'UNGRATEFULL TUSCANS': TEACHING ITALIAN
IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

JOHN GALLAGHER

Gonville and Caius College, University of Cambridge, UK

This essay considers the teaching of Italian in early modern England by looking at the texts, methods, and individuals involved. It considers some ways in which audiences not conforming to the traditional stereotype of the 'Italianate gentleman' shaped Italian pedagogies across the period, and analyses little-known print and manuscript texts that shed light on these audiences. It asks how, if at all, English students of Italian might have encountered the debates of the questione della lingua, *moving from the evidence provided by pedagogical texts to the experiences of travel and Anglo-Italian personal relationships. Both were crucial to shaping English readings of the* questione *and, in at least one case, to the formulation of an Italian-inflected contribution to debates on the English language. Lastly, it looks at how ideas of 'correct' or prestigious written and spoken Italian were constructed for English learners of the language, both in pedagogical texts and in individual encounters with the Italian peninsula.*

Questo saggio è dedicato all'insegnamento dell'italiano nell'Inghilterra di età moderna, e si focalizza sui testi, i metodi e i personaggi coinvolti. Si prendono in considerazione alcune delle modalità con cui lettori differenti dal tradizionale stereotipo del 'gentleman italianizzato' hanno influenzato la pedagogia del tempo, e si analizzano testi a stampa e manoscritti poco noti che gettano nuova luce su tali lettori. Ci si chiede inoltre se gli studenti inglesi di italiano possano essere entrati in contatto con il dibattito sulla questione della lingua, *a partire da alcune prove rintracciabili in testi pedagogici, per poi giungere alle esperienze di viaggio e alle relazioni personali tra inglesi e italiani. Entrambe sono state essenziali nel modellare le interpretazioni inglesi della* questione *e, almeno in un caso, la formulazione di un contributo al dibattito sulla lingua inglese esemplato sul modello italiano. Infine, il saggio riflette sul modo in cui sia venuta a costruirsi un'idea di italiano 'corretto' o prestigioso, sia scritto che parlato, per il pubblico inglese, considerando tanto i testi pedagogici, quanto gli incontri individuali con la penisola italiana.*

KEYWORDS: Language-learning, translation, *questione della lingua*, Italian grammar, cultural encounter, social history of language.

PAROLE CHIAVE: Apprendimento linguistico, traduzione, questione della lingua, grammatica italiana, incontri culturali, storia sociale della lingua.

INTRODUCTION[1]

In the Cambridge University Library there is a heavily annotated copy of the 1562 edition of William Thomas's *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer*, first published in 1550 (see fig. 2).[2] A number of early modern readers have signed their names at various points in the book: the fourteen-year-old Hugh Smith, two brothers named Samuel and John Whytly, a Robert Woodrington and a John Gostling, and none other than John Florio, the most prominent figure of the sixteenth-century Anglo-Italian encounter, who wrote 'Questo libro è di me Johanni Florio' (see fig. 3). One reader annotated the text with reference to the *Pastor Fido*; others added translations and definitions in English, Latin, and French. From a teenage boy to a lexicographer and translator, this book bears markings made by readers from various backgrounds and dating from different periods, which serve as a reminder that the study of Italian grammar in early modern England was not the preserve of any one distinct group.[3] The different names and hands that decorate the text are also a reminder that to learn the grammar of a foreign language was a social and conversational undertaking — not merely a scholarly and silent activity, but one in which texts and their readers engaged with the multilingual oral and aural cultures of early modern England and Italy. Taking a broad chronological perspective — from the first appearance of Italian grammar and grammatical debates in English print in the mid-sixteenth century to the Italophile revival of the early eighteenth century, this essay considers the varied audiences and competences imagined by authors of Italian pedagogical texts in early modern England; the ways in which English students encountered Italian linguistic debates; and the models of 'good' Italian writing and speech that were presented to English readers and learners across the period.

READERSHIPS

Not all students of Italian in early modern England fit the well-worn stereotype of the 'Italianate gentleman'.[4] There was a market at the universities and among the Latinate for instruction in Italian, and early grammars of Italian tended to assume some familiarity with either Latin or with the grammatical terminology associated with Latin instruction. A number of texts aimed themselves specifically at a Latinate audience, such as the Oxford-published 1667 edition of Carolus Mulerius's Latin-language *Linguae Italicae, compendiosa institutio*, first published in the Low Countries in 1631.[5] The relationship between Latin and Italian was evidently on the minds of grammarians and English amateurs of Italian. This perceived closeness between Italian and Latin could be exploited by teachers like Francesco di Gregorio, an Italian living near Moorfields in 1643 and styling himself as 'Professor of the vulgar Italian Tongue, and Latin, in this Citie of London'.[6] Di Gregorio's *Il Discepulo instrutto nelli principij della lingua latina, spiegati per la volgare & inglese a modo di dialogo* (fig. 4) is a strange and hitherto largely unnoticed text which aims to teach Latin to English readers through a text arranged in parallel columns of English and Italian.[7] Di Gregorio claimed to be writing for 'those that would learne the two Italian languages (to wit, Latin and the Vulgar) with brevity':[8] he seems to have thought that the Italian vernacular could be picked up through the study of his idiosyncratic text. He made a desultory attempt to compare Latin grammar with Italian, as in this exchange between a master and his scholar:

> *Ma.* How many articles are there?
> *Scholar.* Three in Latin *Hic* the masculine gender, *Haec* the feminine, *Hoc* the neuter. In vulgar there are two; to wit *Il* or *Lo,* the masculine gender, and *La* the feminine: it hath not the neuter because it is like the masculine.[9]

In reality, the specifically Italian provision in the book is minuscule, and the fact of the text being presented in both English and Italian could hardly have been of much help to the learner. Grammatical concepts are explained through the medium of a dialogue which is presented in parallel columns of English and Italian (see fig. 5), and Italian equivalents of Latin and English phrases are provided, as in the verb conjugations in fig. 6. It is difficult to imagine why any reader — Latinate or otherwise — would have used this curious trilingual text to learn Italian. Di Gregorio's grammar seems to have made little impact: no further editions are

recorded, and only one surviving copy is listed in the ESTC (*English Short Title Catalogue*). But even if it is something of a pedagogical dead end, the *Discepulo* offers a salutary reminder that many English learners of Italian would have approached the language first and foremost through the prism of Latin.

