to denote the study of books, since bibliography was already in use to denote the writing of books. The term bibliology seems to have been used only by Robert Southey (\textit{OED}, s.v. bibliography). Whatever the case, it is clear that de Bure chose bibliographie over bibliologie because he was concerned with a system of accurate description rather than a field of knowledge. See his introduction: “Système complet de bibliographie choisie: ou ordre des facultés et divisions d'un catalogue.” Modern use of the term bibliography, without a modifier, suggests one of three activities: listing books (enumerative bibliography), describing books (descriptive bibliography), and studying books as historical artifacts (analytical bibliography). Traditionally, codicology has been limited to manuscript books and bibliography to printed books. But the borders are porous, especially in the incunabular period, when books are not yet wholly typographical. For more on the distinctions of disciplines, see Greetham 1992: 6-10.
Writers who have described it, but have attempted to correct their errors, to reconcile their differences, and to supply their deficiencies, when necessary and practicable.”

Dibdin’s objective was to provide the scholarly community with a means—the accurate description of an important collection; his principles were those that continue to guide rare book catalogers to this day—the principles of accuracy, significance, and integration. Dibdin belonged to the age of the dawn of bibliographical studies as we now understand them. But this should not belie the fact that the discipline is older than Dibdin, even if the name bibliography is not.

As one might imagine, what we now call bibliography began with an interest in the origins of the technology of print and the particulars of printed artifacts, as distinguished from manuscripts. For reasons of Teutonic pride, the two-hundredth anniversary of Gutenberg’s invention was celebrated with long lists and compilations throughout the German-speaking world. One such list was the excellent catalog of the Stadtbibliothek in Nuremberg, the *Historia Bibliothecae Reipublicae Noribergensis* (1643) of Johannes Saubertus, a

---

43 Dibdin 1814: iii.
45 On Dibdin generally, see Connell (2000) and Ferris (2009).
46 In 1640, the bicentennial was celebrated in Strasbourg. Such was the strength of civic pride that Joannes Mentelin, a Strasbourg native, was credited with the invention, not Gutenberg. (Glomski 2001: 336).
Lutheran theologian and sometime city librarian.\(^{47}\) Ostensibly, Saubertus compiled the catalog to bolster German claims of priority against rival claims, principally Dutch, that printing had been invented in Haarlem by Laurens Coster.\(^{48}\) But for the present argument, Saubertus matters because he treated book-copies as evidence.\(^{49}\) His argument, given at the start of the appendix in which he lists the earliest specimens of printing in Nuremberg, is that the sheer preponderance of evidence is in favor of Fust and Gutenberg.\(^{50}\) The twenty-first-century historian may be less than convinced by mere preponderance. But Saubertus made an a posteriori, archaeological argument about the medium from extant examples. And so, as Mabillon would do for the study of script, Saubertus did for the study of printed books.\(^{51}\) Since the publication of the Historia, a tradition of compilation and analysis developed, from Maittaire (1719), Panzer (1798), Hain (1838), Proctor (1898), Scholderer and Haebler

\(^{47}\) Which, according to Paul Needham, has never been superseded for that collection. Needham 1998: 457.

\(^{48}\) Twyman 1998: 20. The story of Coster’s invention was told in full by Petrus Scriverius, a friend of Daniel Heinsius. Scriverius wrote a poem called “Laure-crans voor Laurens Coster,” which was printed in Haarlem in 1628. According to Scriverius, Coster had an apprentice named Johannes Faustus, who stole his master’s font and fled to Mainz where he began printing. In this story, “Faustus” is most certainly meant to be Johann Fust, Gutenberg’s backer.

\(^{49}\) Incidentally, his is the first use in print of the term incunabula to refer to printed books, see p. 20.

\(^{50}\) Interestingly in that order. As Saubertus stated it:

Monumenta nobis fide dignissima in rem praeuentem suppetant, sic omnino sentio:

\(^{51}\) For Mabillon, page 20, note 17.
(1924) to the “New Bibliography” of McKerrow (1927), Greg (1950), and Bowers (1950).

As the study of the history of printed books advanced and expanded, the uses of evidence changed. Saubertus’s argument had been principally forensic: he was using evidence to prove a point and settle a case. The use of book-copies to make historical arguments, i.e. arguments that present a case rather than settling one, dates to the nineteenth century. In making an historical argument, the analysis of an archaeological artifact is an act of recovery. And the recovery in question is a means rather than an end.

Historians of bibliography have given Henry Bradshaw (1831-1886) the distinction of first formally recognizing and making methodologically explicit the connection between the attributes of the object and the text, the conceptual entity underlying and implied by the attributes. In making this connection, Bradshaw was using book-copies to make historical arguments. In other words, his objective was the recovery of the circumstances surrounding the production and transmission of books. His question was simple: how was a codex put together? And how did its structure affect the text it carried? His principles were bluntly empirical:

---

52 On the distinction between forensic and historical evidence, see Barker 2003: 230.  
54 Bradshaw’s objective remained the same in dealing with manuscript and printed books; only his principles altered as was demanded by the medium. See Needham 1988: 10.
“My only point is my method, which I always insist on in anything in bibliography—arrange your facts rigorously and get them plainly before you, and let them speak for themselves, which they will always do.”

Granted, the facts speak less clearly to us than to Bradshaw, in the sense that our field is enlarged by a century’s thinking and research about the status and implication of “facts.” But even today one finds bibliographers and textual scholars marshaling facts in a way that Bradshaw would certainly find amenable. What has changed, what has complicated the picture, is the large and demanding mass of scholarship on the history of the book and book production that has accumulated over the past century. By the twentieth century, the use of evidence had changed.

The practitioners of the "New Bibliography" were textual scholars, and they were concerned with the evidence insofar as it had bearing on critical editions. In other words, their bibliographical objective was different, even if their principles, as applied to printed books, were similar. Like Bradshaw’s, their principles were self-consciously scientific and empirical. But their objective was refined. Bradshaw had picked up a book and asked how it acquired its form; the New Bibliographers picked up a book and wondered what it could tell us about

55 Quoted in Prothero 1888: 349.
56 See Bland 2010: 5: “Perhaps the most basic concept that needs to be borne in mind when studying early books and manuscripts is that repetition reveals process, identity, and expectation; difference describes history.”
the *original* version, the book as intended by the printer.\(^{57}\) Just as classical philology had been since Politian, the New Bibliography was *historical* in its perspective: developments and processes mattered most. And in common with classical philology, New Bibliography sought the authoritative version of a text. The objective was the representation of the authoritative version in either a.) a “bibliographical description” or b.) a critical edition.\(^{58}\) To these ends, the principles of bibliographical inquiry were ancillary. The principles were represented by the two great manuals of the twentieth century: McKerrow (1927) and Gaskell (1972). The objectives were articulated by the two great apologists of the discipline, W.W. Greg and Fredson Bowers. Greg felt that his objective was so broad that his principles could be applied to several fields of inquiry. His was an archaeologist’s method.

“And as it happens to be in the methods of the science that I am at present interested, I regard the distinction between written and printed books as irrelevant. What I am concerned with is a system of investigation and a method of description, and if, with minor modifications it can be

\(^{57}\) New Bibliographers had a term for this: *ideal copy*, which is defined by Bowers 1950: 113-15 and Tanselle 1980: 20-32.

\(^{58}\) a.) a bibliographical description was, to New Bibliographers, the description of an *ideal copy*. Bowers 1950: 6.

b.) the critical edition was (and is) an editorial project. What distinguished the New Bibliographers in this field was the degree to which they relied on bibliographical evidence in producing a critical edition. Bowers 1964: 11-15. Bowers called this department of bibliographical study *textual bibliography*— “the application of the evidence of analytical bibliography... to textual problems.” Bowers 2006 [1952]: 29.
made to apply to clay cylinders or rolls of papyrus as well as to codices of vellum or paper, so much the better.”\textsuperscript{59}

Greg was likewise concerned with the equality of facts. That is, his objective allowed the admission of all facts that might potentially have bearing on the history of an artifact.

“For until all facts relating to every branch of book production have been collected and considered, it is impossible to say what bearing they may have upon the central problem of text-transmission.”\textsuperscript{60}

The inductive method is a constant in mid-century bibliographical research. One need only glance at the contents of Bowers’ 1959 Lyell Lectures:\textsuperscript{61} “The Treatment of Evidence,” “The Interpretation of Evidence: The Demonstrable and the Probable,” “Inductive versus Deductive Reasoning,” “The Three Orders of Certainty,” and the like.

The strain of thought that is ever apparent in the New Bibliography connects evidence with texts—specifically with the establishment of correct texts. But after the middle of the twentieth century, the editing of texts had become only an aspect of a wider-ranging inquiry into the nature of the book. As the

\textsuperscript{59} Greg 1966: 77.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.: 244.
\textsuperscript{61} Published as Bowers (1964).
emphasis shifted from the text per se to the commercial and social effects of printing, historians looked for facts outside the book-copies themselves.
In addition to those aspects of a book that can be assigned to the technology of print, and can be treated as historical facts, interesting in their own right, there is a larger, more general question surrounding the context in which the technology developed. That question is contained in a term: *print culture*.

By the 1970s, the New Bibliography was giving way to a more inclusive, sociological understanding of the book as a mediated artifact. Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, in their *L’apparition du livre* (1958), represented the principal statement of the French-based movement known as *Histoire du Livre*, an academic discipline that combined bibliography with French-style *annales* historiography.62 In the 1960s, D.F. McKenzie's work introduced the meaningful consideration of factors outside the control of the printers, compositors, and proof-readers.63 His was a social historiography. McKenzie saw texts, and the books that contained them, as sociological products, the materiality and meaning of which were made and mediated by converging forces, including printers, booksellers, and readers. By the 1970s, the objectives and principles of the French school combined with McKenzie's social-historical methods forged a new discipline: the *history of the book*, in which bibliographical facts did not speak for themselves. They spoke in concert with myriad sources of equal validity. The

62 So-called from the name of the journal that propagated their thought: *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*.

63 Collected in McKenzie 2002.
result was the concept of the book as a social force, a medium of transformative potential. And this was the subject of Elizabeth Eisenstein’s tremendously influential *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (1979).64

Eisenstein’s thesis was ambitious, and it is of special importance in the following dissertation. Taking the inclusive, social-historical model from McKenzie and the emphasis on social factors and wide implications from the *Histoire du Livre* school, she forged the concept of *print culture*, arguing that the book, and, by synecdoche, all aspects of book production, combined to generate a cultural force.65 There are two concepts at work in this thesis. On the one hand, for Eisenstein the book is, as McKenzie had seen it, a mediated object: its form and function were negotiated by various parties, all with a vested interest in the object. On the other hand, Eisenstein held that the influence of the printed book was centrifugal. Print culture, in her thesis, is the effect of causes latent in the products of the press: *typographic fixity* being chief among them. These causes work outward from the object to generate an identifiable culture. Her thesis incited an entire corpus of scholarly literature on the notion of *print culture*, some supportive, some critical.

64 See also Grafton’s review, “The Importance of Being Printed” (1980b).

65 Eisentein’s thesis had antecedents in the work of Marshall McLuhan and Walter Ong, both of whom had treated the notion of a cultural impact, an effect, of which print was the cause. See in particular, McLuhan (1962) and Ong (1958). Ong had used the terms *chirographic culture* and *typographic culture* to denote the spheres of scribal versus typographical activity. Eisenstein’s coinage seems to have been an attempt to simplify Ong’s language. She herself later reflected on the term: "The term 'print culture' is being employed in so many diverse contexts that it is in danger of becoming a meaningless cliché." (Eisenstein 2002: 88).
On the notion of print culture generally, Johns (1998) challenged Eisenstein’s premise, arguing that print culture works the other way around: it was not the cause, but the result of a perceived shift in communication, and the characteristics of printed books are not static and inherent, but "transitive" and "mediated." McKitterick (2003) responded differently, arguing that very notion of a dichotomy between media (i.e. manuscript and print) is misleading, and that the changes ascribed to the press and its products were absorbed over many more years than is usually assumed. In other words, the period of co-existence was far too long for Eisenstein’s thesis. In the same year, Dane (2003) responded to the concept of book-historical narratives with profound skepticism. He took as his starting point the "opposition between evidence and discourse" and concluded that the quantitative singularity and qualitative uniqueness of book-copies challenges narratives, and that challenging narratives involves the invocation of other narratives: a skeptic’s impasse.

Most recently, McElligott and Patten (2014) have attempted a definition of print culture. They argue that the notion is historiographically useful, since it mitigates against periodization. But print culture is not, they warn, an effect of the presence of printed artifacts in an environment. They suggest that a print culture, as such, is apparent only when a "widely diffused social knowledge" of printing has become apparent in a society (for instance in popular analogies that

68 Dane 2003: 3.
69 Ibid.: 192.
make reference to the printing process), or when printed artifacts are so ubiquitous that there arises an adjacent industry of "non-essential or entirely frivolous items."\textsuperscript{70}

As for the concept of the socially mediated object, responses came from Robert Darnton (1982) and from Thomas Adams and Nicolas Barker (1993). Darnton suggested that the "interdisciplinarity" of book history had "run riot."\textsuperscript{71} To straighten things out, he proposed that the book should be studied as part of a "communications circuit," studying the book as it passes from author to printer, then to shipper, bookseller, and reader.\textsuperscript{72} The reader does not complete the circuit, but renews it, since he or she influences the author prior to publication.\textsuperscript{73} Book history, he claimed, treats each phase of the circuit, and the circuit as a whole.\textsuperscript{74} Adams and Barker attempted to bring Darnton's communication circuit in line with traditional bibliographic thinking. They redesigned the circuit to focus less on the mediators and more on the mediated: the book as a physical object carrying a text. Books, they claimed, passed through the phases of publishing, manufacturing, distribution, reception, and survival (each of which leaves evidence in the object). And taking a cue from the

\textsuperscript{70} Their analogy is to cell-phones: it is not the presence of cell-phones that makes for cell-phone culture, but the fact that a whole industry exists to supply ringtones. (McElligott and Patten 2014: 4-5).

\textsuperscript{71} Darnton 2006 [1982]: 10.

\textsuperscript{72} As noted by Sutherland, the sociological concept of a "circuit" can be traced to Robert Escarpit's 1958 book \textit{Sociologie de la Littérature}. Sutherland 1988: 574.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.: 11.

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid.
social historiography of the Annales School, Adams and Barker located these phases within “zones of influence”: intellectual, political, legal, and religious.\textsuperscript{75}

Needless to say, historians of reading practices have also contributed to the history of the printed book—and therefore to the notion of a culture, or circuit, or zone that embraces and responds to it. Roger Chartier has argued for the constant relation of form to function in the study of reading matter, i.e. texts and the books that bear them. In addition to traditions of reading, dispositions, and cultural constraints, Chartier would have us conclude that,

“forms produce meaning, and that even a fixed text is invested with new meaning and being when the physical form though which it is presented for interpretation changes.”\textsuperscript{76}

Reading practices then become an aspect of bibliography and book history, which, after all, cannot be separated from the uses to which their objects of study are put. In line with Chartier, Grafton (1997 and 1999) and Grafton and Jardine (1986) argue for sophisticated means of mapping the reading practices of scholars via marginalia. Hellinga (2014) would have scholars examine the cultural implications of printed materials, particularly of the fifteenth century, in light of, and inseparable from, the manuscripts that inevitably lie behind them--the copy.

\textsuperscript{75} Adams and Barker 1993: 15-17.

\textsuperscript{76} Chartier 2002 [1989]: 137.
But despite the points of contact and the common object, Darnton’s interdisciplinarity is still run riot. Recent writing has focused on the common ground between disciplines that often find themselves sundered by agendas, vested interests, and academic bureaucracies. G. Thomas Tanselle has made the claim that regardless of theoretical persuasion, method, or aim, scholars of books are perforce historians. Analytical bibliography, for instance, even as practiced by Greg, Bowers, et al., remains a productive field. It produces historical evidence—whether or not that evidence is used to establish a text. To whatever use it may be put, it sets the historical record straight.77

“The example set by most analytical bibliographers thus far, and even direct statements made by several of them, has fostered the notion that analytical bibliography is primarily, or solely, a tool of editing or literary study. The truth is, of course, that any facts uncovered by bibliographical analysis are historical facts, facts of interest in their own right as the data out of which the broader history of printing and publishing is built.”78

And following Chartier, one might even add reading to the list. As David Vander Meulen has argued, German-style cataloging, Anglo-American analytical bibliography, and French *Histoire du Livre* (and even textual criticism and the study of reading practices) share more than they fight over. In each case, it is the

---

77 Tanselle 1998: 46.
78 Ibid. 47.
historical perspective and the assumption of materiality that shapes the means and ends of the study of printed books.

But the cultural effects of the technology of print and the implications of the term *print culture* remain elusive. This dissertation seeks to contribute to the concept of print culture via the contextualization of a particular printed book, the explication of those aspects of the book that can be assigned exclusively to print, and the discernable implications of those aspects on the use and cultural impact of the book. It remains to offer a few words in defense of this line on inquiry in a classics dissertation.
Classicists have long been familiar with the artifactual, evidential value of the singular copy. The copy, as such, has traditionally been a means put to a certain end, namely the establishment of the archetype or the authoritative text. Copies are place-holders in the stemma, and the philologist affiliates them according to errors of transcription. To serve these ends, the ancillary disciplines—papyrology, codicology, paleography in particular—have developed subtle means for investigating their respective objects, all with a view to assigning a copy a place in a textual tradition. But what of printed books? What is their place in the field? The manuals, bibliographies and vade mecums of classical studies have little truck with printed books.

In the practice of classical philology, printed books have been a full step further removed—only ancillary to the ancillaries. Typography, for instance, has, for the classicist, been merely a curiosity, the fossilized afterlife of medieval and

---

79 For the present purposes, the field of classical studies is broadly defined as the study of Greek and Roman antiquity and two of its principal languages, Greek and Latin.

80 For the history of the concept of archetype, see Kenney 1974: 11 Grafton 1977: 166; for authoritative text, see Feld 1978.


82 On the history of papyrology, see Keenan (2009); the origins of what we now call codicology and paleography are covered above.

Renaissance bookhands. In fact, the absence of typography from the field of classical studies is glaring. Proctor and Scholderer, who in quick succession developed typographic historiography, particularly as pertains to printing in Greek, trained in classics.\textsuperscript{84} But for the most part, the history of typography has been written by printers, designers and historians of design and printing. And the study of printed books as artifacts (analytical bibliography) is little touched by classical philologists, given the small import of printed books to the history of most ancient texts.\textsuperscript{85} E.J. Kenney laid the foundation for the study of printed books by classicists, first in his lectures as Sather Professor in 1967-68 and then in a paper given at Kings College, Cambridge in 1977.\textsuperscript{86} Kenney's argument, although of special importance to the intersection of classics and bibliography, was primarily editorial, not bibliographical. His interest was in the editors of incunabular and sixteenth-century editions of classical texts and their editorial procedures.\textsuperscript{87} Anthony Grafton's work on print-shop correcting and editorial methods followed this line of inquiry.\textsuperscript{88}

Fortunately, the enumerative bibliography of classical books in the fifteenth century has been done by Howard Jones.\textsuperscript{89} Although not analytical in his approach to the artifacts, as such, Jones is willing to separate the study of

\textsuperscript{84} Francis 1966: 13-14.

\textsuperscript{85} There are, of course, exceptions that prove the rule. Book X of Pliny’s Epistulae depends largely, though cautiously, on Aldus's 1508 edition, see Kenney 1974: 17 and Reynolds 1983: 320.

\textsuperscript{86} The former was published as Kenney (1974); the latter as Kenney (1979).

\textsuperscript{87} Reconsidered in the final chapter of Jones (2004).

\textsuperscript{88} Grafton (2011).

\textsuperscript{89} Jones (2004); see also Davies (2006).
the text from that of the copy. He is therefore closer to the present inquiry. His appraisal of classical text-making in the fifteenth century is worth quoting in full.

However, whatever judgment is made of the critical value of the earliest printed editions [of classical texts], the work of those who produced them is as much a part of the history of the classical text as the work of the Alexandrian librarians of the third century BC, the copyists of the Carolingian era, the early modern editors of the nineteenth century, or the creators of hypertext versions in the twenty-first.\(^90\)

This line of reasoning came to fruition in July of 2006, when a conference was held at Trinity College, Cambridge with the express purpose of investigating a “neglected genre,” namely the intersection between two fields: the history of the book and classical scholarship.\(^91\) The papers presented were meant to provide a “useful corrective” to classicists’ tendency for taking printed books for granted. Christopher Stray stated the thesis simply.

Books have a history of their own: from conception to writing, from printing to publication to purchase and use. All these aspects of classical

\(^{90}\) Jones 2004: viii.

\(^{91}\) The papers were published by the Institute of Classical Studies, University of London in Stray (2007).
books deserve further exploration, which it is to be hoped this volume will stimulate.\textsuperscript{92}

In line with Stray, Federica Ciccolella (2005\textsuperscript{a} and 2008) presented a study, with a critical edition, of “failed experiments”—the \textit{Donati graeci}, or Greek translations of Donatus’ \textit{Ars minor}.\textsuperscript{93} In her introduction, she clearly states her objective and principles: the understanding of Greek language pedagogical practices via the study of the books used (and not used) to teach the language.

Even a partial analysis of these tools reveals that the return of Greek studies to the West was everything but a straightforward process; its history includes bright triumphs and depressing failures, consent and criticism, acceptance and resistance.\textsuperscript{94}

More recently, the artifactual study of copies has been taken up by Erika Nuti (2012). Nuti proposed a methodological shift, away from studying Renaissance via traditional classical philology and toward the study of significant copies.\textsuperscript{95} She rightfully claims that traditional textual criticism, as practiced on literary

\textsuperscript{92} Stray 2007: 4.
\textsuperscript{93} Ciccolella 2008: XVI.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid. XV. On the “partial analysis;” “So far, scholarship has paid little attention to grammar books, lexica, and dictionaries: in other words, to the tools that made this revival possible, as well as to the methods that teachers followed to impart to their students a knowledge of Greek.” Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Which she defines as “the most ancient copy for each kind of version.” Nuti 2012: 253.
texts, is of limited value in studying schooltexts, given the dynamic, fluid nature of these texts, which are prone to constant revision, by author, teacher, and student. 96 The problem is simply this: traditional philological criteria, such as autograph, antiquity or proximity to the author cannot help the textual historian establish an authorized, superior, or ideal archetype. As Nuti claims, in the case of Chrysoloras’ grammar,

“there is really no version of Erotemata that can rise above the others and serve as the basis for a critical edition of Chrysoloras’ grammar.”97

As an alternative, she proposes the study of “significant copies”, which, she claims, will yield both a broader historical understanding of the author and audience, and an improved picture of the textual transmission of grammatical texts in the intellectual environment of the late fifteenth century. 98

In 2014, Nuti published such a study, and she presented her objective as follows:

[...] di offrire una panoramica quanto più sistematica e problematica possibile sui materiali grammaticali in lingua greca per lo studio del greco circolanti nell’Umanesimo. Obiettivi sono l’individuazione e la descrizione

96 Nuti 2012: 244.
97 Ibid. 253.
98 Ibid. 254-55.
Nuti intends to inform the discussion of Renaissance Hellenism with reference to its substratum—the materials behind the ideology. And she accomplishes the task by identifying and describing significant copies with regards to their similarities and differences (a principle of description shared by this dissertation).

In the field of typography, classical scholars and palaeographers have become ever more aware of the living link between the hand and the punch, and they have been increasingly willing to discuss engraved letter forms as a significant facet of classical scholarship—as an extension of the classical heritage as embodied in letterforms. On April 4th, 2013, Gareth Williams of Columbia University lectured at Johns Hopkins on “Pietro Bembo, Mt. Etna and Revisiting the Classical Past.” Williams argued that the typeface cut for Aldus by Francesco Griffo was a,

visual argument... an attempt not only to forge, but to manipulate Bembo’s link with the classical past.

---

99 Nuti 2014: VIII. Nuti’s Greek books were drawn from manuscript and print collection of the Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino. See also the online cataloging project with which Nuti is involved: greekbooks.it.

100 See below, CHAPTER 3.

101 This argument is quoted with the kind permission of Professor Williams.
These arguments represent the growth of a new field, a field to which this dissertation offers a contribution. Following the nineteenth-century incunabulists, the New Bibliographers, and the book-historians of recent years, the present work will combine a close scrutiny of the book-copy and edition with a broader historiographical argument, ranging from the print-shop to the classroom.

One reason that the artifactual study of printed books—and the associated notion and question of print culture—have been slow to enter departments of classics is that its place remains insecure. Is the study of printed books an aspect of the reception of classics or the classical tradition? They are not, after all, quite the same thing.102 And the printed book, as an object of study, does not always belong clearly—or exclusively—to either reception or tradition. Tradition is conventionally broader in scope than reception, since the latter implies a conscious attempt to engage with the past in a way that the former does not.103 So where does a book, half in Greek and half in Latin, which purports to teach Greek, written by a Byzantine and revised and published by an Italian belong? There is little doubt that the project, as conceived by either Lascaris or Aldus, was an intentional engagement with antiquity. It was, after all, a means to an end. In this sense it belongs to the reception of classics, and it should be so treated. But there are ways in which the book responds to antiquity less consciously or directly. Its Greek letter forms, for instance, represent a

---

102 A useful distinction is drawn by Barrow, Gildenhard, and Silk 2014: 4-5.
103 Ibid. 12-13.
response, but to the classical tradition generally, not to Greek antiquity specifically.

In the following chapters, it will be assumed that the objectives of this dissertation, and its principles of inquiry, are as valid to the history of classical scholarship as they are to the reception of classics or the classical tradition.
CHAPTER 1: THE GREEK LANGUAGE IN WESTERN EUROPE

A general history of classical scholarship is an account of successive generations’ attempts to recover, preserve, and understand certain texts in the classical languages—contrahere, emendare, annotare, as Suetonius said of Probos.¹⁰⁴ A specific history of classical scholarship is an account of a particular generation’s attempts to do the same, whether in general or with a certain aspect of the classical past. Although many generations since the end of antiquity have played their respective roles, and in various combinations have recovered, preserved, and understood different aspects of the classical heritage, few generations have received more rigorous attention in this respect than the Italian Renaissance. The reasons are manifold, but one is especially evident: the recovery of the Greek language in Western Europe. But what precisely does one mean by the recovery of the Greek language in Western Europe?

The recovery in question was a gradual restoration of the systematic, grammatical understanding of the ancient Greek language, underscored by an ideology or set of related ideologies, institutionally sponsored, and supported by teachers and texts that facilitated language acquisition.¹⁰⁵ Although still a “dream-world” to Petrarch,¹⁰⁶ by the start of the Cinquecento, there was a market for books printed entirely in Greek with texts unencumbered by

¹⁰⁴ *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* 24.
¹⁰⁶ So called by Pfeiffer 1976: 13.
commentary or translation.\textsuperscript{107} Between these two points, events had conspired to truly recover the Greek language. Byzantine teachers had arrived from the East, bringing with them grammatical texts and a teaching tradition;\textsuperscript{108} adherents of the \textit{studia humanitatis} promoted Greek as an ancillary to their studies of Latin authors;\textsuperscript{109} and chairs in Greek were established at schools and universities.\textsuperscript{110} There seems little reason to doubt Burckhardt, who claimed:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Das Studium des Griechischen unter den Italienern selbst erscheint, wenn man die Zeit um 1500 zum Maßstab nimmt, gewaltig schwunghaft.}\textsuperscript{111}
\end{quote}

[The study of Greek among the Italians appears, if the year 1500 is the standard, to have been pursued with great enthusiasm.]

Indeed, a \textit{translatio studii} had occurred, a sea-change of lasting importance to humanistic education in the West: the ascendancy of Greek-language studies as

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{107} The market may not have been booming, but it was nonetheless there, and it had grown considerably since the advent of print. Nuovo 2013: 72-3; Celenza 2009: 160; Lowry: 109-16; Hirsch 1974: 70-2.
\bibitem{110} Pontani 2010: 406; Ciccolella 2008: 99.
\bibitem{111} Burckhardt 1920: 111.
\end{thebibliography}
an aspect of the *studia humanitatis*.\footnote{Berschin 1988: 4. For the impact of Greek on the development of the humanities per se, see Turner 2014: 40-50.} But where had Greek gone that it had to await such a revival?

The following overview of the history of Greek-language study is neither exhaustive nor specific. It is meant to introduce the intellectual, social, and economic antecedents to the world of Italian Renaissance Hellenism generally, and Lascaris, Aldus, and the *Aldine Lascaris* specifically.\footnote{On the term *Italian Renaissance Hellenism*, see below, CHAPTER 2.} The overview begins in Rome, where the ancient Greek language was alive; it proceeds to Late Antiquity, where the status of ancient Greek was a fossil; in the Latin West, during the Middle Ages, Greek was a memory, Walter Berschin’s “dotted line;”\footnote{Berschin 1988: 3-4.} and in the Italian Renaissance, it was an object of curiosity, recovery, and aspiration. At every step in this overview, it should be kept constantly in mind that the subject is Greek—specifically the literary language of Antiquity—studied as a foreign language, not Greek literature broadly.\footnote{General treatments of the history of classical scholarship, a subject that includes the study of Greek as a foreign language, are Sandys (2011 [originally 1906-8, revised 1920]) and Pfeiffer (1976). Full treatments of the history of Greek-language study in Western Europe are Berschin (1988), Weiss (1977), Ciccolella (2005a), (2008), and (2010). Time- or place-specific treatments include Pertusi (1964), Dionisotti (1988a&amp;b), Wilson (1992), Cortesi (1995), McEvoy (1998), Monfasani (2004), Celenza (2009), and Nuti (2012 and 2014).}

Each stage in this overview requires a leap of the historical imagination. The Greek language has not enjoyed a static existence in the West—or even, for that matter, in the East. And it can be difficult to capture the anxiety of
Boethius, the enormity of Grossetteste’s task, or the earnest aspirations of Petrarch. Compared with much that came before, ours is an age of easy access to secure information. Therefore it must be remembered, throughout what follows, that our predecessors faced very real fears for the loss of literacy, and they attempted tasks of recovery that must, at times, have seemed truly insurmountable.

The following survey is divided into three time periods, each of which prefaces the Italian Renaissance in its own way. The true bilingualism of Roman antiquity—specifically the second century BCE to the end of the first century CE—inspired the educational and stylistic reforms of the Quattrocento. The shifting intellectual movements of Late Antiquity saw the gradual loss of classical bilingualism and the fossilizing of an educational program bequeathed to the Middle Ages in the West. And the Latin Middle Ages saw an occasional interest in, yet never a mastery over (or true place for), the Greek language. Nevertheless, two periods of intense interest in Greek deserve special attention. The first is the revival of learning at the court of Charlemagne; the second is the thirteenth-century Greek studies of Robert Grosseteste and his student, the *doctor mirabilis*, Roger Bacon. The Carolingian revival of interest in Greek was based on educational reform and the recovery of classical learning; the thirteenth-century Oxford revival was driven by biblical and Aristotelian exegesis. Both factors remained latent in European intellectual history, and both, in their way, prefigured the revival of Greek studies in fifteenth-century Italy. The fifteenth century added to these factors access to the continuity of
Greek culture in southern Italy, the disintegration of the Byzantine world, and the institutional, civic support for an intellectual movement that included Greek.

[1.1] **Ancient Rome**

Ancient Roman society had been multilingual.\(^{116}\) Certainly for the upper classes, and likely also for the lower, Greek was part of the school curriculum and tutorial, as well as a common language of literate life.\(^{117}\) Grammar, meaning the formalized study of language directed toward a particular end, was introduced to Rome by Crates of Mallos in the second century.\(^{118}\) But even before that, in the age of Ennius, the “semigraeci” gave instruction in both languages.\(^{119}\) After the arrival of Crates, the term *grammaticus* seems to have replaced the Latin equivalent, *litteratus*, but was distinct from *eruditus* and implied knowledge of grammar in the Greek sense.\(^{120}\) The terminology is important, since it returns, with great effect, in the fifteenth century.\(^{121}\) And four terms are worth distinguishing: *litteratus*, *litterator*, *grammaticus*, and *grammatista*.

---

\(^{116}\) Although in different ways at different times. See Dickey 2012: 4; Ciccolella 2002: 77-8; Blumenthal and Kehane 1979: 183; Bonner 1977: 45. The full study of Roman multilingualism is Adams 2002; see especially pp. 107-9.


\(^{118}\) Suetonius, *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (*DGR*) 2. Suetonius mentions treatises circulating in Rome before the arrival of Crates and under the name of Ennius—a *De litteris syllabisque* and a *De metris*—but, he says, these were likely not by *the* Ennius. Ibid. 1.

\(^{119}\) Ibid.

\(^{120}\) Ibid. 4.

