Aldus Manutius’ *Fragmenta Grammatica*

JOHN J. BATEMAN

Scattered through the various editions of Aldus’ Latin Grammar are several references to a work with the title *Fragmenta* or, occasionally, *Fragmenta Grammatica*. This title seems to be abbreviated. The full form, and first reference, occurs in the dedicatory letter to Alberto Pio for the first printed edition of the Latin Grammar, the *Institutiones Grammaticae*, published for Aldus by Torresano in Venice in 1493. Aldus, describing the pains he devoted to the *Institutiones*, mentions some other grammatical works he wrote during the same time. They are: “graecas institutiones: & exercitamenta grammatices: atque utriusque linguae fragmenta: & alia quaedam ualde (ut spero) placitura.” Light is thrown on this sentence by a passage in a letter from Aldus to Caterina Pio, mother of Alberto and Leonello Pio, princes of Carpi, whom Aldus was tutoring from about 1483 to 1489. The letter is dated March 14, 1487. Aldus produces a list of his writings and indicates that they were made especially for the instruction

1 The letter is reproduced by C. S. Scarafoni, the discoverer of this previously unknown edition of the Latin Grammar, in *Miscellanea Bibliografica in memoria di Don Tommaso Accurti* a cura di Lamberto Donati (Rome, 1947), 197.

2 The *atque* suggests that the *exercitamenta* and the *fragmenta* formed a single work. Scarafoni apparently makes the same assumption since he paraphrases the title as “esercitazioni su ambedue le lingue classiche” (*op. cit.*, p. 198). However, the references to the work are always simply to the *Fragmenta* with one exception, where in a discussion of the verb *mutuo* Aldus refers to the fuller treatment in his *exercitamentis grammaticis* (see No. 13).


4 The *de accentibus et Latinis et Graecis opusculum* seems never to have been printed. Its contents are probably to be met with in the Letter to Students appended to the 1501 edition of Virgil and in the section on accents in Book IV of the third edition of the *Institutiones Ling. Lat.*, Venice, 1508.
of children. In addition to the *Grammaticae Linguae Latinae Institutiones*, there is a work on Greek and Latin accents, the *Panegyrici Musarum*, a *libellus graecus tamquam isagogicus*, and a work on the writing of poetry. These *libelli* are doubtless the *alia quaedam* referred to in the later letter to Alberto Pio. Having used these works as textbooks, Alberto at least would understand the reference; the uninitiated purchaser of the *Institutiones Grammaticae* could take pleasure in the thought that his Aldus had more to offer him soon.

Aldus, dissatisfied, as he tells us, with all the textbooks then available, prepared these *opuscula* in connection with his duties tutoring Caterina's children in Carpi, and perhaps some other children too at the time. They all found their way into print sooner or later in one form or another except the *Exercitamenta grammatices atque utriusque linguae fragmenta*. Aldus, it seems, never found the time either to perfect it to his own satisfaction or to see it into print. The manuscript disappeared after his death; stolen, according to his son Paolo. All that survives are the tantalizing references found mainly in the successive editions of the Latin Grammar and in the *De litteris Graecis*. The partial treatment of these references to date has produced a certain amount of confused comment about the *Fragmenta* in the scholarship on Aldus. Therefore, in order to offer a better picture of this lost work, I have collected all of these references, arranged them according to their content, and by comparing them with other contemporary grammatical texts have tried to divine a little of what the *Fragmenta* may have contained.

The title and the extant "fragments" suggest a miscellany of grammatical problems in the Greek and Latin languages whose discussion was intended both to inform and to instigate (exercitare) the mind to further

---


6 Julius Schück, *Aldus Manutius und seine Zeitgenossen in Italien und Deutschland* (Berlin, 1867), p. 7, thought this work was the *De litteris graecis* which was first published in 1495 as an appendix to Constantine Lascaris' *Erotemata*. Pastorello (above, note 3), p. 285 identifies it with the *Breuiissima Introductio ad Graecas Literas*, which she believes was first printed in 1494. But C. F. Bühler shows that the *Breuiissima Introductio* is a condensed reprint of the 1495 Appendix and was probably contemporary with the 1497 edition of the Greek *Horae*; cf. *PBSA*, 36 (1942), 18–23.

7 *De componendis carminibus opusculum*; this work was apparently never printed separately though its contents may have been employed in Aldus' later writings on metrical subjects.


9 Cf. Paolo's letter of November 8, 1565, to Mario Corrado (Epist., VII, 7): "Fragmenta patris mei quod requiris: apud me nulla sunt: furto ablata, quo ille tempore uita excessit, creditum est."
study. Aldus had before him such models as Valla's *Elegantiae*, Perotti's *Cornucopiae*, and Politian's *Miscellanea*, different though they may have been in size, scope, or specific purpose. Aldus' own purpose was to give instruction in grammar. The *Fragmenta Grammatica* must then be considered in relation to Aldus' *Grammaticae linguae latinæ Institutiones*. The fifteenth-century humanistic Latin grammars were modeled on and to a considerable extent derived from the ancient grammars some of which, like Terentianus Maurus, were again coming to light. Special works like the Ars Minor of Donatus apart, these grammars tended to contain a considerable amount of detail. The humanistic grammars sought to eliminate a good deal of this detail, but even a relatively simple grammar like that of Sulpitius Verulanus offered many an obstacle to the beginner. On the other hand excessive simplicity was also pernicious since grammar was a science and the major subject of study by the child until he was ready for oratory and poetry. As mentioned above, Aldus was led to his grammatical writings by his dissatisfaction with currently available textbooks. He says in the epilogue of the *Institutiones*: "I had to teach young children and I was not able to do it as effectively as I wished. No one in my judgment had yet written a grammar suitable for instructing children. One was quite short and concise, another exceedingly diffuse and ostentatious, a third utterly inept and indigestible [he is describing perhaps in order Donatus, Priscian, and Alexander's *Doctrinale*]. Although there exist works which are carefully and learnedly written [presumably humanistic grammars], still I must confess none of them satisfied me... I have sought what I most felt the need of, a grammar to teach children quickly and effectively."