Until the writers of the later seventeenth century made a virtue of discarding some of the structures and terminology associated with Latin grammar in writing about the vernacular, it was common for Italian grammar to be presented as though analogous or semi-analogous with its ancient counterpart. Thus, the first century or so of printed English-Italian grammars discussed the language by analogy with Latin, commonly presenting the Italian vernacular as a language whose nouns decline in the same manner as Latin.[10] Giovanni Torriano, who inherited Florio's manuscripts and became probably the best-known teacher of Italian in mid-to-late seventeenth-century London, distinguished between the books that should be used by his Latinate and non-Latinate readers. He recommended both Florio's dictionary and that of the Accademia della Crusca 'for them that are verst in the Latine', and said that pupils should '[make] use of Lentulo's Grammar, if you understand not the Latine, but Katherinus Dulcis if you doe understand it'.[11] Lentulo was Scipione Lentulo, the Protestant Italian grammarian whose Geneva-printed 1557 Latin work, *Italicae grammatices praecepta ac ratio*, was translated into English by Henry Grantham in 1575, while 'Katherinus Dulcis' was the Latin name of Catherin le Doux, the grammarian, scholar, and private tutor discussed further below, whose work was not available in English. Latinate audiences were a known constituency addressed by authors of grammars for English readers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

An underappreciated audience for texts of this kind (as well as one which problematised the assumption that learners of Italian would necessarily be Latinate) were women.[12] From the earliest period of English interest in Italian, women figured importantly in the study of the language.[13] A number of important sixteenth-century women studied Italian. Jane Grey, the noblewoman executed after her attempt to claim the throne on Edward VI's death, had studied with Michelangelo Florio, who prepared a manuscript copy of his grammar of Tuscan for her.[14] Queen Elizabeth was tutored by Giovanni Battista Castiglione and enjoyed practising her Italian with the musicians of her court, as well as with visiting travellers and diplomats.[15] Anne of Denmark, queen of James VI and I, was taught Italian by Giacomo Castelvetro while still resident in Scotland in the 1590s; as a queen in London in the early years of the

next century, she made John Florio a gentleman of her privy chamber.[16] Florio's second dictionary was dedicated to Anne, and the attached grammar addressed her throughout as his imagined learner.[17]

A number of female dedicatees were addressed by the texts of the later sixteenth century. Henry Grantham dedicated his translation of Scipione Lentulo (his translation was first published in 1575, with a second edition in 1587) to 'the right vertuous mystres Mary and mysres Francys Berkeley daughters to the Right honourable Henry Lord Berkeley', writing that 'I Doe weighe amongest other your vertuous dispositions, the good inclinations you have, and the great endevours you use towardes th'atteining of the Italian tonge'.[18] Similarly, the dedication of Claudius Hollyband's quadrilingual *Campo di Fior* (1583) was made out to 'the yong gentlewoman, mistris Luce Harington: Daughter to the right worshipfull and most vertuous Gentle-man, Maister Jhon Harington Esquier'.[19] Lucy Harington, daughter of the writer and translator of Ariosto Sir John Harington, later became Lucy, Countess of Bedford, and (alongside the earls of Rutland and Southampton) was one of the dedicatees of Florio's first dictionary, *A Worlde of Wordes* (1598), praised for her skill in multiple vernaculars.[20] Later authors moved beyond addresses to individual learned ladies, addressing women as a potential audience of their works. In the mid-seventeenth century, Giovanni Torriano credited high-status women with having revived the study of the Italian tongue in England, claiming that 'of late years several Ladies of qualitie, have been pleased to revive and put again into vogue the Italian Tongue, which hath lain dormant, if not dead, with that noble Sex, any time since Queene Annes days'.[21] An introductory verse to Pietro Paravicino's *Choice Phrases* (1662) asked 'Perchè non parli o bella lingua Tosca?', and hoped that 'le Nobil Dame' would be the ones to return Italian to its old position in England.[22] Authors gratefully acknowledged the important role played by women as students, readers, and patrons of Italian grammars and pedagogical texts.

As Michèle Cohen has shown for French in the same period, it was assumed in vernacular language pedagogy that women had no grounding in Latin grammar, and thus had to follow a pedagogy separate to that employed by their male counterparts.[23] Later authors altered their method or their presentation of grammatical materials according to the gender of their imagined reader. In 1657, Torriano wrote of his female readers that he aimed to:

insinuate the Language, by concealing the tearms of Grammar, so that the Thorns being put by, the Rose may be safely pluck'd, without prejudice to their delicate hands, or tender fingers.[24]

He boasted that he had '[removed] the Latine denominations of the several Moods and Tenses' for their aid. Only after this 'female-friendly' section did he revert to the Latinate method of teaching, including a second part of his grammar aimed at 'such who are not so tender fingered, but may endure to pluck the Rose, notwithstanding the Thorns'. These 'rigid Latine Scholars', it was implied, were not the women for whom Torriano had written the first section.[25] After just over 200 pages of his attempt at a more accessible, relatively jargon-free grammar, he offered 'A Summary of Miscelany Observations; the right and ready understanding of which, presupposes some insight of the Latin Tongue, or at least of terms of Grammar'.[26] Half a century later, in 1709, the Italian emigré and Anglican minister Lorenzo Casotti attempted to provide a pedagogical programme that could be followed by the non-Latinate, saying that:

> the Understanding of these, will render very Easy means of Learning the Italian Tongue, *and especially the Ladies, who do not Understand Grammar*, to whom it will spare half the Time, which would be otherwise Necessary, whereof all those whom I have had the Honour to Teach, can give a sufficient Testimony.[27]

But grammars which addressed women were not necessarily meant solely for their use — 'grammaire pour les dames' carried other connotations about the kind of method and language that the text contained.[28] By the beginning of the eighteenth century at the latest, the presentation of Italian grammar was shaped in part by an awareness of women as an audience with distinct pedagogical preferences.

The mid-seventeenth century saw a decisive shift in the audiences addressed by Italian grammars and language manuals written for English audiences. This followed a slump in production of these pedagogical materials: after Benvenuto Italiano's *Il Passaggiere* in 1612, there were no bilingual English-Italian materials — grammars or otherwise — produced in England until the publication of Giovanni Torriano's *New and easie directions for the attaining of the Thuscan Italian tongue* in

1639.[29] A manuscript book of Italian phrases held at the University of Missouri offers a sense of one audience which was increasingly in need of Italian instruction: the people involved in England's burgeoning Mediterranean trade. The Missouri MS was compiled for a Livorno merchant named Charles Longland in 1626 by an Italian notary in London named Giovanni Aurelio.[30] Inserted into the manuscript is an English-language account of the journeys of 'ships bownd for the Straightes', suggesting an overlap between the linguistic material of the manuscript and the wider commercial context in which it would serve. Italian was the language of Mediterranean trade, and as the English commercial role in the region expanded, so too did authors of grammar and language manuals recognize the importance of providing materials for commercial audiences.[31]

In 1640, Giovanni Torriano's *The Italian Tutor* carried a dedication to Henry Garaway, mayor of London and 'Governour of the right worshipfull and ancient companies of Merchants trading into the Levant Seas, into the empires of Russia and Muscovia'.[32] Torriano presented his book as serving the linguistic needs of the Levant Company, writing that '[t]his is a booke which is intended for the good of all the English Nation, but espetially you who are in a continuall commerce with most parts of Italy, as well as Turkey, where the Italian Tongue is all in all'.[33] A similar approach can be seen in the manuscript 'Raccolta di Frasi Italiane' held in the British Library and dated 1686.[34] The manuscript is a fair copy written for the press (though it seems never to have been printed) and dedicated to individual governors of the Levant Company by the author, one 'B.S.', who described himself as having 'spent some years under the protection and in the service of one of His Majesty's late Ambassadors in Turky, and of your Hono*urable* Society'. B.S. said that he had begun his work while still in the Ottoman Empire, and completed it in the household of Dudley North, his patron and an important (and multilingual) Levant merchant.[35] In 1702, the grammar published by Henry (or Arrigo) Pleunus was dedicated to a group of named English merchants resident in Livorno.[36] At least one writer attempted to modify his teaching materials to cater for the specific needs of a mercantile readership. In his *Choice Proverbs* (1660), the prolific Pietro Paravicino explained that the language of his dialogues was not meant to be elegant, but that he had aimed above all at mercantile utility:

> Quanto ai pochi Dialoghi che si trovano nel libro, ho voluto comporli famigliari, e facili da imparare per i principianti, i quali devono riguardare più al profitto, che al bello della cosa; so che per giovani Negotianti sono assai buoni, poi che hanno da frequentar molto più le piazze de' Mercanti, che le Corti de' Principi.[37]

In the same text, Paravicino offered a bilingual calendar of the main European fairs to which his mercantile audience might travel, while in his *Choice Phrases* (1662) he included '[a] Short Dialogue very profitable for all Young Factors, in the which it is briefly given to them to know which things one Countrey furnishes to another, for to keep Commerce in vigour'.[38] Italian pedagogy in seventeenth-century England was shaped in part by the changing needs of English commerce.

ITALIAN DEBATES, ENGLISH CONTEXTS

Only one printed grammar of this period engaged explicitly with the work of Giovanni Francesco Fortunio. This was John Sanford's *Grammer or Introduction to the Italian Tongue*, published in Oxford in 1605. Sanford took a critical and comparative approach to the Italian grammatical tradition, conscientiously citing the authors he had read and deciding between competing opinions, saying that 'I will only insist upon those precepts which are most necessarie, according as I have collected them out of the best Authours in this kinde; ingenuoslie confessing by whom I have profited'.[39] Sanford claimed that his approach was different to that of grammarians who 'insert and infarce many needlesse and idle questions', among whom he numbered Scipione Lentulo (already known among English Italianists thanks to Henry Grantham's translation of his grammar, mentioned earlier) and 'Franciscus Fortunius', or Fortunio.[40] Sanford still considered Fortunio's *Regole della volgar lingua* relevant enough to cite it at several points: sometimes to refute it, as when he noted that '*Franciscus Fortunius*, & *Ludov. Dolce*, f. 55, will have but two Conjugations. But I rather follow *Lapinius*, f. 26, who after the Latines setteth downe fowre according to the Characteristicall vowels of their Infinitives'.[41] Elsewhere he seemed to endorse Fortunio's view, as when he notes that '*Fortunius*, f. 13. observeth that the Affixes *mi, ti, si, ci,* are somtime superfluous and meere expletive particles'.[42] In spite of his general unwillingness to follow Fortunio's conclusions, Sanford was the only English author of a grammar to make explicit Fortunio's contribution to the

debates that shaped his text. In doing so, he wrote a grammar that made clear to English readers that its prescriptions were matters of debate in contemporary Italy.

Sanford's grammar placed Fortunio in dialogue with other English and continental grammarians, and came the closest to communicating explicitly the variety of approaches to Italian grammar that had characterized linguistic debates in early modern Italy. Earlier, William Thomas had made clear the debt he owed to Alberto Acarisio's *Vocabolario, grammatica et orthographia de la lingua volgare* and Francesco Alunno's *Ricchezze della lingua volgare* (both 1543), while the next grammatical text made available to English readers was Henry Grantham's translation of Scipione Lentulo.[43] These works transplanted Italian texts and ideas into English print. These practices continued sporadically in the grammatical works of the next century. Giovanni Torriano, for instance, was open about the practices of compiling that underlay his work: in 1639, he admitted having borrowed material from 'one Laurentio Franciosino of Florence, Professour of the Italian Tongue; who hath written a tedious volume, to shew how each word ought to be accented'.[44] A year later, he was yet more brazen, writing that:

> I have perused all the grammers that ever I could light on, and I have taken the best from the best of them, and sometimes verbatim where I saw a rule was set downe as it should bee, there is but one truth and a Grammarian is not unlike an historian, hee findes much of his matter made to his hand but the moulding and framing of things in a plaine way is that which is all in all.[45]

Torriano was a critical borrower — we might think of him as a plagiariser — but in his work, he made some attempt to guide his readers through the growing number of texts with which his teaching materials could be supplemented.

John Florio — Torriano's predecessor and probably the most important teacher of Italian to have worked in early modern England — took a critical approach both to Italian grammarians and lexicographers and to the burgeoning native English tradition of Italian instruction. He had plenty of praise for 'the Grammer that Scipio Lentulo made, and Maister Henry Grantham dyd translate', while of Thomas's *Principal Rules* he wrote that 'I like it wel too, but yet he left many things untouched, both in his Grammer, and also in his Dictionarie'.[46] Elsewhere, he made a nod to his Italian inspirations, but only in order to emphasize the steps forward his work took. In

the prefatory material to his 1598 dictionary, he wrote that 'If any thinke I had great helpes of Alunno, or of Venuti, let him confer, and knowe I have in two, yea almost in one of my letters of the Alphabet more wordes, then they have in all their twentie'.[47] The grammar appended to his expanded 1611 dictionary repeatedly criticized Italian texts for omitting essential materials. On the difference between 'closed' and 'open' pronunciations of the letters *e* and *o*, Florio complained 'that I never yet saw booke printed with their differences but one, which was the Familiar letters of that learned man Claudio Tolomei, and that no rule hath yet beene given in so many of their tedious Grammars for the help of the learner'.[48] Florio's explication was occasioned by his experience of teaching Italian to English-speakers: he bemoaned the lack of rules that might teach the learner 'to avoide the many errors that divers commit (namely my countrey men the English) in not giving the their right sounds'.[49] Florio's critique of Italian grammars was born out of the experience of teaching English-speakers a new language, something for which most texts written by Italians for Italians were not designed.