\(^{121}\) Black 2001: 30-32.
Writing in the second century CE, Suetonius claimed that there are those who (Sunt qui) say that a litteratus is to a grammaticus as a litterator is to a grammatista.\textsuperscript{122} The litteratus was the Roman equivalent of the Greek grammaticus (γραμματικός), i.e. one who knows his letters or “occupies himself with literary texts.”\textsuperscript{123} He was therefore equipped to teach them, but not necessarily from scratch. The grammaticus was the middle school teacher, instructing students who had learned their rudiments and were ready to study grammar, i.e. study language formally before proceeding to the rhetor. The litterator, on the other hand, was the translation of the Greek γραμματιστής—he was the primus magister, the most elementary of teachers.\textsuperscript{124} He represented the first rung on the Roman educational ladder. And, as his title implies, he taught the letters to the abecedarii—the small boys, who learned letters first, then syllables, then words.\textsuperscript{125}

But when and how did well-to-do Roman children learn Greek?\textsuperscript{126} During the first centuries BCE and CE, the time for which there is most evidence, Roman children learned Greek at home, directly, and as a contemporary, spoken language. The objective was twofold. On the one hand, among Romans, knowledge of Greek represented status; on the other hand, the language was an

\textsuperscript{122} DGR 4.
\textsuperscript{123} LSJ, s.v. γραμματικός.
\textsuperscript{124} Marrou 1956: 265.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid. 269-70.
\textsuperscript{126} It is, after all, well-to-do children for whom one has evidence. It stands to reason that children from lower strata likewise learned Greek, and one can speculate on the urban environment and influx of eastern immigrants to Rome after the third century CE. But the evidence is limited. See Dionisotti 1988a: 25-30.
educational means. The Romans were “the first to use a foreign language systematically to increase their mastery over their own.”¹²⁷ To these ends, Roman aristocratic households often employed Greek servants—or kept Greek slaves—as governesses and guides to young children. Much like Montaigne in the sixteenth century, surrounded by Latin-speaking servants, Roman boys were cared for by Greeks. They therefore learned Greek naturally, by exposure, before ever studying the language grammatically. So, like Montaigne, Roman boys often had a foreign language before their vernacular.¹²⁸ We gather as much from Quintilian, who advised against the common practice of having boys speak only Greek in their early years, lest they grow up with a Greek accent!¹²⁹ When boys began school, they learned Latin and Greek in tandem, sometimes taught by the same litterator then litteratus.¹³⁰ Some schools or families employed separate grammatici Graeci and Latini.¹³¹ Young men of means frequently traveled to Greece to complete their Greek education.¹³²

It is important to note that Greek was, for the Romans, a lingua franca, and the mark of an educated man. In both senses, the Roman integration of Greek within the educational system was the archetype for European classicism in following centuries—Greek was the goal of education; Greek literature was the highest attainment; and Greek modes of thinking, writing, and speaking

¹²⁷ Marrou 1956: 255.
¹²⁸ Ibid. 262.
¹²⁹ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 1.1.13; Marrou 1956: 262.
¹³⁰ Marrou 1956: 263.
¹³¹ Ibid.
¹³² Hankins 2003: 274-75.
were examples for imitation. In this sense, Cicero is the high water mark of Roman Hellenism. But this does not imply a purely bookish, academic tradition, fossilized and confined to the classroom. As noted above, Greek, in antiquity, was a living language, and it was taught as one: not primarily from texts, but from verbal instruction. This phenomenon has left its mark on the material record. The word-lists and manuals of the ancient world betray textual traditions: both laterally, within antiquity, and vertically, with their medieval apographs. And a relative abundance of word-lists and conversation manuals survived to Carolingian times, but very few formalized, analytical grammar-texts. The Roman study of Greek was therefore not necessarily grammatical knowledge of the language (of the kind we now consider characteristic of classical language study); rather, Greek in the Roman schools is analogous to Spanish in the American: students started young, learned a great deal from casual contact, and developed conversational fluency that did not imply grammatical understanding. Knowledge of the language was nevertheless an essential aspect of ancient Mediterranean life, and a sign of status and intellectual attainment. Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, father of the brothers Gracchi,

---

133 Marrou 1956: 255.
136 Adams (2002) uses the term code-switching to describe the infusion of foreign languages common even in Republican Rome.
addressed the Rhodians in Greek in 164 BCE;\textsuperscript{138} Cato the Elder resisted the influence of the Greek language on Latin;\textsuperscript{139} Cicero was able to deride Verres for not knowing Greek sufficiently;\textsuperscript{140} Augustus wished he had known it better;\textsuperscript{141} Statius boasted of his father’s achievements.\textsuperscript{142}

In material terms, Roman students learned Greek from bilingual glossaries, classified word-lists, grammatical manuals and texts with running translations, all presumably written on wax, wood, ostraca, or papyrus.\textsuperscript{143} Of the latter, some examples, which come to us almost exclusively from Hellenistic Egypt, not from Rome itself, attest to the fluid nature of the instructional and reference media. If these papyri are any indication of the materials used in Rome for instruction in Greek, one can assume the very sporadic, dynamic nature of the texts they contain. The glossaries were copied, both one from another and from dictation in the schoolroom. They were not given to simple transcription; rather, they seem to have been readily adapted, indicating their context by their

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{138}{Cicero, \textit{Brutus} 79: \textit{Erat isdem temporibus Ti. Gracchus P. f., qui bis consul et censor fuit, cuius est oratio Graeca apud Rhodios}.}
\footnotetext{139}{But he learned Greek, so the story goes, in old age. Cicero, \textit{De senectute} 26: \textit{Quid qui etiam addiscunt aliiquid? ut et Solonem versibus gloriantem videmus, qui se cotidie aliiquid addiscentem dicit senem fieri, et ego feci qui litteras Graecas senex didici; quas quidem sic avide arripui quasi diuturnam sitim explere cupiens, ut ea ipsa mihi nota essent quibus me nunc exemplis uti videtis. Quod cum fecisse Socratem in fidibus audirem, vellem equidem etiam illud (discebant enim fidibus antiqui), sed in litteris certe elaboravi}.}
\footnotetext{140}{Cicero, \textit{In Verrem} 4.127.}
\footnotetext{141}{Suetonius, \textit{Divus Augustus} 89.1.}
\footnotetext{142}{McNelis 2002: passim.}
\footnotetext{143}{Dickey 2012: 11-15; Kramer 2001: 1-31. For full treatments of grammatical papyri, see Wouters (1979) and Weems (1981). The questions and possibilities arising from ancient documentary evidence will be treated at length in chapter 3 below.}
\end{footnotes}
vocabulary or relevance to specific texts or situations. Moreover, since most students came to school with Greek in their ears, they could progress reasonably well from the word-lists to the monolingual grammars of the ancient world, namely Dionysius Thrax and Herodian. They had little need for propaedeutic texts with explanation and illustration in their native language. It is for this reason that precious little evidence of foreign language learning survives in the material record: it is less than straightforward to distinguish a glossary or grammar used by a Roman to learn Greek from those used by a Greek studying his own language. For material evidence of a curriculum per se, one has to wait for an age that learned Greek exclusively from books.

But if the study of Greek as a foreign language were so naturally strong in the Roman world, so much a second lingua franca, when exactly did it decline, and for what reason? Already in the first century CE, Pliny’s Greek is considerably more mannered than Cicero’s, more an imitation of Cicero—a literary trope—than a natural mode of expression. Perhaps Greek declined in Rome because Hellenism hardened into a mannerism, an affectation that was not natural or vibrant enough to survive. Perhaps the knowledge of Greek became increasingly unnecessary. As Rome expanded and the Latin language spread, Romans may have deemed their own language sufficiently cosmopolitan for commercial needs. And certainly Roman literature had arrived by the first

---

144 This is the problem in determining the origin(s) of the extant phrasebooks. Dickey 2012: 50-55.
145 Marrou 1956: 260: “But the resemblance [of Pliny’s Hellenism to Cicero’s] is so perfect that it becomes slightly suspicious, and one begins to wonder whether there is not a trace of affectation in Pliny and his friends.”
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century CE. For the needs of many Romans, Cicero was sufficient, and they did not require recourse to his Greek models. But this is speculation. The causes of the decline of Roman Hellenism and the study of Greek are manifold and obscure. But their effect is palpable. By the second century CE, knowledge of Greek was changing in kind and quality.

[1.2] Late Antiquity

Greek learning remained part of the educational system in Late Antiquity, which extends from the second to the eighth centuries CE.\textsuperscript{146} carried partly by the sheer momentum of the educational establishment and partly by the developing Christian culture, which, even after the appearance of the Vetus Latina and Vulgata, continued to acknowledge its Greek-language antecedents.\textsuperscript{147}

In the early second century, Juvenal acknowledged the still-strong presence of Greek-Latin bilingualism among the elite.

\begin{quote}
\textit{quaedam parua quidem, sed non toleranda maritis.}

\textit{nam quid rancidius quam quod se non putat ulla}

\textit{formosam nisi quae de Tusca Graecula facta est,}

\textit{de Sulmonensi mera Cecropis? omnia Graece:}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{146} A period, following Peter Brown (1971), which extends from the second to the eighth centuries CE.

\textsuperscript{147} Which was pulling apart as it developed. Reynolds and Wilson 2013: 37-39 and Berschin 1988: 19-26.

\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., and 48-51; Weiss 1977: 3-4.
cum sit turpe magis nostris nescire Latine.

[These are indeed small things, but they ought not to be tolerated by husbands. For what is more offensive than a girl who does not think herself beautiful unless she is changed from a Tuscan to a little Greek, from a maiden of Sulmo to one of Athens? Everything is in Greek. Although it is worse for us not to know Latin.]

Juvenal’s scorn for these upper-crust women makes it clear that Greek was as yet a living language in the early second century. But there is more than a trace of reaction—a reaction not dissimilar to Cato’s against the Hellenists of the second century BCE. One gathers, yet again, that Roman Hellenism was permissible as a supplement to Roman culture, not as a replacement. In other words, the exchange between Latin and Greek, between the native language and the foreign, was no more equal after Cicero than it had been before.

The study of Greek as a foreign language reached a conspicuous and perhaps exceptional high point in the Σὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν, or Meditations, of Marcus Aurelius. Indeed, the Greek culture of Hadrian and the Antonines is well known. But it can hardly be considered indicative of the status of the Greek language in Rome generally. And one must set Marcus’s achievement against the wider climate of Roman Hellenism depicted by Juvenal. But conversely, in support of a more wide-spread, living Hellenism, one notes that in the second

---

and third centuries CE, Tertullian and Apuleius lived in a still-bilingual Africa, where knowledge of Greek, though classicizing, remained natural. Even in Gaul during the third century CE, boys were learning Greek alongside Latin.\footnote{Morgan 1998: 29-30.}

But knowledge of Greek, and likewise the teaching of Greek, changed gradually in Late Antiquity, and it changed in such a way that the notion of a Greco-Latin identity, as such, was diminished.\footnote{Dickey concluded that the \textit{colloquia} of the \textit{Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana} were composed—or assumed their final shape—partly in the West, partly in the East, between the second and fourth centuries. Dickey 2012: 51-52. See also Ciccolella (2005b). For the notion of a gap created by the loss of a Greco-Latin identity, see Cavallo 1990: 48.} For instance, in the fourth century, Augustine of Hippo had to ask,

\begin{quote}
\textit{quid autem erat causae cur graecas litteras oderam, quibus puerulus imbuebar?}\footnote{Confessiones 1.13.20.}
\end{quote}

[Why did I hate the Greek letters in which I was steeped as a boy?]

Why indeed? Augustine’s was a formalized study, different in kind and quality from Cicero’s. He learned Greek from books, not from immersion, and he was not thrilled with the process. When he was made to read Homer, Augustine tells us,

\begin{quote}
\textit{nulla enim verba illa noveram, et saevis terroribus ac poenis ut nossem instabatur mihi vehementer.}\footnote{Confessiones 1.14.23.}
\end{quote}

[I did not know any of the words, and so that I would know them, I was vehemently threatened with fear and punishments.]
And this he contrasts with Latin, which he learned,

*non a docentibus sed a loquentibus*.\(^{154}\)

[Not from those teaching [me], but from those speaking [with me].]

Augustine’s world was undergoing two changes of great significance to the history of Greek-language study. First, the papyrus roll was giving way to the codex, a change that no doubt affected the availability and nature of foreign language schooltexts; second, the school curricula were ossifying.\(^{155}\) In other words, the curriculum that would be passed to the Middle Ages, which included only the notion of Greek, not the necessity or systematic inclusion of Greek, was already taking shape in Augustine’s time.\(^{156}\) The problem in accurately describing the nature of Greek as a foreign language during Late Antiquity in the West is a lack of documentary evidence. Given the sub-literary and ephemeral character of grammatical and lexical texts, very few codices survive from antiquity. Our knowledge of fourth-and fifth-century Greek-language learning is therefore wanting, since it depends almost exclusively on literary evidence.

---

\(^{154}\) Ibid.

\(^{155}\) Reynolds and Wilson 2013: 32-39. It was Augustine, together with Donatus, Priscian, Servius and Martianus Capella who bequeathed to the Middle Ages the fossils of ancient education.

\(^{156}\) That Greek was fundamentally a notion, and not a necessity, can be inferred from a.) the increased dependence on translations of Greek texts in Late Antiquity and b.) the increase in the number of intellectuals able to avoid fluency in Greek. See Ciccolella 2008: 84.
To the end of the Roman Empire in the West, Greek remained present, but decreasingly so, and in an ever more classicizing, fossilized way. Boethius certainly knew Greek, and he knew it well. But his and Cassiodorus’ anxiety over the loss of Greek knowledge indicates a popular decline in Greek-language instruction, a decline that was very likely along the lines of the North African change in the nature of Greek instruction endured impatiently by Augustine.\textsuperscript{157} The fact is that Greek learning was a luxury that the periphery of the Roman world could not afford.\textsuperscript{158} By the end of Late Antiquity, the world of Greek-language studies had shrunk considerably.

\textbf{[1.3] The Latin Middle Ages}

Greek slipped from the West after the age of Boethius, Symmachus, Priscian, and Cassiodorus.\textsuperscript{159} But it would be a mistake to think the Middle Ages Greek-less. Certainly there was less Greek, and what Greek there was remained scattered and limited in scope. But it is important to note that Greek was never entirely extinct; nor was it forgotten. And when conditions permitted, the language was revived, sometimes quixotically, sometimes with a view to

\textsuperscript{157} Reynolds and Wilson 2013: 82; Ciccolella 2008: 83.

\textsuperscript{158} Hankins 2003: 275.

\textsuperscript{159} Reynolds and Wilson 2013: 80-81; Ciccolella 2010: 577-78; Wilson 1992: 1; Berschin 1988: 73-86. Dionisotti (1988:a: 29) believes Greek may have given way because the Romans had never fully developed a system for learning it as a foreign language from books, i.e. they learned it as we learn a modern foreign language.
systemized knowledge. This section, then, is the story of attempts, false starts, and periods of short-lived but important successes.

In the seventh century CE, Isidore of Seville called Greek one of the *tres linguae sacrae*;\(^{160}\) and in the manner of the ancients, he incorporated Greek words, in Greek characters, into continuous Latin prose.\(^{161}\) Isidore’s knowledge of Greek is derived primarily from Roman sources and is not first-hand. But his assertion that Greek was a sacred language was important. Given the status of his text in medieval schools, his comment on Greek condition medieval Christians to accept Greek as a desideratum. By Bede’s time, in the eighth century, Latin had become a thoroughly foreign language, and knowledge of Greek had become purely lexical, limited to whatever understanding could be gleaned from bilingual bibles, word-lists, and Latin grammars.\(^{162}\) When Charlemagne sponsored a revival of learning on the continent, interest in Greek expanded, as did contact with Greeks.\(^{163}\) According to his biographer Einhard,

---

\(^{160}\) *Etymologiarum sive originum libri* XX: 9.1.3: *Tres sunt autem linguae sacrae: Hebraea, Graeca, Latina, quae toto orbe maxime excellunt. His enim tribus linguis super crucem Domini a Pilato fuit causa eius scripta.*

\(^{161}\) Berschin 1988: 92-3; but cf. Bischoff (1976), who presents a picture of increasingly corrupted letter forms in the manuscript tradition as the Greek characters were made Latin.\(^{162}\) Ciccolella 2008: 88; Weiss 1977: 12.

\(^{163}\) Including a few proposed marriages: the somewhat obscure engagement of Charlemagne and Irene, the near-marriage of his daughter Rotrude to her son Constantine VI and again, in the 10th century, the betrothal of Hedwig, Otho I’s daughter, to a Byzantine prince. These stories are suspect in their particulars, but probably true generally. All three cases led to an interest in Greek. Rotrude and Hedwig learned the language, and some schools may have incorporated Greek at some level. See Sandys 2011: 478, 506-7.
the great man was capable in Greek, although he could not pronounce it.\textsuperscript{164} Paul the Deacon taught Greek at Charlemagne’s court,\textsuperscript{165} and he showed his proficiency in Greek to particular effect in his famous summary of Festus’s epitome of Flaccus. In the middle of the ninth century, John Scottus, \textit{vir ille barbarus in finibus mundi positus},\textsuperscript{166} translated at least one Greek text \textit{ad litteram}, the \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum} of Pseudo-Dionysius.\textsuperscript{167} Also in the ninth century, one of Alcuin’s most prominent students, Rabanus Maurus, is said to have known Greek. But Rabanus’s student, Servatus Lupus, does not seem to have known the language, beyond the fact that the combination \textit{p} and \textit{h} linked Latin words to Greek antecedents.\textsuperscript{168}

For Greek, Charlemagne’s revival was not a renaissance, and neither Paul’s nor John’s ability with the language, whatever it was, had lasting effect.\textsuperscript{169} But it was a peak in interest, motivated both by an earnest desire to capture the Greek world behind Latin literature and by the need to discover theological truths behind (or under) Latin Christendom.\textsuperscript{170}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{164} Einhard. \textit{Vita Caroli}: 25: \textit{Nec patrio tantum sermone contentus, etiam peregrinis linguis ediscendis operam impendit. In quibus Latinam ita didicit, ut aequa illa ac patria lingua orare sit solitus, Grecam vero melius intellegere quam pronunciare poterat.}
\textsuperscript{165} Sandys 2011: 472.
\textsuperscript{166} Anastasius Bibliothecarius to Charles the Bald, in the edition of Ussher, J. 1632. \textit{Veterum Epistolarum Hibernicarum Sylloge}. Dublin: Societatis Bibliopolarum.
\textsuperscript{168} Sandys 2011: 484.
\textsuperscript{169} Reynolds and Wilson 2013: 120; Dionisotti 1988a: 33.
\textsuperscript{170} Witt 2012: 76.
\end{flushright}
Again, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, sporadic contact with eastern and south-Italian Greeks made an impact, albeit small, on the educational programs of Western Europe.\textsuperscript{171} Occasional Greek learning can be found in the twelfth century, the great age of scholastic philosophy, but nothing that implies an institutionalized, systematic study of the language.\textsuperscript{172}

There were great strides in the thirteenth century, in particular the Greek studies of Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon. Grosseteste, driven primarily by the demands of biblical exegesis, and aided by access to Constantinople granted by the Latin invasion of 1204, took up Greek in or around the 1230s.\textsuperscript{173} His Greek studies have been covered in detail.\textsuperscript{174} Let it suffice to say that Grosseteste’s achievement as a student and translator of Greek offered an example, albeit one that found few imitators. He did in fact show that Greek could be convincingly learned from books and teachers, even by

\textsuperscript{171} Sandys 2011: 502-523; see especially 520-21. For the Greek learning of Liudprando of Cremona, see Witt 2012: 89 and Koder (1980).
\textsuperscript{172} Sandys 2011: 555-557.
\textsuperscript{173} Grosseteste was influenced and/or aided in his attempts by 1.) William of Moerbeke, Latin Archbishop of Corinth, who had learned Greek and begun his translations of Aristotle in the first half of the thirteenth century, 2.) John of Basingstoke, Archdeacon of Leicester, who brought Greek—and Greek books—back to England from his stay in Athens. and 3.) a man named Nicholas Graecus. The last was a Greek clerk and member of Grosseteste’s staff. Bacon says of him that he was Greek “natione et conversatione,” and that he was of the “paucissimi qui sciunt docere grammaticam veraciter.” Noland and Hirsch 1902: liv-lv.
\textsuperscript{174} Dionisotti (1988\textsuperscript{b}) and McEvoy (1998). The former offers a reconstruction of Grosseteste’s library.
a Western European. And he did not simply learn Greek words, but continuous, literary prose. As Dionisotti put it, “his own venture was extraordinary.”

Grosseteste’s student, Roger Bacon, attempted to place Greek on firmer ground with a grammar, the first written by a Western European. Bacon’s grammar is a brilliant, if somewhat mysterious, text. And it is of special importance to the present inquiry, given its status as, perhaps, the first attempt to systematically grasp the Greek language and present it in a text designed for teaching and learning by Latin-speaking students. Even if Bacon’s text did not circulate widely, his work prefigured the revival of interest in Greek studies by western Europeans, and in many ways represented the earnest desire to restore a grammatical knowledge of Greek to the curriculum that marked the early Quattrocento.

---

175 Dionisotti 1988b: 34.
177 See the introduction and description of manuscripts in Nolan and Hirsch (1902).
179 Ibid. 96.
180 Bacon’s grammar “represents a significant symptom of a systematic interest in the study of Greek three centuries after the *Scotti peregrini* and one century before Humanism.” (Ciccolella 2008: 96).
By the fourteenth century, the desire to grasp once and for all the Greek world behind Latin literature had arisen, first in the person of Petrarch, subsequently in his followers.\textsuperscript{182} In 1354, when Petrarch was fifty years old and living in Milan, he received a copy of Homer's \textit{Iliad} from Nicholas Sygerus, a Byzantine diplomat and general.\textsuperscript{183} Petrarch wrote Sygerus a letter of thanks, which is happily preserved in his collected correspondence.\textsuperscript{184} After listing famous gifts and givers of old, Petrarch comes to the Homer:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Quid enim vir ingeniosissimus atque eloquentissimus nisi ipsum ingenii et eloquentiae fontem daret? Donasti Homerum quem bene divinae omnis inventionis fontem et originem vocant Ambrosius et Macrobius.}
\end{quote}

[For what would a most intellectual and articulate man give besides that very font of genius and eloquence? You have given Homer, whom Ambrose and Macrobius rightly call the font and origin of every divine invention.]

Moreover, Petrarch goes on to claim,

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{181} On the terms \textit{Renaissance} and \textit{humanism}, see \textit{Section 1.5} below.
\textsuperscript{183} Ibid. The manuscript of Homer in question is now MS Milan, Ambros.Gr.198.
\textsuperscript{184} \textit{Epistolae de rebus familiaribus} 2.18, ed. by Joseph Fracasetti, Florence (1859).
\end{flushright}
Donasti eum non in alienum sermonem violento alveo derivatum, sed ex ipsis graeci eloquii scatebris purum et incorruptum, et quails primum divino illi profluxit ingenio.

[You have given him [Homer] not drawn off into another language by a violent channel, but pure and uncorrupted, from the springs of Greek eloquence itself.]

But, famously, Petrarch’s copy of Homer was mute to him.¹⁸⁵ As he laments to Sygerus, he had learned too little from the Calabrian monk Barlaam, and Sygerus was himself not present to help Petrarch. Thus Petrarch’s grasp was tenuous, and it was left to the next generation to secure the place of Greek in the West.

But Petrarch did inspire followers, and his followers made headway. Chief among them was Giovanni Boccaccio, whose Hellenism, whatever its own merits, was tremendously important for the establishment of Greek in Florence. Boccaccio, wanting to learn Greek, invited a student of his master’s teacher, Leonzio Pilato, a student of Barlaam.¹⁸⁶ On arrangements made by Boccaccio, Pilato set up as a teacher of Greek in Florence. The position did not last more than three years, and its impact on the place of Greek in the developing studia

¹⁸⁵ Petrarch in a letter to Nicholas Sygerus, Epistolae de rebus familiaribus 2.18, ed. by Joseph Fracasetti, Florence (1859).
¹⁸⁶ On Pilato’s career, see Ciccolella 2008: 98 and Pertusi 1964: 475.
was not as yet substantial. But Boccaccio’s idea for the establishment of a Florentine chair in Greek was important, and its effect was lasting.

Coluccio Salutati, Chancellor of Florence from 1375-1406 and devotee of the *studia humanitatis*, made good his desire to put the Greek language on firm ground. He invited a Byzantine scholar, Manuel Chrysoloras, to teach Greek in Florence. Chrysoloras did not linger, but his teaching had two lasting effects. On the one hand, he induced talented scholars to bring Greek literature to the West via translation *ad sensum*; on the other hand, he wrote a grammar that, by simplifying the Byzantine tradition, facilitated the learning of Greek by Westerners. Therefore the focus of Greek-language studies in the Italian Renaissance has lain between Chrysoloras’ foothold in the late fourteenth century and the grammatical and lexical work of Cleynaerts and Budé in the middle of the sixteenth, which, as Botley rightly points out, define Greek studies in Europe for the century after 1530.

The progress of Greek-language studies in the West is of interest to scholars in many fields for many reasons. The subject touches social history, linguistics, and Renaissance prosopography; it informs our knowledge of classical and biblical textual criticism, the history of the book, and the history of

---

187 Celenza 2009: 152.
188 Ibid. and Witt 2000: 292-337.
192 Botley 2010: xii.
education. But the study of Greek-language learning in Western Europe has remained, and should remain, a distinct field of inquiry, informing and informed by the many related aspects of classical and Renaissance studies. Moreover, scholars in this field should conduct evidence-based research and endeavor to present their results in a demonstrable manner. The study of Greek-language learning is, after all, a sort of archaeology, since our conclusions will always depend on what clues we can glean from the evidence, and the evidence will be the tools of the trade per se—the grammars, lexica, and glosses that were used to study the language.193 By retaining the field's relative autonomy and by keeping close to the evidence (in this case the grammatical texts, as they are manifest in manuscript and printed editions), scholars of Greek-language learning will be better able to articulate the historical significance of the return of Greek to Western education, the place of Greek in the studia humanitatis, the proficiency of the students of Greek, both expected and realized, and the impact of Greek on printing and the book trade.

It is, of course, rarely easy to distinguish grammatical from non-grammatical, or school-based from non school-based texts in the extant documents. As Sarah Weems put it, “not all grammatical papyri are school texts and exercises, of course, and only a small proportion of extant school papyri contain grammatical material.”194 And even since Weems in the early 1980s, the historiography of ancient language acquisition has “witnessed a tremendous

193 Ciccolella 2008: xv.
increase of its documentary base." Since language-learning texts are ambiguous—in authorship, transmission, and literary status—the increase in material evidence has meant the loss of a simple dichotomy between the literary and sub-literary in the papyrological record. Instead, students of ancient language learning have had to reexamine the very typology of their discipline. As one might expect, questions have revolved around the production, use, and mediation of the objects themselves.

And of special importance to the present dissertation is the place of these objects in their environment. The environment in questions is, of course, the so-called *studia humanitatis*, a movement of stylistic reform within the sphere of Latin education. What, then, was the place of Greek? Before positing an answer, let us review the historiography of Italian Renaissance education and define some necessary terms, in particular *Renaissance* and *studia humanitatis*.

---

195 Wouters and Swiggers 2011: 313.
The place of ancient Greek in the academy, at any point in its history, is neither unique in its characteristics nor obvious in its origins, and its history should not be taken for granted. Greek-language study is not unique because it has in common with other ancient languages a process of loss and rediscovery; it is not of obvious origin because it is not the cause, but the effect of the periodically intense study of classical antiquity. The current state of academic Hellenism is both effected and affected by its own history, a history extending at least to the Roman Hellenists of the 3rd century BC, and, in the interim, filtered through a great deal of time and space. Therefore, in the case of Greek-language studies, the historian’s purpose is an understanding of the status quo at any given point on the continuum. Where was Greek studied? How? And by whom? But how exactly does the historian recover the prevailing attitudes, practices, successes and failures of any given time and place? And how does this information enhance our understanding of the history of Greek language studies?

The revival of Greek studies in fifteenth-century Italy is a facet of the history of education. As such, it is inseparable from the terms *renaissance* and *humanism*, both of which persistently surround the rediscovery and interpretation of classical languages and texts and both of which require special

---

196 Scullard 2004: 10; Conte 1994: 89-90.
The terms *rennaissance* and *humanism* have various significance in the history of education. Historians of Europe refer, for instance, to a Carolingian Renaissance, an Ottonian Renaissance, and a Twelfth-Century Renaissance. Nevertheless, in the present dissertation, the term *Renaissance* (with a capital *r*) will be used to refer to the period between the years 1400 and 1600 in Italy; the term *humanism* will be used to describe a specific sphere of activity in which scholars prior to, during, and after the Italian Renaissance operated. A *humanist* will be broadly understood to have been a practitioner of

198 Witt 2012: 26-31; Trompf 1973: 3-26 passim.
199 Ibid. 71-83.
201 Following Black 2001: xv.
202 “Humanism is that concern with the legacy of antiquity [...] which characterizes the work of scholars from at least the ninth century onwards. It involves above all the rediscovery of ancient Greek and Roman texts, the restoration and interpretation of them and the assimilation of the ideas and values they contain.” Mann 1996: 2. “Humanism, then, with reference to the classical tradition, can be thought of as a respect for the authoritative and exemplary status of the classical, Graeco-Roman world.” Celenza 2010: 462. “By humanism we mean merely the general tendency of the age to attach the greatest importance to classical studies, and to consider classical antiquity as the common standard and model by which to guide all cultural activities.” Kristeller 1961: 95. “The origins of Italian humanism were necessarily linked, therefore, to a classicizing aesthetic driven by a serious effort to imitate ancient models.” Witt 2000: 36. See also Monfasani 2000, Giustiniani 1985, Pfeiffer 1976: 15 (and a response in Black 2002).
these activities. The activities in question were those surrounding the reform of Latin stylistics with a view to the imitation of ancient authors, not necessarily classical studies as we understand them. The activities are collectively known as the *studia humanitatis*.

Greek studies fit into this sphere of activities. But the precise place of Greek in the stylistic or educational program of a fifteenth-century humanist is unclear. Although this dissertation does not pretend to resolve the larger debates surrounding the origins and significance of humanism, and its impact on Italian Renaissance education, it will nevertheless offer a clearer understanding of the role of Greek language studies in the intellectual environment of humanism. Therefore this dissertation is not a general, but a specific history of Renaissance education. It will describe the place of a particular book within Greek studies.

---

203 *Humanism* and *humanist* do not share the etymology that their obvious relationship implies. “There was no word *humanismus* in fifteenth-century Latin, nor were there equivalents in the vernacular languages. The term “humanist” (Italian *umanista*), on the other hand, was in use during the Renaissance.” Percival 2007: 116. See also Celenza 2009: 152.

204 Although Renaissance humanists were classical scholars, and they were actively engaged in an historicizing scholarship (see Garin 1957: 103 and Black 2001: 17), they did not, as yet, practice what we might call *altertumswissenschaft*. Their sphere of activities determined their interest, not their interest their sphere of activities. Rhetoric and Latin stylistics led them to the philological study of classical texts by way of imitation (Kristeller 1961: 95-98).

205 Some uncertainty surrounds the origin and implication of the term *studia humanitatis*. Petrarch himself used the term *humanitas* to translate φιλανθρωπία. But *studia humanitatis* itself seems to have been coined by Niccolò Niccoli, according to Bruni, to describe Petrarch’s literary interests: *hic vir, studia humanitatis, quae iam extincta erant, reparatit*. Bruni 1994: 271-72. See also Pfeiffer 1976: 15-17. By the Quattrocento, the *studia* referred to the five subjects of university education: grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and moral philosophy (Celenza 2009: 152). See also Pfeiffer 1976: 15-16.
within the province of humanism and humanist education during the Italian Renaissance. It will offer a picture of the use of a means to a particular end and thereby offer a foothold on the question of how, exactly, a scholar intended to teach—and a student intended to learn—Greek.

But this specific history belongs to one far more general, so it will be necessary to review the historiography of Italian Renaissance education beyond the role of a Greek book, noting the principal contributions to the field and the ways in which they have informed the present work. Throughout this survey, two strains should be borne in mind: on the one hand, the following histories take into account the substance and purpose of education; on the other hand, they seek to explain the continuities and changes (or similarities and differences) in educational practices. In this case, substance refers to the stuff of education, the objects involved in the process of education at any given time, whatever form they might take; purpose refers to the ends to which the objects are put. Continuity and difference describe the substance and purpose of educational practice relative to a continuum and permit the historian of education to develop contextual associations of substances and purposes.

In an ideal account of Renaissance education, one would have not only the objects of instruction—the media—but multiple first-hand accounts of the Greek classroom from different perspectives: that of a teacher, a student, perhaps even an educational theorist, a parent, or a magistrate. The historian would then balance the accounts, weigh prejudices, place the witnesses in relation to one another, use the accounts to contextualize the objects, and allow a picture to
emerge. In addition to the many fifteenth-century schoolbooks on library shelves, such literary and documentary accounts do exist for the Quattrocento, and they have been the principal fodder for the landmark studies of the twentieth century: Eugenio Garin’s *L’educazione in Europa* (1957), Anthony Grafton’s and Lisa Jardine’s *From Humanism to the Humanities* (1986), Paul Grendler’s *Schooling in Renaissance Italy* (1989), and Robert Black’s *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (2001). In turn, each has recalibrated this literary, documentary, and artifactual evidence in an attempt to offer the most accurate, balanced, recovery of educational practice in the Italian schools.

Garin assumed contrast and authority. His is a history of humanist education from the humanist perspective, clearly marking the difference between the new and the old.206 And his conclusions were drawn from the authority of the writings of self-styled promoters of the *studia humanitatis*, the self-consciously novel curriculum of the new intellectuals.207 For Garin, medieval education was a dark world of discipline and narrow-minded pedantry, dedicated to speculative grammar and logic.208 Pupils learned to read post-classical texts, the *autores octo*.209 And they directed their attention to the professional, technical training that could be achieved with a patina of classical learning, which was introduced by the occasional use of classical authors, yet always

---

208 Black 2001: 14; Grafton and Jardine 1986: xii; Garin 1957: 21, 70.
209 Garin 1957: xxii.
presented as a means rather than an end.\textsuperscript{210} In Garin’s view, the new intellectuals intended to supplant the medieval learning with a fundamentally imitative, holistic education.\textsuperscript{211} Their program was imitative because it replaced the \textit{auctores octo} with classical texts that were used as ends in themselves, as examples of excellence in character and the community of man.\textsuperscript{212} It was holistic because it sought not to educate part of a man for a particular task (for instance a man’s Latinity for the \textit{ars dictaminis}) but the whole man for his whole life.\textsuperscript{213} Garin was careful to make an additional point, one particularly relevant in the present work: the schools that promoted the new curriculum were unprecedented. In other words, they were unlike either the grammar schools of the Middle Ages or the universities.\textsuperscript{214} Essentially, the teachers who will play an important role in the course of this dissertation—teachers such as Guarino da Verona, his son Battista Guarino, and Vittorino da Feltre—founded institutions that significantly broadened the scope of secondary education, making the step between elementary and university/professional education considerably more significant.

Although a capable philologist, Garin primarily made use of published, secondary sources in substantiating his arguments,\textsuperscript{215} and his recourse to artifactual or non-literary documentary evidence was limited. Garin was deeply

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{210} Ibid. 51-2, 71, 93.
\item \textsuperscript{211} Ibid. 21, 24, 27, 85ff.
\item \textsuperscript{212} Ibid. 102.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Garin 1967: 75.
\item \textsuperscript{214} Black 2001: 15-16.
\item \textsuperscript{215} Black 1991: 316; Gehl 1993: 8.
\end{footnotes}
influenced by contemporary politics and intellectual trends surrounding the Second World War. And his arguments about the place and purpose of humanist education in the fifteenth century were profoundly influenced by his involvement in twentieth-century Italian educational reform.\textsuperscript{216} This detracts nothing from Garin as a historian of Renaissance education, and his work, as Robert Black rightly demonstrates, formed and has remained an academic orthodoxy to the present day.\textsuperscript{217}

In the historiography of Renaissance education, Anthony Grafton's and Lisa Jardine's \textit{From Humanism to the Humanities} (1986) offers the response to or critique of Garin's work.\textsuperscript{218} Although they shared Garin's premise that a fundamental change in education had occurred at some point in the fifteenth century, Grafton and Jardine disagreed as to the cause and effect of the change.\textsuperscript{219} The cause of the curricular revolution, they would claim, was the adjustment in prevailing political attitudes in Italy during the fifteenth century. New attitudes meant new demands on the educated population, and a new curriculum arose to address those needs.\textsuperscript{220} As for the effect, they took issue with Garin's argument for a qualitatively positive shift from “scholastic” to “humanist” education, arguing instead for a shift that produced a system much

\textsuperscript{216} Black 2001: 18-20; Celenza 2004: 28-45.
\textsuperscript{217} Black 2001: 16; Celenza 2004: 55-56 (see also Celenza's qualification of Garin's influence, 56).
\textsuperscript{218} Black 2001: 16-17; Gehl 1993: 9.
\textsuperscript{219} Black 2001: 21-22.
\textsuperscript{220} Grafton and Jardine 1986: xiii-xiv.
less suited to professional training and productive thought.\textsuperscript{221} The new curriculum, i.e. the philological, imitative study of Latin, they claimed, “fostered in all its initiates a properly docile attitude towards authority,”\textsuperscript{222} and thus was in keeping with the political exigencies of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, which demanded compliance and acceptance.\textsuperscript{223}

In their review of the foregoing historiography, Grafton and Jardine took issue with the stated goals of the social historians of the 1970s and 80s, namely the collection of documentary evidence to support general assertions about educational doctrines and institutions.\textsuperscript{224} Grafton and Jardine claimed at the outset that the social historians were insensitive to “shades of local variation and individual history” and that they “failed to confront complimentary evidence... preserved in textbooks, student notes and theses.”\textsuperscript{225} In this sense, Grafton and Jardine are closer to the present argument, even if they inferred a great deal more. Finally, just as Garin was influenced by his role in the reform of Italian educational practices, so Grafton and Jardine were influenced by their roles in the professional academy.\textsuperscript{226} They polemically rejected the assumptions underlying modern humanities and liberal arts programs.\textsuperscript{227}

\textsuperscript{221} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{222} Ibid. xiv.  
\textsuperscript{223} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{224} Grafton and Jardine 1986: xi-xii.  
\textsuperscript{225} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{226} Black 2001: 17.  
\textsuperscript{227} Grafton and Jardine 1986: xiv.
Paul Grendler and Robert Black deserve to be treated in tandem. Grendler’s *Schooling in Renaissance Italy* (1989) did not directly challenge Grafton and Jardine. Instead, his argument sidestepped theirs and reaffirmed Garin’s: a picture of a sharp break between a post-classical, medieval school curriculum and the coming of the *studia*. By volume, Grendler availed himself of a great deal more sources than had Garin: teachers’ correspondence, municipal letters of appointments, contracts, and schoolbooks themselves, which often contain notes by students or teachers. He argued that although classical authors were taught in the medieval schools, the Renaissance schools taught different authors differently. Accordingly, Grendler focused on a shift in substance and purpose. In substance, texts that promoted the concept of imitation replaced texts that had been used solely for instruction. For instance, Cicero’s letters replaced his *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herrenium*, serving as models for, rather than instruction in, prose composition. And he elucidated Garin’s argument for the organizational changes in schooling during the Quattrocento.