To achieve this end Aldus simplifies the standard pattern. He reduces the amount of illustrative material, eliminates the extended treatment of

10. Aldus derived the notion and perhaps part of his title from Quintilian I, 4, 6, which he quotes in Book IV of the *Institutiones* where he exhorts the student to read and reread his remarks on the letters and related material in Book I (Venice, 1523, 101b). Quintilian says grammar is a "subject of great subtlety which is calculated not merely to sharpen the wits of a boy, but to exercise (exercere) also the most profound erudition and knowledge." Aldus' own fascination with language and the intricacies of grammatical description surfaces in many places in his writings and occasional comments of which the prefatory letter in his 1496 *Thesaurus Cornucopiae, & Horti Adonis* (*2*°) is very typical.

11. The *Græcae Institutiones*, written in the 1480’s and published only posthumously in 1515, was never used by Aldus for the same purposes as the Latin Grammar and contains nothing pertinent to this study.

12. This passage occurs in the first edition, published in 1493, is revised slightly for the second edition of 1501 and is eliminated from the subsequent editions.

13. Represented, for example, by the *Ars Maior* of Donatus and Perotti’s *Regulae Syppontinae [Rudimenta grammaticæ]*, Venice: Christophorus de Pensis, November 4, 1495.
complex subjects, and introduces several passages of mnemonic verse (not of course in itself an innovation). He reveals his rationale in a remark made when he comes to heteroclite nouns: "We have considered these few things about genders to be sufficient for those who are learning the first rudiments of grammar. But we shall treat copiously of genders in our 
Fragmenta because the child will have progressed by then." 14 The 
Institutiones contain the rudiments—hence the title of the 1501 edition. 15 Advanced material is reserved for the Fragmenta. We can perhaps perceive here the role of the Fragmenta in Aldus’ plan of instruction. The various works listed in the letters to Caterina and Alberto Pio make a graded series of textbooks from the first step of learning simultaneously the Greek and Latin alphabets through the mastery of the two languages and the eventual writing of poetry in classical forms. Aldus is thus the forerunner of modern pedagogical practice and textbook preparation and publication.

We shall never really know why all of these writings did not eventually appear in print as some of them did. No doubt the demands of time and money made by the printing business were a factor: priority had to be given to other publications. More important perhaps were the changes in Aldus’ own views and intentions as he advanced in years and learning. 16 Our knowledge of the Exercitamenta Grammatices atque Utriusque Linguae 
Fragmenta is derived, as noted above, chiefly from the four editions of the Latin Grammar published by Aldus during his lifetime, from the various editions of the De Literis Graecis, and from a famous insert made in the 1512 edition of Constantine Lascaris’ Erotemata in order to fill two blank pages. Inference also may be drawn from remarks in sundry other publications edited or supervised by Aldus, most notably the 1509 edition of Horace’s Carmina. These works are in chronological sequence:


C: Institutionum Grammaticarum Libri Quatuor. Venice: Aldus Manutius, April 1508.

14 See Fragment No. 1, below.
15 Rudimenta Grammatices Latinae Linguae. The return to the original title of Institutiones etc. for the revised edition of 1508 also signals a new attitude on Aldus’ part to the function of the grammar and his own role as teacher through the printed word.

16 The evidence may be found primarily in the shift in the kinds of books Aldus undertakes to print—a new direction is taken in 1501—and in the revisions and expansions made in the third edition of the Latin Grammar of 1508. As remarked in note 15 above, it no longer purports to offer only the rudiments of the language.
Cd: De literis graecis, ac diphthongis, & quemadmodum ad nos ueniant. Etc. Appended to the Latin Grammar but separately signed.  


E: (De vitiata vocalium ac diphthongorum prolatione πάτεργον.) Pages &2r–3r in Constantine Lascaris’ [Erotemata], Venice: Aldus Manutius, October 1512.  


Fd: De literis graecis, etc. Appended to the 1514 edition of the Institutiones Grammaticae.

The Institutiones Grammaticae was written during the 1480’s when Aldus was at Carpi, as is evident from the letter to Caterina Pio. But the work was being revised as late as 1492, probably as it was being prepared for the press, since Aldus refers in it (p. 192v) to the capture of Granada by Ferdinand and Isabelle on January 2. The dedicatory letter to Alberto Pio, perhaps written shortly before the book went to press, implies that the Fragmenta Grammatica was ready for publication in the near future. The verbs which Aldus uses in the 1493 text to refer to the Fragmenta/Exercitamenta are all in the future tense. These futures can be interpreted to indicate the relationship of Aldus the teacher speaking to his students (that is, you are now studying this point of grammar in a rudimentary fashion, you will take it up again in a more advanced form in the future in my Fragmenta); or Aldus the author addressing his wider public: I am now writing the rudiments of the grammar, I shall presently discuss the

17 This work is actually a collection of separate, short pieces on the Greek alphabet and the ways of writing it, prayers and poems which together constitute a Greek Primer. It first appears in print as an appendix (ALPHABETUM GRAECUM) to the 1495 Aldine edition of C. Lascaris’ Erotemata and was subsequently appended in revised versions to all the other editions of Lascaris’ Grammar as well as to his own Latin Grammar published by Aldus. It probably originated as the libellus graecus tamquam isagogicus mentioned in the letter to Caterina Pio (above, note 6).

18 See Fragment No. 19 below for further information about this item. The title Aldi Manutii, De Vitiata Vocalium ac diphthongorum prolatione, πάτεργον, first appears in an edition of Jacobus Ceratinus’ De Sono Literarum, Prasertim Graecarum libellus, published by Johann Soter in Cologne in 1529, pp. B3r–4r. Soter or his editor apparently extracted the material from the 1512 Lascaris Erotemata and gave it this title. It was frequently reprinted thereafter, including several times by the Aldine Press late in the sixteenth century, and thus enters the bibliographical records as a minor opusculum of Aldus Manutius.