Anglo-Italian encounters were not solely textual. Outside of grammatical texts, there is a social history of Italian grammar in early modern England, one built of personal encounters and relationships formed in England and on the continent. Students who studied with Florio (father or son) would have met well-read native speakers of Italian with their own views on the *questione della lingua*.[50] The same would have been true for those who studied with Alessandro Citolini (a friend and follower of Claudio Tolomei) or read his grammar as it circulated in manuscript in sixteenth-century London.[51] Those who encountered Giacomo Castelvetro — the Modena-born exile who led a peripatetic existence as a teacher, editor, and intellectual — were meeting the nephew of a renowned humanist, Ludovico Castelvetro, who had debated linguistic questions with Pietro Bembo himself.[52] The 'Katherinus Dulcis' referenced by Torriano and cited repeatedly by John Sanford turns out to have been Catherin le Doux (1540–1626), a Savoy-born grammarian, translator, and writer who became a teacher of French and Italian at universities in Germany in the early decades of the seventeenth century. In the 1590s, le Doux was employed as a tutor in the household of Sir John Harington — the English translator of Ariosto — where he taught both Harington's daughter Frances and 'the most illustrious heroine Lucy Countess of Bedford', becoming another Italianist in her polyglot network alongside Florio and Hollyband.[53] Harington was well connected in

Italianate English circles, and le Doux had an active correspondence with Nicholas Bacon, serving as an agent for the Earl of Essex.[54] His library catalogue shows that le Doux's collection boasted Italian-French and Italian-Spanish dictionaries, an Italian bible and an Italian-Latin New Testament, a trilingual edition of Castiglione's *Il libro del Cortegiano* (possibly that published by John Wolfe in 1588), a 'Nomenclator quatrilinguis' and an 'Onomasticon 7. linguar*um* Junij'.[55] On the literary side, le Doux also owned both the *Gierusalemme liberata* and the *Gierusalemme conquistata*, as well as a volume of Tasso's letters.[56] Evidence of his interest in contemporary linguistic questions is provided by the appearance in this list of Benedetto Varchi's *Hercolano*, a dialogue about the Tuscan language, and Pierfrancesco Giambullari's *Regole della lingua fiorentina*.[57] Members of Harington's household and his wider circle, as well as those with links to Essex or Bacon, might have encountered an opinionated authority on Italian grammar in the person of Catherin le Doux.

The experience of continental travel offered another way for early modern English-speakers to come face to face with the ideas of the *questione della lingua*. Language-learning was a central aspect of all elite foreign travel in this period, and most of those who travelled to Italy made at least some effort to learn the language. Late in the 1540s, Thomas Hoby travelled to Italy. On his arrival in Padua in 1548, Hoby set himself to language study, recording how 'Here I applied my self as well to obtain the Italian tung as to have a farther entrance in the Latin'.[58] As part of his study of Italian, Hoby recorded how he attended the university lectures of 'Claudius Tolomeus a senest in the Italian tung'.[59] This 'Claudius Tolomeus' was, of course, Claudio Tolomei — a key figure in the linguistic debates of the sixteenth century and the authority cited by John Florio in his description of the pronunciation of Italian vowels. What Hoby made of Tolomei's lectures is unrecorded, though while resident at Paris later in his journey, he tried his hand at writing some form of grammar or manual of Italian, recording that 'from thense I sent unto Sir Henry Sidney the epitome of the Italian tung which I drue owt there for him' (the text has been lost).[60] Hoby was evidently inspired to think systematically about the language and grammar he had learnt through study — formal and informal — during his travels.

Hoby's encounter with Claudio Tolomei is all the more intriguing since, on his return, Thomas Hoby made his name as the English translator of Castiglione's *Il libro del Cortegiano*, a book intimately concerned from the beginning with questions of speech, language, and style. The English reader of the text would have found

themselves plunged almost immediately into the midst of an ongoing linguistic debate, reading Castiglione's defence of his own language in the prefatory letter to Bishop Miguel da Silva. In Hoby's English, Castiglione cited those people '*that blame me bicause I have not folowed Boccaccio, nor bound my self to the maner of the Tuscane speach used nowadayes*'.[61] The confused reader would have found helpful context for Castiglione's defensiveness in the linguistic debates that make up a significant part of the first book of the Hoby's *Courtyer*. It is telling that in translating a text intimately concerned with debates about language, its history and its reform, Hoby chose to buttress his translation with contributions to burgeoning debates about the English language. The English text began with a discussion of translation and the duty of English-speakers to 'store the tunge' with new knowledge, and ends with the famous letter from John Cheke on the problem of borrowing foreign terms.[62] The sense of correspondence between the linguistic controversies considered by Hoby's paratexts and the *questione della lingua* as debated in Castiglione's text is no accident. The structure of Hoby's translation meant that the *questione* was enfolded — literally subsumed — into the framework of concerns about the future of English. Hoby's invocation and translation of the *questione* in an Anglophone context suggests that his Italian travels, with their studies and encounters, had shaped his linguistic and literary opinions.

Hoby was far from the only English student at Padua in this period; nor was he the only traveller to seek out renowned scholars in his travels.[63] In a letter written in 1594, Henry Wotton recalled how 'At Chiavenna among the Grisons, I lay in the house of one Scipione Lentulo, now a minister, sometime secretary to a cardinal':[64] this was the same Scipione Lentulo whose grammar of Italian had been translated into English by Henry Grantham some two decades previously. Wotton noted further that Lentulo 'recommended me to his son, a man well travelled and languaged [...] [who] hath been brought up most part of his life in England'.[65] This was Paolo Lentulo, who (it seems likely) was the physician of that name with whom Robert Cecil practised his Italian in England in the 1580s.[66] While in Siena, Henry Wotton also made the acquaintance of Orazio Lombardelli, making enough of an impression that Lombardelli addressed his *Fonti Toscani* (1598), a discourse contributing to debates about the best variety of Tuscan, to the 'Illustre Signore, il Signore Arrigo Vuottoni Inglese', with whom he had met and discussed Henri Estienne and Greek grammar, presumably alongside the vernacular concerns of the *Fonti*.[67] The personal

relationships of travel and language-learning brought English-speakers into the orbit of Italian grammarians, and print and the written work were not the only vectors through which the debates of the *questione della lingua* could reach English ears.

MODELS OF ITALIAN WRITING & SPEECH IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

William Thomas's *Principal Rules*, the first printed Italian grammar for English readers, advertised itself as being 'for the better understandyng of Boccace Petrarcha, and Dante'.[68] Closing his manuscript grammar of Italian presented to Henry Herbert, Michelangelo Florio recommended the reading of these three — the Tre Corone — alongside the modern authors including Pietro Bembo and Agnolo Firenzuola.[69] Grammarians' assumptions about their pupils' ideal reading matter prompt a critical question: when early modern English-speakers learnt Italian, what were they learning? What varieties did they encounter, and how did they — and their teachers — view the bewildering varieties of written and spoken language found on the Italian peninsula? How did they negotiate the debates over linguistic authority that animated the *questione della lingua*? What authors did they draw on as authorities for correct usage, and how did this change over time? How did English-speakers engage with the variety of Italian speech?