---

229 Grendler does respond to Grafton and Jardine in claiming that “a very recent book” is tainted by a “twentieth-century perspective.” According to Grendler, Grafton and Jardine failed to sufficiently contextualize their study and interpreted the humanist curriculum from their own perspective. Grendler 1989: 407.
232 Ibid. 336; Grendler 1989: 3-102.
Robert Black’s *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (2001) presents yet another perspective: one of continuity. Unlike Garin, Grafton and Jardine, and Grendler, Black does not take as his premise a distinct break in educational practice. He is therefore less likely than his predecessors to assume a linear cause and effect pattern for the rise of humanist educational practices. Instead, Black argues for the persistence of substance and purpose throughout the Quattrocento. Italian schools did, he claims, continue to teach Latin grammar via the same methods as their predecessors, and it was only at the “upper levels of the grammar syllabus” that teachers promoting the imitation of antiquity were able to operate.²³³

Moreover, Black points out a categorical mistake in arguments that assume a fundamental shift in educational practices between the medieval and Renaissance classrooms: the classrooms compared were not the same. In other words, one cannot compare the school curriculum with the university curriculum. Garin had argued (and subsequent studies had assumed) that a humanist curriculum had begun to supplant the medieval curriculum in Italian schools during the fifteenth century and that new kinds of schools had emerged to promote the new curriculum. Black demonstrated that significant elements of the late-medieval school curriculum were persistent throughout the Quattrocento²³⁴ and that teachers of the *studia* should be contrasted not with teachers of Aristotelian logic and theology (university subjects), but with

---


²³⁴ As stated by Grendler, “He [Black] denies the existence of significant curricular change in Latin schooling in Italy before 1500.” Grendler 1991: 335.
medieval grammar masters.\footnote{Black 2001: 22, 366-68.} He proposed that scholars change the question. Rather than assuming a definitive break in the educational tradition and asking how humanist educational practices differed from scholastic, one should look for continuities and ask how proponents of the \textit{studio humanitatis} differed in their approach from the scholastics.\footnote{Ibid. 28-29.} In this sense, one compares apples to apples, school subjects to schools subjects, without confounding the borders between school and university education.

As with Grafton and Jardine and Grendler, Black relies chiefly on primary sources to substantiate his argument. But unlike his predecessors, Black’s argument is not qualitative but statistical. He argues chiefly from one hundred and twenty-seven extant manuscripts of classical authors that, he claimed, were used as schoolbooks in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.\footnote{For a summary and criticism of Black’s methodology, see Witt 2012: 488-91.}

Beyond Black and Grendler, specialized studies have informed the discussion of Renaissance education. Witt (2012) seeks the foundations of humanism in the documentary culture of the \textit{Regnum}, noting that the causes of educational reform were rooted in Lovato Lovati’s “classicizing of linguistic expression.”\footnote{Witt 2012: 485.} And Percival (2007) takes the practice of grammar specifically as evidence for a “line of demarcation” separating medieval from Renaissance educational practices.\footnote{Percival 2007: 96.}
There is little doubt that debates on Renaissance education, and the role of humanism in classroom practices, will continue to develop further. As will become clear in the following section, the present dissertation will blend the arguments and methodologies of the foregoing. In keeping with the premise of Garin, Grafton and Jardine, and Grendler, this project will assume a distinct change in educational practices during the Quattrocento, specifically insofar as Greek became an aspect of the curriculum, whether real or ideal. In keeping with Black and Percival, it will assume that the change was gradual and that the differences are increasingly distinct over larger intervals of time. Because this dissertation is concerned with one facet of Renaissance education, namely Greek language studies, the question of substance and purpose is predetermined. The substance in question will be the instructional materials without which Greek language study could not have taken place; the purpose will be instruction in Greek, a crucial aspect of the humanist educational agenda. And it will be the object of this dissertation to locate one particular instructional book in a sequence of cause and effect, asking what events conspired to produce this book and, in turn, what, if any, changes in educational practice were effected by this text.

Because this dissertation is concerned with an object, it finds greater affinities with more recent accounts of Renaissance education than with earlier. It is distinct from Grender’s account of Renaissance education insofar as documentary evidence will be used to contextualize the object rather than to

\footnote{240 Ibid.}
present the argument. And it is distinct from Black’s project insofar as statistical evidence will play a minimal role, since statistical data is as yet insufficient for any argument concerning the production, distribution, or use of the objects in question.

In the following chapter, this dissertation will detail the life of the principal actor in this story—Aldus Mantius—as well as his associates in the making of the *Aldine Lascaris* and his place in the intellectual environment we call *Renaissance Hellenism*. 
CHAPTER 2: THE ALDINE LASCARIS IN THE MAKING

The Aldine Lascaris arose in a particular place and time, namely Venice at the end of a century of educational and stylistic reform that we now call the Italian Renaissance. The following is an account of an intellectual and education epiphenomenon known as Italian Renaissance Hellenism. For the purposes of this dissertation, Italian Renaissance Hellenism will be defined as a persistent interest in the acquisition of the ancient Greek language and its texts that took place between the arrival of Manuel Chrysoloras in 1397 and the death of Aldus Manutius in 1515. The focus will remain on the Italian peninsula, and the Hellenism of the Iberian Peninsula, France, and northern Europe lie beyond the present scope.

Given that such an epiphenomenon as Italian Renaissance Hellenism is discernable in the Quattrocento, one might ask it to reveal its causes, its aims, and its means. The current survey will make relatively light work of the first question, which has already been explored in great depth. Instead, it will focus on the second and third questions, namely the why and the how of Italian Renaissance Hellenism—what did Hellenists of the period hope to achieve by learning Greek, and how did they learn it? The second part of this section will address the link between the study of Greek and the movement of Latin stylistic

---

and pedagogical reform known as the *studia humanitatis*; the final part of this section will link both the study of Greek and the *studia* with Aldus Manutius, the teacher-cum-printer who produced the premier Greek language textbook of the late-fifteenth to early-sixteenth centuries.

The number of Italians who mastered Greek during the Quattrocento, particularly prior to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, may never have been high.\textsuperscript{242} The quality of Greek teaching throughout the fifteenth century seems to have quite mixed, and some humanists may have had only the patina of Greek learning.\textsuperscript{243} But the number of those who mastered the language was most likely higher than in the centuries reviewed in Chapter 1, and the number of those who attempted it was undoubtedly higher. But whatever the number, the study of Greek was effectively reborn.\textsuperscript{244} Greek held a symbolic place in the new learning, the *studia humanitatis*, and humanist schools promoted the new subject by hiring Greek teachers. As Paul Grendler put it, “the call to learn Greek, a talisman promising almost magical benefits, had great power to win converts to the *studia humanitatis*.\textsuperscript{245} Therefore, it is not the mastery of Greek

\textsuperscript{242} It should be mentioned that those Italian humanists who did become expert in Greek prior to the middle of the fifteenth century had studied in Constantinople. The list includes Guarino da Verona, Francesco Filelfo, Giovanni Aurispa, Giovanni Tortelli, et al.

\textsuperscript{243} As can be judged from mistakes in their translations (Ciccolella 2008: 144).

\textsuperscript{244} Hankins 2003: 274.

\textsuperscript{245} Grendler 1989: 125. See also Grafton and Jardine 1986: 119: “Greek, in short, ended the Renaissance in the position in which it first entered Italy: as a new subject: something on the margins of the curriculum.” According to Hankins, “Greek remained then [in the 1450s] and long after a “luxury” subject on the margins of the curriculum but it had nevertheless secured a permanent foothold.” (Hankins 2003: 285). Indeed, in many ways this describes Greek studies in the present day.
that concerns us at present; it is the elementary stages of instruction. And it is for these stages that an abundance of evidence exists: the student texts that circulated in both print and manuscript in fifteenth-century Italy, particularly in Milan and Venice. Given that the fundamental question posed by this dissertation is how would a teacher-turned printer design a textbook for Greek using the printing press, it is appropriate to limit the scope to Italian Renaissance Hellenism as pertains to the studia and Aldus.

---

246 Printers frequently inaugurated their presses, as explained below, with student books of all sorts—accidences, primers, abecedaria, etc. There is little doubt that many more were produced than survive, given that student books are often used up. But such was the steady market for these books that many remain in libraries to the present day.
Were one to imagine three steps in the development of Italian Renaissance Hellenism, the first would be false, the second uncertain, and the third decisive. The first was the earnest desire of Petrarch to learn Greek and read his Homer. As noted above, Greek had survived the Middle Ages in the West, but Hellenism had not. And that distinction is important. Petrarch knew what Greek was, and he knew that he should read it. But no systematic tradition existed in southern France or Italy that could facilitate his acquisition of a foreign language with a foreign script.\(^{247}\) Petrarch studied with Barlaam of Calabria for two months in 1342, while he was resident in Avignon.\(^{248}\) But little came of it. The second step was Boccaccio’s attempt to learn the language, also from a Calabrian, Leonzio Pilato. Boccaccio got further, but Pilato’s teaching was not systematic enough to create a school of Greek. According to the story, this was partly due to his supposedly difficult character.\(^{249}\) But it was more likely due to a lack of appropriate teaching aids that would enable an Italian, for instance, 

\(^{247}\) It should be noted that such a tradition did exist in southern Italy, but its efficacy is doubtful. Weiss characterized its effect on Italian humanism as “not entirely indifferent.” (Weiss 1977: 42). Conversely, Ciccolella notes that this region “played a significant role in the exchange of school books” (and perhaps also teaching methods). (Ciccolella 2008: 110).

\(^{248}\) Celenza 2009: 152; Ciccolella 2008: 97-98.

\(^{249}\) Ciccolella 2008: 99.
to learn a foreign language from its rudiments to its literature. The third, decisive step was taken by Coluccio Salutati, then Chancellor of Florence, who invited Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1355-1415) to teach Greek in that city. It was Chrysoloras’s arrival in Florence that served as catalyst for Italian Renaissance Hellenism as such, and so it is with his arrival—the decisive step—that the account begins. By the end of the century, Greek would be firmly established in humanist schools, and many of the Greek teachers would be Italians.

---

250 Cortesi 1995: 464. Chrysoloras’s residence in Italy has been variously interpreted. Was he teaching Greek in Italy for pay, sympathy, or patriotism? Clearly not the first. Chrysoloras was related to royal Paleologan house; he was man of means. Although his salary was high (150 florins per annum), he could hardly have needed it. Sympathy with the Italian humanists and their imitation of antiquity was certainly in his mind. The sort of imitation of Latin literature that the Italians were undertaking in the Quattrocento was very much like the strict Atticizing that was well engrained in the Byzantine educational system. But patriotism might well have been the principal factor. The Byzantine world was under ever increasing threat from the Turks, and émigré scholars were very much in favor of a union of the Greek and Roman churches that would preserve the Greek legacy. As Pope Pius II noted, the loss of Greece was a real prospect, and a union of the churches the only possibility for the preservation of Greek culture. Given a common enemy (the Muslim Turks), the churches inched closer together through the efforts of intellectuals, principally on the Greek side. Chrysoloras was explicit about his aims in a letter to Umberto Decembrio in 1407: Cum ab initio eo dicente et persuadente speraveram boni aliquid ex mea praesentia erga illas orientales partes, et quoad unionem ecclesiae et quoad infidelium oppresionem... (for the full letter, see Sabbadini 1890: 331). It is worth noting that Chrysoloras, as Barlaam had, converted to the Roman church. See Hankins 2003: 273-79; see also Ciccolella 2008: 100, n. 81. Geanakoplos (1962: 24) states emphatically that Chrysoloras was sent to Italy by the emperor for the purpose of seeking aid against the Turks.

251 Percival 2002: 97; Celenza 2009: 152. It seems Guarino da Verona, who studied with Chrysoloras, would agree that Chrysoloras deserves the credit for restoring Greek to the West. He wrote to Angelo Corbinelli in 1411: Qua in re abs te peto et magis atque magis oro, ut illustrismo in primis Manuel Chrysolorae gratias habeas suumque attollas ad sidera
The causes of Chrysoloras’s arrival in Florence have been amply covered. Insofar as his effect on the movement, one could still ask what he intended to accomplish and how he accomplished it. And understanding both facets of his work is a necessary prerequisite to the study of Aldus’s work nearly a century later. Chrysoloras’s most direct intention was grammatical, systematic knowledge of the Greek language, specifically the kind of knowledge that would enable Italians to translate Greek literature into Latin ad sensum. To attain this skill, Chrysoloras must have realized that it would be necessary to adapt Byzantine methods of teaching Greek to suit Italian students. In other words, his challenge was to teach the language from scratch, without the assumptions a grammar teacher would be permitted in Greek-speaking parts of southern Italy or the Greek East. He streamlined the Byzantine grammatical tradition and

nomen, quoniam eius viri opera simul et humanitate factum est ut graecorum splendor litterarum ad nostros redierit homines... (quoted by Garin 1958: 308.) Another student of Chrysoloras, Bruni, in his Commentaria rerum suo tempore gestarum, written in 1440-41, echoed Guarino: Graecam disciplinam ad nos Chrysoloras Byzantius. See also Robins 1993: 236, “One of the earliest and probably the most important agent in the revival of systematic and structured teaching of Greek in Italy and thence in all Western Europe was Chrysoloras.”


255 Grafton and Jardine 1986: 102-3. The difficulty facing the Byzantine teachers of Greek at this time should not be underestimated. The grammatical texts of their own youth were impractical for teaching Greek as an entirely foreign language (as opposed to an ancestor of one’s native language). The first book of grammar instruction in the Greek East was Dionysius Thrax’s (c. 170-c. 90 BCE) Τέχνη γραμματική, a concise summary of morphology. Greek-speaking students would then proceed to the Περὶ συντάξεως of Apollonius Dyscolus.
mirrored traditions of Latin grammar teaching. Because Chrysoloras developed a tool suitable for the instruction of non-Greek students, and because his work exerted a strong influence on subsequent Greek grammars in the West, it is worth noting his achievements in some detail.

Chrysoloras's grammar book is called Ἐρωτήματα, which was translated as Quaestiones by his student Guarino da Verona, who translated and abridged the text. The catechistic form was modeled on the Ars minor of Aelius Donatus, the fourth-century CE grammarian and teacher of Jerome. Donatus' text was designed to introduce students to the rudiments of Latin morphology, proceeding from the simple to the difficult, from the part of speech to literary style. The Ars minor, or possibly from Ianua, a medieval abridgement of the Ars minor. That would nicely explain Chrysoloras's modeling of his text on his own Latin schoolbooks.

(Second century CE), which treated syntax. For metrics and accents, teachers would use Herodian's Κανόνες τῆς κοθολικῆς προσφοδίας (Appolonius's son, also second century CE.) Providing a substitute for Dionysius’s text was the crucial step. It was ill-suited to non-Greeks, being insufficiently basic and monolingual. Critical editions are available in Teubner's Grammatici graeci. For Dionysius, see Uhlig (Leipzig: 1883); for Apollonius, see Schneider and Uhlig (Leipzig: 1910); for Herodian, see Lentz (Leipzig: 1870). For a full treatment of Byzantine grammar, see Wilson (1983), Robins (1993), Ciccolella 2008: 103-17, Nuti 2014: 1-71.

256 On the date of composition, which cannot have been after 1406, see Botley 2010: 7-8. See also, Nuti 2012: 242. Battista Guarino mentions his father's studies in recommending Chrysoloras’s text to students of Greek, De ordine docendi et studendi 18:

Eam igitur adolescenes arripiant, nec confuse et inordinate ut apud Graecos trade solitum erat, sed eas habent regulas quas parentis nostril praeceptor Manuel

Chrysoloras summatim collegit...

257 Chrysoloras had in fact learned Latin before arriving in Florence, which very likely contributed to his success. But how had he learned Latin, a language that was not commonly taught in Constantinople? It would be very clean to assume that he learned Latin from the Ars minor, or possibly from Ianua, a medieval abridgement of the Ars minor. That would nicely explain Chrysoloras's modeling of his text on his own Latin schoolbooks.

Unfortunately there is no clear answer as to where, when, or how he learned Latin.
entirety of Donatus’ work is in four books, known collectively as the *Ars grammatica Donati*, of which the *Ars minor* is the first book. The text of the *Ars minor* mimics a classroom dialog in which a teacher asks a student a question, for instance *partes orationis quot sunt?* The student then gives the answer: *octo*. Or, in Chrysoloras’s grammar, Πόσα μέρη τοῦ λόγου; ὀκτώ. The catechistic form is ancient and basic, and it has been well engrained in the religious, technical, and grammatical training of Western Europe since Antiquity.258 The form was suitable for classroom use, lent itself to memorization, and served as common ground for students in both East and West, where similar texts had been used for centuries.259 And, importantly, the catechistic method was both systematic and gradual: systematic because it presented information in an ordered, designed fashion that does not imitate the direct, immersion method and gradual because it presents only relevant information step by step, so that the student is not overwhelmed by unnecessary information too early in the process.

Chrysoloras also reduced the sheer mass of data that a prospective Italian student would have to face. To take the most famous example of his systematic reduction, he decided to group nouns by their genitives rather than their nominatives, thereby ending up with ten paradigms rather than the very unwieldy fifty-six.260

258 Ciccolella 2008: 1-4. But the catechism should not be assumed to be actual, i.e. representative of actual schoolroom practices. Perhaps students did memorize the questions and answers, but the form is really meant to be a simplification. Hankins suggests comparing it to FAQs! (Hankins 2003: 248).


In summary, Chrysoloras succeeded where Barlaam and Pilato had failed—he created an instrument of learning that was calibrated to the special needs of his students and served as a means to his students’ end: the translation of Greek literature into Latin. Moreover, one point further recommends his Ἐρωτήματα: Chrysoloras created a text that was independent of its author. He did not write a “teacher proof” text; he wrote a text that could be used by teachers other than the author. This fact opened the door to other teachers, of any nationality, who now had a system, a template, for their own Greek teaching. His text represents the fusion of Byzantine and Latin grammatical traditions as well as the beginning of the short-lived influence of the Byzantine pedagogical influence in Western Europe.262

Chrysoloras’s Ἐρωτήματα had a claim to priority,263 it had the endorsements of his students Guarino and Bruni (and both Umberto and Pietro Candido Decembrio among others), and it was linked to Salutati and the impetus of Florentine humanism.264 But it was not alone in the field (see table 2.1). In fact, Chrysoloras was the first of a triad of Byzantine émigré teachers whose

---

261 The notion of a teacher-proof textbook will recur in chapter 4. Following Purves, it can be said to mean, “books that fit into an ‘instructional system.’” A system in which, “the teacher is programmed to use the books in precisely the way that the authors or editors had designed.” Purves 1993: 16-17.


263 Priority in several ways. It was the first of the three most influential grammars to be composed, the first printed in Italy (see table 2.1) and the first printed outside Italy (in Paris by Gilles de Gourmont, 1507, USTC: 180245).

264 Although Salutati seems to have used the grammar of Manuel Calecas, which was composed in the late fourteenth century. See Botley 2010: 6.
accomplishments were comparable.\textsuperscript{265} He was followed by Theodore Gaza (1400-1475),\textsuperscript{266} whose Εἰσαγωγὴ γραμματικῆς was also modeled on Donatus’ \textit{Ars}.\textsuperscript{267} He composed it in four graded books. Much like a course—more so than Chrysoloras’s—Gaza’s treatise covered morphology (which he further simplified),\textsuperscript{268} accentuation, prosody, and finally syntax. Gaza was, in turn, followed by Constantine Lascaris (1434-1501), whose work is the subject of this dissertation and will be covered in greater detail below. It can be said with some certainty that these three texts received the widest circulation in manuscript and print during the fifteenth century. But they were not alone, and other texts must have exercised local or specific influence.\textsuperscript{269} Nor should it be imagined that any one text was used either in isolation or entirely in its original state. It is the reward and frustration of the study of pedagogical texts that they are, by the nature of the genre, inherently unstable.\textsuperscript{270}

\textsuperscript{265} “During the fifteenth century, Greek grammar meant the works of Chrysoloras, Gaza, and Lascaris. Botley 2010: 2.

\textsuperscript{266} Gaza had studied at the school of Vittorino da Feltre and translated texts into Greek for Pope Nicholas V. He most likely taught Greek to (and learned Latin from) Vittorino. He was in Mantua and Ferrara between 1443 and 1449. See Ciccolella 2008: 121 and Botley 2010: 14.

\textsuperscript{267} Ciccolella 2008: 122.

\textsuperscript{268} He reduced Chrysoloras’s ten nominal declensions to five: four parasyllabic and one imparasyllabic. And he reduced the verb conjugations to five, giving full paradigms of τύπτω and τίθημι at the end of the first book.

\textsuperscript{269} For more on them, one should consult Ciccolella (2008) and Botley (2010).

\textsuperscript{270} Rollo (1994) represents an attempt to stemmatize the text of Chrysoloras’s grammar. Nuti (2012) is a response and reconsideration of the process of studying grammar texts. See also Ciccolella (2009), a study of the printed versions of the text.
## Table 2.1

### Conspectus of Greek Grammars, c. 1400-1515

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Editio Princeps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Calecas (d. 1410)</td>
<td>Untitled(^{271})</td>
<td>c. 1390s (before 1406)</td>
<td>not printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1355-1415)</td>
<td>Ερωτήματα</td>
<td>not after 1406</td>
<td>[Venice: Adam de Ambergau, about 1471]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine Lascaris (1434-1501)</td>
<td>Ερωτήματα, or Ἐπιτομή τῶν ὀκτώ λόγου μερῶν(^{272})</td>
<td>c. 1463</td>
<td>Milan: Dionysius Paravisinus, 30 Jan. 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius Chalcondyles (1423-1511)</td>
<td>[Ερωτήματα]</td>
<td>c. 1493</td>
<td>[Milan: Uldericus Scinzenzeler, about 1493]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbano Bolzanio</td>
<td>Institutiones graecae grammaticae</td>
<td>c. 1497</td>
<td>Venice: Aldus Manutius, Romanus, Jan. 1497/98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{271}\) In catechistic form. Used by Salutati, who died in 1406. (Botley 2010: 6).

\(^{272}\) In Aldus’s 1495 version, this text is called an Ἐπιτομή (Compendium); in the short-title catalogs, it is often listed as an Ερωτήματα. Lascaris himself called it the former.
Having asked how an Italian of the early Quattrocento might have acquired the rudiments of the Greek language, and for what purpose he (or she),\textsuperscript{273} acquired them, it remains to ask how the knowledge of Greek and the translation of Greek texts fit into the intellectual environment generally. Why did one wish to learn Greek? And what was its place in the educational systems of Quattrocento Italy? After all, Italian Renaissance Hellenism was, as mentioned above, an epiphenomenon, an aspect of a wider stylistic and educational reform that is now called humanism. The purpose of the study of ancient Greek—the desired outcome—must have been an aspect of the humanist enterprise, i.e. an aspect of the recovery and imitation of classical Latin. And it is in this respect that Italian Renaissance Hellenism is distinct from the Carolingian or thirteenth-century revivals mention in \textit{Chapter 1}. Certain members of the new establishment intended not only to recover Greek learning, but to provide for it a sustainable place in the educational program called the \textit{studia}.\textsuperscript{274} Therefore, before proceeding to the life of Aldus—a teacher of Greek and Latin—it will be worthwhile to review the place of Hellenism within humanism.

\textsuperscript{273} There is evidence that aristocratic girls learned Greek in the Quattrocento—Ippolyta Sforza, for instance, was taught by Lascaris. But for the most part, Greek was reserved for boys. See Ciccolella 2008: 107, n. 103.

\textsuperscript{274} “Greek studies could not, however, have successfully been transplanted to Italy had not the Italians themselves been well disposed to receive them.” (Hankins 2003: 280).
In his treatise *De ordine docendi et studendi*, Battista Guarino, son of Chrysoloras’s student, wrote of the importance of the study of Latin and Greek in tandem.\textsuperscript{275} He states, quite categorically,

\textit{Mihi vero, dum vivam, nemo hunc errorem (si error est) eripiet, ut eam [scil. Graecam linguam] non modo utilem sed pernecessariam litteris nostris esse non credam.}

[For my part, I shall hold fast to this “error” (if error it be) as long as I live, and shall believe that Greek is not only useful but absolutely essential for Latin letters.]\textsuperscript{276}

Guarino reasons that there is so much Greek in Latin—that the Romans of the classical age were so imbued with Greek literature—that no one can fully grasp Latin without Greek.\textsuperscript{277} He offers examples. Those without Greek do not correctly grasp the quantity of vowels in words of Greek origin; they will not understand etymologies (he uses the example of *Avernus* \(< \acute{o}rvo\gamma < \acute{o}rvig\); and, perhaps the worst shame at a humanist party, they will not get puns (he uses

\textsuperscript{275} Composed at Verona in 1459 and first printed sometime between 1472 and 1475, likely at Ferrara. See ISTC: ig00528000; Goff: G-528; GW: 11595.

\textsuperscript{276} *De ordine* 16. For an edition of Guarino’s text, see Kallendorf (2002). The translation is Kallendorf’s.

\textsuperscript{277} On Greek in Guarino’s school, see also Ciccolella 2008: 140 and Nuti 2014: 354-55. For the notion of Greek behind Latin and an ancient precedent for Greek learning, see also Hankins 2003: 246.
Ovid, naturally). Nevertheless, there are those, he claims, who persist without Greek.

*Scio enim plerosque esse qui eam latinis litteris necessarium esse negent, qui, quoniam ignari ipsi sunt, optarent reliquos inscitiae suae pares esse, ut ceteros si non superiors saltem nec inferiors iudicarentur.*

[I know there are many people who say it [Greek] is unnecessary for Latin literature. These are people who are themselves ignorant of Greek and want everyone else to be ignorant, so that if they may not be judged superior to others, at least they can avoid being thought inferior.]

The evidence suggests that one can believe Battista Guarino’s appraisal of the situation: by the middle of the Quattrocento: 1.) Greek was accepted as teachable and learnable (given the efforts of Chrysoloras in particular), 2.) Greek was acknowledged by some to be the apex of humanism—the means to a better grasp of Latin literature, and 3.) Greek remained somewhat contentious, being considered by some “unnecessary.” That Greek was a high achievement and ultimately behind Latin literature (2.) was an age-old trope, one that began with the Romans, pervaded the Latin Middle Ages, and came down to the humanists

---

278 *De ordine* 16.

279 Ibid.

280 It is interesting to note Guarino’s choice of words. He contrasts those who deny that Greek is *necessarium* with those who affirm that it is *pernecessarium.*
via the revivals of the ninth and thirteenth centuries sketched in Chapter 1. But what of (1.) and (3.)?

Despite the fact that Greek was the acknowledged partner and antecedent of Latin (and Christian) literature, Greek was, in modern terms, the language of the so-called other. Greek-ness, pagan and Christian, was opposed to Latin-ness. The Pope had excommunicated the Patriarch in the eleventh century; the Eastern Christians were deemed schismatics; and the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 was a clear statement of Western hostility toward the East. That Greek would become 1.) teachable and 3.) acceptable (at least to some) were significant steps in the intellectual history of Europe. Both depended on a special mixture of elements that had not obtained in earlier revivals: an interest in the imitation of Antiquity on the part of the West and a softening of dogma on the part of the East. These conditions, as mentioned above, effected 1.), but they also effected 3.).

The Italian interest in the imitation of Antiquity and the Byzantine interest in the reunification of the church in light of the Muslim threat were not

---

281 The Italian receptiveness to Greek was an aspect of what Hankins called the “Ciceronian” side of Petrarch’s project (Hankins 2003: 280). The proliferation of Latin translations that flowed from Chrysoloras’s school is a testament to the power of this conviction: even those who had not access to a Greek teacher should be granted access to Greek via Latin. For the competitive aspect of social standing and patronage via translation projects, see Celenza 2009: 155.


283 Celenza 2009: 156.
universal. Opposition to the new learning in Italy was never silent.\textsuperscript{284} And the so-called *dotti bizantini*—expatriates and willing converts to the Roman church—were a minority within the Byzantine world.\textsuperscript{285} Undoubtedly those to whom Guarino refers held a lingering hostility to things Greek and perhaps a healthy skepticism of the Byzantine Greek teachers and their motives. It was, after all, a complex world, one that cannot be oversimplified to fit an argument.

Nevertheless, by the middle of the fifteenth century in Italy, thanks to intellectual movements on both sides of the Adriatic, Greek had a place in the new range of subjects promoted by Guarino and his caste of teachers, whether Byzantine or Italian. And one of this caste is the principal character in the present dissertation, Aldus Manutius.\textsuperscript{286}

The life of Aldo Manuzio, who will be referred to below by his Latinized name, Aldus Manutius, has many facets, each with a special importance to the history of the Italian Renaissance.\textsuperscript{287} The following account will ask the questions: How, where, and why did Aldus learn Greek? How did he understand the role of Greek in the *studia*? And how did he intend to promote Greek studies

\textsuperscript{284} Hankins 2003: 277-78.
\textsuperscript{285} Ibid.: 278-83.
\textsuperscript{286} The foremost modern treatments of the life of Aldus Manutius are Orlandi (1975)\textsuperscript{286} and Lowry (1979). Additional, more specific treatments are Grendler (1984), Barker (1992), and Davies (1999). A Festschrift honoring Franklin Murphy was published in 1998 and includes Clough (1998), Hexter (1998), and Jensen (1998), each of which focuses on a particular aspect of Aldus’s impact on Renaissance culture. For Aldus and Renaissance Hellenism, see Pincus (2008) and Flogaus (2008).
\textsuperscript{287} Lowry (1979), in his chapter on the life of Aldus, focuses on Aldus’s somewhat curious mid-life career change from tutor to printer; Grendler (1984) focuses on his place in the history of printing generally.
through the new medium of print? Answers to these questions will suggest the objectives and guiding principles behind the design and production of the Aldine Lascaris. And the answers will be sought in intersections, points in Aldus’s life at which his interests were influenced by significant men and media.

Aldus’s life spanned the second half of the Quattrocento. He was born around 1450, three quarters of a century after the death of Petrarch, in Bassiano, a small town south of Rome. His early years are uncertain, as is the exact year of his birth. When he died in 1515, his son Paulus claimed that he was sixty-three at the time of his death, putting his birth in 1452. His grandson, also named Aldus, claimed 1449. Relatively little is known about Aldus’s earliest years. And unfortunately nothing is known with certainty about his earliest education.

He studied in Rome at some point after 1467 and before 1478—termini set by the arrival in Rome and death of Domizio Calderini, whom Aldus claimed to have heard as a boy. Calderini was an associate of Bessarion, an apostolic secretary to Sixtus IV, and, from 1470, a lecturer in the university. Calderini

---

288 Paulus claimed mio padre morì negli anni sessantatre; Aldus the younger claimed that 1597 was the centesimus quadragesimus septimus ab Aldi Avi natali agitur annus. Pastorello 1965: 165.

289 It is likely that his earliest education was late-medieval in character. In the preface to his grammar of 1501 (USTC: 840307), Aldus rails against the practice of memorizing the twelfth-century verse grammar of Alexander de Villedieu, which he calls “inept.”

Equidem puero mihi, cum Alexandri carmen ineptum de arte grammatica memoriae mandabam, non ita contigisse plurimum doleo.


290 Orlandi V, 39

traveled to France with Bessarion in 1472, taking the opportunity to invent the person of a Latin grammarian whose work he claimed to have discovered and to invent the work of a Latin grammarian whose work everyone wanted to read.\textsuperscript{292} He returned to Rome in the following year and mentioned his discoveries publically. And it is at this point that Aldus must have heard Calderini, in the mid-1470s, but prior to Calderini’s death in 1478. In the preface to his 1502 Statius,\textsuperscript{293} addressed to Marcus Musurus, Aldus wrote,

\begin{quote}
Quapropter ex Germania Valerii Maximi quaedam, quae in Italia non habentur, ex Gallia vero duodecim Asconii Pediani elegantiarum libros percupidi expectamus, quos extare, esseque M. Fabii Quintiliani, ac inde bonam partem elegantiarum suarum accepisse Laurentium Vallam, vel puer Romae, cum audirem Domitium, intellegebam.\textsuperscript{294}
\end{quote}

[On that account we very eagerly await certain parts of Valerius Maximus from Germany (which are not in Italy), and twelve books of the \textit{Elegantiae} of Asconius Pedianus, which, as I learned when I heard Domizio as a boy in Rome, are extant and are of Quintilian, and from which Valla took a good part of his \textit{Elegantiae}.]

\textsuperscript{292} Dunston 1968: 144-9; Grafton 1977: 165; Lowry: 49
\textsuperscript{293} USTC: 857455
\textsuperscript{294} Ibid. 2v-3r.
But Calderini’s importance in Aldus’s life altogether transcends the dates he sets for it. Calderini’s relationship with the printing press is worth noting, and it is ever tempting to see a connection with Aldus’s much later decision to exploit this medium. Calderini published during his lifetime. His commentaries on Martial were printed three times in 1474 alone, and he edited texts for the press: Quintilian in 1475, and Ptolemy in 1478. Calderini’s views on the press are unfortunately nowhere made explicit. Did he, perhaps, believe Giovanni Andrea Bussi’s claims for the press? Could we potentially link Bussi’s views with Aldus’s directly or via Calderini?