19 Matter pertinent to this study appears first in the version of the De literis graecis which was prepared by Aldus for publication with the 1508 edition of the Latin Grammar. It was reprinted without revision in the 1512 Lascaris Erotemata. Several minor changes and additions were then made in the text for the publication with the fourth edition of the Latin Grammar in 1514.
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topic in detail in the (not yet written) Fragmenta. These future tenses remain in the second edition of 1501 (1502), which could mean either that Aldus overlooked them in revising the text or, more likely, that they fitted the actual circumstances: despite the announcement in the letter to Alberto Pio the work was not really finished and in a form suitable for publication. Final revisions were perhaps never completed: hence the failure to publish. But some advance was certainly made during the six years between the publication of the second edition of the Latin Grammar in February 1502 and the third edition in April 1508. In the third edition five of these future tenses (see Nos. 7, 8a, 9, 10, 11a below) are changed to the perfect tense. This change in tense could be taken to mean that the Fragmenta was now finished.\footnote{Engelbert Drerup seems to have been the first scholar to notice the implication of these changes in tense; cf. his Die Schulausprache des Griechischen (Paderborn, 1930), I, 35. Drerup was comparing the use of the future tense in a reference in the 1508 edition of the De literis graecis and the perfect tense on page \& 3* of the 1512 Erotemata. He had not examined the texts of the Latin Grammar and was consequently not aware of all of the ramifications of his observation; and he would not of course have known about the existence of the 1493 edition and the letter to Alberto Pio. He was thus led to infer that the Fragmenta was contemplated by Aldus in 1508 and finished in 1512.} However, four other verbs in the future are left unchanged (Nos. 12, 13 bis, 14a below). These are probably oversights on Aldus’ part. But the use of the future in No. 18 which first appears in the 1508 edition of the De litteris Graecis (though the sentence itself could have been written several years earlier) suggests a third possible relationship: that of Aldus the publisher to his prospective customers. This possibility may receive some support from the change of tenses in No. 11b. The future erit in the phrase mihi cum illis erit has de re certamen of the 1493 and 1501 editions is changed to est in the 1508 edition and then back to erit in the 1514 edition. In changing est to erit (unless this is due to the compositor), Aldus seems to be contemplating future publication since all the other indications suggest that work on the Fragmenta is now finished.

It is possible that these changes from future to perfect or present tense in the third edition of the Latin Grammar should be correlated with the times, otherwise unknown, during the six-year period when Aldus was revising the text for the third edition and simultaneously working on the Fragmenta. The perfect tenses would imply that the Fragmenta was finished before Book III of the Institutiones went through the press in 1508.\footnote{The four Books are printed so that each book ends with a gathering. This procedure suggests that the work was printed in sections and not continuously. Aldus was very likely working on it even as it was going through the press.} The future tense which appears in the passage on the diphthongs in Book I (No. 15a) would have been added by Aldus closer to 1502 than to 1508.
Revisions in the text of the *De literis graecis* which was also being prepared for publication with the new edition of the Latin Grammar in 1508 bear almost entirely on the subject of correct pronunciation though other matters enter too. One of these latter is a quotation from Lucian’s *Judicium Vocalium*. Since the second edition of Lucian appeared in June 1503, this date could be taken as a *terminus post quem* for the start on the revisions of these writings. However, the earliest actual evidence of Aldus’ interest in the correct pronunciation of the classical languages and the first reference to the *Fragmenta* in this connection occurs in the 1501 edition of the Latin Grammar (14*: cf. No. 14a below). The question of the correct pronunciation of the classical languages was obviously a subject of continuing interest with Aldus. There are references to his discussion of the sound of eta in the *Fragmenta* in Book IV of the 1508 *Institutiones* (No. 14c, d below). This book, whose contents are largely a new addition to the Latin Grammar, is centered on metrical matters and was probably being written in 1507 or 1508.

Aldus, like most humanist grammarians, had long had an interest in classical metrics. One result of this interest is the metrical introductions to the lyric poems in the second edition of Horace’s *Poemata*, published in March 1509. Moreover, Aldus was stimulated, perhaps on the spur of the moment, to add some notes on the text which involve metrics and a sketch of Horace’s lyric meters which together occupy the first two sheets (gatherings) of the book. The signaturing of the book suggests that Aldus had originally intended to use only one sheet for the front matter, and after the presswork on the body of the book was begun or even finished decided to include his annotations and suggested new readings. For instance, in his note on *Carmina*, 1, 27, 5, he justifies his change of the

---

22 Aldus’ concern for a good pronunciation of Latin in the sense of being fluent and not improperly affected by contemporary sounds of the vernacular dialects is already evident in the opening pages of the 1493 edition where he apologizes for his exercises on syllabification and observes (a2*): Nam si bene didicerit puer: & quot syllabarum sint ditiones: easque tum in libro tum ad digitos syllabatim connectere: nec scribet: pronuntiabitque caelli caellorum: & allius allia alliud per geminum ll ut plurimi in Gallia cisalpina solent: quod ipse saepe & uidi & audiui nec ubi una esse debet consonans duas ponet: nec ubi duae unam. ubi eadem in Gallia perpauci sunt qui non errent. Quod si sub litterarii ludi magistro cum essent paruuli didicissent ad digitos plurima ueba syllabicum: quod fieri in Latio assolet: non toties & scribendo & loquendo Barbarismum facerent. His sensitivity to dialectical differences in Italian and indeed his deep interest in these linguistic features may be observed in the preface to the *Thesaurus Cornucopiae*. & *Horti Adonidis*, published in 1496, where he remarks that the language and pronunciation are quite different in Rome, Naples, Calabria, Florence, Genoa, Venice, Milan, Brescia, and Bergamo and cites some examples of common words which are pronounced very differently in these places.
received *acinacis* to *acinaeas* on the ground that the erroneous pronunciation of \( \eta \) as \([i:]\) had influenced the transmission of the text since the customary Latin equivalent of Greek eta was a long e. He then says: *Sed de hoc alius erit tractatus*. The *tractatus* is certainly the *Fragmenta Grammatica*. The future tense again points more likely to the act of printing than of writing. It would thus accord with the uses of the future notes above in Book I of the 1508 *Institutiones* and in the *De literis graecis* appended to it.