The first grammars available to English learners of Italian shared William Thomas's concern with Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Dante as linguistic authorities. Thomas cited the Tre Corone in order to defend particular usages, writing (for instance) that 'Petrarke hath written, *piovommi* for *piovonomi*, and *Istusilla* for *Istusinola*: like as Boccace hath also said, *vogliommi bene*, for *voglionomi bene*'.[70] Thomas's grammar was first and foremost concerned with literary Tuscan as a language to be written and read, informing his readers that '*Ne,* is more used in verse than in prose', and that '*Ci,* in prose is common'.[71] He was also willing to point out moments where an authoritative writer had broken a grammatical rule: 'Dante hath written, *la conforte, le conforte*, though well it seemeth not to folowe the rule'.[72] Poetry and prose could follow different but no less rigid rules: Henry Grantham noted that while *re* was the singular and the plural word used for 'king', 'Poetes maye saye somtymes in the plural Regi'.[73] In the grammar attached to Florio's 1611 dictionary, he mentioned some exceptions to a rule 'in verse by *Poetica Licenza*, which among Italians is very great'.[74] In his *New, Plain, Methodical and Compleat Italian Grammar* (1702), Henry Pleunus finished his grammar with a section on the 'Poetical

13

Licences', giving the standard usage (like 'cavalli' for 'horses', or 'chiede' for 'he asks') in one column, and their equivalents in poetic writing ('cavai', 'chere') in a parallel column.[75]

The Grantham/Lentulo text took a similarly critical approach to some habits of Trecento authors: speaking of the Tuscan custom of dropping the *i* at the beginning of a noun after 'lo' or 'gli', as in 'lo 'mperatore' or 'gli 'mperatori', Grantham wrote 'Howebeit, I wold not have the*m* (though Boccace be theire author) to be imytated in this: since it is an affected kinde of speach'.[76] The Tre Corone were not the only literary authors put before English learners of Italian: Claudius Hollyband's *Pretie and wittie Historie of Arnalt & Lucenda: With certen Rules and Dialogues set foorth for the learner of th'Italian tong* (1575) offered a bilingual Italian-English text of a fifteenth-century Spanish romance, Diego de San Pedro's *Tractado de amores de Arnalte y Lucenda*.[77] Three years later, John Florio's *Firste Fruites* did give some mention to Petrarch, but the Italian author to whom Florio devoted the most space and the most praise was Ludovico Ariosto, including chapters with titles like 'Of wrath, with certain fine sayings of Ariosto, and other Poets, and what pacience, and flattery is', and dialogues which praised Ariosto as a poet 'woorthy to be crowned with a crown of Bayes, for his rare invention'.[78] In his later work, Florio would boast of the breadth of his reading, including lists of the authors he drew on in the prefatory materials to both of his dictionaries. Stefano Guazzo, Castiglione, Guarino Guarini, Ariosto, Tasso, Boccaccio, and Petrarch, Dante, Aretino, Francesco Doni, Tommaso Garzoni, Annibale Caro, Lodovico Castelvetro, and the equestrian author Federico Grisone were just some of the authors he named in the preface to his 1598 dictionary. It was a prime boast of Florio's dictionary that it did more than describe fine speech: he included a vast array of technical and regional terms, so that his readers might be able to 'understande so manie and so strange bookes, of so severall, and so fantasticall subjects as be written in the Italian toong'.[79] Among English grammarians, respect for classic authors did not mean unquestioning adherence to a fossilized standard: William Thomas compared Italian to Latin and Greek, noting that 'as experyence sheweth, howe muche those twoo have flourisshed, remaygnynge yet (as they dooe) in great estimacion: so seemeth [Italian] nowe to growe as a thirde towardes theim'.[80] Thomas saw the development and improvement of the Italian language as an ongoing process at the time of writing, rather than locating perfection in an idealized literary Tuscan past.

For some sense of the social role of literature in the teaching of Italian in early modern England, we can look to the fascinating album *amicorum* kept by Giacomo Castelvetro.[81] Castelvetro died in England, having spent some time at Cambridge and Oxford in 1613–14, where he seems to have taught Italian (potentially among other subjects) and forged relationships with a network of students and fellows.[82] In their inscriptions in his album, these acquaintances wrote in multiple languages, some sharing literary tags, including quotations from sixteenth-century Italian authors including Guidobaldo Bonarelli and Torquato Tasso. One writer included a quotation from Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* alongside a tag from Luigi Groto's tragedy *La Dalida* (1572).[83] These passages appear without any indication of their authorship, suggesting that the people who copied them out shared a familiarity with these works with their teacher and friend. Other inscriptions include proverbs in Italian, many of which can be found in John Florio's great collection, the *Giardino di ricreatione* (1591): these students and friends used foreign-language proverbs to establish solidarity between students and teacher.[84] The overarching impression is of a community of students demonstrating their knowledge and skill to a teacher, and reaching for shared literary or proverbial references in order to reproduce their pedagogical and emotional relationships on the page. It is a moment in which the social and emotional content of a literary Italian education in early modern England can be glimpsed.

During the seventeenth century, English interest in literary writing as a source of authority for Italian did not disappear entirely. In his *Passaggiere* of 1612, Benvenuto Italiano boasted of having 'observed the most corrected Prints, as that of Aldo Manutio, as also having seene Verses and Prose, written with the proper hand of most learned and rare Writers, and moderne Authours'.[85] The printed word — and vernacular humanist expertise — could be a source of literary-linguistic authority. In 1660, Pietro Paravicino listed the authors out of whom he had taken his 'Choice Proverbs'; while J. Smith advertised Italian to the readers of his *Grammatica Quadrilinguis* (1674) by telling them that the language 'boasts it self in the renown'd Writings of Guarino, Dante, Torquato Tasso, Bembo, &c'.[86] However, over the course of the seventeenth century, the importance ascribed to individual classic authors in establishing correct usage diminished in English grammatical texts. One telling indicator of this is the contrast between the approaches taken by Florio and

Torriano to points of grammar and usage. Florio, in 1578, wrote of the word 'ambedue' that:

> Dante for the selfe same woord [ambedue], useth *ambodue*, and *amendue*, *amenduni*, and *amendune*. The Commons wyl say, *Tutte due*, *tutte dui*, and *tutti duo*. And some auncient poetes have written, *Entrambi*, and *intrambi*.[87]

Where Florio referred to the usage of Dante, of '[t]he Commons', and 'some auncient poetes', Torriano (writing in 1657) only gave the following: '*Ambo*, both masculine and feminine; as *ambi li fratelli*, both the brothers; *ambo le sorelle*, both the sisters: but *ambo* is not so frequent in common discourse'.[88] Elsewhere, Torriano took the example given by Florio of a noun being made into an adjective, but where Florio described it as the practice of 'some late good writers', Torriano simply introduced it by saying 'Note, That Italians most elegantly doe make of an Adjective a Substantive'.[89] Torriano's method was not entirely free of the literary legacy of 'auncient poetes', but he was less interested in classic Tuscan usage as a model for the speech to be learnt by his readers. Interestingly, there survived in Torriano's grammatical offerings a number of quotations from classic works, but he tended not to make explicit their authorship: the language of Petrarch and Boccaccio had not been expunged, and still served to illustrate some examples of correct usage, but the invocation of their names for reasons of grammatical authority had largely disappeared.[90]