In the years 1468 to 1472, Bussi, then Bishop of Aleria and prolific editor for the first printers in Italy—Sweynheim and Pannartz—had promoted, via his prefaces and dedications, a manifesto for the new medium. Bussi had been a pupil of Vittorino da Feltre in Mantua in the 1440s, and he seems to have learned from that master the importance of educating men of all classes. He saw the press as a means, and he sought to fill the market with affordable

---

295 Rome: Johannes Gensberg, for Johannes Aloisius Tuscanus, 22 Mar. 1474. ISTC: ic00036000; GW 5887; Goff: C-36.
2. Venice: Johannes de Colonia and Johannes Manthen, [after 22 Mar.] 1474. ISTC: ic00037000; GW: 5888; Goff: C-37.
296 Rome: Johannes Schurener, de Bopardia, 30 Oct. 1475. ISTC: iq00021500; GW M36793; Goff: Q23.
299 Lowry: 25.
books—books that would allow any man to build a library. He wrote to Pope Paul II in his preface to Sweynheim and Pannartz’s 1469 edition of Aulus Gellius,

_Hec enim mens mihi est, hoc unum imprimis studium, ut quod fieri possit, omnis homines Latinos, me quoque ipso esse optem doctiores._\(^{300}\)

[For this is my mind, this my one great passion, that it would be possible for all Latin men, me among them, to become more learned.]

To Bussi, as Lowry puts it, “quantity and diffusion provide the answer to all difficulties.”\(^{301}\) Did Calderini feel the same? Did Bussi’s ideals reach Aldus through Calderini? Or directly, if Aldus was in Rome in the early 1470s, when Bussi was promoting Sweynheim and Pannartz’s press? There is no way to be sure. Aldus never mentioned Bussi by name,\(^{302}\) and he only shows his awareness of Bussi’s work in a critical remark.\(^{303}\)

But regardless of Bussi’s influence, whether directly or via Calderini, Aldus must have encountered the press in Rome. Sweynheim and Pannartz had

\(^{300}\) Botfield 81.
\(^{301}\) Lowry: 71.
\(^{302}\) Ibid. 50.
\(^{303}\) In Aldus’s edition of Bessarion’s _In Calumniatorem Platonis_ (1503, USTC: 814295), Aldus criticized Bussi’s work on Sweynheim and Pannartz’s edition of 1469, claiming that his edition was considerably corrected and that the Roman edition had been done incorrectly (_perperam_):

... _quo multa correximus, quae perperam Romae impressa fuerant..._
been printing in Rome since 1467, and Aldus heard Calderini mention Asconius some time after the disastrous spate of 1472-3, which had a tremendous affect of the industry and could not plausibly have escaped Aldus’s notice. There can be little doubt that Calderini saw the mechanical reproduction of texts as a means, an expedient, and a useful tool. And there can be equally little doubt that Aldus, during his Rome years, was first-hand witness to the confluence of literary humanism and the new technology.

Aldus’s association with Gaspare da Verona offers both a connection to the press that most likely dates from his student days in Rome and a connection to Greek that looks forward to his years in Ferrara and Carpi. Gaspare left Rome in 1473, which means that Aldus must have studied with him in Rome prior to that date. In terms of Aldus’s exposure to Greek via Gaspare, the latter had studied with Guarino da Verona, a student of Chrysoloras. In terms of exposure to the press, Gaspare is known to historians of printing for his mention of

---

304 Their first dated Roman book is Cicero’s *Epistolae ad familiares*. ISTC: ic00503500; GW 6799; Goff: C-503a.

305 The spate was an overabundance of unsold printed books, caused by a demand that could not match the supply. The books in question were principally classical, chiefly Cicero. On behalf of Sweynheim and Pannartz, Bussi famously intervened with Pope Sixtus IV. A petition was filed directly with the Pope at some time between August 1471 and August 1472, and Bussi wrote a preface to volume five of Sweynheim and Pannartz’s 1472 edition of Nicolaus de Lyra’s *Postilla super Bibliam* (ISTC: in00131000; GW: M26523; Goff: N-131). The petition gives much-needed biographical details on the printers (their holy orders, for instance), and the preface gives bibliographical details. Bussi, speaking in the first person with his printers, tells us that See also, Hirsch 1974: 44-45; Nuovo 2013: 120.

306 Lowry: 49.
Sweynheim and Pannartz in his biography of Paul II.\textsuperscript{307} He carefully recorded their editions and noted their intention to produce even more books by means of their new art. Lowry speculates, and one is tempted to agree with him, that Aldus could not have escaped the influence and potential of the press in Rome whether through Calderini, Gaspare, Bussi, or Sweynheim and Pannartz directly.

Following Aldus’s exposure to Greek, the next fixed points in his biography provide two tantalizing clues, namely that Aldus was connected to the school of Battista Guarino and associated with Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. The first fixed point is an explicit reference that Aldus made to his Greek studies with Guarino. In the dedicatory epistle attached to his 1496 Theocritus,\textsuperscript{308} which he address to Guarino praeceptor suo, Aldus wrote,

\begin{quote}
\textit{Hunc vero librum tibi dicamus, praeceptor excellentissime, tum mea in Veronenses benivolentia (debo enim plurimum Veronensibus; nam a Gaspare Veronensi peregrego grammatico didici Romae Latinas litteras, a te vero Ferrariae et Latinas et Graecas), tum quia totus fere hic liber est de moribus.}
\end{quote}

[I dedicate this book to you, most excellent teacher, both out of my benevolence toward the Veronesi (I owe most to the Veronesi, for I learned

\textsuperscript{307} Published in the series \textit{Rerum Italicarum Scriptores}, second series 3.16, edited by Giuseppe Zippel.

\textsuperscript{308} ISTC: it00144000; Goff: T-144; GW: M45831.
Latin at Rome from Gaspare, that outstanding grammarian, and both Greek and Latin from you at Ferrara), and because nearly the whole book is about mores.]

Aldus had clearly studied with Guarino in Ferrara. The dates are uncertain, although they are, in themselves, of little consequence. What matters most is the link between Guarino, whose views on the study of Greek have been noted above, and Aldus, whose Greek publishing project would form the final act of Quattrocento Hellenism. One can safely say in passing, and of no small consequence, that Aldus must have studied Greek with Guarino from Chrysoloras’s Ἐρωτίματα, since Guarino expressly recommends that text.

In 1485, still floating between Ferrara and Carpi, Aldus wrote to Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494). He claimed that Manuel Adramytenus (1445-1485), his familiarissimus, had shown him a Greek letter written by Politian. Aldus wrote to Politian that the letter was,

...ornate quidem et docte atque copiose scriptam, quae non a Romano viro, sed a mero attico, qui Athenis semper fuisset, elucubrata videbatur.

309 Lowry: 51-52. As noted above, Aldus was in Rome in the mid to late 1470s. He was definitely in Carpi in 1480, where he was granted citizenship as tutor of Alberto and Lionello Pio, very likely recommended by their uncle, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. But Aldus claims to have left Ferrara only in 1482. On this evidence, Lowry decided that Aldus’s residence at the school of Guarino was most likely broken up by stints as a teacher. Alberto Pio is famously immortalized in a portrait attributed to Bernardino Loschi (1512). In the picture, Alberto holds a small book, not unlike an Aldine octavo.

310 De ordine 16.
Quamobrem coepi, mi Angele, amare te vehementer, doctrinam tuam atque ingenium non mediocriter admiratus.  

[...written ornately, learnedly, and fully, which seems to have been composed by lamplight, not by a Roman, but by a pure Greek, one who had always been in Athens. Therefore, my Angelo, I began to love you fervently, and I was not mildly struck by your learning and genius.]

Aldus was keen to present himself to Politian and express his commitment to Italian Renaissance Hellenism, as it had been defined by one of its great practitioners.

Another of Aldus’s statements on Renaissance Hellenism is happily preserved in a document known either as Musarum Panegyris or Epistola ad Catherinam Piam.\footnote{312} After some admonitory elegiacs directed to Alberto and Leonello Pio, his students at Carpi, Aldus writes to their mother, Caterina. The letter is full of examples for the boys to emulate and precedents for ancient learning. At one point, Aldus asks,

\footnote{311} Lowry (1979) does not print the letter. See Dorez (1896).

\footnote{312} Printed by Orlandi 1975: 157-64. The text was written in the late 1480s, when Aldus was still tutor to the boys at Carpi. But he clearly re-circulated it when he arrived in Venice, not later than 1490. It was first published around 1489, presumably by Baptista de Tortis in Venice, although the edition lacks a colophon (ISTC: im00227000; Goff: M-227; GW: 20730). Did Aldus use this text (and his link with the Pio family) as an advertisement for his services as a teacher in Venice? ISTC: im00227000; Goff: M-227; GW: 20730.
Quomodo enim, qui Graece nescit, Graecos imitari auctores potest in omni disciplinarum genere quam doctissimos?

[For how can those who do not know Greek imitate the Greek authors, as learned as possible in every discipline?]

The key word here is *imitari*. Guarino, in the *De ordine*, had insisted on the imitation of Latin authors and the knowledge of Greek to complement and complete Latin studies. Aldus seems to take his Hellenism a step further.

He insists that the boys should imitate the Greek authors themselves, because the Greek authors were the best in every field. It is in this further step that we see Aldus’s Hellenism grow from the Greek studies of his teachers to the Greek studies of the sixteenth century. Hellenism was gaining its independence within the *studia*. And before the end of the Quattrocento, Aldus would assert its independence with plain, untranslated Greek texts, printed for a market that he believed would sustain them. When he was compelled to print a Latin translation—as in the *Aldine Lascaris* considered below—he apologized for it and promised untranslated texts to come.\(^{313}\) With Aldus, Hellenism, at least notionally, had come a long way from Bruni’s first translations.

The next section will cover Aldus’s move to Venice, his publishing program, his associates in that city, and the making of his first Greek books.

---

\(^{313}\) Botely 2002: 207.
## Table 2.2

**Conspicuous of the Career of Aldus Manutius, c. 1450-1495**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Aldus's Residence</th>
<th>Teachers/Tutors/Associates</th>
<th>Contact with Greek</th>
<th>Contact with the Press</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1450</td>
<td>Bassiano</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1467</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Gaspare da Verona (c. 1400-1474)</td>
<td>[*]³¹⁴</td>
<td>[*]³¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domizio Calderini (1446-1478)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1478</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>Battista Guarino (1435-1505)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alberto Pio (1475-1531)</td>
<td>*³¹⁵</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Carpi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 March</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>[*]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manuel Adramytenus (1445-1485)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-1480s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1490</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Andrea Torresano (1451-1528)</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1494</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arstoboulos Apostolis (c. 1465-1535)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus Musurus (c. 1470-1517)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³¹⁴ Gaspare had known Guarino da Verona and studied under Tommaso Parentucelli (Pope Nicholas V). He also had sold Greek books to Lianoro de' Lianori, who had studied with Gaza. Gaspare must have known Greek, yet Aldus, in the preface to his 1496 Theocritus, only thanks Gaspare for his *Latin* instruction.

³¹⁵ Alberto was Aldus's student in Carpi in the 1480s. But he was also an accomplished Hellenist in his own right, studying with Marcus Musurus. See Geanakoplos 1962: 125-28.

³¹⁶ For reasons noted above, Aldus's exposure to the press in Rome is plausible but cannot be confirmed.
[2.2] The Aldine Publishing Program and Its Relation to the Aldine Lascaris

Quamquam huius bibliotheca domesticis et angustis parietibus continebatur, Aldus bibliothecam molitur, cujus non alia septa sint, quam ipsius orbis.

~ Erasmus, Adagia, 1001, Σπεύδε βραδέως

Aldus was in Venice by the early 1490s, certainly working as a teacher and most likely planning his career as printer. The precise reasons for his move from Carpi to Venice are uncertain. But there are reasonable conjectures. First, for a man who had decided to become a printer, Venice offered the obvious choice. Venice was at the time teeming with Greek-speakers (on whom Aldus could rely for advice and skilled labor), had ready patronage with deep pockets, wide-ranging trade networks, and an already prominent printing industry, and

317 Lowry puts great emphasis on the mystery surrounding Aldus's decision to become a printer when he was already in his forties. The truth is that posterity will never be certain which of the several possible influences mentioned above turned Aldus to the press (or what combination of these influences). Lowry suggests that it his fascination with language and an extension of his work as an educator (Lowry: 61-66). This was most likely part of the decision. Might Aldus have also wanted to try his hand at the new technology? Might he have been enticed by the potential for financial gain in a risky start-up business? Whatever the case, Aldus was in Venice in time to hear Hermolao Barbaro lecture Aristotle. Barbaro was exiled in 1491.

the library of Bessarion, which had been left to the city in 1468.\textsuperscript{319} The larger questions are: what did Aldus do in Venice, and how did it affect the course of European Hellenism? The more specific, immediate questions are: what brought Aldus to his first edition, and how (and why) did he produce the \textit{Aldine Lascaris}?

First a word on the larger questions.

Aldus’s impact on the history of classical scholarship and European Hellenism is famously alluded to by Thomas More in his \textit{Utopia} (1516), published just one year after Aldus’s death. More’s traveling character, Raphael Hythlodaye, brings books in his luggage and uses them to introduce the Utopians to Greek (as well as to the art of printing). That Raphael’s books fit in his luggage is not insignificant; they must have been small. And one’s suspicion is confirmed by his remarks on the Greek authors he carried with him:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Platonis opera pleraque, Aristotelis plura, Theophrastum item de plantis [...]};\textsuperscript{320} \textit{Plutarchi libellos habent carissimos, et Luciani quoque facetiis ac lepore capiuntur. ex poetis habent Aristophanem, Homerum, atque Euripidem; tum Sophoclem minusculis Aldi formulis. ex historicis Thucydidem atque Herodotum; necnon quin Herodianum.}\textsuperscript{321}
\end{quote}

[Most of Plato and Aristotle, Theophrastus on plants [...]]; they hold the books of Plutarch most dear, and also those of Lucian for their wit and

\textsuperscript{319} On Bessarion’s library and Aldus’s would-be use of it, see Lowry: 229-32.

\textsuperscript{320} Excerpted is the brief section on the monkey that tore up Raphael’s Theophrastus.

\textsuperscript{321} More, \textit{Utopia}, Book 2. Note the absence of Aeschylus, whose text Aldus did not print.
charm. Of the poets they have Aristophanes, Homer, and even Euripides and Sophocles in Aldus’s small formats. Of the historians, they have Thucydides, Herodotus, and even Herodian.

The significance of the passage is twofold. On the one hand, it implies the appeal and value of Greek literature among a social elite; on the other hand, it emphasizes the availability and accessibility of Greek authors in portable formats. The former is the effect of which Italian Renaissance Hellenism was the cause: the wide-spread, accepted allure and prestige of reading Greek authors; the latter is the effect of the Aldine publishing program: the availability, in portable format, of a canon of Greek authors. The two are inextricably connected.

Before 1495, very few Greek authors were in print, and the printed Greek texts that were available were expensive, large, and difficult to find. Between the Aldine Lascaris of 1495 and his death in 1515, Aldus published ninety-four

322 Since the Aldine Lascaris is a quarto, not one of Aldus’s famous italic octavos, a word should be said here concerning his formats. More alludes to the portability of Aldus’s books, which was, indeed, one of their most noticeable features. Aldus himself called them libri portatiles in his 1503 catalog. In the portrait of Alberto Pio by Loschi, Alberto holds what looks like an Aldine octavo, noticeable and innovative for two reasons: it was a smaller format than had been common for literary texts prior to Aldus and, if Alberto could show us the pages, we would see them unadorned with commentary—a plain text. Aldus himself, in his edition of Horace’s Enchiridium (835851), wrote: quo te sua parvitate ad se legendum, cum vel a muneribus publicis vel a Venetarum rerum componenda historia cessare potes, invitet. On Aldus’s small formats and the italic type that facilitated them, see Barker 1992: 109-17.
**editiones principes** of Greek authors.\(^{323}\) By the time of his death, nearly all the Greek authors recovered by the Italian Renaissance Hellenists were in print, and nearly all of them in Aldine editions. In this way, the Aldine publishing program was the culmination of Italian Renaissance Hellenism. Aldus and his partners made real the notion of the *studia humanitatis*—the immersion in and imitation of Latin authors. They realized that the *studia* depended on the profusion and accessibility of Greek texts, since it was only through access to Greek that real immersion in and imitation of Roman authors could be achieved.

Aldus also realized what Ralph Hexter called the “shape of the classical corpus.”\(^{324}\) He provided humanists—that is, practitioners of the *studia*—with the not only the second half of the classical heritage, the Greek literature behind the Roman, but also the full singularity of what we now call *classics*. The notion of classics, as now understood, is singular but binary. It is one pursuit composed of two fundamentally separate elements: the Roman and the Greek. Since Aldus provided access to the Greek element (access of a kind that had not existed prior to his publishing program), he is responsible for the notional corpus of classical authors that includes both the Latin and Greek authors—the corpus now recognized as classical literature. The Aldine publishing program, as Lowry would have it, “amounts to and almost complete cross-section of the Greek literary heritage as reconstituted by the fifteenth-century humanists and transmitted to the modern world.”\(^{325}\) But if Aldus set out to print the entirety of

---

\(^{323}\) Lowry: 258.

\(^{324}\) Hexter (1998).

\(^{325}\) Lowry 258.
extant ancient Greek literature, why did he start with the grammatical text of a Byzantine émigré?\textsuperscript{326}

Three catalogs of the Greek editions of the Aldine press survive. The first is dated 1498 and preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (ms.gr. 3064).\textsuperscript{327} It lists Aldus’s publications thematically, arranging them under the headings \textit{In grammaticam}, \textit{In poetica}, \textit{In logicam}, \textit{In philosophiam} and \textit{In sacra} scripturam. From this one can glimpse both a business strategy and an ideological commitment. By far the largest category of Greek texts published by Aldus up to 1498 is the category of grammatical texts. He lists the texts of Lascaris, Urbanus, the \textit{Thesaurus} of 1496, Gaza, and the Greek dictionary of 1497.

\textsuperscript{326} There has always been some uncertainty surrounding the true first edition of the Aldine Press. Two editions from the first year of the press (1495) are dated in their colophons and in the catalog of 1498: the \textit{Aldine Lascaris}, Gaza’s grammar, and the first volume of the five-volume Aristotle. Two editions that likely belong to the year 1495 are undated: the \textit{Galeomyomachia} (not included in the 1498 catalog) and Musaeus’s \textit{Opusculum de Herone et Leandro}. Did either of these two books precede the \textit{Lascaris}? Paper stocks provide some evidence. The Greek quires of the bilingual \textit{Opusculum} are printed on the same paper as quires A-B of the \textit{Lascaris} (See the analysis of paper stocks below, \textbf{SECTION 3.2}. The paper of the \textit{Galeomyomachia} is entirely different, bearing the watermark of a circled anchor (Briquet 467). It seems likely that the \textit{Opusculum} and the \textit{Lascaris} shared paper stock and were therefore printed in close proximity. But did the \textit{Opusculum} precede the \textit{Lascaris}. It seems unlikely that Aldus would inaugurate his press with such a work instead of the \textit{Lascaris}.

\textsuperscript{327} Reproduced by Orlandi 1975: 23; USTC: 993248.
As a business strategy, grammatical texts were a relatively safe bet in what could be a very risky business. To print an edition required a significant capital layout, and returns on the investment could be distant. Printing was a relatively new technology, as yet unregulated by guilds or industry standards. It was venture capitalism at its most uncertain. The largest initial cost was in type. When a printer set up shop, he needed to buy, borrow, or cut and cast a new font of type—a very large investment in material and skilled labor, often undertaken years before the first sheet came off the press. Then there were paper, ink, and pressmen. Finally, when an edition was ready to come to market, there were the additional expenses of transportation and distribution, usually paid as a percentage of sales that ultimately reduced returns. Many more printers attempted the first phase of this business than history records. And

---

328 Printers knew, as their predecessors (the scribes) had known, who the main users of books were. “The requirements of the clergy, of the professions, of teachers and students were tradition-bound and well established.” (Hirsch 1974: 31).

329 The actual expenses of fifteenth-century printers are difficult to calculate: in part because the cost of equipment varied a great deal from place to place (and in quality); in part because currencies fluctuated constantly in fifteenth-century Italy; in part because not every printer had the same requirements upon setting up his shop. For an attempt to analogize cost, see Hirsch 1974: 27-40.

330 No guild regulated printing practices in fifteenth-century Italy. Nuovo 2013: 1: “Without a guild that governed production and trade in books, space was open to all.”

331 Not unlike the business of Silicon Valley, according to Hexter 1998: 157: “a risky capital venture at the intersection of business, the academy, technical innovation, marketing, and at times government interest.”
many more printed only one edition, being unable to satisfy their creditors enough to finance a second.\textsuperscript{332}

Since Gutenberg, printers had relied on certain steady markets to offset the hazardous investment. Bibles, of course, always sold well, as did canon law texts, personal devotionals, and grammars. In fact, Gutenberg’s first presswork was most likely an edition of Donatus’ \textit{Ars minor}.\textsuperscript{333} Even the Dutch prototypographical fragments seem to suggest that the first texts produced by mechanical reproduction, even before Gutenberg, were copies of Donatus.\textsuperscript{334}

Aldus claims, in his preface to the first part of the \textit{Aldine Lascaris}, that the edition was \textit{quasi praeludium}, like a prelude, to his publishing program.\textsuperscript{335}

\textit{Constantini Lascaris viri doctissimi institutiones grammaticas
introducendis in litteras Graecas adolescentis quam utilissimas, quoddam quasi praeludium esse summis nostris laboribus, et impendiis, tantoque apparatui, ad imprimenda graeca volumina omnis generis fecit cum multitudo eorum qui graecis erudiri litteris concupiscunt,}

\textsuperscript{332} For the technicalities of the venture, see Proctor (1900), Scholderer (1966), Hirsch (1974), Lowry: 7-48, and Flogaus (2008).

\textsuperscript{333} ISTC: id00314800. Printed with the type of the 36-line Bible as early as 1452.

\textsuperscript{334} ISTC: id00320860, for instance. According to the Dutch humanist Petrus Scriverius, Johann Fust stole the font of his Haarlem-based master, Laurens Coster, returned to Mainz, and promptly printed the \textit{Doctrinale} of Alexander de Villedieu—even before Gutenberg printed a letter.

\textsuperscript{335} See the full text below, APPENDIX A.1.
[The grammatical works of that most learned man, Constantine Lascaris, as useful as one could imagine for introducing the young to the Greek language, and can be seen almost as a prelude to our great efforts, our expenses, and our machinery for printing Greek volumes of every kind by both the large number of those who desire to be accomplished in Greek,]

And he claimed that such a book was a wise business strategy,

nullae enim extabant impressae venales et petebantur a nobis frequenter,

[for no printed books existed for sale and they frequently sought them from us.]

Aldus’s claim that no printed books—meaning printed Greek pedagogical books—were for sale, and that he was often asked for them, is very likely true, even if he exaggerated for advertisement. The second claim here is beyond business: that Lascaris’s institutiones were quam utilissimae. Aldus likely believed it. And as much as the business of printing informed his choice of a first edition, so too did his commitment to Renaissance Hellenism and the education of the young in Greek.

As an ideological commitment, Aldus’s choice to produce grammatical texts early reinforces the notion that he was, first and foremost, a teacher; and he had conceived of a programmatic, educational-literary enterprise. He was convinced that the tide of Greek studies in Venice was swelling, he saw the
Milanese and Florentine interest in Greek typography,\textsuperscript{336} and he was ready to see the new medium as an extension of his work as an educator.\textsuperscript{337} One gathers as much from his catalog of 1498. He produced grammars and lexica to sell. But he also produced them to teach, and so created the notional space of classics by providing the media for teaching, learning, and studying Greek (and Latin) texts. Aldus had to “enable the reading of Greek texts before he could expect to market them.”\textsuperscript{338} And he meant to market them to those adherents of the \textit{studia} who would practice this discipline and inhabit this notional space. He addressed his prefaces \textit{Aldus Manutius studiosi}.\textsuperscript{339}

\textsuperscript{336}Lowry: 82.

\textsuperscript{337}Ibid. 66: “To Aldus, printing was not a break in his activity as an educator, but a continuation of it into a new dimension.”

\textsuperscript{338}Hexter 1998: 157. Hexter uses the analogy of hardware and software: once customers have the capability to use a product line, the line can be expanded indefinitely.

\textsuperscript{339}Or some variation thereof. The Greek of the [1495] Musaeus is Ἄλδος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος τοῖς ὁποudingιοῖς. Every grammatical or lexical text listed on the 1498 catalog is addressed to the studiosi. A conceit, certainly. But a meaningful one. The term \textit{studiosi} pervades Aldus’s prefaces, and usually as a noun, not an adjective. Following Hexter, this is very likely more than a “stylistic tic.” Hexter claims: One might say that Aldus created the corporation of \textit{studiosi} by apostrophizing them, but it would be more accurate and less mystical to formulate it thus: in its totality, Aldus’s publishing project enabled such a group to become and to function as \textit{studiosi.”} (Hexter 1998: 158-59.) This notion of a “corporation” may be tied to an aspect of Aldus’s program not detailed in this account: his ambitions to found a New Academy. To quote Hexter again: “An “academy” was invoked and therefore exists, on paper at least […] and interactive network and ever-renewing body of texts and scholars, \textit{libri} and \textit{studiosi.”} (Ibid. 160). Nuovo adds that the members of the Manuzio family, “…stressed their participation in the Republic of Letters more than in the world of production and merchandising, From Aldo Manuzio we have evidence of the dedication of editions, an aspect of the book that established a new and highly successful manner of communication between the publisher and the reader.” (Nuovo 2013: 5).
But who were the *studiosi*? Whom did Aldus hope to reach with his Greek publications? Was there really a market for such idealistic Hellenism? Aldus’s program was ambitious. Between 1495 and 1500, he printed 4,212 leaves of Greek compared to only 1,807 in Latin.\(^\text{340}\) That amounted to sixteen discrete editions of Greek authors compared with thirteen Latin. The Greek editions included the great four-volume folio Aristotle, which alone consists of 1,792 leaves of Greek. And the Latin editions were, in many ways, complimentary to the Greek; they could even be considered part of the Greek publishing program. Aldus’s 1495 edition of Bembo’s *De aetna*\(^\text{341}\) is full of allusions to the study of Greek; his 1497 Iamblichus,\(^\text{342}\) translated into Latin by Ficino, was clearly a compliment to the Greek editions; his 1498 *Opera* of Politian\(^\text{343}\) promoted the work of the greatest of Quattrocento Hellenists; the 1499 *Astronomici veteres*,\(^\text{344}\) a bilingual volume, included Latin translations of Greek authors; and the 1500 Lucretius\(^\text{345}\) was dedicated by Aldus to Alberto Pio as an example of Greek philosophy.

The Greek books themselves fall into two categories, as mentioned above: the language-acquisition texts, including grammars and lexica, and the literary texts. One can imagine that the market for each category could be distinct,

\(^{340}\) Lowry: 111.
\(^{341}\) ISTC: ib00304000; Goff: B-304; GW: 3810.
\(^{342}\) ISTC: ij00216000; Goff: J-216; GW: M11750.
\(^{343}\) ISTC: ip00886000; Goff: P-886; GW: M34727. The interesting history of this edition, which was not begun but finished by Aldus, is told by Lowry: 118.
\(^{344}\) ISTC: if00191000; Goff: F-191; GW: 9981.
\(^{345}\) ISTC: il00335000; Goff: L-335; GW: M19135.
though not without overlap. The books of the former category likely sold well, as they frequently made it to second and third editions. The books of the latter category? It cannot be certain how well they sold. They were not inexpensive. The Aristotle cost eleven ducats for the set of four volumes; Aristophanes cost two-and-a-half ducats; the Aldine Lascris cost four marcelli.\textsuperscript{346} Aldus was printing in runs of 1,000 to 3,000 copies (the number is uncertain). One can judge from a change in volume that the books were not moving off the shelf as quickly as Aldus would hope.

From 1501 to 1503, he printed only 2,235 leaves of Greek—compared to his 4,212 of the period 1495-1500. A sharp decline. And in the same period—1501-1503—Aldus printed 3,839 leaves of Latin. A sharp \textit{incline}. Of course the Venetian world had been financially upset by wars with France and the Turks, and the printing industry was considerably set back. But it would not be far-fetched to draw some tentative conclusions as to Aldus’s publishing practices from these statistics. It is likely that he and his partners were less inclined to focus on the big, ambitious Greek projects than they had been at first. Perhaps the market of \textit{studiosi} had been temporarily saturated, and Aldus was forced to back-peddle, relying increasingly on Latin and vernacular texts to pad his Greek publishing program. It is impossible to be sure. But one thing is certain. Even during this period of reduction, Aldus brought out a second edition of the \textit{Aldine Lascaris}.\textsuperscript{347}

\textsuperscript{346} According to the 1498 catalog. See note 323 above.

\textsuperscript{347} USTC: 840307.
There is another clue to the actual—rather than the speculative—market for Greek books. On the same day that the Aldine Lascaris was printed, February 25th, 1495, Aldus applied to the Venetian government for a privilege to protect his invention of a new method for casting Greek letters (discussed in detail below). But he asked for something more: he wanted to have exclusive privilege for the printing of all Greek texts. He requested that,

...tutti i libri greci, cussì cum la exposition latina, come senza, et latini traducti de greco non stampadi altra volta che lui supplicante stampirà, o farà stampir, niuno altro non li possa restampar, ne far restampar ne portar ne far portar stampadi nel Dominio...

[...all Greek books, with a Latin translation or not, as well as Latin books translated from Greek that have not been printed, and that your supplicant will print or cause to be printed, [we ask that] no other may reprint or cause to be reprinted or import or cause to be imported in this Dominion...]

A bold appeal. It was challenged in March of 1498. Gabriel Braccius, a rival, filed suit against Aldus for the claim that he (Aldus) had exclusive right to a method of casting Greek letters and printing Greek texts. Aldus won the first part of this suit: his invention was protected; he lost the second half—after 1498 he did not
have exclusive claim on the publication of Greek texts. Aldus had, in effect, undermined himself. As Nicolas Barker put it,

In 1495, Greek was apparently a ‘minority interest,’ requiring the support of a privilege; in 1498, it was self-supporting.348

Aldus had not only created a market, he had created a readership. By the end of the Quattrocento, his studiosi—his readership—were able to sustain his publishing program and cause the Venetian state to see competition in this arena as healthy and desirable.

The fact is that certain aspects of the history of the Aldine publishing program are as yet uncertain. The documentary evidence is suggestive but rarely fills the gaps comprehensively. The statistics, such as they are, should be handled with caution, since they represent only a snapshot of a complex undertaking. Finally, the history of Italian Renaissance Hellenism cannot be written from the surviving evidence of the Aldine publishing program. That history inevitably lies somewhere among the books, their readers, their publishers, and the many anonymous or uncertain links in the cycle that connects them.

The following section briefly covers the associates of the Aldine press as they pertain to the publication of its first edition: the *Aldine Lascaris.*

---

For Aldus’s arrival in Venice, one finds a terminus in the publication of his Latin grammatical text, the *Institutiones grammaticae latinae*, which bears the date March 9th, 1493.\(^{349}\) The text was set up and printed by Andrea Torresano, who had been working in Venice since at least 1479.\(^{350}\) It was with Torresano and Pierfrancesco Barbarigo, son of the former Doge, Marco Barbarigo, that Aldus formed a partnership for the publication of Greek texts.\(^{351}\) Torresano had, up to this point, published principally theological, devotional, and canon law texts,\(^{352}\) and the factors of his decision to enter the risky business of Greek-language publishing have unfortunately been obscured by time.\(^{353}\) There is some speculation that Aldus’s former pupil, Alberto Pio, personally financed his teacher’s early experiments, and that Torresano became a principal backer only after Aldus’s realized a return on the investment.\(^{354}\)

\(^{349}\) ISTC: im00226500; GW: M2072620 (not recorded by Goff).

\(^{350}\) His first recorded edition is a small Roman breviary: ISTC: ib01119450; GW: 5132 (not recorded by Goff). He may have studied under Jenson in the mid-1470s (Lowry: 77-78). Aldus married Torresano’s daughter in 1505.

\(^{351}\)

\(^{352}\) His 1491 edition of Ficino’s Plato is a notable exception: ISTC: ip00772000; Goff: P-772; GW: M33918.

\(^{353}\) No trace of the contract has survived. On the known intricacies of the deal, see Lowry: 81-82 and Grendler 1984: 15-16.

\(^{354}\) Lowry: 82.
Moreover, there is naturally some question as to who, in such a triumvirate, controlled the corporation. The details survive in the extant contracts and business documents of the corporation but, even then, are a matter of interpretation. In a document of 1542, recording the dissolution of the original partnership, Torresano and Barbarigo are called the principals, with Aldus “taking a certain part.”355 But what was that “certain part?” There can be little doubt that neither Torresano nor Barbarigo could have provided the “parts” of most interest in the present inquiry. The former could not have directed a highly specialized, academic publishing program, replete with the technical knowledge of Greek philology required; the latter had little previous (or subsequent) interest in printing and was, in contemporary terms, primarily a venture capitalist, interested mainly in returns.

Whatever the details of the business, which will unfortunately never be known in their entirety with certainty, Aldus was not working alone in the years leading up to his first imprint. Printing was, by its very nature, a multifaceted business, and it required a team of specialists—in particular where the Greek language was involved. Moving to Venice in his early forties, emerging from a career as tutor to princes, Aldus could not have had the expertise required to print any book, let alone a Greek one. He found financial backing, equipment, and technical advice in the persons of Torresano, Barbarigo, and, perhaps, Pio. But to realize his ambition, to print Greek books, many of which had not been

printed before, he needed more. He would need copy, and a font of type, and editorial support.

The story of Aldus’s copy-text for the *Aldine Lascaris* begins with Pietro Bembo’s return from Messina to Venice in 1494. Bembo and his friend, Angelo Gabriele, had been studying Greek in Messina with Constantine Lascaris for fourteen months, partly drawn by Lascaris’s fame as a teacher, partly drawn to Messina to avoid political turmoil.\(^{356}\) How exactly Aldus and Bembo met is not known. But the latter presented the former with two significant objects: a roman coin of Trajan’s era bearing an anchor and dolphin and the motto *festina lente*,\(^{357}\) and a composite manuscript written by Bembo and Gabriele and corrected by their teacher, Lascaris.\(^{358}\) The precise role of the manuscript in the preparation of the *Aldine Lascaris* has never been determined with certainty. Aldus claims, in his preface,\(^{359}\)

\begin{quote}
*Nam deleta quaedam videbit, multa correcta, plurima addita. Ita vero emendatum manu ipsius Constantini librum nobis dedere commodo Petrus Bembus et Angelus Gabriel Patritii Veneti adeo nobiles, praestantique, ingenio iuvenes, qui nuper in Insula Sicilia graecas litteras ab eo ipso Lascari didicerunt.*
\end{quote}


\(^{357}\) Aldus did not use his famous device until his 1502 Dante (USTC: 808768).

\(^{358}\) Now Vat.gr.1401.

\(^{359}\) Fot the full text, see APPENDIX A.1 below.
[For he, the reader, will see certain things deleted, much corrected, and much more added. Pietro Bembo and Angelo Gabriele, Venetian nobles, gave us this book—corrected in by the hand of Lascaris himself. They were recently learning Greek on Sicily from that same Lascaris.]