In conclusion, then, the 1512 edition of Lascaris’ *Erotemata* provides the evidence of a *terminus ante quem* for the completion of the *Fragmenta*. Parts of it were being worked on simultaneously with the revision of the Latin Grammar for the new edition which appeared in 1508. Completion and publication were being contemplated in 1509. Aldus’ abiding interest in grammatical questions began early and lasted right up to the end of his life in 1515. His awareness of the differences between contemporary and ancient pronunciations of Greek and Latin first becomes evident in 1501, though it is only in 1508 that he begins to make forthright statements about contemporary errors and the need to correct them.\(^{23}\) It seems to be this new interest in correct pronunciation of the classical languages which continued to delay the completion and publication of the *Fragmenta* and which perhaps eventually frustrated Aldus’ plans altogether.

### The Fragments

What follows is a collection of the actual and possible references to the *Exercitamenta Grammatices atque Utriusque Linguae Fragmenta* found in the works listed on pp. 229 f. I have separated and organized the “fragments” according to subject matter, beginning with morphology, then syntax, and finally pronunciation. This is roughly the order of Aldus’ Latin Grammar and the Appendix On Greek Letters and may have been the order followed in the *Fragmenta Grammatica*. However, it is possible that since the grammar traditionally began with the letters (*de litteris*), Aldus may have begun the *Fragmenta* with his views on pronunciation. This would have required a revision of the order which evidently obtained in the earliest version(s), and as I have suggested above, may have been one reason for the long delay in completing the work. In any case the topics of the different

---

\(^{23}\) It was precisely at this time that Erasmus came to Venice to work with Aldus. The implications for this association have been traced by Deno Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), pp. 256–278; see also my article, “The Development of Erasmus’ Views on the Correct Pronunciation of Latin and Greek,” *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry* (Urbana, 1969), pp. 50–53.
passages in each broad category will give some idea of the scope of the lost work and the range of Aldus’ interests in grammar.

The alphabetical sigla identify the work from which each passage has come; the rest of the reference indicates the location of the passage by signature, page number, and recto or verso. (Pagination, even if it does exist in any of these Aldine books, is not a reliable guide.) Variant readings are noted after each passage. In general, I have reproduced the text of the original edition as closely as seemed feasible. Thus I have kept the orthography of the copy text except that abbreviations have been resolved and the ampersand replaced by et. I have capitalized words according to modern practice and have similarly brought the punctuation into accord with modern usage, but only to the extent of replacing periods and sometimes commas with semicolons (which were not in the Aldine roman fonts) within the sentence. The notes are intended to explicate the overly succinct references and to set the fragment into some context.²⁴

A. General Grammar and Morphology

1. A: a8v–blr; B: a8v–br

There is on these pages a section of the Grammar containing a brief summary of the rules on gender of nouns. At the end of the section is the statement:

Haec perpauca de generibus satis esse duximus iis, qui prima discunt rudimenta grammatices. Sed in fragmentis nostris de generibus, quia tunc iam profecerit puer cumulate tractabimus.

This statement disappears from the third (1508) and subsequent editions of the Institutiones Grammaticae. The reason apparently is because the brief compendium of rules is now replaced by some six pages De Generibus (CF: b5v–7r). The new section is completely rewritten and contains material from the earlier editions only by coincidence. In addition to the general rules on gender, it consists mostly of lists of nouns and adjectives which are arranged alphabetically according to their nominative singular endings.²⁵

There is nothing novel or unusual about the contents of this section or

²⁴ I have used the following copies of these Aldine publications: A: Biblioteca Nazionale di San Marco, Incunabuli V. 632; B: British Museum, G 7581; C: British Museum, 625. c. 14; Cd: Idem; D: University of Illinois Library (uncatalogued); E: University of Illinois Library, 485. L33g. 1512; F: British Museum, 625. c. 15; Fd: Idem.

²⁵ The head words, for example, are B (the letter), Epigramma, Cubile, Libye, Gerundi, Sermo, Cornu, Lac, Lupercal, Mel, Pugil, Consul, Delubrum, Carmen, Torcular, and so on with -er, -or, -ur, -as, -es, -is, -os, -us, -ix, -ps, and -ns. This method of classifying nouns by their endings is common in mediaeval and humanistic grammars alike and probably comes from Priscian. Cf. also Pompeius, GLK, 5, 164, 28–165, 18.
their presentation. It would appear that Aldus has introduced into his revised edition of the Grammar the detailed discussion which he had at an earlier time thought unnecessary and indeed unsuitable for beginners in grammar. The material presumably came from the *Fragmenta*.

2. (a) A: $b^7r$; B: $b^4v$

Singulariter. haec Dido, huius Didus et Didois, huic Didoi, hanc Dido et Didoeam, o Dido, ab hac Didoe. Pluraliter. hae Didoes, harum Didoum, his et ab his Didoibus, has Didoes, o Didoes; sine n. Sed inflecte iam tu cum litera n sic, haec Dido, huius Didonis, haec Calypso, huius Calypsonis, sicut haec Iuno, huius Iunonis. Sed de his multa dicemus in fragmentis.

(b) C: $d^1r$; F: $d^{1r}$

Singulariter. haec Dido, huius Didus et Didonis, huic Didoni, hanc Dido et Didonem, o Dido, ab hac Didone. Pluraliter. hae Didones, harum Didonum, his et ab his Didonibus, has Didones, o Didones; sic haec Calypso, huius Calypsus et Calypsonis, sicut haec Iuno, huius Iunonis. Sed de his multa in fragmentis.