In learning to speak, the same questions about variation and authority applied as did in the study of the literary and written language. Implicit in all texts and methods of teaching Italian were a series of decisions and positions — rarely commented on explicitly or at length in pedagogical texts — about variety, register, and the meanings of 'Italian'. English readers were more likely to encounter explicit comment on these issues in texts about travel and about the culture and history of Italy. William Thomas's *Historie of Italie* (1549) touched on the question of linguistic variety, arguing that while the peninsula was home to many different dialects, Italians of higher status were able to communicate with ease across dialect boundaries thanks to their shared knowledge of the variety known as the 'lingua cortigiana':

to reherse the conformitee of speeche that is amongest theim selfes (consideryng what a noumbre of diversitees they have in theyr tounge) it is a mervaile, that in maner all gentilmen dooe speake the courtisane. For notwithstandyng that betwene the Florentine and Venetian is great diversitee in speeche, as with us betwene a Londoner and a Yorkeshyreman, and likewyse betwene the Mylainese and the Romaine, the Napolitane and the Genovese: yet by the tounge you shall not lyghtlie discerne of what parte of the countreye any gentilman is, because that beeyng children they are brought up in the courtisane onely.[91]

In Thomas's telling, the *cortigiana* allowed for a flattening of regional difference, and was an ingredient of a pan-Italian courtly culture — one that many English readers travelling on the peninsula would hope to access. Writing in 1575, Claudius Hollyband attempted to prepare his readers for the difference in pronunciation between the *cortigiana* and Tuscan:

Pronounce, ch, as k, in English: as *antichi*, saye antiki: *che*, ke: *prediche*, predike: boscho, & boschi, as boscko, & boski. I know that *the* Romish speach, which is called *la cortizana*, doth not follow this every where, but sound gli *ochi*, and divers others not by, k, but as ch, in English, but here I leave the reader at his owne choice.[92]

Some English travellers commented on the different varieties of speech they encountered in different cities and regions of Italy, but it is possible that Thomas's account of the relatively widespread knowledge of a 'lingua comune' among early modern Italian elites accounts for English travellers (themselves largely an elite group) largely succeeding in making themselves understood.[93]

An early English author of travel advice, Thomas Palmer, told his readers that 'Travailers can*n*ot be too good Gra*m*marians'.[94] Linguistic knowledge could reveal cultural insights. Robert Dallington bemoaned that 'those ungratefull Tuscans [...] in no case will acknowledge to be beholden to the Latines' for the origin of their language, noting the words that Tuscan shared with other vernaculars and with ancient tongues, and admiring its way with diminutives.[95] His account of the Tuscan language saw the diversity of varieties as related to Italian political fragmentation:

> As for the difference of speach among the *Tuscanes*, I thinke it be as great, as was ever the difference of mindes among the *Italians* and hath as many factions: for as we had in times past the factions *Sassadelli* and *Vaini* in *Imola:* the *Cerchi* and *Donati* in *Florence:* the *Bianchi* and *Neri* in *Pistoia:* the *Fregosi* and *Adorni* in *Geno:* the *Lambartazzi* and *Gerenei* in *Bologna:* the *Colonni* and *Orsini* in *Rome:* the *Imperialls* and the *French* in all: So haue yee at this day one language of the *Florentine*, another of the *Saneze*, the third of the *Lucchese*, and the fourth of the *Pisan*, but the worst of the *Pistolese*.

Dallington concluded, as did many of his contemporaries, that 'the *Florentine* hath the best *words*, but his pronunciation is somewhat too gutturall'; he went on to argue that 'the *Sanese* hath the best *pronunciation*, but his words relish too much of the *Latine*'. The proverb 'Favella Florentina in bocca Sanese' suggested that 'he that shall have the tearmes of the one, and the accent of the other [...] shall hit the marke'.[96] Some decades later, the title of Torriano's *Della Lingua Toscana-Romana* echoed a version of this same proverb, increasingly current among English writers on Italy, that the best Italian was 'lingua toscana in bocca romana' — a Tuscan tongue in a Roman mouth.[97] Torriano's is one of the few texts in which non-Tuscan varieties appear conspicuously. He included elements of the language spoken in Rome in the text — for instance, including 'magnare' (rather than 'mangiare') for the verb 'to eat'.[98] Torriano, in his collection of proverbs published in 1666, also made a point about the variety of vocabulary, 'all our Provinces not agreeing in one and the same Proverb adequately to a word'; he gave examples of differing usage (though did not say where each usage came from).[99] English learners of Italian who wanted to speak and be understood on the continent needed to be aware of the variation that they would encounter. Only some texts attempted to make these differences explicit; others were more invested in projecting an image of an 'Italian' that was more unified and less diverse.[100]

CONCLUSIONS

In his *Grammatica Quadrilinguis* (1674), J. Smith offered the following advice on how to pitch one's speech depending on the status of one's interlocutor:

Speaking to an equal, use the second person plural of the Present Tense Indicative. As *Parláte forte acciò che vi senta.* Speak aloud that I may hear you. Or the Subjunctive Pres. *Sappiate melo dire a tempo.* Let me know it, or tell it me in time. Speaking to a Superiour, or much honour'd use the third person singular Conjunctive present Tense. V.S. *Mi dica il suo parére.* Sir, be pleased to tell me your opinion. *Dicano le signorie loro, i loro parere* [sic]. Sirs speak your minds. Speaking to an Inferiour, or bosome Friend, use the Imperative. As *Camina,* go quickly. *Parla piano*, speak softly.[101]

Smith's instructions make evident a crucial point about Italian early modern England: the language, and its grammar, had a social life. The study of grammar was inseparable from concerns about correct usage: language-learners wanted to be able to speak in company as well as to read and write, especially where skill in the language was a social accomplishment or a commercial necessity, as it was for so many English learners, male and female. The texts that early modern English-speakers used to learn Italian often seem to have only a glancing concern with the intricacies of the debates of the *questione della lingua*. However, this essay has shown some of the ways in which English authors, translators, travellers, and teachers placed these Italian linguistic debates — implicitly or explicitly — before an English-speaking audience. Understanding how the arguments of the *questione* came to be known in England, even partially, offers new insights into the spread of linguistic ideas in early modern Europe, illuminating a complex interplay between voices, texts, and individuals that shaped English ideas of Italian and even the emerging debates over the status of the English language itself.

---

[2] William Thomas, *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer* (London: Thomas Powell, 1562); Cambridge University Library, Pet. G. 6. 40.

[3] For an excellent linguistic study of the materials available for English learners of Italian (and their authors), see Lucilla Pizzoli, *Le grammatiche di italiano per inglesi (1550–1776): un'analisi linguistica* (Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 2004).

[4] George B. Parks, 'The First Italianate Englishmen', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 8 (1961), 197–216; Sara Warneke, *Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England* (London-New York-Köln: Brill, 1995), pp. 56–60, 107–134; Hilary Larkin, *The Making of Englishmen: Debates on National Identity 1550–1650* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2014), *passim*.

[5] Carolus Mulerius, *Linguae Italicae, compendiosa institutio* (Oxford: John Crosley, 1667).

[6] Francesco di Gregorio, *Il Discepulo instrutto nelli principij della lingua latina, spiegati per la volgare & inglese a modo di dialogo* (London: printed for the author, 1643), title page. Where I transcribe from early modern texts, I do so in a conservative manner, only introducing minor changes.

[7] I am grateful to have viewed the only copy of this little-known text listed in the ESTC, in the library of Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge.