But many have doubted Aldus’s claim, or at least the extent of it. Aldus did not help his credibility in this matter by claiming the Latin translation as his own (when in fact it was Giovanni Crastone’s). He does seem to have used Bembo’s manuscript and some of the notes in it. But the alterations to Lascaris’s text were superficial, and Aldus’s text was effectively a reprint of Bonus Accursius’s Milan edition of 1480.\textsuperscript{360}

Aldus undoubtedly received inspiration from Bembo, who was at that time engaged in the promotion of Greek studies in Venice.\textsuperscript{361} But the next actor was certainly more crucial to the program: Francesco Griffo. With the financial backing of Torresano and Barbarigo, Aldus could expect to realize his program; with associates the likes of Bembo and Gabriele he could feel reasonably well connected and promoted. But the problem of printing Greek remained, and it was a challenge for which Aldus was ill-prepared. He was not a calligrapher, nor was he an engraver. His connection with Griffo was critical.

\textsuperscript{360} ISTC: il00066000; Goff: L-66; GW: 17096.

Unfortunately, Francesco Griffo is an uncertain figure. He was from Bologna, and he cut punches for Aldus. That is the extent of certainty. Both facts rest ultimately on lines of praise printed by Aldus in his 1501 Vergil.\textsuperscript{362} These lines are affirmed by Gerolamo Soncino’s claim, in 1503, that he had hired Griffo, and that Griffo had indeed cut Aldus’s type-faces.\textsuperscript{363} By 1518, Griffo seems to have been convicted of murdering his son-in-law with an iron bar. After that, he disappears from history.\textsuperscript{364} Despite Griffo’s obscurity, he is necessary. Given Aldus’s inability to design, cut, and cast Greek letters himself, there is need to assume an collaborator, an \textit{incisor litterarum}, who could have accomplished such a feat.\textsuperscript{365} Griffo is the best candidate.

Finally, if Aldus could not have set up his own shop or cut his own Greek font, nor would he have been ready to promise a series of Greek books without sustained editorial advice. Unfortunately for the historian of the Aldine press, the 1495 \textit{Lascaris} comes at a point just prior to the documented involvement of Aldus’s two principal assistants in this regard: Aristoboulos Apostolis and Marcus Musurus.

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{362} USTC: 862688. \textit{Qui Graeiis dedit Aldus, en Latinis}
\begin{center}
\textit{Dat nunc grammata scalpta daedales
Francesci manibus Bononiensis.}
\end{center}
\textsuperscript{363} Moreover, Soncino claims that Griffo was an expert cutter of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew letters. Lowry: 88.
\textsuperscript{364} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{365} Not to mention the design and execution of the famous Aldine italic, for which see Barker (1998).
\end{footnotes}
Aristoboulos was the son of a famous father, Michael Apostolis, author of an oration on the teaching of Greek and well known copyist.\textsuperscript{366} Like his father, Aristoboulos was born in Venetian Crete and pursued a career as copyist and teacher.\textsuperscript{367} He had left Crete for Venice around 1492, presumably to find a living teaching Greek, and spent some time in Florence with Janus Lascaris.\textsuperscript{368} But Aristoboulos’s time in Florence, just as Lascaris’s, abruptly ended with the fall of Piero de’ Medici in 1494, and he likely found himself again in Venice. His involvement with the Aldine press is attested as early as 1495 with the publication of the \textit{Galeomyomachia}, for which Aristoboulos wrote the preface. But whether or not he was involved at all with the \textit{Aldine Lascaris} is far from certain. Even if the \textit{Galeomyomachia} were to precede the \textit{Lascaris}, there would be no certainty that Aristoboulos had a hand in the production of the latter.

Marcus Musurus, also a Cretan, is perhaps the most important editorial name associated with the Aldine press and Aldus’s Greek publishing program. Evidence of his involvement with the press is found in the undated Musaeus, to which he contributed two Greek epigrams. But was he involved with the planning and publishing of the \textit{Lascaris}? Again, Aldus is silent. Musurus’s first involvement is not explicit until Aldus’s 1497 edition of the lexicon of Giovanni

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{366} On Michael, see Geanakoplos 1962: 73-110; on his oration, in an edition by Rollo, Pontani (1996). Attesting to his importance as a copyist, over one hundred manuscripts in his hand are extant. See Vogel and Gardthausen 1909: 305-10.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{367} His hand is clearly modeled on his father’s. See Vogel and Gardthausen (1909): 42-44.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{368} Geanakoplos 1962: 169-70.}
Crastone, the Carmelite monk who originally composed the Latin translation of Lascaris.369

So one is left with a cast of potential actors: Torresano and Barbarigo (and perhaps Pio) financed the start-up; copy (or at least impetus) was supplied by Bembo and Gabriele; letters were likely cut by Griffo, though Aldus’s own role in their design is uncertain; and editorial oversight was potentially lent to the project by Aristoboulos Apostolis or Marcus Musurus, though their involvement is unattested and tentative. Despite these reservations, it remains certain that Aldus could not have accomplished the task himself, and the Aldine Lascaris was likely a corporate project.

At this stage, it is worth a few words to explain a peculiar difficulty in the printing of Greek books, one that made Greek books, in the early 1490s, even more difficult than Latin or vernacular, namely the type. Greek always confounds new media. The polytonic, circular, ligature-ridden nature of the script did not adapt readily to the punch or matrix, any more than it has to XHTML or Unicode. The following section will review Aldus’s struggles with the development of a font of type appropriate for his first edition, the Aldine Lascaris.

369 ISTC: ic00960000; Goff: C-960; GW: 7814. Musurus is mentioned in Aldus’s preface on fol. 1v (a1v).
In the quote above, Aldus alludes to a fact, one that troubled fifteenth-century typographers nearly as much as it troubled their late twentieth-century counterparts: designing and accurately executing non-roman characters was much harder (durior) than the default. For the historian of printing, and of pedagogical books in particular, this fact is of central importance: the recovery of the Greek language in the West was effected not only by prevailing ideologies and institutional or singular acts of reclamation, it was also effected by the availability of media. Would-be Hellenists needed a way to learn the language, and they needed books to read. And, most importantly, the former had to correspond to the latter. In other words, literacy in Greek depended on a graphic system that linked instructional media to target media—schoolbooks to literary texts. This, as Aldus tells us, and as is clear in retrospect, was much harder to do with Greek than with Latin.

The reasons for this difficulty are the subjects of the following three sections: format, typography, and layout. All three pertain to the visual display of information that constitutes a graphic system and affects literacy in the target

370 Preface to *Thesaurus Cornu copiae et Horti Adonidis*. ISTC: it00158000; Goff: T-158; GW: 7571.
language; and all three, as will be seen, were in fact quite difficult. Although considered within the scope of the history of printing, the visual display of information is an aspect of the history of graphic design, and the presentation of verbal content in a printed book reveals the reciprocal nature of process, expectation, and use. In the realm of Italian Renaissance Hellenism, specifically in its first phase—the acquisition of the Greek language—the underlying processes, expectations, and uses of a pedagogical book will reveal the means and ends of book design, marketing, and consumption in the Quattrocento.

It will be noticed that binding is not systematically treated below. The incunabular period antedates the practice of publishers' bindings. This fact relegates the evidence of binding to the study of ownership and use as opposed to the study of design and production.

As with writing, the purpose of printing is to convey meaning, both in a sequence of words, figures, punctuation, etc. and in the context of the page—the design of a book, its size, its materials, its type and visual presentation.371

~ David McKitterick

Even before coming to Aldus’s first Greek type-face—perhaps the most immediate and defining characteristic of the Aldine Lascaris—a word should be said concerning the imposition of an edition with facing translation. In bibliographical terms, imposition is the process of arranging the text in the forme (the iron frame that contained the type) prior to printing.

Two previous editions of Lascaris’s grammar had been published with the Latin translation of Giovanni Crastone: Milan, [Bonus Accursius], 29 September 1480,372 and Vicenza, Leonardus Achates de Basilea, 14 June 1489.373 In both editions, Crastone’s translation was printed in adjacent columns, not facing. This mise-en-page belonged to the manuscript era. It caused little problem for printers, who were able to set up type in adjacent columns, locking type-sorts from two fonts in the same form and printing a page. The only challenge would be one of alignment, and that could be solved with relative ease by casting the

371 McKitterick 2003: 37.
372 ISTC: il00066000; Goff: L-66; GW: M17096.
373 ISTC: il00067000; Goff: L-67; GW: M17099.
Latin and Greek faces on the same sized body. But the column-layout is not ideal for language-acquisition, given such close proximity. One could imagine it as more a gloss than a translation, more a crutch than a study-guide.

Aldus conceived something different, something that would have been quite cumbersome in the writing of a manuscript but entirely manageable with the press: imposing a quarto so as to print eight pages in alternating type—Greek on versos, Latin on rectos, so that a two-page spread would have Greek on the left, Latin on the right.

Assuming a sheet of super-chancery paper (the sheet preferred by Aldus for quartos) the compositors would set up type in distinct pages and impose them on the outer and inner formes of the sheet. It is likely that they would not keep type standing, given insufficient quantities. Instead, they would have cast-off from their copy-text—i.e. determined the imposition ahead of time—so as to print the pages out of order. The printing order of the sixteen pages on eight leaves would, in fact, be: 1, 16, 4, 13, 15, 2, 14, 3, 5, 12, 8, 9, 11, 6, 10, 7. Only pages 8 and 9 are sequential. In a quire of facing Greek-Latin pages, the sequence of printing would be: L, G, G, L, L, G, G, L, L, G, G, L, L, G, G, L.

This practice was not revolutionary, but Aldus’s use of it was innovative. It gave him the advantage that previous editions had lacked: he was able to provide students with a facing translation. It also puts the Aldine Lascaris firmly in the world of print, as opposed to manuscript. Although not impossible in manuscript, producing a facing translation was impractical in the extreme and is therefore quite rare. In this, as in his typography, Aldus was using the
technology of the printing press to give his buyers the language-acquisition advantages they had previously lacked. FIGURE 2.1 shows the imposition of a quarto in eights (composed of two sheets) with facing translation.
FIGURE 2.1

THE IMPOSITION OF A QUARTO IN EIGHTS WITH FACING

Translation

FIRST SHEET

Outer forme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inner forme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND SHEET

Outer forme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inner forme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But Aldus knew that not every student would want such a book. Envisioning other groups of readers, Aldus addressed the *studiosi* in his opening letter:

*Interpretationem vero latinam ergone addidimus arbitratu nostro, rati commodius, utilisque futurum graece discere incipientibus. parcant velim qui haec sine interpretatione latina desiderant, nam rudibus, & ignaris penitus litterarum graecarum Lascaris institutiones imprimendas curavimus. mox eruditis & doctis optimi quique graecorum libri favente CHRISTO IESU imprimentur.*

[We have directly added the Latin translation on our own initiative, thinking it would be more agreeable and useful for those beginning to learn Greek. And we would ask that those wanting the text without the Latin translation spare us, for in printing Lascaris’s grammatical treatises, we have cared for those without any knowledge of Greek. Soon all the best Greek books will be printed for the learned, Christ willing.]

Certainly there were those wanting a monolingual version, either in Greek or Latin. Those wanting a Greek-only version probably had their rudiments already and wanted the latest, most up-to-date Ἕπιτομή; those wanting a Latin-only version are harder to envision, but that class of readers likely existed. A late fifteenth-century manuscript in the Walters Art Museum

---

374 See APPENDIX 1 for the full letter.
preserves sections of Chrysoloras’s grammar copied from a printed book, but only in Latin, presumably as a study-guide or crib-sheet. And Aldus designed his second edition of Lascaris’s grammar, [1501-1503], to be printed for all three conceivable groups.

In this edition, there is a register after the colophon which instructs the binder on the arrangement of the quires. Aldus designed the book to be bound in three ways: Greek only, Latin only, or with facing translation. His system was a rather ingenious bit of book-art. The [1501-1503] Lascaris is a quarto, like the 1495. But unlike the imposition illustrated in Figure 2.1, Aldus printed two sheets entirely in Latin and two sheets entirely in Greek. The binder would be able to sell a quarto in eights entirely in Latin, or the same format entirely in Greek. If the buyer wanted a bilingual version, the binder could interleave the eight leaves of Latin with the eight leaves of Greek. This arrangement would give an alternating facing translation—Latin left, Greek right; Greek left, Latin right, etc. The problem arose on the eight and ninth leaves, which would end up with Greek facing Greek. Aldus handled that problem by printing a student text (the Πίναξ attributed to Cebes of Thebes, a member of the Socratic circle and main interlocutor in Plato’s Phaedo) entirely in Greek then entirely in Latin, as the quires dictated.

Aldus had envisioned multiple readerships, each relative to his or her proficiency in Greek. But he chose to market his first book (albeit with a disclaimer) to what was likely the broadest class: those wanting to learn Greek

---

375 Walters 90.376.
376 USTC: 762307.
with the latest version of Lascaris’s text with the latest means of presenting the translation that the new technology of the press had to offer. But Aldus’s biggest achievement, and perhaps the achievement for which the *Aldine Lascaris* is most noted, is his design of a Greek type-face that set the course of Greek letter design in Europe for centuries.
The subject of type and type-forms follows a narrow path, a kind of “watershed” between biography and bibliography.\textsuperscript{377}

~ Daniel Berkeley Updike

The history of Greek typefounding is inseparable from the history of Greek letter-forms generally.\textsuperscript{378} The shaping of Greek letters—whether by chisel, pen, or type-sort—belongs to the continuum of writing, and it is crucial that Greek typography be considered as a form of writing, albeit mechanical. The difference, and the factor that shapes the present inquiry, was well summarized by Harry Carter in his 1968 Lyell Lectures in Oxford: “Type is something you can pick up and hold in your hand.”\textsuperscript{379} A piece of Greek type may represent an extension of the stylus and the chisel, but it is different in that it is both process and product, both the means of forming a letter and the letter itself. In this sense the typographer’s art is neither the stone-cutter’s nor the scribe’s, for both of the

\textsuperscript{377} Updike: xlii.

\textsuperscript{378} There are three comprehensive treatments of the technicalities of Greek typefounding: Proctor (1900), Scholderer (1927), and Barker (1992). This section will deal exclusively with Aldus’s Greek typography. But the \textit{Aldine Lascaris}, as noted above, is bilingual. Aldus’s Latin typeface is an uncomplicated roman that bears the influence of established Venetian roman typography, especially the influence of Jenson. His first proprietary roman type-face was designed by Griffo for Bembo’s \textit{De Aetna} (1496).

\textsuperscript{379} Carter 1969: 1.
latter produce (or reproduce) a letter-form from an instrument that is not itself a letter-form. Conversely, the typographer (or the compositor, who is the more appropriate analog for the scribe) cannot produce a letter form that does not already exist in his type-case. The letters are the letters.\textsuperscript{380} The typographer’s art is, in fact, the engraver’s art; and the product aside, in process it bears more resemblance to sealstone or die engraving than to writing on papyrus or paper.\textsuperscript{381}

The two related problems that Greek posed for earliest typographers were 1.) fitting Greek letters to the grid, and 2.) handling the multiplicity of accents. These problems correspond to the challenges of 1.) choosing a script on which to model a font, and 2.) cutting and casting the font affordably, efficiently, and in such a way that a compositor could set type.

First the grid. As Nicolas Barker pithily put it: “the adaptation of letters was a problem in geometry.”\textsuperscript{382} Gutenberg and his contemporaries had faced this problem with roman letters and roman and Arabic numerals. But, not coincidentally, the gothic missal script on which Gutenberg based his type—the so-called DK type—possessed a geometry sympathetic to the engraver’s art.\textsuperscript{383}

\textsuperscript{380} On the compositor and the scribe, see Dane 2011: 3-24.

\textsuperscript{381} For a description of the process of ancient sealstone engraving, see Younger (1981); for the relation of fifteenth-century punch engraving to printing with movable type, see Hupp (1929). Gutenberg had been a goldsmith; Nicholas Jenson had been a die-cutter at the royal mint in Tours before coming to Venice to print. The transition was natural.

\textsuperscript{382} Barker 1992: 21. In speaking of geometry, typographers generally use the term \textit{grid} where paleographers might use \textit{ductus}. Both terms refer, at a basic level, to the geometrical patterning or sequence of shapes in letter-forms.

\textsuperscript{383} This script—a \textit{littera textualis}, \textit{textus quadratus}, or \textit{textura} (\textit{textura formata quadrata}, in Lieftnick’s nomenclature)—was a highly mannered, calligraphic script, formed by lifting the pen after each stroke. See Derolez 2003: 73-84 and plate 40. Although often called a "missal
The letters are formed primarily on vertical and horizontal axes contained within the baseline and headline; they were, in other words, basically rectangular. Ligatures and abbreviations might alter existing letter forms, thereby becoming their own form and requiring their own type-sort. But they did not disturb the geometry. Of course the rectangular forms admitted different dimensions, which typographers call the body of the type on which the face stands in relief. And the different sizes of body required for the different letter forms posed a problem for casting, i.e. one would need as many molds as there were casting dimensions. But Gutenberg solved this problem with the adjustable script," it was as often used for schoolbooks as for Bibles and missals (See Needham1993: 23). This script confined the scribe to a predictable geometry, which made the letters particularly adaptable to the process of typefounding. But of course this is an oversimplification of a complex process. And we can no longer say, with Updike, that: "The first type-cutters and type-founders were merely somewhat servile imitators of the manuscript letter-forms to which they were already accustomed." (Updike 5). Even if there is substantial truth in the statement, it implies that the earliest typographers had been scribes and intended to reproduce scribal practices by a new means. This repeats a cliché that is no longer generally accepted, i.e. that the earliest printers designed their books to look exactly like manuscripts. In fact, the earliest printers were not scribes. They were minters, goldsmiths, and engravers. And the assumption that they meant for their books to be mistaken for manuscripts risks oversimplifying complex and intimate connections between media. It is also contrary to a significant body of evidence, namely the colophons of the earliest printed books, which frequently draw attention to their sculptural—as opposed to scribal—nature. The colophon of the Mainz Catholicon, for instance, reads: non calami, stili, aut penne suffragio, sed mira patronarum formarumque concordia proporcione et modulo, impressus est. On this relationship, see McKitterick 2003: 30-32. Rather than Updike’s "servile imitators," one might prefer "resourceful adaptors." The concept of the grid is at some level innate and inherent.
mold. And at no point did the variety of body-sizes disturb the grid. When the first roman faces were designed (as distinguished from “gothic” faces), it was found that, although composed of curved lines, the letter-forms did not break the rectangle. Fluidity of shape was not a problem for engravers; notional space was.

Greek letter-forms posed precisely this problem: the grid—the notional space assumed by western scribes and adopted by the earliest printers—was disturbed. Greek minuscule scripts of the fifteenth century did not conform to the geometrical expectations of Western writers or printers, and letter-forms often extended beyond the notional space of the grid. In a ligature, for instance, the pen-stroke could travel over the space of several letter-forms, and contractions frequently incorporated shapes not only from horizontally but also

384 Although Gutenberg’s actual process remains very much in doubt. For Paul Needham’s theory of “cuneiform typography,” see Agüera y Arcas (2003).

385 There were, of course, printers of Greek who took a path of less resistance. Janus Lascaris’s work for Lorenzo di Alopa in Florence was expressly suited to the engraver’s art. He tells us as much in his letter to Piero de’ Medici at the beginning of his Planudean Anthology (see more below, page 156): Novam hanc et literarum studiosis perutilim imprimendi occasionem nactus litterarum graecarum elementa a deformi et indecenti admodum depravatione vindicare constitui. Cumque animadverterem earum notas, quae inpraesentia sunt in usu impressioni adhibitas nec excudi commode nec apte invicem cohaerere posse, quod perplexae nimium et circumvolutae sunt, priscas litterarum figuras iam diu obsoletas diligentius inquisivi, atque huic imprimendi artificio per excusores atque id genus opifices accommodatas impressoribus tradidi. [Taking the recent opportunity of printing, so useful to students of literature, I decided to save the elements of Greek letters from deformity and unbecoming corruption. And when I considered the shapes of the letters now in use in printing—neither well suited to engraving nor able to be fitted to one another because they are too intricate and rounded—I diligently sought out ancient letter-forms, long obsolete, and I gave the printers letter-forms that were adapted to the process of printing by engravers and similar craftsmen.]
from vertically adjacent shapes. This caused a problem for incunabular printers because they were unable to break the grid vertically, i.e. to join printed matter vertically across lines of text. This was, at its root, a mechanical problem. In the writing of manuscripts (in minuscule), ruling is a guideline, not a hardline. But since type is something you can hold in your hand, its shape is predetermined, and the baseline becomes a fixed line. When the type is locked up in its form, it has to be leaded and adjusted so that the baseline is consistent, which means that the length of the longest descender forms the true typographical baseline (just as the height of the longest ascender forms the typographical headline); what in palaeographical terms is called the minim is, in typographical terms, the x-height. Greek letter-forms, with their easy vertical movement between lines, were simply beyond the technology of the first few decades of hand-press printing. A connected difficulty surrounded the relation of content to format, i.e. the relation of text to the number of pages in a codex.

From the early stages of Mainz printing, the number of lines to a page, and the number of pages to a book, were set by the system of "casting off," which means determining the format (folding) of a book, and the number of leaves needed, prior to setting up type. This process makes the number of lines to the page not a typographical, but a bibliographical matter (much as the number of lines per page in a manuscript is not a palaeographical, but a codicological matter). Therefore, even if a printer could cut and set up Greek type, he would
find it quite difficult to incorporate Greek letters into a Latin text and cast off accurately.\textsuperscript{386} And then, of course, there were the accents.

The polytonic nature of the language was instantly problematic, and it was the most immediate difficulty facing printers who wanted to incorporate Greek text in their books in the five decades following Gutenberg. The problem that accents caused the fifteenth-century printers was multiplicative. The small \textit{alpha}, for instance, admits of twenty-four variations, assuming every diacritic mark: \texttt{α ᾀ ᾁ ᾂ ᾃ ᾄ ᾅ ᾆ ᾇ ᾈ ᾉ ᾊ ᾋ ᾌ ᾍ ᾎ ᾏ ᾐ ᾑ ᾒ ᾓ ᾔ ᾕ ᾖ ᾗ ᾘ ᾙ}. Were one to multiply that number by every vowel, and expect to cut and cast each form as a unique type-sort, one would end up with one hundred and fourteen sorts, for vowels alone.\textsuperscript{387} The problem is immediately apparent. Given the enormous capital expense of a font of type, and given the space limitations in a fifteenth-century print shop—not to mention the Greek-language limitations of compositors—such font would be prohibitive.\textsuperscript{388} These two related problems—fitting Greek letters to the grid

\textsuperscript{386} It should be born in mind that the earliest Greek was printed in bilingual texts, e.g. Cicero and Lactantius. Printers faced the daunting task of assuming half-, quarter-, or eighth-line leading far in advance of setting up the type, if they wanted to accommodate those parts of the Greek letter-forms that broke the grid vertically.

\textsuperscript{387} The complete set of small vowels would be:

\begin{verbatim}
α ᾱ ᾰ α̂ ᾱ̄ ᾰ̆ α̂̂ ᾱ̆̆ ᾰ̂̂ α̂̆̆ ᾱ̄̆̆
ε ε̄ ε̆ ε̂ ε̄̄ ε̆̆ ε̂̂ ε̄̆̆ ε̆̂̂ ε̂̆̆ ε̄̄̆̆
η η̄ η̆ η̂ η̄̄ η̆̆ η̂̂ η̄̆̆ η̆̂̂ η̂̆̆ η̄̆̆̆ η̆̂̂̂ η̂̆̆̆ η̄̆̆̆̆
i ī ĭ î ī̄ ĭ̆ î̂ ī̆̆ ĭ̂̂ î̆̆ ī̆̆̆ ĭ̂̂̂ î̆̆̆ ī̆̆̆̆
o ō ŏ ô ō̄ ŏ̆ ô̂ ō̆̆ ŏ̂̂ ô̆̆ ō̆̆̆ ŏ̂̂̂ ô̆̆̆ ō̆̆̆̆
u ū ŭ û ū̄ ŭ̆ û̂ ū̆̆ ŭ̂̂ û̆̆ ū̆̆̆ ŭ̂̂̂ û̆̆̆ ū̆̆̆̆
ω ω̄ ω̆ ω̂ ω̄̄ ω̆̆ ω̂̂ ω̄̆̆ ω̆̂̂ ω̂̆̆ ω̄̆̆̆ ω̆̂̂̂ ω̂̆̆̆ ω̄̆̆̆̆
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{388} What exactly a complete case of type looked like in fifteenth-century Venice is unclear—even more so for a Greek font than for a Latin. The first pictorial representation of a font of Greek type is in the chapter “Composition du grec” of Pierre Théotiste Lefèvre's \textit{Guide}
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and coping with the abundance of diacritics—provoked two challenges: choosing a model set of letter-forms that would be conducive to the technology of print and thinking through the problem of accents.

The earliest (extant) printed Greek can be found in Fust and Schoeffer’s *De officiis* of 1465. In book 1, chapter 8, Cicero uses the neuter singular κατόρθωμα, meaning “righteous action.” The section occurs on fol. 2v of Fust and Schoeffer’s edition, and the Greek reads, “χαθωχοϲχα.” The *alpha* is the small *α* of Fust and Schoeffer’s Latin font; the *xhi*, *theta*, and *omega* are, obviously, not.

Two conclusions can be drawn from this glimpse of Greek printing less than two decades after Gutenberg’s work. First, the model chosen—which is unknown—does not disturb the grid, i.e. no alteration in the leading was necessary. Second, the problem of accents was handily solved: they were simply left out. Based on these two conclusions, Robert Proctor called this species of Greek type “Graeco-Latin,” which was used by “printers who habitually printed Latin or vernacular books, and were not under direct Hellenic influence, but who used Greek letters

*pratique du compositeur d’imprimerie* (Paris, 1883): 210. But was this what Aldus’s type-case looked like? Proceeding from the hypothesis that the layout of a Greek type-case was a modification of a Latin case, it would seem plausible enough. But a complete study of the practice of Aldus’s compositors (along the lines of Charlton Hinman’s study of Elizabethan practices) remains a desideratum, and only such a study would shed any light on the layout of Aldus’s font.

389 ISTC: ic00575000, Goff: C-575, GW: 6921

390 In modern editions, the text reads: *Perfectum officium rectum, opinor, vocemus, quoniam Graeci κατόρθωμα, hoc autem commune officium καθηκον vocant*. Fust and Schoeffer’s text reads (with abbreviations, contractions, and suspensions expanded): *Perfectum autem officium rectum opinor vocemus quoniam Graeci κατόρθωμα hoc autem commune officium vocant*. The second Greek word is omitted.
to print the passages in that language which occur in such books.”\footnote{Proctor 1900: 13.} Especially given the orthography, their model was most likely a late-medieval hand by a scribe with little or no knowledge of Greek who made Greek letters the way he knew how: much like Latin letters. One sees a similar solution as pertains to model and technology in the Greek types of Sweynheim and Pannartz in their 1465 Subiaco Lactantius,\footnote{ISTC: il00001000; Goff: L-1; GW: M16541.} John and Wendelin de Spira in theirs,\footnote{ISTC: il00005000; Goff: L-5; GW: M16566.} and Nicolas Jenson in his Aulus Gellius.\footnote{ISTC: ig00120000; Goff: G-120; GW: 10594.} These latter incorporate accents, but not in such a way as to upset the grid, and always while maintaining a thoroughly upright, rectangular, and ligature-free letter-form.\footnote{There is similarity between the practice of incunabular typographers and Italian Renaissance humanists. Compare, for instance, the upright, rectangular, and relatively ligature-free hand of Palla Strozzi, a student of Chrysoloras, preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale as MS Paris, Gr. 1908. See the plate at Barbour: 87. This is most likely not coincidence but tendency: in acquiring a new script—particularly in a foreign language—one may copy a model but be unable to escape the tendencies of one’s native letter-forms.} The accents were cut and cast together with the letter, so as to form one sort. But only the combinations of breathing and accent together would be made, the other letter-forms being made by cutting away the unwanted breathing or accent. For example, ㉠ would be cast. When only ㉡ was required, the circumflex would be cut off. When a new ㉢ was needed, it would simply be recast from its matrix. This accounts for the frequent ghosting or off-center appearance of accents, particularly in Jenson’s Greek typography.
Other attempts were made under more immediate guidance from native Greeks or Italian Hellenists. In 1476, Dionysius Paravisinus printed the *editio princeps* of Lascaris’s *Ἑπιτομὴ* in Milan—the first book printed entirely in Greek. Unlike Proctor’s “Graeco-Latin” fonts, Paravisinus’s was a font of type modeled on a known style of writing. The preface to his Lascaris was written by one Demetrius Damilas, a calligrapher of considerable ability. In Damilas’s preface one finds an early and explicit reference to the two problems stated above—fitting Greek letters to the typographer’s grid and handling accents:

> Quapropter cum multum mente, plurimum vero experientia laboravimus, vix tandem inveni quonam modo libri quoque graeci impremerentur, tum literarum compositione, quae varia et multiplex penes literas graecas existat, tum maxime locis accentum servatis; quod profecto arduum erat, nec parva indigebat consideratione.

[Wherefore, although we have considered this to a great extent and made many experiments, nevertheless I have just discovered how Greek books should be printed, both in the composition of letters (which are various and complex) and especially in the preservation of accents. This had been very arduous and not lacked small consideration.]

---

396 ISTC: il00065000; Goff L-65; GW M17102.

397 More than fifty manuscripts have been attributed to Damilas, many on vellum. See Barker 1992: 19 and Geanakoplos 1962: 107.
Like their predecessors, the problems of grid and accents gave Paravisinus and Damilas the challenge of finding the right model and casting the letters. How did they do it? Damilas did not choose to design a font of type based on his own hand, which is a calligraphic minuscule quite full of ornate ligatures and alternate letter forms. Instead, he chose the very clear, rather upright miniscule hand of Michael Apostolis.\footnote{Preserved on MS London, BL Harley 5618. The text is Hephaestian, \textit{De metris}.} Michael wrote his letters distinctly, with very few ligatures, close accents, and short ascenders and descenders that rise above the height of the minims but not above the height of the accents. This gives the typographer a straightforward model. Damilas’s font, incidentally, was recast (presumably from the punches and matrices he kept with him) for the \textit{editio princeps} of Homer.\footnote{ISTC: ih00300000; Goff: H-300; GW: 12895.}

In technical terms, Damilas’s typography foreshadowed Aldus’s and Griffo’s. When he refers to the \textit{compositio literarum} in his preface, he most certainly means the fitting of letters so as to appear continuous—a typographical ductus. He accomplished this with horizontal kerning, which gave the letter-forms a more cursive, less block-like style, thereby giving them an appearance closer to script. The accents on which he labored are a considerable improvement on the technique of the “Graeco-Latin” class. There are no ghosted or misplaced accents on letters, since Damilas apparently cast the letters and accents together.\footnote{This is the conclusion of Proctor 1900: 56-58.} He must have had a larger type-case (and more competent compositors) than Jenson. But in more closely resembling the script of Byzantine
émigré scholars and Italian Renaissance Hellenists, Damilas came much closer
to the nature of Greek manuscripts than had his predecessors—an important
step, as elaborated below.

Aldus and Griffo are justifiably famous for their Greek typography. But
it remains to ask what, precisely, they did for Greek letters. Like their
predecessors, they faced the problems of grid and accent and the concomitant
challenges of finding a suitable model for their type-face and cutting and casting
the letters in their font. It is quite impossible to state in which order Aldus and
his associates considered these problems and addressed the challenges. But it
was his solution to each aspect of this complicated situation that has earned him
his place in the history of graphic design.

The first and most immediate, technical fact is that with Aldus arrived
the third and final phase of incunabular Greek type-founding. Rather than omit
the accents or cut them off ad hoc (the earliest printed Greek) or cast all
combinations together on the same sort (Damilas), Aldus and Griffo developed a
method of casting letters and accents separately and kerning vertically. In other
words, his grid was 2:1—two parallel type-lines equaled one line of Greek text.
The accents occupied one line; the letters occupied the line below them.

This fact is clear in the copy of the *Aldine Lascaris* now at the Walters Art
Museum (91.720). On fol. a6v, line 17, one remembers Harry Carter’s admonition
that type is a thing “you can hold in your hand,” and one perceives the
impression of the type bodies themseleves in the paper (perhaps due to an

---

401 Or infamous. Proctor felt strongly that Aldus’s letter-forms had adversely affected the
history of Greek typography. See below, page 153.
unsettled type-sort on the form.\textsuperscript{402} Two bodies are evident: the letter-line body is 3.15mm in height; the accent line is the same height, making for a total height of 6.3mm between the foot of the x-height below to the foot of the x-height above. Observations of this kind puzzled Proctor, who felt that the total body size did not square with the evident distance between ascender and descender.\textsuperscript{403} But thinking that Aldus and Griffo had placed the letter-faces low on the type-body and kerned accents horizontally (by sitting them on the shoulder of the extra body above the letter-faces), Proctor missed the fact that there are two distinct lines of type. It was precisely in this that the solution lay for freezing, as it were, the fluid script of contemporary manuscripts in a font of type. This innovation in grid and casting gave Aldus considerably more flexibility in his choice of model letter-forms and more efficiency in his manufacture of type-sorts.

In fact, it was this very system—the 2:1 grid and vertical kerning—that Aldus sought to protect from competition, even—or especially—from Griffo. In the aforementioned 1495 appeal for a privilege, Aldus petitioned the Venetian government for exclusive control over his Greek typography for twenty years.\textsuperscript{404} The privilege system protected the investor, i.e. the publisher, and not the designer. It therefore prohibited Griffo from recasting type from his punches and

\textsuperscript{402} Similarly evident at c6\textdegree{}:19 and h1\textdegree{}:24. The impressions are evident on the versos only, which bear the Greek text.
\textsuperscript{403} Proctor 1900: 100-01.
\textsuperscript{404} Lowry: 88-90; Barker 1992: 53-63 passim.
matrices and gave the corporation of Aldus, Barbarigo, and Torresano ownership. Griffo and Aldus, not surprisingly, quarreled.\footnote{Lowry: 90.}

Whether he had chosen his model and developed a typographical system to accommodate it, or developed a system then found a model, is quite impossible to state with certainty. But one could be reasonably comfortable with the former assumption. Aldus, after all, was a teacher with a plan to publish accessible Greek texts for a community of Hellenists. He would likely have intended his books to have a certain appearance and functionality (which will be considered in greater detail below). Moreover, it is likely that Aldus and his team would have been successful in developing a new typographical system with a particular goal in mind, namely the imitation of a script that required a certain relation of letters, accents, and space. Whatever the case, Aldus had his model in the hand of Immanuel Rhusotas.\footnote{Whose biography will be given below, page 151. His hand was identified as the model by Barker on the bases of idiosyncratic abbreviations and differential forms. (Barker 1992: 55). An example of Rhusotas’s hand can be seen on MS London, BL Harley 5641. The text is Gaza’s Grammatices introductio.}

Rhusotas’s hand is considerably more calligraphic than that of Michael Apostolis. It has a steady, not especially strong stroke contrast, long ascenders and descenders, a considerable number of alternate letter forms, and heavy serifs. His accents are at a consistent space from the top of the minims (or x-height), and they are distinctly long. Rhusotas made ample use of ligatures of two species: tied letters and contractions. Illustrated with the type Aldus designed to represent them, his tied letters—such as the common \textit{sigma-epsilon} (\ldots)}
(στ) or gamma-rho (ϡ) or his distinctive nu-gamma (Ϛ) or epsilon-upsilon (ϡ)—required separate type-sorts, as the shape had to be cut and cast on one body (not kerned horizontally) in order to be convincingly calligraphic.