Leaving aside the matter of the elimination of the question and answer format between the second and the third editions, Aldus has evidently moved somewhat in his thinking about this particular kind of declension between 1501 and 1508. The grammatical question under consideration here is whether Greek nouns like *Dido* and *Calypso* are to be declined in Latin on the Greek stem (Dido- + us, i, etc.) or whether the stem too had to be Latinized as *Didon-* before using Latin endings. The grammarians usually preferred the second approach.\(^{26}\) However, Aldus found a dissenting voice in Phocas who says the forms in -nis etc. are repudiated by the harshness of the sound and the authority of the ancients (*GLK*, 5, 424, 19–24), a view to which Quintilian seems to give some support (I. 5, 63 f.). Aldus quotes these passages together with Priscian in C (e$3^r$; F: e$3^r$–4$^r$; the passage does not occur in AB):


Vatibus Ausoniis Tyriam dat Graecia Dido.
Fecit Didonem romula uox Taciti.
At Calypsonem Latii das inclyte Caesar.
Quodque decor patitur Quintiliane iubes.

Sed errant, ait Foca grammaticus, qui Didonis, aut Mantonis genitiuum dicunt, cum et uocis asperitas, et eterum autoritas eiusmodi declinationem repudiét; nam translatá in Latinam linguam, nihilominus Graece declinantur, sic Dido, Didois, Didoi, Didoi, Didoe, Didoe. Idem sentire uidetur Quintilianus his uerbis: Nunc recentiores instituerrunt Graecis nominibus Graecas declinationes potius dare, quod tamen ipsum non semper fieri potest. Mihi autem placet Latinam rationem sequi, quousque patitur decor; neque enim iam Calypsonem dixerim, ut Iunonem.27

The changes made in the presentation of the declension in the third edition of the Grammar do not make it entirely clear whether or not Aldus followed Quintilian’s suggested via media. Phocas is clearly the source of the forms Didois, Didoi, etc., which appear in A and B and which were presumably justified in the Fragmenta. Their suppression in the 1508 edition, which thus bows to tradition and perhaps the authority of Quintilian, need not reflect Aldus’ own solution to this question. His predilection for things Greek may have ultimately made him side with Phocas.

3. A: b8v; B: b6v; C: d2r; F: d2r


* ut ... grammaticis AB] ut supra est dictum CF

The removal of the reference to the Fragmenta Grammatica suggests, as in No. 1 above, that the new material on this grammatical point in the 1508 edition was taken from the Fragmenta. Aldus has inserted here in Book I between the section on gender and a section entitled Quaestiones de nomine28 some ten pages of material under the heading De nominum declinatione (b7v–c5r in C). In these pages he takes up the morphology of the noun, case by case, singular and plural, through the five declensions. The reference, ut supra dictum est, is therefore to this prior discussion of the genitive case and specifically to pages b8v–c1r. He says here:

Genitiuus quartae declinationis quot terminationes habet? treis, ut haec manus huius manus, hic fructus huius fructus; uis diuisas, ut haec manus huius manus, hic fructus huius fructus, haec anus huius anuis. Terentius eius anuis opinor causa, quae mortua est. M. Varro in primo de agricultura Contra ut Mineruae caprini generis nihil immolarent propter oleam, quod

27 Priscian, GLK, 2, 209 f. is the source of the citations from Accius, Ennius and Plautus; Quintilian, 1, 5, 63, that from Caesar. I do not know the source of the tetrastich. Phocas is paraphrased rather than quoted directly; cf. GLK, 5, 424, 19–24.

28 Examen in nomine in A, Interrogationes in nomine in B.
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eam quam laeserit fieri dicit sterilem; eis enim saliue et fructuis uenenum. A quo genitiuo uis in frequenti usu est datiuus ui. Nam a genitiuuo manus huic manu est datiuus. Item u ut hoc cornu huius cornu. 29

Aldus' starting point for his discussion of this topic in the *Fragmenta* was undoubtedly Priscian, who says the ancients produced a genitive ending in *uis divisas* and cites the passage of Terence (*GLK*, 2, 362, 24-363, 5). Aldus was familiar with this passage in Priscian since he quotes the line from Terence elsewhere in the 1493 edition in a second note on *anus* (a curious doublet, A: c1r; B: b6v). The additional material probably comes from Aulus Gellius either directly or through an intermediate source like Sulpitius Verulanus. 30 Gellius (4, 16) says Varro and P. Nigidius used the forms *senatuis*, *domuis*, and *fluctuis*. He also cites the line of Terence. Gellius does not actually quote Varro. Aldus may simply have read through the De *Re Rustica* until he came upon one of these forms in the passage cited; it comes from near the beginning of the work. Gellius is also the source for Aldus' comment on the endings of the dative case in the fourth declension. 31

C: c1r f.; F: b8v (not in AB)


* Item a genitiuo F] ~ datiuo C

The starting place for this note is likewise Priscian who cites the Virgilian phrase, *parce metu cytherea* (*Aen.*, 1, 257), in his discussion of the dative forms of the fourth declension (*GLK*, 2, 363, 10). The reference to

29 Terence, *H. T.*, 287; Varro, *De re rust.*, 1, 2, 19.
30 Aldus was acquainted with Gellius before 1493 because the term, *patrius casus*, for the genitive case comes from Gellius. Sulpitius, *De arte grammatica* (ca. 1480; Hain 15142), b4v says, for example: Genitiuus ergo in us. terminorum exit in us productum ut Hic visus. huius visus. Vetustissimi tamen in uis. syllabas terminabant, et datiuum in u. vt senatus, huius senatus. huic senatu. Hic metus. huius metuis. huic metu. Huius rei Aulus gellius est approbatus assertor.
31 The odd phrase, *lege A. Gel.* (read Aulus Gellius), in the middle of this passage looks like a marginal note which Aldus wrote to himself and which was included in the printed text by the compositor. The reference is still to Gellius, 4, 16.
Caesar comes from Gellius. The rule on the genitive and dative cases is taken from Servius' *Commentary on Aeneid*, 1, 156: "curru" non, ut quidam putant, pro "curru" posuit, nec est apocope, sed ratio artis antiquae, quia omnis nominativus pluralis regit genetivum singularem et isosyllabus esse debet, ut "hae musae, huius musae," "hi docti, huius docti." Item a genetivo singulari dativus regitur singularis, ut isosyllabus sit, ut "huius docti, huic docto." The view of Servius seems to have been originally formulated against the position advanced by Priscian who views these texts as instances of the use of the ablative in place of the dative and hence from another perspective as figures of speech. Aldus' use of *cursus* here instead of *curru* seems to be a *lapsus memoriae*. *Cursu* in the ablative occurs in the very next verse of the *Aeneid*. The direct connection of the form of the dative in -ui with the genitive in -uis, and of the dative in -u with the genitive in -us, which would flow from the Servian rule, seems to be Aldus' own idea. Such matters were evidently reserved for the advanced discussions in the *Fragmenta*.