[8] Di Gregorio, *Discepulo*, f. A3 r.

[9] Ibid., p. 2.

[10] See, for instance, John Sanford, *A Grammer or Introduction to the Italian Tongue* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1605), p. 9.

[11] Giovanni Torriano, *New and Easie Directions for attaining the Thuscan Italian tongue* (London: Richard Oulton for Ralph Mab, 1639), f. A6 r–v.

[12] Pizzoli sees the cultivation of female audiences as largely an eighteenth-century phenomenon: I argue here that women are a key audience from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards. Pizzoli, *Grammatiche*, 60–61.

[13] For an overview of female linguists in early modern England, see Vivian Salmon, 'Women and the Study of Language in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England', *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 16, 2 (1994), 95–119.

[14] On Florio's grammar, see Giuliano Pellegrini, 'Michelangelo Florio e le sue regole de la lingua thoscana' *Studi di filologia italiana* 12 (1954), 72–201; Gamberini, 'Primi Strumenti', 455–57.

[15] Michael Wyatt, *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England: A Cultural Politics of Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 125–40.

[16] Kathleen Butler, 'Giacomo Castelvetro, 1546–1616', *Italian Studies*, 5 (1950), 14–15; Eleanor Rosenberg, 'Giacopo Castelvetro: Italian Publisher in Elizabethan London and His Patrons', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 6 (1943), 124–25.

[17] See John Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words* (London: Melchisedec Bradwood for Edward Blount and William Barret, 1611).

[18] Henry Grantham, *An Italian Grammer* (London: Thomas Vautroullier for John Harison, 1587), 'To the right vertuous mystres Mary and mysres Francys Berkeley daughters of the Right honorable Henry Lord Berkeley', ff. A2 r–v.

[19] Claudius Hollyband, *Campo di fior or else the flourie field of foure languages* (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1583), ff *2 r–*3 r.

[20] John Florio, *A Worlde of Wordes* (London: Arnold Hatfield for Edward Blount, 1598), f. A3 r.

[21] Giovanni Torriano, *Della Lingua Toscana-Romana* (London: John Martin and James Allestrye, 1657), f. A4 v.

[22] Pietro Paravicino, *Choice Phrases* (London: printed for the author, 1662), f. A1 v.

[23] Michèle Cohen, 'French Conversation or "Glittering Gibberish"? Learning French in Eighteenth-Century England', in *Didactic Literature in England 1500–1800: Expertise Constructed*, ed. by Natasha Glaisyer and Sara Pennell (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 99–117. On gender and Italian grammar, see Helena Sanson, *Women, Language and Grammar in Italy, 1500–1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2011).

[24] Torriano, *Della Lingua Toscana-Romana*, f. A5 r.

[25] Ibid., ff. A5 v–A6 r.

[26] Ibid., p. 232.

[27] Laurentio Casotti, *A New Method of Teaching the Italian Tongue to Ladies and Gentlemen* (London: Elinor Everingham, 1709), p. 1. Italics are mine.

[28] See Helena Sanson, ''Simplicité, clarté et précision': Grammars of Italian 'Pour Les Dames' and Other Learners in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century France', *Modern Language Review*, 109 (2014), 593–616; see also Gabriele Beck-Busse, 'À propos d'une histoire des 'Grammaires des Dames'. Réflexions théoriques et approches empiriques', *Documents pour l'histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde*, 47–48 (2015), 3–6, 10–11; ead., 'Les 'femmes' et les 'illiterati'; ou: la question du latin et de la langue vulgaire', *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 16, 2 (1994), 77–94.

[29] For a detailed overview of the market for language-learning materials, see John Gallagher, 'Vernacular Language-Learning in Early Modern England', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge (2014), pp. 24–75.

[30] University of Missouri Special Collections, PC1121 .I82 1600, 'Italian and English phrases'. I initially encountered this manuscript (and the excellent digitized images) through a blog post on the MU Special Collections website: Kelli Hansen, 'Monday Manuscript: How to teach yourself Italian in 1626', 31 March, 2014, <http://library.missouri.edu/scriptamanent/2014/03/31/monday-manuscript-how-to-teach-yourself-italian-in-1626/> [last accessed: 26 January 2015].

[31] Joseph Cremona, '"Accioché ognuno le possa intendere": The Use of Italian as a Lingua Franca on the Barbary Coast of the Seventeenth Century. Evidence from the English', *Journal of Anglo-Italian Studies*, 5 (1997), 52–69.

[32] Giovanni Torriano, *The Italian Tutor* (London: Thomas Payne, 1640), f. π2 r.

[33] Ibid., ff. A1 r.

[34] London, British Library (hereafter BL), Harleian MS 3492.

[35] Ibid., ff. 2 v–6 r.

[36] Arrigo Pleunus, *A New, Plain, Methodical and Compleat Italian Grammar, Whereby You May Very Soon Attain to the Perfection of the Italian Tongue* (Leghorn: Jacopo Valsisi, 1702).

[37] Pietro Paravicino, *Choice Proverbs and Dialogues, in Italian and English* (London: E.C., 1660), f. A4 r.

[38] Paravicino, *Choice Phrases*, p. 81.

[39] Sanford, f. A4 r.

[40] Ibid., f. A4 r.

[41] Ibid., p. 20. The references are to Lodovico Dolce and his *Osservationi nella volgar lingua*, first published in Venice by Gabriele Giolito in 1550, and which had several further editions, and to Eufrosino Lapini's *Institutionum Florentinae linguae libri duo* (Florence: Giunti, 1569). This is a grammar of Florentine that uses Latin as its metalanguage. It was meant for a learned readership, well versed in the classical languages. In the dedicatory letter, Lapini specifies that his work was meant for German students of the Italian language and that he had devised it when, living abroad, he was teaching Florentine to some German nobles. Florentine forms and examples are therefore translated into Latin for the benefit of its learned readers. See Helena Sanson, *Women, Language and Grammar in Italy, 1500-1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2011), pp. 106–07.

[42] Sanford, p. 41.

[43] William Thomas, *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1550), 'The occasion', f. π2 v.

[44] Torriano, *New and Easie Directions*, f. A7 v.

[45] Torriano, *Italian Tutor*, 'To the Courteous Reader', f. A2 r.

[46] John Florio, *Florio His firste Fruites* (London: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Woodcocke, 1578), ff. 108 v–09 r.

[47] Florio refers here to the works of the lexicographers Francesco Alunno (c.1485–1556) and Filippo Venuti (1531–1587). Florio, *A Worlde of Wordes*, f. B1 r.

[48] Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words*, p. 618. In his list of books consulted for the 1611 dictionary, Florio includes 'Lettere famigliari di Claudio Tolomei' (Ibid., f. ¶6 r), that is, Tolomei's *De le lettere* [...] *libri sette* (first published in Venice: Gabriele Giolito, 1547).

[49] Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words*, p. 618.