Rhusotas’s contractions were ligatures in which multiple characters were joined so as to create a new shape. But his use of these forms was sparing, and he never broke into forms so distorted that their constituent parts were not easily recognizable. For instance, his σύν, γάρ, and τὸν (utivo, γάρ, τί) all require that three letters be cast on one body, but they are not so complex as, for instance, Estienne’s ὑπερουντελικός, which had the form ὑπερουντελικός.407

But why did Aldus choose this script when fonts of the da Spria and Jensen type were already used in Venice? What could have justified his investment of time and money in the production of a design and method of casting that was entirely new at the time? To what ends were his efforts in letter-design directed? And how did his typography affect his publishing program generally?

It was once fashionable, following the opinions of Robert Proctor, to condemn Aldus’s Greek type-faces on aesthetic grounds. Lorenzo de Alopa had, as mentioned above (note 381), printed a magnificent edition of the Planudean Anthology, edited by Janus Lascaris, entirely in monumental capitals.408

---

408 ISTC: ia00765000; Goff: A-765; GW: 2048. In the middle of the sixteenth century, Guillaume Pellicier sent hundreds of Greek books from Venice, where he was a diplomat, to France. Alopa’s Anthology was among them. But when it arrived in France, it was set apart
high art was greatly admired in the nineteenth century; it was considered pure, majestic, and uncompromising. Aldus’s typography was, on the other hand, considered decadent and pandering.\footnote{Proctor 1900: 103: “In truth, in spite of all his estimable qualities, Aldus seems to have been a man of phenomenally bad taste for his time, and unfortunately the blunders which in a lesser man would have been unnoticed, the enormous influence of the books he which produced influenced and sanctioned.” Much a similar statement could made concerning Proctor’s opinions. His near legendary status as an incunabulist, and the convincing thoroughness of his work on Greek typography, gave his feelings about Aldus’s type a long life.} Certainly Aldus’s type-faces have never been to everyone’s liking. But it would be irresponsible to judge them on purely aesthetic grounds.\footnote{This is not to impugn Robert Proctor, who was a superb scholar. But Proctor, it must be remembered, was not only a keeper and scholar of rare books. He was a type-designer himself, and a disciple of William Morris. His verdicts are thus a mix of the scholar’s, the artist’s, and the idealist’s.} Aldus’s Greek typography was both a commercial and an educational enterprise. The \textit{Aldine Lascaris} had not only to sell but also to teach. As every textbook author knows, a book has to move off the shelves; as every teacher of Greek has learned, teaching a language with a non-native script requires not only grammatical but also visual literacy.

Aldus worked within a milieu of Byzantine émigrés and Italian Hellenists, the kind of group that would have definite expectations as to the appearance of the books they would purchase. The cursive script that Aldus froze in type was the fashionable, modern script of his friends, associates, and patrons. His former student-turned-patron Alberto Pio, for instance, purchased the Greek from the other books and called “not easily read because of its age.” The catalog of Pellicier’s acquisitions is in Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Paris, Gr. 3064. Alopa’s book is mentioned on fol. 56r.
library of Giorgio Valla in 1500. It included an abundance of Greek manuscripts in the cursive, minuscule style that Aldus and Griffo sought to capture in type. What to some (e.g. Proctor) may have seemed a pandering move, out of keeping with the elegant aesthetic of Janus Lascaris, was in fact a wise business decision.

Aldus (likely with Torresano’s aid) could distinguish his certain from his speculative market. In planning an ambitious program of Greek books, he knew who was certain to buy copies. And he knew what script they routinely read. The use of the new type-face in the Aldine Lascaris was therefore twofold: it was meant to introduce possible buyers to Aldus’s project and its potential, and to introduce students of the studia to Greek, thus creating a market of future Hellenists. The Aldine Lascaris was an advertisement and a propaedeutic.

In a propaedeutic, Aldus realized that a graphic system was an efficient means of effecting literacy in Greek and generating a readership for his publishing program. The student of Greek must be taught to recognize and reproduce the letter-forms that he or she will encounter once graduated from the elementary stages and attempting to read texts. Textbook authors are conscious of this fact and must consider the script or type of their students’ target texts when teaching the language. This is precisely the reason that textbooks of Greek teach letter-forms appropriate for their stated purpose: textbooks of literary Greek teach primarily miniscule, Didot-Porsonian letter-forms, because these, with only slight modification, have been the Greek letter-forms of literary texts

\[\text{\textsuperscript{411}}\] Much of which is preserved in the Estense Library in Modena. See the catalog of Puntoni (1896).
printed since the nineteenth century; textbooks of archaeological Greek teach epigraphic and palaeographic letter-forms likely to be encountered by the students using that textbook.⁴¹²

Aldus and Griffo set out to design a typeface that would provide the student of Greek with model letter-forms, forms that would enable the student to recognize contemporary Greek in manuscripts and other printed books and write a Greek hand that would conform to contemporary tastes. The choice of Rhusotas’s hand was conscious. The squared-off, unconnected Greek letters of the “Graeco-Latin” class would prove a poor model for recognition or imitation, since few Greeks or competent Italian Hellenists wrote in such a hand.⁴¹³

This line of reasoning might be called the propriety of letter-forms, i.e. the notion that certain letter-forms are appropriate to certain situations.⁴¹⁴ A common sense enough proposition, but one that is of special importance to the

⁴¹² An excellent example of this latter category is Parisinou and Shipley, *Hellênizein: A Flexible Structure for Teaching Greek to Archaeologists and Ancient Historians* (London, 2008).

⁴¹³ Chrysoloras wrote in a plain, rather upright hand. He used few ligatures, and his letters, thought certainly cursive, do not run together completely. Barbour (plate 87), mentions that Chrysoloras may have written so “for purposes of teaching non-Greeks.” That is probably true, and it is borne out in Palla Strozzi’s hand (plate 88), which is clearly modeled on Chrysoloras’s. This similarity reinforces the notion of visual literacy that Aldus understood. But Chrysoloras’s and Strozzi’s hands do not represent scripts typical of the infusion of Byzantine literary MSS available in Italy. For the hands of Italian Renaissance Hellenists that are typical of contemporary scripts, see Politian’s (plate 103) or Filelfo’s (plate 106). Note that unlike Chrysoloras’s or Strozzi’s, these hands are replete with ligatures and contractions, vertically abutting shapes, and alternate letter-forms.

⁴¹⁴ For a summary of research pertinent to the psychological study of letter-form propriety, see Brumberger (2003) and Henderson, et al. (2004).
educator. In an educational context, the letter-forms that a student learns to read and write are a complex mix of convention and expectation. Were the student asked to learn the grammar of the Greek language exclusively via, say, epigraphic majuscules, and then asked to read, say, Porsonian minuscule with lunate *sigmas*, he or she would encounter an added difficulty, one that would diminish the efficiency and efficacy of the textbook used to learn the language.

ΑΡΩΗΝ ΚΕΛΕΥΕΙΣ Η ΤΟ ΔΕΝΔΡΟΝ ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ
ορθήν κελεύεις, ἣ τὸ δένδρον φαίνεται; ⁴¹⁵

Aldus realized the similar difficulty in asking students to learn Greek via Latinized, upright Greek letters of the “Graeco-Latin” class, and then expecting them to graduate to manuscripts or printed books in the contemporary style. In effect, it would be learning to read Greek in Porsonian letter-forms—but with haphazard accentuation and no ligatures—then reading them in a script or type full of ligatures, tails, swirls, and abbreviations.

For an example, imagine learning Greek from the 1480 Lascaris of Bonus Accursius ⁴¹⁶ and then reading his Aesop in figure 2.2. ⁴¹⁷

---

⁴¹⁶ ISTC: il00066000; Goff: L-66; GW: M17096. Copies of this edition are rare, and no image is available at present.
That would work well. The letters are of the same font, so the texts complement one another. But what if one were to learn Greek from Accursius’s Lascaris, then attempt to read the same text in the contemporary script of figure 2.3?

The problem is obvious. Even for the present-day student, familiar with Greek grammar and vocabulary, but accustomed to Porsonian letter-forms, this hand requires hard work. It demonstrates that visual literacy is a necessity in learning non-native scripts: one has to learn what one intends to read. Aldus 418

418 MS London, BL Harley 5744, fol. 6v, circa 1500, [Italy].
understood this fact and took great care to design the letters of his grammatical and lexical texts so as to correspond not only to his literary texts but also to the texts circulating in Venice in the late Quattrocento.

Before 1515, Aldus and his typographers designed a subsequent three fonts of Greek type, each an improvement of the preceding. But all were designed to this end: that they would capture the fluid letter-forms of contemporary Greek miniscule and enable his readers to acquire visual literacy in the Greek language.
If we look at the typographical design in printed books from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and if we also consult the secondary literature, we soon perceive an advance from a ‘medieval’ design to a far clearer ‘humanist’ layout.\textsuperscript{419}

~ Frans Janssen

The imposition of the book and the design of letter-forms are both preliminary to the layout of the text on a page. And the layout, or mise-en-page, like the letter-forms themselves, reflects the processes, expectations, and uses that constitute the object’s context.

In the process of designing a printed page in the \textit{Aldine Lascaris}, Aldus stood at the crossroads of Greek and Latin manuscript and printing practices. Two traditions met and melded in this book, each with a history and a purpose. Following the tradition of manuscripts made for school use in both the Italian and Byzantine worlds, Aldus designed a page packed with text, rarely broken by illustration, and relatively unparagraphed. The book opens with its only two decorative woodcut initials: a large Greek \textit{gamma} on fol. 2\textsuperscript{v} gives us the first letter of γράμμα, and a large \textit{L} gives us the first letter of the Latin translation, \textit{littera}, on fol. 3\textsuperscript{r}. At the top of fols. 2\textsuperscript{v} and 3\textsuperscript{r} there are woodcut headers. These constitute the complete set of decorations in what is, after all, a practical book.

But in such a practical book, what aspects of its manufacture, or what expectations for its reception and use, can be gleaned from the appearance of the

\textsuperscript{419} Janssen 2004: 9.
Certainly Aldus made every attempt at efficient functionality: the book was meant to provide the student with a clear Greek text that reflected his graphic system and inculcated both grammatical and visual literacy; and it was meant to give the student easy, accurate access to the translation of whichever Greek text he or she was consulting. But there was a difficulty in manufacturing this efficiency. Just as it had been a challenge to format a book with facing translation, it was a challenge to design a two-page spread on which each page mirrored the other. While in theory the content of any two-page spread is effectively the same, the languages and their characters are different, and they require different physical spaces in which to express the same content. For instance, Aldus printed the title of Lascaris’s text on the aforementioned folia. The content is the same. But as can be seen in Figures 2.4 and 2.5 below, the space required of the content differs.\footnote{Figures 2.4 and 2.5 are personal photographs of Walters 91.720.}

\textbf{Figure 2.4}
Two facts of process are evident. First, the Greek content was notionally prior to the Latin. Second, Aldus’s design strategy was limited by the available type in his font, which made it necessary to resort to what might seem like an awkward solution. As for the priority of the Greek, it should be borne in mind that hand press printers set up type in the order of imposition, not in the order of pages. As in Figure 2.1 above, Aldus’s compositors would have composed the pages of a quire unsequentially: 1, 16, 4, 13, 15, 2, 14, 3, 5, 12, 8, 9, 11, 6, 10, 7, forming, in most quires, the pattern L, G, G, L, L, G, G, L, L, G, G, L, L, G, G, L. In the first quire of the book, due to Aldus’s front matter, the sequence is: L, G, G, L, L, G, L, G, L, G, L, G, L. Given the non-sequential nature of the process of casting off, and given the fact that the texts had to mirror one another, Aldus needed to determine before manufacture which text would take priority, i.e. would the Greek be made to match the Latin, or vice versa?

Not surprisingly, since the Greek is the target and the Latin the guide, he settled on the latter: the Latin has been made to match the Greek. But the visual setting of a Latin text occupies a different space than the Greek. Therefore one can see on the page the notional priority of the Greek, which is set cleanly,
evenly spaced, and without distortion. The Latin translation, however, requires a somewhat awkward recourse to lower-case letters in the second line. This adjustment of space in the Latin text is evident throughout and reveals, in a rather plain way, the nature of the process underlying the production of this book. And it leads to the second fact of design: Aldus's font contained only a lower and an upper case. There is no evidence of small caps or signs of reference.

Throughout, headings of sections and chapters are distinct only in their placement on the page, which is radically inconsistent; their type-size is limited to the two available cases. Aldus made every attempt to left-justify the text on the facing pages and indent section headings by at least two character-spaces. Given the priority of the Greek page, the text of the Latin page seems to vary at random, as enjambed lines push section headings to the center or far right. Unlike the scribe, who could adjust the size of his letters while writing, the compositor was limited to the two type-cases available. He was therefore compelled to use space on the page, not letter-size, to match texts.

There are few tables, as one might expect in a modern textbook. In the *abecedarium* one finds three tables representing the grades of vowels and consonants, on fols. 143\textsuperscript{v}, 144\textsuperscript{r}, and 144\textsuperscript{v}. These are consistently centered on each page, which is possible given the fact that the *abecedarium* is monolingual.

Altogether, the mise-en-page of the *Aldine Lascaris* belongs to the manuscript era. Its pages are well ruled, and attempts have been made at the efficient organization of information. But these are inconsistent and would as yet depend on the aftermarket rubrication and marks of reference evident in the
copies described in CHAPTER 3. But despite the attempts at textual organization, the pages are densely packed, uneasy to navigate, and difficult to reference. There is no index, no foliation or pagination, and only the three tables. The mise-en-page reveals the process of print, replete with its promises and limitations. But it belongs to the first generation of a new technology and does not yet betray the new expectations and uses to which the press would be put in the sixteenth century, namely indexes, paratext, variable type-size, and more sophisticated means of leading so as to align text for improved legibility and reference. In the third edition of the *Aldine Lascaris*, published in 1512,\(^{421}\) and printed with his fourth Greek font, Aldus provided the student with four type-sizes, allowing for greater flexibility in layout. He also gave the student an *index verborum et locorum* and numerous tables, which certainly aided the student in an already difficult undertaking.

With the life of Aldus, his relation to Italian Renaissance Hellenism, his associates, and his innovations, the making of the *Aldine Lascaris* concludes. CHAPTER 3 will detail the contents and characteristics of the edition via the description of four copies, noting the consistencies and discrepancies between Aldus’s claims and the reality of surviving copies.

\(^{421}\) USTC: 837409.
Chapter 3: The Aldine Lascaris

The Aldine Lascaris is an edition of composite volumes: the grammatical treatise of Constantine Lascaris and what will hereafter be called the Aldine Appendix, a compilation of texts designed to give a student relative fluency in elementary ancient Greek. The present chapter will prepare the way for the argument of Chapter 4 by presenting Aldus’s list of contents compared with the actual contents, the collation of the edition, and bibliographical descriptions of the four copies examined in depth for this dissertation.

[3.1] The Colophons

The copies of the Aldine Lascaris inspected for this dissertation have two colophons, a fact that will be of special importance in the discussion of this edition’s form and function in Chapter 4. Fol. 140v bears the following colophon.

\textit{Finis Compendii octo orationis partium et aliorum quarundum necessariorum Constantini Lascaris Byzantini viri doctissimi optimique. Impressum est Venetiis summo studio, litteris ac impensis Aldi Manucii Romani. Anno ab in Carnatione Domini nostri Iesu Christi mcccclxxxiii ultimor Februarii. Deo gratis.}
[The end of the Compendium of the eight parts of speech and other necessities of Constantine Lascaris the Byzantine, a man most excellent and learned. Printed at Venice with the greatest care, and with the letters and expense of Aldus Manutius of Rome.\textsuperscript{422} In the year of our lord 1494 on the last day of February. Thanks be to God.]

This colophon applies to Lascaris’s Ἔπιτομη and two other grammatical texts (see TABLE 3.1 below). Prior to 1500, Aldus seems to have used the Venetian calendar, which began the year on March 1\textsuperscript{st}. In the modern calendar, this part of the edition would receive the date February 28\textsuperscript{th}, 1495, which it is now usually given.

The second colophon is found on fol. 164\textsuperscript{v}. It reads simply,

\textit{Valete. Venetiis. MCCCCLXXXV. Octavo Martii.}

[Farewell. At Venice, the 8\textsuperscript{th} of March 1495.]

No alternate colophons for this edition are known. From the presence of two colophons, it is certain that the Aldine Lascaris was completed in two distinct press-runs. But the two press runs in no way make up two editions.

The latter is an important fact: no copy of either one of these texts has been found without the other. But they were distinct, and much of the argument

\textsuperscript{422} \textit{litteris}: Aldus meant the font of type, which he had produced in the years prior to 1495 with great labor and expense.
of Chapter 4 depends on the various arrangements in which these two parts are found. The texts themselves and their functional relationship to the whole will also be described in Chapter 4.

[3.2] The Collation

The Aldine Lascaris is 166 fols. in quarto. Aldus signed the pages with small roman letters a-s for the Lascaris part of the edition and large roman letters A-C for the Aldine Appendix. There are two unsigned leaves at the end of the second part. The quires are for the most part gatherings in eights, for which each quire is composed of two sheets of super-chancery paper; the final quire of the first part is one sheet; the final quire of the second part is a half-sheet.

Assuming the earlier dated part of the text to be bound first, the collation can be depicted thus:

\[\text{a} - \text{r}^8 \, \text{s}^4 \, \text{A} - \text{C}^8 \, [\, * \, ]^2\]

This collation gives the total of 166 fols., Aldus’s division of the two parts being clearly marked by the signatures.

First part, February, 1495 [1494]
Together with typographical discrepancies, Aldus’s use of paper stocks is a key factor in identifying alternate states within an edition. Alternate states, in turn, are the key to determining how many (if any) times the press was stopped in a run of 1,000 to 3,000 copies. If a press run was interrupted, it is always for a reason, since time was expensive. And confirmation of press-stops can provide bibliographical evidence as to editorial oversight and the workings of a printshop.423

For the printing of the *Aldine Lascaris*, Aldus used three distinct paper stocks. For the first part, quires *a*-q, Aldus used paper with a bull’s head watermark, similar to Briquet 14522. This stock is likely from southern Germany, although possibly from Venice. It dates from c. 1491-1495. Quires r-s have a balance mark with two circular finials similar to Briquet 2538. Signatures A-B have the watermark of a balance with a star finial, similar to Briquet 2540. This paper is very likely Venetian in origin. Finally, quire C (including the quire signed *), has the watermark of a balance with a star finial

---

423 For the uses of paper as bibliographical evidence, see Needham (1994).
atop a circle, likely also Venetian and perhaps from the same shop as the paper of A-B.

Several variants in the paper stock are known. In one of the three copies at the British Library (C.2 a.1), in quire A, a half-sheet cancel has been inserted at A³ that bears the mark of a bull’s head with a cross circled by a snake, much like Briquet 15394. This suggests the stop-press correction of misprint, or perhaps a damaged leaf. In Walters 91.720, described below, a quarter-sheet cancel is inserted and hand signed at s³. It has no evident watermark. As above, this is most likely a stop-press correction, although the half-sheet that was reset was not given its signature. The correction cannot have been an error in the setting of type, as no aspect of the text differs. It was likely a printing error, or some damage to the page, leaf, or sheet that occurred on the press. A copy in the Bodleian Library (Bodleian L-041) shows paper of several different stocks from those noted above. Some sheets bear offset impressions from other books, including sheets that clearly show the index of Aldus’s edition of Perottus’s Cornucopiae (1499). This would suggest that before Aldus brought out his second edition of the Lascaris around 1501, there was still a demand, at least as late as 1499, for the first edition. This caused him to dip into other paper stock in his shop for reprints.

Altogether, the evidence of Aldus paper stocks is telling, even if research on the subject is far from complete, and the results presented here are tentative. It remains a desideratum that a full study be made of Aldus’s stocks, their origins, and most importantly, their distribution among his editions.

424 ISTC: ip00296000; Goff: P-296; GW: M31090.
Aldus’s list of the contents of the *Aldine Lascaris* is depicted in FIGURE 3.1, which appears on fol. 1r in the copies examined.

**FIGURE 3.1**

In hoc libro haec Continentur.

Constantini Lascaris Erotemata cu interpretatione latina.

Deiris græcis ædipthögis et quæ admodum ad nos ueniant.

Abbreviationes quibus frequentissime græcia utuntur.

Oraúo Dominica & duplex salutatio Beatæ Virginis

Symbolum Apostolorum.

Euangelium Dii Ioannis Evangelistæ.

Carmina Aurea Pythagoræ.

Phocilidis uiri sapientissimi moralia. Omnia supra scripta

habent e regione interpretatione latīna deuerbo ad uerbū.
[3.5] Actual Contents

The actual contents of the copies examined are depicted in Table 3.1 with the caveat that the order of texts is inconsistent, as will be explained in the following chapter.

It will be noticed that Aldus, in his table of contents, does not mention the grammatical treatise of Tryphon, Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων, the Περὶ ἀνωμάλων ῥημάτων, an alphabetical listing of anomalous formations, or the brief grammatical work of Moschopoulos, which does not have a Latin translation and seems to have been an afterthought designed to use up a page. Tryphon's grammatical work is printed with the Lascaris, and together the Lascaris and Tryphon will be referred to, in the following descriptions, as Lascaris (as opposed to the Aldine Appendix).

---

425 Aldus seems to have needed something to avoid blank space: et quia charta supererat, ne periret placuit addere quod legi apud Moscopulum... (fol. 166r).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Fol.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐπιτομή τῶν ὀκτώ τοῦ λόγου μερῶν καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἁναγκαίων</td>
<td>2r-110r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Compendium octo orationis partium et aliorum quorundam</em></td>
<td>(a1r-o9r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περί παθῶν τῶν λέξεων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ γραμματικοῦ τρόφωνος</td>
<td>110r-114r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De passionibus dictionum ex grammatici tryphonis</em></td>
<td>(o6v-p2r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περί ἀνομάλων ῥημάτων</td>
<td>114r-140r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De anomalis verbis</em></td>
<td>(p3v-s4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldus Manutius Romanus Studiosis</td>
<td>141r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alphabetum graecum et Abbreviationes frequentissime graeci utuntur</em></td>
<td>142r-148r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐχή κυριακῆ, Χαίρε δέοποινα, Σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων</td>
<td>148r-151v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oratio dominica, Salve regina, Symbolum apostolorum</em></td>
<td>(B1r-B3v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χρυσῆ ἔπη</td>
<td>152r-154v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carmina aurea</em></td>
<td>(B3v-B5v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στίχοι εἰς Φοκυλιδῆν</td>
<td>154r-164r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Versus in Phocylidem</em></td>
<td>(B5v-C3r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilogue</td>
<td>164r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(C8v)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errata</td>
<td>165r-166r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(r1r-r2r)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moschopoulos</td>
<td>166r-166v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(r2r-r2v)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[3.6] The Texts of the Aldine Lascaris

Assuming the arrangement of texts in Table 3.1—the chronological arrangement following colophon dates—this section will provide brief histories of the texts of the Aldine Lascaris followed by a discussion of their significance. Their functional relationship will be the subject of Chapter 4.

The first text is the Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν ὀκτώ λόγων μερῶν of Constantine Lascaris. As noted in Table 2.1, Lascaris composed this text at some point in the 1460s. An exact date of composition cannot, of course, be assigned to the text, since it was doubtless in flux from its conception to the author’s death. Therefore, rather than adopt the notion of an authorized or definitive text, it would be best to treat this Ἐπιτομὴ—as printed by Aldus—as a particular version of a notional text that was ever evolving in the hands of its author and his students. Nevertheless, a critical edition of the Ἐπιτομὴ, based exclusively on MS Vatican City, Vat.Pal.gr.116 can be found in Förstel (1992). Lascaris’s Ἐπιτομὴ, as printed by Aldus, is shown schematically in Table 3.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Fol.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Περὶ διαίρέσεως τῶν γραμμάτων  
*De divisione litterarum* | 2⁻⁴r  
(a²v-a⁴r) |
| Περὶ συλλαβῆς, λέξεως, λόγου  
*De syllaba, dictione, oratione* | 3⁻⁴r  
(a³v-a⁴r) |
| Περὶ ὅνωματος  
*De nomine*  
(Includes a treatment of the article) | 3⁻²⁴r  
(a³v-c³r) |
| Περὶ ἰματος  
*De verbo* | 23⁻⁹¹r  
(c³v-m³r) |
| Περὶ ἀντωνυμίων  
*De pronominibus* | 90⁻⁹³r  
(m³v-m³r) |
| Περὶ προθέσεων καὶ ἐπιρήματος καὶ συνδέσμων  
*De praepositionibus et adverbio et conjunctionibus* | 92⁻⁹⁶r  
(m³v-m³r) |
| Περὶ τῶν εἰδῶν τῶν παραγώγων  
*De speciebus derivatiorum*  
(Includes a treatment of the comparative, superlative, diminutive, denominative, and verbal substantives) | 95⁻¹⁰۲r  
(m³v-n³r) |
| Περὶ προσῳδιῶν  
*De accentibus* | 10¹⁻¹⁰⁴r  
(n³v-n³r) |
| Περὶ στιγμῆς  
*De puncto* | 10³⁻¹⁰⁴r  
(n³v-n³r) |
| Περὶ τόπων τῶν τόνων  
*De locis tonorum* | 10⁴⁻¹⁰⁷r  
(n³v-o³r) |
| Περὶ διασυλλάθηκαν  
*De disyllabis* | 10⁶⁻¹¹⁰r  
(o³v-o³r) |
In the version printed by Aldus in 1495, Lascaris’s text begins with a treatment of the Greek letters (littera, γράμματα), the syllable (syllaba, συλλαβή), the word (dictio, λέξις), and the sentence (oration, λόγος). There follows a treatment of the parts of speech (partes orationis, μέρη λόγου), beginning with the noun (nomen, ὄνομα), which has the properties of gender (genus, γένος), derivational status (species, εἶδος), number (numerus, ἀριθμός), case (casus, πτῶσις), accent (accentus, προσῳδία), and article (articulus, ἄρθρον). There is a brief treatment of the article, followed by the five nominal declensions, four parisisyllabic (aequisyllabicus, ιοούλλαβος), one imparisisyllabic (inaequisyllabicus, περιοσούλλαβος), e.g. ὁ Άιας, τοῦ Άιαντος. Like Chrysoloras before him, Lascaris provided for another five contracted declensions formed from the fifth declension (a quinta declinatione, ἀπὸ τῆς πέμτης κλίσεως). These are formed, Lascaris explains, by synaeresis (synaeresis, συναίρεσις) or crasis (crasis, κράσις), concepts which he explains in a brief section following the nouns. Lascaris then proceeds to a brief treatment of numerals (De numeralibus nominibus, Περὶ τῶν ἀριθμητικῶν ὄνομάτων), followed by the adjective (adjectivus, ἐπίθετος). The section on the verb (verbum, ῥῆμα) is by far the longest.

Lascaris treated the Greek verb in thirteen conjugations, six baritone, including three contracted conjugations made from the sixth baritone, and four conjugations of the verbs ending in –μι. Verbs have the properties of mood (modus, ἔγκλισις), voice (genus, γένη), derivational status (species, εἶδος), figure (figura, σχῆμα), number (numerus, ἀριθμός), person (persona, πρόσωπα), and

426 species, εἶδος: whether a noun is primitive or derived.
tense, \textit{(tempus, χρόνος)}\textsuperscript{427}. After an outline of these properties, the treatment of the verb in earnest begins on fol. 27\textsuperscript{r}. Following tradition, Lascaris begins with the first baritone conjugation in the present active indicative using \textit{τύπτω} \textit{(verbero)}.

The treatment of the verb in this edition would not have been easy for the student without an experienced teacher. It covers nearly seventy folia—by far the longest section in the \textit{Ἐπιτομή}.

Bound together with Lascaris's \textit{Ἐπιτομή} is the treatise \textit{Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων (De passionibus dictionum)}, excerpted from the grammatical work of Tryphon, a late first-century BCE grammarian who was active in Alexandria. His work is fragmentary, and what has been transmitted under his name may or may not be authentic\textsuperscript{428}. Aldus did not advertise Tryphon's work in his own table of contents (\textsc{Figure} 3.1), but he must have considered it useful, and he may have taught from it himself. Tryphon treated figures and tropes, dividing these phenomena into those that affect the quality of words and those that affect the quantity. Tryphon lists five general categories: πλεονασμός \textit{(superabundantia)}, ἕνδεια \textit{(defectus)}, μετάθεσις \textit{(transpositio)}, μετάληψις \textit{(transsumptio)}, and τμῆς \textit{(sectio)}. Belonging to πλεονασμός there are nine species: πρόθεσις \textit{(additio)}, ἀναδίπλωσις \textit{(geminatio)}, ἐκτασις \textit{(productio)}, ἐπέκτασις \textit{(porrectio)}, διαίρεσις \textit{(divisio)}, παρένθεσις \textit{(interpositio)}, διπλασιασμός \textit{(duplicatio)}, παρέμπτωσις \textit{(paremptosis)}, and προσχηματισμός \textit{(proschematismus)}. Of ἕνδεια there are also nine species: ἀφαίρεσις \textit{(aphaeresis)}, ἀρσις \textit{(arsis)}, συστολή \textit{(sistole)}, συνκοπή

\textsuperscript{427} \textit{figura, οχήμα}: compositional status, simple or compound.

\textsuperscript{428} An edition of the fragments can be found in Velsen (1853).
(syncope), συναλοιφή (synaloepha), ἔλλειψις (ellipsis), παράλλειψις (paralepsis), ἔκθληψις (ecthipsis), and ἀποκοπή (apocope).

The interest that Tryphon’s text would hold for a late-Quattrocento student of classical literature is obvious. The treatise covers the subtleties necessary not only for clear reading and the understanding of the complexities of Greek morphology, but also for idiomatic composition.429

The Alphabetum graecum cum multiplicibus letteris is Aldus’s own composition. He took this opportunity to teach the alphabet with a panoply of letters—a relatively complete set of the free-standing letters that a student might encounter while reading Greek manuscripts (and especially while reading Aldus’s printed Greek books). The abecedarium also served to present a sort of type-synopsis of Aldus’s first Greek type-face. Every free-standing sort is represented, so the student can see the full breadth and depth of Aldus’s font—an essential step in his attempt to establish visual literacy and a graphic system. Table 3.3 gives the number of forms for each letter and their pronunciation as represented by Aldus’s transliteration.

429 It is likely that Bembo studied from Tryphon’s text with Lascaris in Messina. See Wilson’s introduction to Bembo (2003); for an overview of this text’s importance in the Byzantine school tradition, see Conley (1986) and Valiavitcharska (2011).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Letter</th>
<th>Number of forms</th>
<th>Aldus’s Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Epsilon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Iota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lambda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>My</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Omicron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section of the *Aldine Appendix* closely resembles the hornbook and primer material of medieval and Renaissance classrooms. The letters are introduced, then the vowels and consonants (as well as their qualities), with special attention to pronunciation.

The accurate pronunciation of classical Greek was of special importance to Aldus, and his *abecedarium* reflects as much. Accurate pronunciation was, to practitioners of the *studia*, an aspect of the comprehensive recovery of the classical heritage. In his *De ordine*, Guarino, as his father before him, had taught

---

that it was the foundation on which grammar, and therefore all subsequent knowledge, was built.

_In illis autem erudiendis ordinem hunc servavi oportebit, ut litteras et verba aperte quidem et expedite, non tamen expresse nimis pronuntiare consuescant._431

[In teaching the former [beginning students], however, he [the teacher] should stick to the following order: they should get used to pronouncing the letters and words clearly and easily, but not with excessive precision.]432

And as is well known, Aldus was succeeded in many of his endeavors in Hellenism by Erasmus, his sometime colleague in Venice, who wrote extensively on the subject of the Greek and Latin pronunciation.433 But the first edition of _Aldine Lascaris_ reflects little by way of revision. As can be seen in Table 3.3 above, Aldus simply repeats the received Byzantine pronunciation, in which the sounds of ι, η, υ, ει, οι, and υι are all translated by the Latin _i longum_.434 Even

---

431 _De ordine_ 7.
432 The translation is Kallendorf’s.
433 Erasmus was with Aldus in Venice in 1507-1508. See Lowry: 28-29. On the Erasmian pronunciation of Greek, see Dillon (2001) and Erasmus’s _De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione_ (Basel: 1528).
434 Fol. 146r: _υ_ _facit i longum_; _οι_ _facit i longum_. However, on fol. 149r, Aldus notes that _ει_ is changed into _e longum_ in contraction with the suffix _–αος_, as in _Ἀχιλλείος_ (Achilleus).
the sounds of certain consonants reflect a Byzantine model. The letter beta, for instance, is pronounced with the Latin v, as illustrated on fol. 145v, where Aldus transliterates βάρβαρος as varvaros and βαβαί as vavae. And the diphthong αυ is pronounced medium inter b et f.

Aldus seems to have revised his thinking on translation in subsequent editions of the Lascaris, in particular the 1512 edition, which disclaims the current in favor of a reformed pronunciation of Greek on the (retrospectively) obvious assumption that different letters represented different sounds. It is on fol. 540v of the 1512 edition that Aldus quotes Terentianus Maurus⁴³⁵ and first made his now-famous statement,⁴³⁶

\[ Oves vero non vi vi, ut nunc βῆ βῆ barbarae pronuntiamus. Sed βē βē belant. \]

[Indeed sheep do not bleat “vee vee,” as we now barbarously pronounce it. They bleat “bay bay.”]

But Aldus did not gesture toward such reforms in the first edition of the Aldine Lascaris, and one is left to wonder to what extent he had considered these questions prior to 1495.

⁴³⁵ Litteram namque ē videmus esse ad ἡτα proximam, sicut ὧ et ὦ videntur esse vicinae sibi. Temporum momenta distant, non soni nativitas.
Aldus treats diphthongs starting on fol. 149r, giving in every case a Latin transliteration of the word so as to indicate the correct pronunciation of the Greek. As in Latin primers of the period, the abecedarium is followed by the Pater noster, the Ave Maria, the Symbolum apostolorum, as well as the beginning of the Gospel of Saint John. Just as young students would learn Latin with familiar texts—the texts ringing in their ears from the liturgy—so Aldus designed his primer to teach Greek to these same students, students who already knew these texts in Latin by rote.

Following the primer material, Aldus introduces some elementary readings. He began with the Χρυσά ἔπη, or Carmina aurea, which was then attributed to Pythagoras. This text seems an odd choice to the modern classicist, by whom it is seldom, if ever, read. But it was an important text in the Italian Renaissance, and Aldus boldly asserts its value in his preface to the Appendix.437 The figure of Pythagoras, the ancient sage, was familiar in the Latin West prior to the Quattrocento. He appeared in Ovid’s Metamorphoses and Capella’s De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae. But Pythagoras’s influence expanded with the intensification of interest in Greek literature during the late fourteenth century. Salutati and Bruni maintained a keen interest in him, an interest fed by the dotti bizantini and the rise of Renaissance Platonism.438

Pythagoras represented the union of ancient wisdom and Christian truth. And he just so happened to have written (supposedly) a relatively simple

437 See appendix A.2.
438 For an overview of the presence and influence of Pythagoras in the fifteenth century, see Joost-Gaugier 2009: 19-36.
moralizing text, the Χρυσοᾶ ἔπη, a set of gnomic, sagely maxims, not dissimilar to pseudo-Cato’s distichs, which were so popular as elementary Latin reading material (the first of the auctores octo).\textsuperscript{439}

The next text is the Στίχοι εἰς Φωκυλίδην, or Versus in Phocylidem. The verses were most likely written by a Jewish poet living in Alexandria, now called Pseudo-Phocylides to distinguish him from the sixth-century BCE poet of the same name. It belongs to the genre of gnomic poetry, again much like the Disticha Catonis just mentioned. A modern edition of the poem, with introduction and commentary, can be found in Wilson (2005).