4. (a) A: c1r; B: b7r; C: d9r; F: d3r

Dies huius dies, huius die, huius dii cuius declinatus? quinti. Quare? quia quinta in inflexionis nomina etiam in es et in e et in ii inueniuntur prolata in casu patrio apud antiquos ut ostendemus abunde in fragmentis.*

* ut ... fragmentis AB] ut ostendimus superius, ubi de genitivo quintae declinationis scripsumus [scribimus C] CF

The reference in CF, as in No. 3, is back to the discussion on c1r (b8r–c1r in F). We may again assume that material from the *Fragmenta* has been introduced here.

(b) C: c1r; F: b8r–c1r


32 Cf. GLK, 2, 366 f. Forms like *curru* or *die* (for *dies*) are discussed in various contexts by the grammarians. The handle, as here, is usually offered by the text of Virgil; cf. Servius on Georg., 1, 208, and Priscian, GLK, 3, 189, 8 ff.

33 prospeciens genitor caeloque invectus aperto
flectit equos, *curru*que volans dat lora secundo.
Defessi *Aeneadæ*, quae proxima litora *cursu*
contendunt petere . . . (155–158)
ratae tentamina sumpsit pro fidei. Idem in sexto, Vtque fide pignus dextras utriusque pospocit pro fidei pignus. Caesar in secundo de analoga huius die huius specie dicendum putat.\textsuperscript{34}

(c) C: \(ct^r\); F: \(ct^r\)

Datius quintae declinationis quot terminationes habet? treis, ei ut huic diei, ii ut huic facii, e ut huic facie. Lucilius in satyris, ut citat Gellius, Primum inquit facie honestas accidit. Idem qui te diligit, aetati facieque tuae se fautorum ostendat. Sunt tamen inquit Gellius non pauci, qui utrobi facii legant.\textsuperscript{35}

The citations from Virgil's \textit{Georgics} and from Sallust and Ovid are used by Priscian (\textit{GLK}, 2, 366, 9–18); the Sallust passage is also cited by Servius in his note on \textit{Georgics}, 1, 208. These texts and the use made of them in discussing the variant forms of the fourth and fifth declensions are thus part of the common tradition. The rest of the forms and passages used to illustrate them are taken from Gellius, \textit{N.A.}, 9, 14. Gellius had already been incorporated into the humanistic grammars and commentaries on Virgil in the fifteenth century. Thus Sulpius Verulanus cites him in his account of the fifth declension forms of the genitive and dative,\textsuperscript{36} and Antonio Mancinelli cites him by book and chapter in his annotation on \textit{Georgics}, 1, 208, and quotes from him the examples from Virgil, \textit{Aeneid}, 1, 636, Cicero's \textit{Pro Sestio} and Caesar. None of the illustrative material, therefore, is really original with Aldus or the result of his own reading of the classical authors. What is new perhaps is the organization of the material and the way in which the different forms are accounted for. That is probably what was "abundantly shown" in the \textit{Fragmenta}. However, there is no reason to assume that insofar as illustrative matter was concerned, Aldus went beyond his immediate sources in the grammatical tradition.

5. A: d7\textsuperscript{v}; B: c6\textsuperscript{v}

Quot species deriuatiorum uerborum? quinque. inchoatiua, meditatiua, deminutiua, frequentatiua, desideratiua, ut Inchoat, arcesso, uiso; meditatur, amasco; sorbillo minuit; legitoque et curso frequentant. Parturit est partum desiderat, esurit esse. Sed de his cumulatissime in fragmentis.

The reference to the \textit{Fragmenta} is suppressed in C, and the brief account of A and B is expanded into one and a half pages of material. Presumably


\textsuperscript{35} Gellius 9, 16.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{De arte grammatica} (ca. 1480), b5\textsuperscript{v}.
the added matter is again taken from the *Fragmenta*. This additional material consists chiefly of a longer list of examples under each type of verb, the rules for their formation and conjugation, and a brief discussion of the past tense of "meditative" (that is, inchoative in modern terminology) verbs. All of this material is traditional and can be found, though with some variation, in Diomedes, Donatus, Servius, and Priscian above all and, following Priscian, in the humanistic grammars of Perotti and Sulpitius Verulanus. Since the *Fragmenta*, in its original conception, was to contain advanced grammar, it was certainly appropriate to reserve this somewhat complicated material for it. Its inclusion in the revised edition of the *Institutiones Grammaticae* implies a change in Aldus' view of the purpose and educational functions of his Latin Grammar and also perhaps of the *Fragmenta Grammatica*.

However, what had originally necessitated a very detailed (*cumulatissime*) treatment of these verbs in the *Fragmenta*, which was apparently retained in it, was Aldus' acceptance of the position of Lorenzo Valla on this question. Valla severely criticized the traditional account in his *Elegiatae* (I, 22–24) and in effect turned it upside down. He centers his attack on Priscian, who gives the fullest exposition of the subject. Priscian presents a five-type classification of inchoative, meditative, frequentative, desiderative, and diminutive verbs. Inchoative verbs end in -sc-, are mostly derived from intransitive verbs, do not have perfect tenses or a supine stem, and belong to the third conjugation, like *calesco, fervesco*. Meditative verbs end in -uri-, are derived from the supine in -u but lack their own supine stem, and belong to the fourth conjugation. Frequentative verbs end in -to, -so, or -xo, are derived from the supine in -u except those verbs having a stem in -gi (like *legito*), and all belong to the first conjugation. Desideratives end in -so or -sso and signify "to be eager to do something," as *viso, facesso, capesso*. Diminutive verbs end in -lo.