[50] On Michelangelo Florio's contribution to the linguistic debate, see Pizzoli, pp. 27–28. On the *questione* and Italian grammar in sixteenth-century England, see Wyatt, pp. 204–18.

[51] Pizzoli, p. 28. In his first Italian text, Hollyband suggests that Citolini's grammar was in circulation in London, when he urges the curious reader to consult 'a Grammer set foorth by Master Alexander Citolini, where he may see (as in a full sea) the full and whole skill and use of the same tongue, and all the difficulties and points of the same plainly shewed and taught': Claudius Hollyband, *The pretie and wittie Historie of Arnalt & Lucenda* (London: Thomas Purfoote, 1575), 'Claudius Hollybande to the Reader'.

[52] Valerio Marchetti and Giorgio Patrizi, 'Castelvetro, Ludovico', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960–), 22 (1979), 8–21.

[53] Catharinus Dulcis, *Linguarum exoticarum in Academia Marpurgensi Professoris Vitae Curriculi Breviarum* (Marburg: Johann Saur, 1622), pp. 18–19. A helpful biographical sketch is provided by Isabel Zolina and Gabriele Beck-Busse at <http://www.dulcis-info.de/vita.html> [last accessed: 1 February 2016].

[54] London, Lambeth Palace Library (hereafter LPL), MS 654, f. 248 r; LPL MS 656, f. 186 r.

[55] LPL MS 654, ff. 185 r–86 v.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid.

[58] *The Travels and Life of Sir Thomas Hoby, Knight*, ed. by Edgar Powell (London: Camden Society, 1902), p. 8.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., p. 78.

[61] Baldassare Castiglione, *The Courtyer of Count Baldessar Castilio* (London: Wyllyam Seres, 1561), f. B4 v.

[62] Ibid., f. B1 r.

[63] Jonathan Woolfson, *Padua and the Tudors: English Students in Italy, 1485–1603* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1998), and id., 'Padua and English Students Revisited', *Renaissance Studies*, 27 (2013), 572–87.

[64] Logan Pearsall Smith, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907), I, 299.

[65] Ibid., p. 300.

[66] Ibid.; Paolo Lentolo to Robert Cecil, 1 September 1604, in *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, vol. 16: 1604*, ed. by Montague Spencer Giuseppi (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1993), item 594.

[67] Orazio Lombardelli, *I Fonti Toscani d'Orazio Lombardelli senese, Accademico Umoroso* (Florence: Giorgio Marescotti, 1598); R. Weiss, 'Henry Wotton and Orazio Lombardelli',

Review of English Studies, 19 (1943), 285–89. I am grateful to Helena Sanson for drawing my attention to the Wotton-Lombardelli relationship.

[68] Thomas, *Principal Rules*, title page.

[69] Cambridge University Library, Dd.XI.46, f. 124 v. On language-learning for literary purposes, see Jason Lawrence, *'Who the Devil Taught Thee so much Italian?' Italian Language Learning and Literary Imitation in Early Modern England* (Manchester-New York: Manchester University Press, 2005).

[70] Thomas, *Principal Rules*, f. C2 r.

[71] Ibid., f. C2 v.

[72] Ibid., f. B2 r.

[73] Grantham, p. 7.

[74] Florio, *Queen Anna's World of Words*, p. 619.

[75] Pleunus, pp.131–36.

[76] Grantham, p. 20.

[77] On this text, see Ivy A. Corfis, *Diego de San Pedro's Tractado de Amores de Arnalte y Lucenda* (London: Tamesis, 1985).

[78] Florio, *Firste Fruites*, ff. 44 v, and 42 v.

[79] Florio, *A Worlde of Wordes*, f. B4 v. On Florio as a lexicographer, see Dewitt T. Starnes, 'John Florio Reconsidered', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 6 (1965), 407–22.

[80] Thomas, *Principal Rules*, 'To my verie good friend Maister Tamwoorth. At Venice', f. 2π r.

[81] BL Harleian MS 3344.

[82] Butler, 'Giacomo Castelvetro', pp. 32–42.

[83] BL Harleian MS 3344, f. 63 r contains a tag from Guidobaldo de'Bonarelli, *Filli di Sciro* (Paris: Raccolta di Cazin, 1786), p. 227. F. 67 v contains a tag from Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*. F. 63 v contains tags from the *Shepheardes Calender* and from Luigi Groto, *La Dalida* (Venice: Domenico and Giovanni Battista Guerra, 1572). A transcription of the 1572 edition has been made available online by Dana F. Sutton at <http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/groto/>; last accessed: 17 June 2014).

[84] Proverbs can be seen at BL Harleian MS 3344, ff. 58 r, 64 r, 101 r; compare with the alphabetized *Giardino di Ricreatione* which was published as a supplement to John Florio, *Second Frutes* (London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Woodcock, 1591).

[85] Benvenuto Italiano, *The Passenger* (London: Thomas Snodham for John Stepneth, 1612), f. A1 r.

[86] J. Smith, *Grammatica Quadrilinguis, Or, Brief Instructions for the French, Italian, Spanish, and English Tongues* (London: Dorman Newman, 1674), f. A2 v.

[87] Florio, *Firste Fruites*, f. 122 r.

[88] Torriano, *Della Lingua Toscana-Romana*, p. 41.

[89] Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words*, p. 623; Torriano, *Italian Tutor*, p. 85.

[90] See, for instance, Ibid., pp. 87, and 97.

[91] William Thomas, *The Historie of Italie, a Boke Excedyng Profitable to be rRdde: Because It Intreateth of the Astate of Many and Divers Common Weales, How Thei Have Ben, & Now Be Governed* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1549), f. 3 v.

[92] Hollyband, *The Pretie and Wittie Historie*, pp. 307–08.

[93] See Brian Richardson, 'The Concept of a *lingua comune* in Renaissance Italy', in *Languages of Italy: Histories and Dictionaries*, ed. by Anna Laura Lepschy and Arturo Tosi (Ravenna: Longo, 2007), pp. 11–28; id., 'The Italian of Renaissance Elites in Italy and Europe', in *Multilingualism in Italy Past and Present*, ed. by Anna Laura Lepschy and Arturo Tosi (Oxford: European Humanities Research Centre, 2002), pp. 5–23.

[94] Thomas Palmer, *An Essay of the Meanes How to Make Our Trauailes, into Forraine Countries, the More Profitable and Honourable* (London: Humphrey Lownes for Mathew Lownes, 1606), p. 54.

[95] Robert Dallington, *A Survey of the Great Dukes State of Tuscany: In the Yeare of Our Lord 1596* (London: George Eld for Edward Blount, 1605), p. 63.

[96] Ibid., p. 64.

[97] Pizzoli, pp. 193–95, 209–210.

[98] Torriano, *Della Lingua Toscana-Romana*, p. 252.

[99] Giovanni Torriano, *Piazza universale* (London: Francis and Thomas Warren for the author, 1666), f. B1 r.

[100] On how English-speakers tended to imagine a more unified Italy than was the case, see Wyatt, pp. 7, 138–39.

[101] Smith, *Grammatica Quadrilinguis*, p. 119.