Finally, Aldus included a section of the grammar of Manuel Moschopoulos, a late thirteenth-century Byzantine grammarian and scholiast. Moschopoulos had been an important influence on Chrysoloras, Gaza, and Lascaris,\textsuperscript{440} and there can be little doubt that Aldus was well versed in his catechistic grammar. This section is brief, and it serves, as Aldus claims, to use up a leaf (\textit{Et quia charta supererat, ne periret placuit addere quod legi apud Moscopulum}). It is a treatment of the subjunctive of the verb χρυσοᾶω.

This concludes the texts of the Aldine Lascaris. The following four sections are dedicated to the detailed description of the copies examined for this dissertation. The functional relationship of the texts just mentioned will be the subject of \textsc{Chapter 4}, the conclusions of which will be based on these four

\textsuperscript{439} An excellent rehearsal of the reception of, reaction to, and scholarship on the Χρυσοᾶ ἔπη, along with a critical edition, can be found in Thom (1995); for the availability of the \textit{Golden Verses} in the Italian Renaissance, see Grafton 1987: 789.

\textsuperscript{440} Ciccolella 2008: 113.
copies and details gathered, via correspondence, on an additional twenty copies in Europe and the United States. First, a word should be said concerning the description of incunabula.

The standards of bibliographical description are set forth by Bowers (1950), who includes a section specific to incunabula. Bühler (1949) is an exclusive treatment of incunabula. Saenger and Heinlen (1991) offer an even more copy-specific approach. Terminology and descriptive headings conform to the guidelines of the Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books), hereafter DCRM(B), published by the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (Washington, D.C., 2011).

The common ground between all of the above is the recording of copy-specific details. As Curt Bühler stated,

> It must always be borne in mind that incunabula represent the bridge between manuscripts and the printed books of the sixteenth century—and as they thus stand between the hand-written book and the modern printed volume, they partake in the problems of both.

And with that the emphasis on the concept of ideal copy, so important in Bowers’ Principles, is reduced.

Here follows the copy-specific description of Walters 91.720, Beinecke Zi 5546, Bryn Mawr College Goodhart L-68, and Houghton Inc 5546. Each description is followed by a brief summary.

---

441 Bühler 1949: 4.
Goff: L-68
Gesamtkatalog: M17107
ISTC: il00068000

Super-Chancery 4º; 166 fols.
Collation: a–r⁸ A–C⁸ [*2].

a–r⁸ s⁴ is the Ἐπιτομή of Lascaris and the Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων of Tryphon
A–C⁸ is the Aldine Appendix

Two woodcut initials and two woodcut headpieces, a2v–a3r. Red tint, highly rubbed

Type: Greek 1*:125; Roman 3:108
Page height/width: 202 x 147 mm
Text height/width: 147 x 112 mm

a1r [Title-page with table of contents.] Incipit: in hoc libro haec continentur
Ex libris stamp, Bibliotheca Monacensis
Annotations: inscription 20 quaterni

a1v Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Letter] to students of Greek

a2v (fols. 2v-110v). Lascaris, Constantinus: Ἐπιτομὴ τῶν ὁκτὼ τῶν λόγων μερῶν καὶ ἄλλων
tινῶν ἀναγκαίων. . .
Incipit: Περὶ διαμόρφωσις τῶν γραμμάτων βιβλίων πρῶτον. [Γ]ράμμα ἐστὶ μέρος ἐλάχιστον
φωνῆς. . .

a3v Lascaris, Constantinus: Compendium octo orationis partium et aliorum quorundam
necessariorum
Incipit: Dedivisione litterarum. Liber primus. [L]ittera est pars minima uocis
individua. . .

o6v Τέλος τῆς ἑπιτομῆς
o6r Finis compendia
Annotations: sixteenth-century hand, Τέλος Λασκαροῦ

o6v (110v-141r). Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων
Incipit: Τὰ τῶν λέξεων πάθεις δῶ γενικώτατα...

o7r De passionibus dictionum
Incipit: Dictionum passiones in duo generalissima...

ρ3v Περὶ ἀνομάλων ῥημάτων
Incipit: Αρχή τοῦ α...

p4
De anomalis verbis
Incipit: Principium alpha...

Annotations (s4): manuscript signature Γ iii (long s with roman numeral three).

s3v
Τέλος
s4r
Finis
s4v
Colophon

A1v  **Manutius Romanus, Aldus:** [Letter] to students of Greek.

A2r  Manutius Romanus, Aldus: Alphabetum Graecum cum Multiplicibus litteris

Incipit: Litterae apud graecos sunt quatuor & viginti. . .

Annotations: Marginal annotations extend from A2r-A3r. Occasional alternate letter-forms, tick marks, letters circled or crossed-out. Square brackets before initial letters: [A... [B..., etc. Paragraph rubrications indicate section headings.

A3v  Abbreviationes perpulchrae scitu quibus frequentissime graeci utuntur indifferenter et in principio et in medio et in fine uersus

B1v  Εἰς τὴν αἰών ἑτέρα
Incipit: Χαίρε δίοποινα. . .

B2r  Oratio dominica
Incipit: Pater noster. . .

Annotations: Glosses in Greek in margins.

B1v  Εἰς τὴν αἰών ὑπέτερα
Incipit: Χαίρε δίοποινα. . .

B2r  Salve Regina
Incipit: Salve regina...

B1v  Σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων
Incipit: Πιστεύω οὖν εἰς ἕνα θεόν

B2r  Symbolum apostolorum
Incipit: Credo in unum deum patrem...

Annotations: The Latin translation bears occasional Greek glosses. Some words are those of the facing Greek translation; others are synonyms. Hand is likely sixteenth-century.

B2v  Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου
Incipit: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος...
B2r  *Euangeliu Sancti Ioannis*
Incipit: *In principio erat verbum...*

B3r  Pythagoras [pseudo-]: *Χρυσά ἐπη*
Incipit: *Ἄθανάτους μὲν πρῶτα Θεούς νόμῳ ὡς διάκειται...*

B4r  Pythagoras [pseudo-]: *Carmina aurea.*
Incipit: *Immorales quidem primum deos lege...*

Annotations: Heavy underlining throughout, on both Greek and Latin pages.

B5r  Στίχοι εἰς Φωκυλίδην
Incipit: ὁ Φωκυλίδης εὐπρεπὴ ζήσας βίον...

B7r  *Versus in Phocylidem*
Incipit: *Phocylides decentem uiuens uitam...*

B6r  *Εἰς τὸν ἄντον ἔχεροι*
Incipit: *Ταῦτα δίκης ὀφείλη τοῖς*

B7r  *In eundem alteri*
Incipit: *Haec iudiciis diuinis Dei consilia declarat...*

Annotations: (C1r-C2r): Asterisk and underlines, lines 1-2.

C7r  *Τέλος*

C8r  *Finis.*

C9r  Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Epilogue.]

[Colophon.]

C8v  [Errata.]

Annotations: Black ink, near-contemporary. Numerous ticks and marks.
Some unclear references to folia (perhaps in another edition).

[*2r]  Manutius Romanus, Aldus Pius: [Note on the inclusion of the extract from Moschopulos.]
Incipit: *Et quia charta supererat ne periret placuit addere...*

[*2r]  Moschopoulus, [Manuel]: [Extract on the subjunctive]

**BINDING.**
18th-cent. Russia leather with gold-tooled crest (unidentified).

**BOOKPLATE.**
Leo Olschki; Richard Heber

**PROVENANCE.**
Sold to Henry Walters by Leo Olschki. From the Library of Richard Heber.
COPY-SPECIFIC REFERENCES.


SUMMARY.

Walters 91.720 is a relatively clean text with only a few traces of use. Manuscript annotations are limited to the *abecedarium* and the *Apostles’ Creed*, with some glosses in the margins of the *Pater noster*. There are extra-textual annotations in the *errata*, but their reference is unclear.

If this copy was used, it seems to have been used exclusively for its *Aldine Appendix*, likely by a beginner in the early stages. The single hand represented is not expert in forming the Greek letters, and its scribe seems interested in alternate letter-forms and practice. There is some indication of lexical experimentation in the *Apostles’ Creed*, where synonyms are used in place of the printed words. Many of these have been heavily rubbed out and are no longer legible. The book was cleaned in the nineteenth century, possibly at the time of binding.
Super-Chancery 4°; 166 fols.
Collation: a–r⁸ s⁴ A–C⁸ [*2].
a–r⁸ s⁴ is the Ἐπιτομή of Lascaris and the Περὶ πάθων τῶν λέξεων of Tryphon
A–C⁸ is the Aldine Appendix
Two woodcut initials and two woodcut headpieces, all colored in red and blue, 2⁰–a3⁰

Type: Greek 1°:125; Roman 3:108
Page height/width: 205 x 151 mm
Text height/width: 147 x 112 mm

a¹ [Title-page with table of contents.] Incipit: in hoc libro haec continentur
Ex libris stamp, Bibliotheca Monacensis

a¹ Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Letter] to students of Greek

a² (fols. 2⁰-110⁰). Lascaris, Constantinus: 'Ἐπιτομή τῶν ὀκτώ τῶν λόγων μερῶν καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀναγκαίων. . .
Incipit: Περὶ διαίρεσως τῶν γραμμάτων βιβλίων πρώτον. [Γ]ράμμα ἐστὶ μέρος ἐλάχιστον φωνῆς. . .
Annotations: A considerable number of underlinings and strike-throughs throughout, limited to the Greek side. Very little text. Prominently placed manicules, likely early sixteenth-century, throughout. Rubrication (in red and occasionally blue) mark subject headings. Woodcut initials are colored with red and blue.

a³ Lascaris, Constantinus: Compendium octo orationis partium et aliorum quorundam necessariorum

o³ Τέλος τῆς Ἐπιτομῆς

o³ Finis compendia

o³ (110⁰-141⁰). Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων
Incipit: Τά τῶν λέξεων πάθεις δῶι γενικώτατα...


De passionibus dictionum

Incipit: Dictionum passiones in duo generalissima...

Περὶ ἀνομάλων ῥημάτων

Incipit: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ α...

De anomalis verbis

Incipit: Principium alpha...

Annotations: ownership inscription, rubbed out.

Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Letter] to students of Greek.

Manutius Romanus, Aldus: Alphabetum Graecum cum Multiplicibus litteris

Incipit: Litterae apud graecos sunt quatuor & viginti. . .


Abbreviationes perpulchrae scitu quibis frequentissime graeci utuntur indifferenter et in principio et in medio et in fine uersus

Εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἐτέρα

Incipit: Χαῖρε δόσισμα. . .

Annotations: B1v (Greek page): Heavy underlining. Eἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ἐτέρα rubricated.

Salve Regina

Incipit: Salve regina...

Σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων

Incipit: Πιστεύω οὖν εἰς ἐνα θεόν πατέρα...

Symbolum apostolorum

Incipit: Credo in unum deum patrem...

Ἐὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἰωάννου

Incipit: Ἑν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος...

Euangelium Sancti Ioannis

Incipit: In principio erat verbum...
B³v  Pythagoras [pseudo-]: Χρυσά ἔπη
    Incipit: Ἀθανάτους μὲν πρῶτα Θεοὺς νόμω ώς διάκειται . . .

B₄v  Pythagoras [pseudo-]: Carmina aurea.
    Incipit: Immorales quidem primum deos lege . . .

B₆v  Στίχοι εἰς Φωκυλίδην
    Incipit: ὁ Φωκυλίδης εὐπρεπῆς ζῆσας βίον . . .

B₇v  Versus in Phocylidem
    Incipit: Phocylides decentem uiuens uitam . . .

B₈v  Εἰς τὸν ἀντὸν ἔχειν
    Incipit: Ταῦτα δίκης ὅσησε θεοὶ . . .

B₉v  In eundem alteri
    Incipit: Haec iudiciis divinis Dei consilia declarat . . .

C₇v  Τέλος

C₈v  Finis.

C₈v  Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Epilogue.]

C₈v  [Colophon.]

[*₁v]  Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Note on the list of typographical errors.]

[*₂v]  [Errata.]

[*₂v]  Manutius Romanus, Aldus Pius: [Note on the inclusion of the extract from Moschopulos.]
    Incipit: Et quia charta supererat ne periret placuit addere . . .

[*₂v]  Moschopoulus, [Manuel]: [Extract on the subjunctive]
SUMMARY.

Beinecke ZI 5546 is the oldest binding examined for this dissertation, and it reveals the possibility that the *Lascaris* and the *Aldine Appendix* were originally in a different order. The volume was re-bound at some point in the late-sixteenth, possibly early-seventeenth century in limp vellum. At the time of re-binding, the pages were trimmed. Before the trimming, the books had been foliated by hand, and some of the manuscript foliation remains visible throughout.

Although impossible to be certain, the foliation seems to have been done when the *Appendix* was bound first in the volume. On the (current) fol. 91r, for instance, the manuscript foliation is legible in the upper right corner and reads, *cxvii*. It would be possible for the current fol. 91 to be numbered fol. 117 if the *Aldine Appendix*, which is composed of 26 fols., were to precede the *Lascaris* in the volume. Again, on fol. 117 (current), there is a partially legible *cxlii*, discernable from the curve of the bottom of the *c*, the cross of the bottom of the *x*, and three tick marks. The arithmetic would again indicate that the *Aldine Appendix* very likely was bound before the *Lascaris*.

This could also account for the extensive use of the *abecedarium*, which is evident via the abundance of annotations in at least three near-contemporary hands, and the relatively unattested use of the *Lascaris* in this copy. This evidence will aid the argument in Chapter 4, where the hypothesis will be that the *Aldine Appendix* was meant to precede the *Lascaris* in common practice.
[3.9] Bryn Mawr College Goodhart L-68

Goff: L-68
Gesamtkatalog: M17107
ISTC: il00068000

Super-Chancery 4°; 166 fols.
Collation: a–r⁸ s⁴ A–C⁸ [*2].
a–r⁸ s⁴ is the Ἐπιτομή of Lascaris and the Ἐπιτομή τῶν τῶν λέξεων of Tryphon
A–C⁸ is the Aldine Appendix
Two woodcut initials and two woodcut headpieces, initials colored in yellow, a2v - a3r
Type: Greek 1*:125; Roman 3:108
Page height/width: 194 x 145 mm
Text height/width: 147 x 112 mm

a¹ [Title-page with table of contents.] Incipit: in hoc libro haec continentur
Ex libris stamp, Bibliotheca Monacensis
Annotations: Ad usum fratrum Abusiacensium, Anno Domini MDLXXV

a² MANUTIUS ROMANUS, Aldus: [Letter] to students of Greek
(fols. 2v-110r). Lascaris, Constantinus: Ἐπιτομή τῶν ὀκτώ τῶν λόγων μερῶν καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀναγκαίων. . .
Incipit: Ἐπιτομὴ διαμεῖνα τῶν γραμμάτων βιβλίων πρῶτον. [Γ]ράμμα ἐστὶ μέρος ἐλάχιστον φωνῆς. . .

a³ Lascaris, Constantinus: Compendium octo orationis partium et aliorum quorundam necessariorum
Annotations: particularly on the Latin side. Heaviest annotations (manicules, underlining, and occasional glosses) from fols. 3r-29r. Less thereafter.

o³ Τέλος τῆς Ἐπιτομῆς

o⁴ Finis compendii

o⁵ (110v-141r). Ἐπιτομή τῶν τῶν λέξεων
Incipit: Τὰ τῶν λέξεων πάθεις δῶς γενικώτατα...

o⁶ De passionibus dictionum
Incipit: Dictionum passiones in duo generalissima...
Incipit: Περί ἀνομάλων ῥημάτων

De anomalis verbis

Incipit: Principium alpha...

Τίλος

Finis

Colophon

Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Letter] to students of Greek.

Annotations: Sentence initials are decoratively rubricated. Manicules.

Manutius Romanus, Aldus: De litteris graecis ac diphthongis et quemadmodum ad nos ueniant

Incipit: Alphabetum graecum cum multiplicibus litteris. Litterae apud graecos sunt quatuor et viginti... 

Annotations: Heavy traces of use. Letters are enumerated in the margin and copied several times. Correspondence table of roman numerals to Greek letters. Underlining and manicules. Of particular interest are manicules and underlines on 142r indicating the Latin translation of Greek letters—vita, zita, my, and taf for β, ζ, μ, and τ. On 142v and 143r the tables for vowel grades are rubricated.

Abbreviationes perpulchrae scitu quibus frequentissime graeci utuntur indifferenter et in principio et in medio et in fine versus

Annotations: Heavily underlined and bracketed sections in at least two hands.

Εἰς τὴν ημέραν ἐτέρα

Incipit: Πάτερ ἡμῶν... 

Oratio dominica

Incipit: Pater noster... 

Annotations: The Latin is glossed with the Greek words from the facing page. Perhaps evidence of reading-study.

Εἰς τὴν αἰώνιν ἐτέρα

Incipit: Χαίρε διόσποινα... 

Salve Regina

Incipit: Salve regina... 

Annotations: As above, the Greek words from the facing translation are written next to and above Latin words.

Σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων
Incipit: Πιστεύω οὖν εἰς ἑνα θεόν

B_2^v Symbolum apostolorum
Incipit: Credo in unum deum patrem...

Annotations: As above, although fewer words are glossed.

B_2^v Euangelium τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου
Incipit: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος...

B_2^v Euangelium Sancti Ioannis
Incipit: In principio erat verbum...

B_3^v Pythagoras [pseudo-]: Χρυσάπη
Incipit: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος...

Annotations: The initial letter of every verse is rubricated. Hasty paragraph marks are added. Significant underlining. Evidence of previous, rubbed-out asterisks and tick-marks.

B_4^v Pythagoras [pseudo-]: Carmina aurea.
Incipit: Immorales quidem primum deos lege . . .

B_5^v Σείχοι εἰς Φωκυλίδην
Incipit: ὁ Φωκυλίδης εὐπρεπὴς ζήσας θίον...

B_7^v Versus in Phocylidem
Incipit: Phocylides decentem uiuens uitam . . .

B_6^v Εἰς τὸν ἀντὸν ἐπεροὶ
Incipit: Ταῦτα δίκης ὁσίης θεοὶ

B_7^v In eundem alteri
Incipit: Haec iudiciis divini Dei consilia declarat . . .

C7^v Τίλος

C8^v Finis.

C8^v Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Epilogue.]

C8^v [Colophon.]

[*1^v] Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Note on the list of typographical errors.]

[*1^f] [Errata.]

[*2^v] Manutius Romanus, Aldus Pius: [Note on the inclusion of the extract from Moschopulos.]

Incipit: Et quia charta supererat ne periret placuit addere . . .

[*2^f] Moschopoulus, [Manuel]: [Extract on the subjunctive]
BINDING.
Sixteenth-century chestnut calf over wooden boards, blind stamped and tooled, bronze hardware; subsequent repairs to corners, and head and tail of spine; ink inscription on verso of front free endpaper
BOOKPLATE.
Red morocco label: Goodhart, Howard Lehman, 1884-1951; Bryn Mawr College bookplate
PROVENANCE.
Goodhart, Howard Lehman, 1884-1951, donation to Bryn Mawr College

SUMMARY.

Goodhart L-68 was most heavily used in the first part of the Lascaris and the first part of the Appendix. Several hands, ranging from near-contemporary to, perhaps, nineteenth-century, have annotated the copy heavily. It is interesting that the hands seemed to have concentrated in the same parts of the texts and not in various parts. The Latin pages of the Pater noster, Salve regina, and Credo are glossed with the Greek words facing. This would indicate the learning of Greek words as translations for their Latin equivalents, a practice further considered in CHAP4ER 4 below.

The particular attention paid to the letters and their numerical correspondence is of interest. One user seems to have been concerned with the letters β, ζ, μ, and τ. This concern may point to an interest in the pronunciation of Greek, which was in flux beginning in the sixteenth century. Was this student concerned with Aldus’s transliteration of the Greek letters? If so, why?
Super-Chancery 4°; 172 fols.
Collation: a–r⁸ s¹ A–C⁸ [*2].

a–r⁸ s¹ is the Ἐπιτομή of Lascaris and the Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων of Tryphon
A–C⁸ is the Aldine Appendix

Two woodcut initials and two woodcut headpieces, a2r–a3r

Type: Greek 1*:125; Roman 3:108

Page height/width: 194 x 145 mm
Text height/width: 147 x 112 mm

a₁v  [Title-page with table of contents.] Incipit: in hoc libro haec continentur

Ex libris stamp, Bibliotheca Monacensis

a₂v  Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Letter] to students of Greek

(a2v–110r). Lascaris, Constantinus: Ἐπιτομή τῶν ὀκτώ τοῦ λόγου μερῶν καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀναγκαίων. . .

Incipit: Περὶ διαιρέσεως τῶν γραμμάτων βιβλίων πρῶτον. [Γ]ράμμα ἐστὶ μέρος ἐλάχιστον φωνῆς. . .

a₃v  Lascaris, Constantinus: Compendium octo orationis partium et aliorum quorundam necessariorum

Incipit: De divisione litterarum. Liber primus. [L]ittera est pars minima uocis individua. . .

o6v  Τέλος τῆς Ἐπιτομῆς

o7v  Finis compendii

(110v–141r). Περὶ παθῶν τῶν λέξεων

Incipit: Τὰ τῶν λέξεων πάθεις δύω γενικώτατα...

o8v  De passionibus dictionum

Incipit: Dictionum passiones in duo generalissima...

p3v  Perὶ ἀνομάλων ῥημάτων

Incipit: Αρχὴ τοῦ a...
p4r De anomalis verbis
Incipit: *Principium alpha...*

s3v Τίλος

s4r Finis

s4v Colophon

A1r **Manutius Romanus, Aldus**: [Letter] to students of Greek.

A2r Manutius Romanus, Aldus: *De litteris graecis ac diphthongis et quemadmodum ad nos ueniant*

Incipit: *Alphabetum graecum cum multiplicibus litteris. Litterae apud graecos sunt quatuor et viginti...*

Annotations: Illegible due to cleaning.

A3v *Abbreviationes perpulchrae seitu quibus frequentissime graeci utuntur indifferenter et in principio et in medio et in fine uersus*

B1v *Εὐχὴ κυριακῆ*

Incipit: *Πάτερ ἡμῶν...*

B2v *Oratio dominica*

Incipit: *Pater noster...*

B1v *Εἰς τὴν αἰών ἐτέρα*

Incipit: *Χαίρε δόξασον...*

B2v *Salve Regina*

Incipit: *Salve regina...*

B1v *Σύμβολον τῶν Ἀποστόλων*

Incipit: *Πιστεύω ὦν εἰς ἑνα θεόν πατέρα...*

B2v *Symbolum apostolorum*

Incipit: *Credo in unum deum patrem...*

B2v *Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Ἄγιον Ἰωάννου*

Incipit: *Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος...*

B2v *Euangelium Sancti Ioannis*

Incipit: *In principio erat verbum...*

B3v Pythagoras [pseudo-]: *Χρυσά ἔπη*

Incipit: *ἄθανάτους μὲν πρῶτα Θεούς νόμοι ὡς διάκειται...*

B4v Pythagoras [pseudo-]: *Carmina aurea.*

Incipit: *Immorales quidem primum deos lege...*

B6v *Στίχοι εἰς Φωκυλίδην*

Incipit: *ὁ Φωκυλίδης εὐπρεπὴς ζῆσας βίον...*
Versus in Phocylidem
Incipit: Phocylides decentem uiuens uitam . . .

In eundem alteri
Incipit: Haec iudiciis diuinis Dei consilia declarat . . .

Τέλος
Finis.

Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Epilogue.]
[Colophon.]
Manutius Romanus, Aldus: [Note on the list of typographical errors.]
[Errata.]  
Manutius Romanus, Aldus Pius: [Note on the inclusion of the extract from Moschopulos.]
Incipit: Et quia charta supererat ne periret placuit addere . . .
Moschopoulus, [Manuel]: [Extract on the subjunctive]

Binding.
Nineteenth-century limp-vellum library binding.
Bookplate.
Harvard College.
Provenance.
Unknown.
SUMMARY.

Houghton In 5546 is of disappointingly little use in this project. In rebinding, the book was severely trimmed and annotations were washed beyond legibility. There is no evidence of rubrication. The additional folia noted above are later, probably nineteenth-century, additions.

Because this dissertation is concerned with the archaeological investigation of book-copies, the accidents and effects of history play a significant role in the recovery of context. Bibliographical facts are, as noted in the introduction, facts of history, and they reveal the processes and uses of an object at any point in its duration. Bibliographical facts include those processes and uses that have obscured other, previous traces of process and use. In this sense, Houghton In 5546 tells a particular story, that of nineteenth-century incunabula collecting. Its copy-specific details—its present binding, the process of rebinding, its erasures, etc.—are rich fodder for an historian of this period. But they lend precious little to the historian of Italian Renaissance Hellenism.
At the outset, this dissertation promised to argue that the *Aldine Lascaris* should be understood not as an aggregate of texts, the texts reviewed in CHAPTER 3, but as a single textual entity, assembled and marketed by a publisher with the express purpose of presenting a complete course, real or ideal, in ancient Greek. It also promised to argue that the edition was inevitably linked to the advent of Italian Renaissance Hellenism within the broader movement of stylistic reform now called humanism. And finally, it promised to argue that the *Aldine Lascaris* betrays attributes associated solely with print, as opposed to manuscript, which are essential to a new genre in foreign-language pedagogy: the publisher’s textbook.

Using the foregoing analysis of the context, content, and manufacture of the *Aldine Lascaris*, this chapter will answer the following questions, building from specific to general, and leading ultimately to the definition of the term *publisher’s textbook*. First, what do individual copies of printed books tell us about the nature of their edition? Second, what does the nature of an edition tell us about its role in a particular context? Third, how does the edition represent a pedagogical method, and how would that method be realized in a classroom setting? Finally, what aspects of the context, content, use, and manufacture of the edition can be assigned to the effects of the printing press? Since the last
question assumes a cause and effect relationship, it is naturally reciprocal: what, if any, aspects of the press betray the effects of its context, content, use, or manufacture?

In answering these questions, this chapter will begin by presenting the argument that the copies of the *Aldine Lascaris* point to a particular functionality, which in turn points to a need for a refined understanding of the edition. This will be followed by an analysis of the real and ideal functionality of the copies and their relationship with Quattrocento Greek instruction. This chapter will conclude with remarks on the interplay between typography and pedagogy.

[4.1] The Sum of the Parts

In every short-title catalog, from Saubertus to the USTC, books are arranged by their most conspicuous text. The system is that of a finding aid, guided by the principle of efficiency. But a great many books, whether manuscript or printed, are composite. This fact is familiar to anyone who has browsed a rare book library looking for, say, a classical author. More often than not, texts are merged and amalgamated, sometimes by design, other times by accident or at random. Composite volumes may be thematic, an anthology, for

---

442 For a local example, see Luck (1983). In 1979, Dr. Lilian Randall of the (then) Walters Art Gallery discovered that MS Baltimore Walters W. 475 (Ricci no. 18) contained more than the *Vita Homeri* under which it was listed. It also includes Demetrius Chalcondylas’ preface to the *editio princeps* of Homer (Florence, 1488) and the hypothesis to the first book of Homer’s
instance; or they may be programmatic, as with a primer or reader. Whatever the case, it is far from uncommon for the early modernist to find texts buried in the leaves of a book for which no reference in the finding aid or catalog can be found.

This line of reasoning is not meant to fault the finding aid, which has a purpose; it is, however, meant to encourage the copy-specific study of books with special reference to their often composite nature. What texts does a book contain? Is the composite volume the work of one compiler or many? And at what time(s)? How are the texts in the volume formatted? Do they share a hand or type? Do they share a mise-en-page? Are the texts united or differentiated by function, theme, or design? What relationship do the texts have to one another? And what relationship do the parts have to the whole? What is the principle of inclusion (or exclusion)? And one could go on, each general question leading to more specific questions, always building to a better understanding of the place and purpose of the object.

The “Erotemata” of Constantine Lascaris, as it is so often cataloged, is just such a composite volume, and just such questions ought to be put to it. Some can be readily answered, as they have been above: the volume contains a number of texts (see Table 3.1 above) in addition to its most conspicuous, eponymous one; the composite volume is the work of one man, namely Aldus Manutius, its publisher; the volume was planned and executed in the years leading up to its

*Iliad*, which appeared in the same printed book. Professor Luck concluded that some parts of the composite manuscript were used as printer’s copy in in preparation for the great Florentine Homer.
publication in the spring of 1495; the texts in the volume are formatted—in both imposition and layout—to aid the student in the acquisition of a foreign language. With no small ingenuity on the part of the publisher, the texts are designed with facing translation and with a set of letter-forms relevant to the stated purpose of the book. To that end, the texts share a mise-en-page; their design is unified by purpose.

But then other questions are more difficult. The relationship of the texts is not immediately or altogether clear. As noted above, the book was designed in two apparently separable parts. To what end? Nor is the relationship of the parts to the whole easily discerned. There is no doubt that the book is meant to teach Greek. But how, exactly? Finally, the principle of inclusion (or exclusion) is not obvious. Why are certain texts included here? Why not others that might have been more obvious? In attempting to understand the relationship of the texts in this edition, it will be useful to examine the ways in which the texts were arranged and used in extant copies of the *Aldine Lascaris*.

As given in the collation of the ISTC and GW, Lascaris’s Ἐπιτομή precedes the texts of the *Aldine Appendix*. But it is justifiably difficult to imagine a beginner beginning with Lascaris. Basic as it seems, the Ἐπιτομή would, even with the patient aid of a skilled teacher, prove daunting to the Greek-less beginner, much as Donatus’s *Ars minor* would confound the student with absolutely no Latin. In the case of the Ἐπιτομή, the letter-forms alone—always an initial hurdle in learning Greek—are not explained, let alone the

---

443 Several colleagues with a knowledge of the history of Greek pedagogy have asked why some Aesop, for instance, was not included. A fair question.
abbreviations, contractions, etc. Simply put, it is not elementary enough for the true beginner.

But in examining the four copies described in Chapter 3, it became increasingly clear that the Ἐπιτομή may not have been the most frequently or heavily used of the texts in this composite volume. The abecedarium that begins the Aldine Appendix not only seems to precede the Ἐπιτομή in notional function, it also bears the heaviest evidence of use; it stands to reason that this text would be prefatory to the rest of the volume, and in fact it seems likely that, in many cases, it was.

In Beinecke Zi 5546 (Section 3.5 above), manuscript foliation suggests that the volume might have been bound with the Aldine Appendix preceding the Ἐπιτομή. Were this the case, the usefulness of the volume would dramatically increase, at least for the beginner. And the programmatic, functional nature of the volume would be more immediately apparent. It is the Appendix, after all, that is equivalent to the hornbook and primer of elementary Latin education, whereas the Ἐπιτομή can be seen as equivalent to Donatus. Beinecke Zi 5546 therefore led to the question: could evidence support the argument that the volume was meant to be used with primer material first and grammar following?

The ISTC lists sixty-five extant copies of the Aldine Lascaris. Table 4.1 below lists the twenty-four copies in contemporary or near-contemporary bindings (or that betray evidence of previous binding) on which quire-distribution data was gathered for this dissertation either in person or via correspondence. As explained in Section 3.1, the collation is: a – r⁸ s⁴ A –
where \( a - r^8 s^4 \) is the *Lascaris* and \( A - C^8 [^*]^2 \) is the *Aldine Appendix.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Quire Distribution</th>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Quire Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAV (1)</td>
<td>( A-C^8[^*]a-r^8s^4 ) Morgan Library</td>
<td>BAV (2)</td>
<td>( a-r^8s^4B-C^8[^*]^2 ) (wanting ( A^8 )) Newberry Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAV (3)</td>
<td>( A-C^8[^*]a-r^8s^4 ) Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Berlin SB (1)</td>
<td>( a-r^8s^4A-C^8[^*]^2 ) Beinecke Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin SB (2)</td>
<td>( A-C^8[^*]a-r^8s^4 ) Firestone Library, Princeton</td>
<td>Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome</td>
<td>( a-r^8s^4A-C^8[^*]^2 ) University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Corsiniana, Rome</td>
<td>( a-r^8s^4(\text{wanting } A-C^8[^*]^2) ) UCLA</td>
<td>Cambridge UL</td>
<td>( A-C^8[^*]a-r^8s^4 ) Bryn Mawr College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>( A-C^8[^<em>]a-r^8s^4 ) Houghton Library, Harvard (1) ( a-r^8s^4B-C^8[^</em>]^2 ) (wanting ( A^8 ))</td>
<td>München BSB (1)</td>
<td>( a-r^8s^4(\text{wanting } A-C^8[^*]^2) ) Scheide Library, Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München BSB (2)</td>
<td>( A-C^8[^*]a-r^8s^4 ) Huntington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.1
It is apparent that a certain number of copies were either bound with the Appendix preceding the Lascaris or they indicate that the Appendix was at some point in the history of the volume separated from the Lascaris. Three classes emerge: copies bound with the Lascaris first (a–r⁸s⁴A–C⁸[*]²); copies bound with the Appendix first (A–C⁸[*]²a–r⁸s⁴); and copies that for some reason lack some portion of the Appendix. Incunabulists and historians of the Aldine Press have considered the first class to be the default. But this is an accident of history. The collations given in the short-title catalogs are based on copies that were available to the original catalogers, not on the statistical data gathered from a larger set of copies. As noted on page 23, incunabular copies admit a larger number of differentia, which makes generalizations concerning their edition considerably more difficult. And the attribution of an author, in this case Lascaris, is repeated on the principle of “authority work,” giving the illusion that the edition and all of its copies functioned primarily as Lascaris’s grammar. ⁴⁴⁴

But for the purposes of the present argument, it is the second and third classes above that concern us. They betray a different function than might be expected, namely that the edition was not primarily Lascaris’s grammar, but

---

⁴⁴⁴ The principle of establishing control and consistency over the names of entities (authors, publishers, places, etc.). In original cataloging, names are checked against bibliographical authorities, i.e. existing catalogs that have acquired authoritative status and are used as a “control.” When a rare book cataloger populates the authority field in his or her record of a copy, he or she reuses the established author name from an incunabula catalog (Hain, proctor, ISTC, or GW) in which the edition appears. This means that the author name “Lascaris” is reused for purposes of standardization, even if it bears no relation to the functionality of a copy.
that it was designed and used as a course that incorporated primer, grammar, and graded reader.