Valla claims to be disputing with all the ancient grammarians, but in fact is dealing primarily with Priscian and secondarily with Servius in his

---

37 GLK, 2, 427–431, 508, 535, 559–560; cf. also Diomedes, *GLK*, 1, 343–346, Donatus, *id.*, 4, 381–382, Servius, *id.*, 4, 412–413, whose accounts differ from Priscian's in a few respects. For example, they do not recognize Priscian's desiderative type. Donatus and Servius also have an "absolute" or "perfect" type (known to Diomedes, but not considered by him) which is the base form in a sequence like *lego, legito, lecturio*.

38 Verbs of this type are more often considered in the tradition a subclass of frequentative verbs. It was the fact that they have perfective forms and do not belong to the first conjugation which led to their separate classification as desideratives. Priscian was not responsible for this treatment since it was already known to Servius; see his note on *Aen.*, 8, 157. There are traces of an ancient dispute among the grammarians on this point; cf. Servius, *GLK*, 4, 413, 1–3.
role as commentator on Virgil.\textsuperscript{39} His procedure is to begin with a text used by Priscian or Servius, show how the interpretations based on their grammatical theories are false, and by citing other texts construct his own view of the correct signification of these verb forms. For example, he refutes Priscian’s interpretation of the verb \textit{aegrescit} in the Virgilian phrase, \textit{aegrescitque medendo}, as meaning “he begins to be ill,” and supports his refutation with parallel examples from Virgil, Cicero, Quintilian, Plautus, and the Vulgate. These verbs in -sco, he argues, do not signify “beginning” but “becoming.” They are thus complementary to verbs compounded with fio like \textit{calesco: calefio}. Verbs in -sco are different because they imply that the source of their action or passion is in their subject while those in -fio imply that it is outside. These verbs therefore have a perfective tense. Valla subtly discriminates the perfect tenses of verbs in -sco and -fio on the basis of meaning and retorts Priscian’s view by arguing that if verbs in -sco have perfect tenses, then they cannot have an inchoative meaning. The success of his arguments on inchoative verbs no doubt lent credence to his subsequent arguments and interpretations of desiderative and meditative verbs. He again employs the same critical procedure. By refuting Priscian’s interpretation of specific texts, Valla overturns the grammatical theory on which it rests. Additional citations are then used to support his own view of their signification. Verbs like \textit{viso} and \textit{fasseso} signify a physical action and mean “to go to do something.” Verbs in -urio are more aptly called desiderative or optative because they signify an emotional, not an intellectual or physical, aspect of the action they denote. Valla concludes his reinterpretation of the traditional grammar by saying:

If we want to give appropriate names to each of these types without disregarding the usual terminology, we may call verbs in -sco “meditative,” that is “exercising,” because someone who is becoming warm (\textit{calescit} or \textit{calet}) is, so to speak, meditating and exercising to make himself warm. We may call those in -so “inchoative,” those in -rio “desiderative.” And these, I think, were the true and real meanings of these terms. But posterity depraved the meaning assigned to them in antiquity.\textsuperscript{40}

Aldus completely accepted Valla’s interpretations and suggested terminology. His presentation of these verbs thus appears to be unique

\textsuperscript{39} The only ancient texts he seems familiar with are Priscian, the \textit{Ars Minor} of Donatus, and Servius’ Commentaries; he is in effect really disputing with the contemporary school tradition.

among fifteenth century school grammars. Other grammarians like Sulpitius Verulanus certainly knew Valla’s work, but still followed Priscian, perhaps for the reason given by Sulpitius: De nominibus et significatione horum verborum aliter et argutius sentit Valla. sed nos tritiorem usum securi sumus non paruo consilio.\textsuperscript{41} Aldus was clearly not one to follow tritiorem usum. However, his actual discussion, insofar as it can be detected from the succinct presentation in C, is an amalgam of Priscian and Valla. Format and examples from Priscian are accommodated to the views of Valla.

6. C: f8\textsuperscript{v}; F: 8\textsuperscript{r}

Diomedes tamen separatim declinat sic, tempore praesenti utinam amem, imperfecto utinam amarem, perfecto utinam amaverim, plusquamperfecto utinam amauissem, futuro utinam amem. sed de his in fragmentis plura.

This statement is not found in A or B but occurs here as an addendum to the customary conjugation of the verb in the optative mood. Aldus lists these tenses in the usual way, as it is, for example, found in Donatus and Priscian,\textsuperscript{42} thus:

(a) present and imperfect: utinam amarem, etc.
(b) perfect and pluperfect: utinam amauissem, etc.
(c) future: utinam amem, etc.

Between 1501 and 1508 Aldus evidently became familiar with Diomedes or some statement on the optative purportedly derived from him. Diomedes (\textit{GLK}, 1, 340, 4–22) takes note of three divergent views on the optative. Some deny that there can be a present tense of the optative mood. Others admit the present tense, but combine it with the future.\textsuperscript{43} The third group, which Diomedes himself follows, join the present and imperfect together. Similar disputes revolve around the past tenses for some grammarians had evidently raised the question: How could one wish for something in the past. Diomedes has a suitable answer. In his own conjugations of the optative Diomedes then distinguishes four tense forms: present and imperfect (amarem), perfect (amaverim), pluperfect (amassem), and future (amem).\textsuperscript{44}

Aldus’ report in the \textit{Institutiones Grammaticae}, whatever he may have said in the \textit{Fragmenta}, does not square with the transmitted text of Diomedes. He has either wrongly reported Diomedes or he has erroneously ascribed to Diomedes the paradigms of some other grammarian. Probus, for in-

\textsuperscript{41} (Above, note 30), d3r–v. \textsuperscript{42} \textit{GLK}, 4, 360, 27–33; 2, 407, 10–408, 17. \textsuperscript{43} Cf. [Sergius], \textit{in Donatum}, \textit{GLK}, 4, 509, 1–17. \textsuperscript{44} \textit{GLK}, 4, 352, 9–18.
stance, gives the forms of the optative which Aldus here assigns to Diomedes.\textsuperscript{45} I have been unable to discover an exact source for Aldus. In any case his discussion of the tenses of the optative in the \textit{Fragmenta} probably followed the outline of Diomedes.