Table 4.2 below highlights the copies of the second class: bound with the Appendix preceding the Lascaris. It will be seen that fourteen of the twenty-four copies are so bound. That is fifty-eight percent. These copies were examined because they are contained in contemporary or near-contemporary bindings, or because their binding history is evident. That does not, of course, make it certain that they were not re-bound, or that the order of texts was not otherwise disturbed without a trace. But the proximity of binding to printing, or the evidence of binding history, increases the likelihood that the preserved order of texts reflects a functionality closely in line with the principles of design; whereas, for instance, nineteenth-century rebindings that have left no evidence more often reflect the collations given in catalogs than the notional function of a composite volume. Books in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, in particular, were often rebound for conservation in accordance with catalog collations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Quire Distribution</th>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Quire Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAV (1)</td>
<td>A–C[*]2a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Morgan Library</td>
<td>A–C[*]2a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAV (2)</td>
<td>a–r²s¹B–C[*]²</td>
<td>Newberry Library</td>
<td>a–r²s¹ (wanting A–C[*])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(wanting A³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAV (3)</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin SB (1)</td>
<td>a–r²s¹A–C[*]²</td>
<td>Beinecke Library</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin SB (2)</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Firestone Library, Princeton</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome</td>
<td>a–r²s¹A–C[*]²</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Corsiniana, Rome</td>
<td>a–r²s¹ (wanting A–C[*])²</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge UL</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr College</td>
<td>a–r²s¹A–C[*]²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Houghton Library, Harvard (1)</td>
<td>a–r²s¹B–C[*]² (wanting A³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow UL (Hunterian)</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Houghton Library, Harvard (2)</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München BSB (1)</td>
<td>a–r²s¹ (wanting A–C[*]²)</td>
<td>Scheide Library, Princeton</td>
<td>a–r²s¹B–C[*]² (wanting A³)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München BSB (2)</td>
<td>A–C[*]²a–r²s¹</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>a–r²s¹A–C[*]²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If one were to include the copies that are wanting some portion of the *Appendix*, on the assumption that the portion was at some point separated for use, twenty copies would betray that the *Appendix* was used separately. That is eighty-three percent of the copies inspected. These are depicted in TABLE 4.3 below.

The text most often wanting is, not surprisingly, the *abecedarium*. Quire A has the introduction to the alphabet and its pronunciation as well as Aldus’s treatise on diphthongs—the most elementary material in the volume. Why was this quire so often detached? Perhaps it was used in much the way a hornbook had been: mounted on a board for easy, separate reference and portability. Perhaps it was used as a writing-prompt for practicing Greek letters and gaining the visual literacy necessary to any further acquisition of the Greek language. Perhaps both. Without more evidence, the only thing certain is that the findings do not indicate the chances of time. The frequency with which the *abecedarium* was annotated and detached is beyond fortune or accident and clearly betrays system and functionality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Quire Distribution</th>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Quire Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAV (1)</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Morgan Library</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAV (2)</td>
<td>a–r[^s][B–C[^8][^s]]^2 (wanting A[^8])</td>
<td>Newberry Library</td>
<td>a–r[^s][wanting A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAV (3)</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin SB (1)</td>
<td>a–r[^s][A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
<td>Beinecke Library</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin SB (2)</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Firestone Library, Princeton</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome</td>
<td>a–r[^s][A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteca Corsiniana, Rome</td>
<td>a–r[^s][wanting A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge UL</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr College</td>
<td>a–r[^s][A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Houghton Library, Harvard (1)</td>
<td>a–r[^s][B–C[^8][^s]]^2 (wanting A[^8])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow UL (Hunterian)</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Houghton Library, Harvard (2)</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München BSB (1)</td>
<td>a–r[^s][wanting A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
<td>Scheide Library, Princeton</td>
<td>a–r[^s][B–C[^8][^s]]^2 (wanting A[^8])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München BSB (2)</td>
<td>A–C[^8][^s][a–r]^4</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>a–r[^s][A–C[^8][^s]]^2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even if these data sets are incomplete, the evidence presented above points to the need for a redefinition of this edition and a closer look at its use in the sphere of Italian Renaissance Hellenism. It was clearly more than Lascaris’s grammar, and its principal function was clearly more than is evident in any one of its texts. The fact that the *Aldine Appendix* seems to have been most frequently used, most frequently bound first, and designed most deliberately by its author-publisher suggests that it theoretically preceded the *Lascaris* in a programmatic composite that was intended to be the sum of its parts. It is this sum—conceived, designed, manufactured, and marketed by its publisher—that constitutes the genre of publisher’s textbook.
A textbook in the Italian Renaissance is the sort of thing readily recognized but seldom defined. And when one does attempt a definition, the concept turns out to be protean. The trouble lies in the act of definition itself. The concept of *textbook* is often approached formally, e.g. the textbook is a kind of book that has certain specific characteristics. This is a genre definition, and it is not unproblematic. It has the advantage of empiricism: once one hypothesizes what characteristics a textbook should have, one only has to find those characteristics in a book to label it a *textbook*. But there is often confusion as to the starting point, the *summum genus*, as it were: what is the concept of *book* to which one would add specific characteristics, and what terminology does one use to describe it? Then there is trouble with the process: when one looks for them, what specific characteristics, *a priori*, is a textbook likely to have?

Another, perhaps better, approach is a contextual definition: a textbook is any book used in a certain context. This is the underlying assumption of much work on the history of textbooks, particularly the use of literary texts in an educational setting. Scholars from Anthony Grafton (1981 and 2008) to Joseph Freedman (1986) to Ann Blair (1989 and 2008) and Jürgen Leonhardt (2008)

---

445 Although this is not to say it has not been defined. At the start of his essay, “The Rise of the Philosophical Textbook,” Charles Schmitt called the textbook, “[…] a book specifically designed for classroom use.” (Schmitt 1987: 792). Anthony Grafton supposed that a Renaissance humanist might have defined the textbook as an example of the genre of the isagogic treatise. (Grafton 2008: 13.) In fact, following the title so engrained in western education by Porphyry’s introduction to logic, Theodore Gaza called his introduction to Greek Εἰσαγωγὴ γραμματικῆς. See Table 2.1 above.
have taken this point of departure, examining the use of texts, any texts, in an educational setting. But the present dissertation is not concerned with the use of a particular text in an educational setting; it is concerned with the design of a particular book or set of books for use in an educational setting. The difference is one of evidence. While the studies above draw conclusions from the evidence of use, the present study draws conclusions from the evidence of design; in other words, the difference is between actual and intended function.

Therefore, for the present purposes, a textbook cannot be a text used for actual instruction. For the *Aldine Lascaris*, the evidence simply does not support such an argument. The copies described in Chapter 3 betray precious little evidence of use, presumably because the copies that were used were simply used up, as is the case with many early-modern schoolbooks; those that remain on shelves were for some reason unused. The best approach to the present situation is a causal definition, specifically a final causal definition: instruction is the end toward which a *textbook* is the means. A *textbook* is a book designed to instruct. This definition liberates the present inquiry from evidence of actual use and places the burden on evidence of intended use. This evidence exists apart from student glosses and annotations, which are unfortunately lacking, and exists entirely within the manufactured object itself.

Therefore the argument is that the *Aldine Lascaris* is a publisher’s textbook because a publisher, as opposed to a single author, designed the book to teach Greek. The *Aldine Lascaris* incorporates, in one volume, the three phases of elementary language instruction that the fifteenth century inherited from the
Middle Ages, namely the hornbook and primer, the summary of grammar, and
the elementary authors. In the Latin tradition, the first phase was represented
by the *abecedarium, psalterium*, and prayers; the second phase by Donatus’ *Ars
minor*; and the third by the *auctores octo*—a sequence of elementary authors,
often moralizing in tone, and usually beginning with the *Disticha Catonis*. Aldus
conceived of a volume that would mirror the Latin tradition in Greek, using
Latin as the medium of instruction. This had the double benefit of adapting
Greek language instruction to a formal sequence already familiar to anyone who
would use the volume and using texts that would likely have already been
learned by rote in Latin, particularly the *Pater noster, Salve regina, and Apostles’
Creed*.

Beyond the primer material, Aldus had to choose the grammar and
elementary authors that would best mirror the Latin tradition. There was a
Greek Donatus, but Aldus bypassed it.\footnote{\textsuperscript{446} As seen in \textsc{Chapter 2} above,
Constantine Lascaris and his grammar had been lent status and name-
recognition in his association with Pietro Bembo; his text had also been
previously printed and was certainly circulating in manuscript. Lascaris was a
wise and practical choice, from both a pedagogical and economical point of view.
Likewise his choice of Pythagoras to represent the elementary reading usually
associated with the *Disticha Catonis*. Pythagoras was very much in fashion as a
representative of proto-Christian and Platonic teachings. The Greek attributed
to Pythagoras, like pseudo-Cato’s Latin, is straightforward and simple; his

\footnote{\textsuperscript{446} The subject of Ciccolella (2008).}
maxims are moralizing and character-building. Phocylides likewise provided the student with a simple, moralizing set of Greek sentences that lent themselves to memorization. To this set of texts, Aldus added some bonus material. The tropes and figures of Tryphon would have been an excellent introduction to the peculiarities of Greek composition, and the excerpt of the subjunctive by Moschopoulous, evidently because Aldus had some paper to use up, would likely have appealed to more advanced students.

But if such is the sum of the Aldine Lascaris, how, exactly, would it fit into the scheme of Greek pedagogy in the late Quattrocento? And how, exactly, can it be said that Aldus made special use of the new technology of the printing press to develop a new kind of pedagogical book?

[4.3] The Textbook, Typography, and the Renaissance Classroom

While the invention of printing has been discussed conventionally in terms of its value for the spreading of ideas, its even greater contribution is its furthering of the long-developing shift in the relationship between space and discourse.

~ Walter Ong

The revival of Greek studies in fifteenth-century Italy depended in large part on access to materials and teachers. The materials in question, the Aldine Lascaris, for instance, are records of notional texts and methods. The records were designed to be performed, as it were, either verbally or visually, by teachers, not necessarily by their authors. In the performance, the teachers were

---

able to systematically repeat the author’s methods. This, as we have seen, was Chrysoloras’s great contribution to the study of Greek in the West: he left a record of his method—first in manuscript and later in print—that could be used in his absence. But every teacher’s performance of the recorded text involves interpretation and compromise. Simply put, teachers use textbooks, and further developments in those textbooks reflect teachers’ classroom practice, whether real or ideal.448 For the historian of Greek education in Quattrocento Italy, the question is how were textbooks used, how did their design influence methods of instruction, and how did methods of instruction influence their design?

What historians know about the Greek-language classroom in late fifteenth-century Italy is largely drawn from two sources: materials and contemporary accounts. The former category includes the books, both their design (the subject of this project) and any traces they preserve of use, either by teachers or students.

The evidence of design yields two conclusions as to the use of texts in the classroom. The first and most obvious of those mentioned above is the relationship of the catechistic form to its function. Chrysoloras had designed a textbook that worked, in much the same way as Donatus’s Ars minor. But it is likely that the question-answer form of the text does not necessarily reflect a question-answer performance in the classroom—the teacher asking the questions and the student responding. Rather, much like a liturgical catechism,

448 See Ciccolella 2010: 598: “Renaissance editors and printers, who of course wanted to sell books, may have tried to make them suitable for use in the classroom by reproducing the method currently followed by teachers.”
it was an aid to memory, a pattern so familiar to students that it would provide for the long-term storage of information and facilitate its recall. The second conclusion to be drawn from the principles of design mentioned above is the mirroring effect—the attempt of Greek-language textbook authors to replicate the graded Latin curriculum by providing a substitution for each textual step.

Yet Lascaris’s Επιτοµή is unlike Chrysoloras’s Ερωτήµατα, and therefore unlike Donatus’s Ars minor. It is not catechistic in form. In the curriculum that Aldus envisioned, and likely the curriculum used by Lascaris himself, the Επιτοµή is the exposition of grammatical principles represented in the Latin curriculum by Donatus. Why the change from catechism to compendium when its place in the curriculum remained the same? There are two tentative answers, both of which inform the subsequent history of Greek studies in the West. First, it is likely that Lascaris’s text is a record of his practice. He expressed his dissatisfaction with highly abridged texts in the preface to his grammatical works written in Messina but never printed during his lifetime.449

广大市民在抄写的时候，不注意文字的连贯性，往往有错字、漏字、别字等现象。造成这种现象的原因主要有以下几点：

It is a safe inference that Lascaris preferred the approach offered by a compendium to that of a catechism, and that the form of his text reflects his practice. Second, and more tentatively, the advent of print was concomitant with changes in the practices of reading and referencing. And it was precisely these changes that Aldus exploited in his first attempt at a systematic textbook.

One change, for instance, was that texts gradually shifted from the records of verbal acts, designed to aid in the reproduction of those acts, to primarily visual entities, designed to arrange information for efficient reference.\footnote{Chrysoloras’s text, as Donatus’s \textit{Ars minor}, Alexander’s \textit{Doctrinale} or Eberhard’s \textit{Graecismus}, was designed to be used as a script, i.e. an aid to the memory and performance of a verbal act, namely the oral exposition of grammatical principles. Manuscripts were often read through and read aloud. This is not to say that they lacked visual cues and reference points, e.g. rubrication or manicules, etc. But what cues and reference points the reader will find in a Donatus of, say, the twelfth century are ad hoc, idiosyncratic, and unsystematic. More often than not, they serve as aids to the read-through, the oral performance of the text, not as aids to reference. And they are aids to the user, recorded by the user, not aspects of the standardized design of books.}

\textsuperscript{450} For a similar line of reasoning, see Ong 1958: 314: “[in a manuscript culture] books still had been registers of words, aids to the recall of sounds (one ordinarily read aloud even when reading to oneself) rather than places that “contain” well-localized “things.” And Moss 2004: 35: “One important way of organising knowledge in the Early Modern period was to ‘place’ it.”}
In a shift from script to visual reference, the compendium is certainly a more efficient form than the catechism and represents a more reference-oriented method of instruction. The compendium was not, just as most textbooks from the early sixteenth century to the present day are not, a script. It was a visual space, designed for the representation and reference of concepts that could be arranged diagrammatically.\textsuperscript{451} But of course the \textit{Aldine Lascaris} represents a tentative step in the direction of a wholly typographic form and function. It is, as yet, a transitional object. But what does this design—this emphasis on the visual—tell us about its use?

The book is designed to be used as a means of reference, a visual system that contains information that is accessed \textit{as needed}. A teacher or student using this edition would not necessarily read through it. He would begin at a stage relevant to his level and proceed forwards and backwards as needed (even side to side). He would not memorize the exposition of grammar, as it is not designed to facilitate memorization.\textsuperscript{452} In other words, the student would use the text for study, not memorize the text for recall.

This line of reasoning is further evinced by the design of Aldus's subsequent editions and in foreign language textbooks from the end of the Quattrocento to the present day. The mise-en-page of textbooks in the sixteenth century became increasingly elaborate: tables and diagrams were common,\textsuperscript{451} Of course one thinks of Priscian’s \textit{Institutiones grammaticae}, a compendious work that was unlikely to have been memorized. But Priscian’s was a treatise for more advanced students, not analogous to the exposition of grammar in Aldus’s course.\textsuperscript{452} Even in an age of more capacity for memorization than our own, it is unlikely that a student would have memorized Lascaris’s \textit{Compendium}.
indented from the running text, no longer in-line, as in the manuscript era; cross-references increased, inviting students to partake in the visual space by moving between non-linear points in the book (a system that depends on the kind of standardization only available in printed books); sections became clearly marked and labeled; paratext (footnotes, endnotes, page numbers, etc.) aided the student in navigating the concepts in the book. These were the hallmarks of the typographical textbook, a species of pedagogical book that Aldus pioneered. But what exactly can one identify in the *Aldine Lascaris* as belonging to the innovations afforded by the press?

Aldus used the capabilities of the new medium to develop three features in the *Aldine Lascaris*—all three exclusively belonging to the printing press, and all three advantageous to the student of Greek in the fifteenth century. First, as covered in SECTION 2.5, Aldus produced a Greek text with facing translation, a tremendous boon to the student of Greek, an innovation, and an excellent marketing ploy in an unregulated, burgeoning business. Second, Aldus and Griffo designed the graphic system detailed in SECTION 2.6 that served as both an advertisement for the potential of a new press—and its promised series of Greek authors—and an invaluable gain for the student, who could now acquire a visual literacy that corresponded to the target texts, both in Aldus’s future publications and in the world of manuscripts beyond. Finally, Aldus provided students of Greek with a fixed means of reference. Although the first edition of the *Aldine Lascaris* lacks the increasingly sophisticated paratext and tables of
subsequent editions, it nonetheless gave the student a standardized text, effectively the same in every copy, even when the quires were bound differently.

Although it was designed in a transitional period, suspended midway between the conventions and expectations of the eras of manuscript and print, the *Aldine Lascaris* betrays unmistakable signs of typographical thinking. The edition is still, to use Ong’s term, “typographical protoplasm,” a run of text with little concern for spatial display. But it has begun, unambiguously, to move toward a definitively typographical stage, a stage that represents a clear concern for the spatial orientation of information, points of reference, and standardization.

To what extent these features were expected in, anticipated by, or brought into being by the context of humanism or Renaissance Hellenism is an old discussion, one that can only be gestured toward, not concluded. But there can be little doubt that spatial models of organizing thought prevalent in Renaissance thinking had a reciprocal relationship with the new means of producing books. In the manuscript era—an era of unique copies—facing translations, consistent graphic systems, and fixed points of reference had been a relative impossibility. Aldus exploited the potential of the press to produce a composite volume of a new kind: a publisher’s textbook.

At this stage one might wonder what additional light can be shed on the design and functionality of a textbook by contemporary accounts of Greek

---

453 Ong 1958: 311.
454 The discussion of the ‘structure’ of knowledge, or the relationship of knowledge to the senses, often finds its locus in the genre of commonplace book. See Kallendorf (2013) and Moss (2004).
teaching. One such account is an oration of Aristoboulos Apostolis’s father, Michael, composed around 1472.455 Michael was seeking employment as a Greek teacher in Italy and found cause to criticize contemporary methods of Greek instruction. His main points were that Greek should be taught in Greek, not in Latin; that grammar should be learned systematically and thoroughly; and that teachers should not depend exclusively on translation from Greek to Latin as a means of mastery. All three of these charges contained some truth about Greek teaching in Italy.

First, it seems to be true that Greek was taught in Latin. Byzantine émigré teachers were only successful in finding appointments when they had full command of Latin, and the better their Latin the more likely their chances of university work.456 Moreover, Aldus’s decision to print a facing Latin translation in every edition of the *Aldine Lascaris*, even if he wavered in his preface, represents his adherence to an old practice: the *ad verbum* style of learning Greek by studying a literal Latin translation. By this means, students acquire an idea of Greek grammar and vocabulary via their knowledge of Latin. There is some question as to Aldus’s feelings on this matter, for instance the old story that members of his *Neacademia* spoke only Greek.457 But the myth is

455 For the complete text in an edition by Antonio Rollo, see Pontani (1996); for excerpts, see Percival (2002). The main points of his oration summarized here are repeated from Percival 2002: 95.

456 Gaza, for instance, rose to the position of rector at the University of Ferrara. But when he first arrived in Italy, he was not able to work, since his Latin was insufficient. Chrysoloras had excellent Latin even before leaving Constantinople. (Percival 2002: 96-97.)

457 On the Aldine Academy and its mythology, see Lowry (1976).
unsupported by evidence, and Aldus did continue to print the facing Latin translation in every subsequent edition of the *Aldine Lascaris* that issued from his press. What of Michael's last two charges?

As an admirer of Politian and a committed Hellenist, Aldus was quite serious about grammatical competency and thoroughness, and he made every effort to supply it in the *Aldine Lascaris*. The use to which his text was put in this regard is quite unknown and likely varied dramatically from classroom to classroom. As for excessive dependence on translation from Greek to Latin, Aldus was a man of his time. Renaissance humanists rarely attained the expressive, communicative fluency in Greek that they might attain in Latin. Latin was first and more familiar; Greek was the great experiment, replete with challenges and difficulties of access and availability. The *Aldine Lascaris* was indeed designed to teach the translation of Greek into Latin and to invite the comparison of the two. But for many who would use this edition in the classroom or tutorial, that was precisely the point. Aldus was committed to the practice of learning Greek by reference to familiar Latin texts. As seen above, he continued to issue the facing Latin translation, albeit with slight modifications. Even his *Brevissima introductio ad litteras graecas* of about 1497 was a reprint of the first two quires of the *Aldine Appendix*.

---

458 ISTC: im00226400; Goff: H-391; GW M12363. This pamphlet is a sextodecimo that Aldus produced to accompany his Greek book of hours, ISTC: ih00391000; Goff: H-391; GW: 13396. It contains the same error as is found on fol. 150v, line 7 of the Lords' Prayer in the *Aldine Lascaris*, where ῥῦσαι is printed instead of the correct ῥῦσαι. There is a copy of the Greek *Horae* in the Walters Art Museum that belonged to Philip Melanchthon, who used it to learn
Another text that sheds light on the place of the *Aldine Appendix* in the teaching of Greek is, of course, the preface that Aldus wrote for it. This preface remained unchanged in the three editions of the *Aldine Lascaris* printed during his lifetime, and it even appeared in the volume as late as the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{459} In the preface, Aldus claims that,

\begin{quote}
*NIHIL praetermittere est animus quod utile credamus futurum iis qui Graecas litteras discere concupiscunt optimeque scire Latine.*
\end{quote}

[We are of a mind to pass over nothing that we believe will be useful to those wanting to learn Greek and to know Latin best.]

Is this the expression of a man who really believed that he could use a new medium to offer students the best advantages? Or is it an advertisement, well worded by a good businessman? In the end, it is likely both. In either case, in his attempt to pass over nothing, Aldus tells us something of his educational ideals: he is, as noted, committed to the use of Latin in teaching Greek, and he is committed to the Italian Renaissance notion that knowledge of Greek is a boon to one's Latin. But Aldus was not necessarily guilty of Michael Apostolis's final charge: that translation from Greek to Latin was too often the ultimate goal of Greek—his glosses run throughout the volume betraying his use of the familiar Latin text (by memory) to learn the Greek.

\textsuperscript{459} See the Epilogue for later editions of the *Aldine Lascaris*. For the text of Aldus's preface to the *Appendix*, see APPENDIX A.2 below.
the study of Greek. Even if Aldus taught Greek via Latin, there can be little doubt that the series of Greek books that issued from his press was designed for the study of Greek literature as an end in itself, not simply as a text for translation into Latin.

In the end, the *Aldine Lascaris* is a book of its time. As a pedagogical text, as a statement of purpose, and as an element in the history of graphic design, it is liminal. But it unequivocally points in a direction, towards the more permanent place of Greek in western European education, towards the study of Greek literature in its own right, and towards the textbook as a primarily visual entity.

As true to the heady ideals of his intellectual movement as he was to his business partners, Aldus designed a book that would accomplish three things. First, the *Aldine Lascaris* is an earnest attempt to teach students Greek from scratch. Whether working with a teacher, tutor, or studying alone, the book, as a whole, is meant to bring a student to basic literacy. Second, the *Aldine Lascaris* is an attempt to capture a market of students who already had some Greek, but who wanted the latest copy of a prominent Greek scribe-teacher's text, endorsed by a rising intellectual, and who would benefit from an edition that included additional reading material and a facing translation—an important technical innovation. Finally, the *Aldine Lascaris* was an advertisement. As a piece of printing, it is a tour-de-force, showcasing the latest (patented) Greek type, an elegant, familiar roman letter, a functional format, and an abundance of material. It was a calculated introduction to a publishing program, and it was
designed to create a market. In accomplishing these three things, Aldus was ever the teacher and publisher. He produced a book that could sell and work.

**EPILOGUE: THE ALDINE LASCARIS AFTER ALDUS**

That the *Aldine Lascaris* was a success, both commercially and pedagogically, is evident in Table E.1, which represents the publishing history of Lascaris’s Ἐπιτομή. Every edition of the text published after 1495 was effectively a reprint of the *Aldine Lascaris*; only small changes were made to both Lascaris’s text and the *Appendix*.

Since in hand-press printing there is a direct correlation between the number of pages set in type and the cost of the printing job, there can be little doubt that the *Appendix* was not reprinted on momentum alone. If it had been Lascaris’s text alone that sold well and worked in the classroom, only his text would have been reprinted, and many sixteenth-century publishers would have saved a good deal in capital. If Aldus’s name had been the selling point, his name would be affixed to every subsequent edition. It is not. As early as Mazzocchi’s 1510 edition, printed while Aldus was still alive, the author of the *Appendix* is uncredited, although his work is substantially reprinted wholesale. Only two editions printed at Rome in the seventeenth century were of Lascaris’s text alone, without any part of the *Appendix*.

Despite a short-lived revival in nineteenth-century Venice, the *Aldine Lascaris* was a late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century phenomenon. The reason, perhaps, is that Lascaris’s text, and the *Appendix* that Aldus designed to
accompany it, were simply superseded. Just as the *Aldine Lascaris* was a transitional edition, combining the characteristics of manuscript and printed book, so the texts it contained were transitional, belonging to an era of recovery and rediscovery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Milan</th>
<th>Vicenza</th>
<th>Venice</th>
<th>Ferrara</th>
<th>Florence</th>
<th>Louvain</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paravisiinus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>[Bonus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accursius]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Leonardus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de Basilea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E.1

(Highlighted editions are of the *Aldine Lascaris*)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Milan</th>
<th>Vicenza</th>
<th>Venice</th>
<th>Ferrara</th>
<th>Florence</th>
<th>Louvain</th>
<th>Paris</th>
<th>Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melchiorre I Sessa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melchiorre I Sessa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bartolomeo Zanetti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melchiorre I Sessa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giovanni Antonio Nicolini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giovanni Farri &amp; fratres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giovanni Antonio &amp; Pietro Nicolini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girolamo Scoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>Vicenza</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Ferrara</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Louvain</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pietro &amp; Giovanni Maria Nicolini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pietro Ravani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulo Manuzio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blantes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blantes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES

NOTES ON THE TEXTS OF THE APPENDICES

• Orthography, including capitalization, has been retained.
• The principal source of the following texts in Walters 91.720.

[A1]

ALDUS MANUTIUS ROMANUS STUDIOSIS. S.D.


Est tritum vulgari sermone proverbium: peccato veteri, recens poena. Cuius est, sibi assumat (ut aiunt). Forte et tuum est; dixerit quispiam. Audi: non imus
inficias, fatemur, enim ingenue. Sumus homines. Atque utinam homines et re et
nomine. Non nomine solum homines, et re ex numero pecudum. Sunt enim ait
Cicero, nonnulli homines non re sed nomine. Sed de his hactenus. Dabit Deus his
quoque finem, et ut spero propediem. Accipite interea studiosi litterarum
bonarum Constantini Lascareos rudimenta grammatices, longe correctiora iis,
quae impressa visuntur. Nam ea Constantinus ipse in locis circiter centum et
quinquaginta emendavit, quod facile cognoscet, si quis cum hisce illa conferet.
Nam deleta quaedam videbit, multa correcta, plurima addita. Ita vero
emendatum manu ipsius Constantini librum nobis dedere commodo Petrus
Bembus, et Angelus Gabriel Patritii Veneti adeo nobiles, praestantique, ingenio
Iuvenes, qui nuper in Insula Sicilia Graecas Litteras ab eo ipso lascari
didicerunt, et nunc Patavii incumbunt una liberalibus disciplinis.
Interpretationem vero Latinam eregione addidimus arbitratu nostro, rati
commodius, utilisque futurum graece discere incipientibus. Parcant velim qui
haec sine interpritatione Latina desiderant, nam rudibus, et ignaris penitus
litterarum graecarum Lascaris institutiones imprimendas curavimus. Mox
eruditis et doctis optimi quique graecorum libri favente CHRISTO IESU
imprimentur. Valete.
TRANSLATION

[Aldus Manutius of Rome to the studious. The grammatical works of that most
learned man, Constantine Lascaris, as useful as one could imagine for
introducing the young to the Greek language, and can be seen almost as a
prelude to our great efforts, our expenses, and our machinery for printing Greek
volumes of every kind by both the large number of those who desire to be
accomplished in Greek (for no printed books existed for sale and they frequently
sought them from us) and by the status and condition of our times—the huge
wars that now pervade all Italy, since God is angry with our sins, and that seem
to be about to overturn the whole world or rather to shake it apart. This is
because the crimes of man are far greater and more extensive than those which
once caused God to submerge the whole of humanity with the waters and destroy
it completely. Your sentiment, Valerius Maximus, is quite true, even golden, and
worthy of memory: while divine anger arrives slowly at its punishment, it
compensates for its slowness with severity. Then there is the well known proverb
in the common speech: for an old sin, a fresh punishment. Whose it is, he should
take it, as they say. ‘But it is also yours,’ someone might say. Listen: you are not
utterly corrupted, I admit it frankly. We are in fact human. And would that we
were men by fact and by name—not by name only and by fact just sheep from
the flock. For there are, says Cicero, some who are men not by fact but by name.
But enough of these things. God gives even them an end, and, I hope, soon.
Meanwhile, you who study the belles-lettres, accept these grammatical
rudiments of Constantine Lascaris, much more correct than those that appear to
have been printed earlier. For Constantine himself corrected these rudiments in nearly one hundred and fifty places, which will easily be perceived, if anyone compares these with those. He will see certain things deleted, much corrected, and even more added. Indeed the book corrected in the hand of Lascaris himself was given to us by Pietro Bembo and Angelo Gabriele, Venetian gentlemen and nobles and young men surpassing in their genius. They recently learned Greek from Lascaris himself on Sicily, and they now hold positions at Padua in the liberal arts. We have directly added the Latin translation on our own initiative, thinking it would be more agreeable and useful for those beginning to learn Greek. And we would ask that those wanting the text without the Latin translation pardon us, for in printing Lascaris’s grammatical treatises, we have cared for those without any knowledge of Greek. Soon all the best Greek books will be printed for the learned, Christ willing. Farewell.

[ALDUS MANUCIUS ROMANUS STUDIOSIS. S.P.D.]

NIHIL praetermittere est animus quod utile credamus futurum iis qui Graecas litteras discere concupiscunt optimeque scire Latine. Quamobrem Graecas litteras omnis ac diphthongos earumque nomina et potestatem ac quemadmodum in Latinum transferantur cum exemplis ad id accommodatis annotavimus. Addidimus etiam abbreviationes scitu quidem pulcherrimas, et
quia operae pretium existimavimus scire Graece adolescentulos salutationem
Angeli ad Beatissimam Virginem, exulumenque filiorum Evae ad eandem, nec non
Divi Ioannis Evangelium In principio erat verbum. Item symbolum Apostolorum.
haec omnia Graece curavimus imprimenda, atque e regione latinam
interpretationem. Addidimus carmina Pythagoreae cognomento aurea ob
ipsorum excellentiam et divinas admonitiones. Item Phocylidis sapientissimi viri
moralia docta quidem et plena praeeceptis Sanctissimis et documentis, quae
postea Deo favente condonabantur. Omnam enim vitiam decrevimus ad
hominum utilitatem consumere. Deus est mihi testis nihil me magis desyderare
quam prodesse hominibus. Quod et anteacta vita nostra ostendit ubicunque
viximus et ostensurum speramus (quando id volumus) in dies magis quamdiu
vivimus in hac lachrymarum valle et plena miseriae. Dabo equidem operam ut
quantum in me est semper prosim. Nam et si quietam ac tranquillam agere
vitam possimus, negotiosam tamen eligimus et plenam laboribus natus est enim
homo non ad indignas bono viro et docto voluptates. Sed ad laborem et ad
agendum semper aliquid viro dignum. Non torpeamus igitur non vitam in otio
ventri somnoque reliquisque voluptatibus indulgentes transeamus veluti pecora.
Nam (ut inquit Cato) vita hominis prope uti ferrum est. Ferrum si exerceas
conteritur si non exerceas tamen rubigo interficit. Ita si se homo exerceat
consumitur si non exerceat torpedo plus detrimenti affert quam exercitatio. Sed
his omissis de re dicere incipiamus. Haec tam multis verbis dixi amore
incredibili erga omnis homines incitatus meo.
TRANSLATION

[Aldus Manutius of Rome to the studious. We are of a mind to pass over nothing that we believe will be useful to those wanting to learn Greek and to know Latin best. Therefore we have noted, with examples, all the Greek letters and diphthongs as well as their names and properties and how they can be translated into Latin. We have even added the abbreviations most beneficial to know. And because we thought there would be some value in young men knowing the salutation of the Angel to the blessed Virgin, and of the exiled children of Eve to the same, and the Gospel of St. John, in the beginning was the word, likewise the Apostles’ Creed—we have provided for all of these things to be printed in Greek with the Latin translation. We have added the Carmina of Pythagoras, called “golden” on account of their excellence and divine admonitions. And we have added the Moralia of that wisest Phocylides, learned and full of sacred precepts, all of which, God willing, will be excused, since we have decided our whole life will be employed for the utility of men. With God as my witness, I desire nothing more than to benefit men. This our earlier life has demonstrated, wherever we have lived; and this we hope it will demonstrate, as long as we live in this vale of tears, full of misery. I will give aid—however much is in me; I will be useful. For, even if we are able to live a quiet and tranquil life, we will nevertheless choose hard work, replete with labors. For man is born not to pleasures unfit for a gentleman, but to the work and do the constant labor worthy of a man. Therefore let us not be numb to life in gluttonous leisure, and
sleep, and other undignified pleasures. Let us transcend the herd. For as Cato says, the life of a man is like iron. Iron, if you use it, is worn clean; if not, rust kills it. So if man exercises himself, he is perfected; if not, sluggishness brings more detriment than exercise. But, these things aside, let us begin to speak about the matter at hand. I have said these things in so many words out of the incredible love that I bear towards all men.]

[A.3]

Habetis ingenui Adolescentes et studiosi bonarum litterarum, quae vobis in fronte sum pollicitus. superest ut nobis habeatis quam plurimam gratiam. Quam tamen vel cumulatissime relatam existimabo, si emeritis sine cunctatione lucubrationes nostras. Quod si (ut spero) facietis erit vobis duplex bonum quod et nunc discetis rudimenta litterarum graecarum, et facietis me posthac ad caetera his multo maiora dignioraque edenda alacriorem. Valete.

**TRANSLATION**

[You have, youth both noble and studious of the belles-lettres, what I promised you at the start. It remains that you have as much thanks for us as possible, which I will nevertheless consider to have been most fully offered, should you acquire our lamplight work without delay. But if (as I hope) you do this, you will have a double benefit: you will learn the rudiments of the Greek letters, and you
will make me swifter in bringing out better and more dignified editions.

Farewell.]

[A.4]

Non fieri potuit quin impressores quaedam (ut assolet) inverterint depravarintque. Quare opus fuit ut totum librum percurrerem, quaeque alicuius esse momenti videbantur errata annotarem. Id quidem fecimus ut exiret liber in manus studiosorum quam emendatissimus. Sed ut facilius singuli quique emendari errores possent. Scripsimus alphabeti litteram qua signatus est quaternus, atque ibidem chartarum numerum et in charta numerum versusum sic.

Translation

[It is not possible but that printers (as they are accustomed) transpose certain things and misprint them. Therefore it was necessary for me to run through the whole book and note any potentially significant errors. We did this so that the book would come into the hands of the studious as correct as possible. But so that any individual errors may be corrected more easily, we have noted down the letter of the alphabet by which the quaternion is signed, and likewise the number of pages and the number of versus in the page.]
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