As well as Book IV, which is completely new, there are several other insertions of new material in the third edition of the Latin Grammar. For example, in the first two editions Aldus had printed some seventy mnemonic verses in dactylic hexameter on heteroclite nouns in order that children though they are learning only the rudiments of the language may not be wholly ignorant of the fact that some nouns are declined in different ways. This poem is revised for the third edition and, as noted above, is preceded by fourteen new pages on heteroclite nouns. While for the most part containing mere lists of nouns, these pages have occasional grammatical disquisitions. Similarly the treatment of the verb is reorganized and nine new pages of general information on its morphology are added before the quiz and paradigms. A considerable amount of new material on syntax also appears in Book III. It is not apparent at first sight whether any of this new material comes from the \textit{Fragmenta} in the way postulated above. A careful study of the text of the four editions of the Latin Grammar might answer this question, at least in part. Such a study would certainly prepare the way for a better estimate of Aldus’ own scholarship and a deeper insight into his mind at work.

B. Syntax

7. A: i7r-v; B: i2r; C: m4r; F: m4v

\textit{Quomodo construuntur impersonalia uociis passiuis?} cum ablatiuo agente cum praepositione a uel ab, ut a me studeor, id est, ego studeo; a te dormitur, id est, tu dormis. Post se uero regunt casum uerborum si a neutris tertiae et septimae speciei deducta fuerint, ut seruio tibi, a me seruitor tibi; eo ad templum, a me itur ad templum. Nam quae ab actius ueniunt ego non memini legisse cum casu patiante. Non enim legi unquam apud doctos quale est amatru Socratem, aratur terram, sed passiue semper, amatru Socrates, aratur terra. Quod ne apud Graecos quidem fieri deprehendi nec quii inuine ire qui legerit. Illud enim apud Priscianum \textit{λέγεται Διογένη} τὸν κυκκὸν hoc est diictur Diogenem Cynicum, si non subauditur \textit{ποιήσω} ἡ τύφει uel aliud infinitum Graeci non approbant. Negant enim dici apud \textit{οσ στέργεται} τὸν \textit{Σωκράτη} hoc est amatru Socratem. Docetur uero grammaticam et petitur gratiam ita diictur ut donatur tibi, turbatur agris, a me accipitur a te.

\textsuperscript{45} GLK, 4, 160, 28-161, 4. Aldus presumably did not know this particular work which was first published by Angelo Mai in 1833. But in view of the way manuscripts of grammatical treatises were written and circulated, even in the fifteenth century, it is not impossible that he could be acquainted with the contents.
Non enim in his pati aliquid significamus. Ponuntur frequentius absolute, ut amatur, statur. Sed quare non liceat dicere amatur Socratem ostendimus* in fragmentis nostris.

* ostendimus CF] ostendemus AB

The construction, impersonal verb with retained object in the accusative case, criticized here by Aldus is accepted in both mediaeval and humanistic grammarians. Alexander, for instance, says,

quae [sc. verba] sine persona sunt atque gerundia iungis,
si tamen a verbo, quod transeat, illa creabis:
Matthaeum legitur; psalmos erat ante legendum.
(Doctrinale, 1262–1264)

Sulpitius Verulanus uses the same example of Matthaeum legitur and gives the rule justifying the construction: omnes dictiones quibus significatus, id est, modus significandi est idem regunt eundem casum. However, he also points out that in learned (that is, classical) authors the accusative with such verbs is found only with prepositions.46 It is not clear from this limited context just what Aldus' arguments against this construction in his Fragmenta might have been other than its absence in classical authors. But even this point may have been open to question. A sentence in a letter of Antonio Codro to Aldus shows that Aldus was seeking the help of his friends in exploring this problem. Codro writes: Impersonale uerbum, quod est apud Ouidium cum accusatiuo, cum inuenero, ad te scribam, nunc oδ δύναμεων.47 It is possible that Codro told Aldus that the construction was classical and used by Ovid, but on being asked for the source was unable to supply it. Or Aldus may simply have been asking Codro's help on this point as well as on several others since this particular sentence occurs in a series of such replies in the letter.

8. (a) A: i8r; B: i3r; C: m5r; F: m5v

Et notandum horum uerborum nominatuum semper neutri generis esse oportere, quemadmodum Laurentius Valla praestanti uir ingenio docet, cui ego facile asserior, quia nusquam aliter memini legere* quam cum nominatuo neutri generis. Sed an uerbum aliquod sit impersonale, ostendimus† abunde in fragmentis grammaticis.

* legere CF] legisse AB † ostendimus CF] ostendemus AB

Aldus is describing the syntax of interest and refer (the horum uerborum of

47 Printed by Julius Schück (above, note 6), p. 118.
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the first sentence). The reference to Valla is to his discussion of these two verbs in *Elegantiae*, II, 1. There Valla remarks about the construction, *Hoc interest mea*, that, hoc uerbum habere ante se nominativum, sicut sum, es, est. Sed in neutro genere quis dubitet, quum omnia plena sint exemplorum. But Aldus’ reference to the *Fragmenta* here seems to point to a larger question about personal and impersonal verbs than just the proper constructions with *interest* and *refert*. But I do not see just what he has in mind.

(b) A: k1r; B: i3v; C: m5v; F: m6v

(A text) Notandum etiam dici latine tua discipuli interest libros legere etsi sunt qui negant: sed de his in fragmentis.  
(BCF text) Praeterea tua discipuli interest libros legere, sunt qui negant dici posse* latine, sed tua, qui es discipulus. sed de his in fragmentis.

* posse om. CF

The use of notandum to introduce these two topics and the references to the *Fragmenta* in the text of A suggest that these two passages are in fact notes added to the original text of the *Institutiones*. The reference in *sunt qui negant* is probably primarily to Valla who in this same chapter of the *Elegantiae* (II, 1) says about joining a substantive and a pronominal adjective: Adeoque uerum est, hos ipsos genitiuos respuere consortium substantiui, ut ne in possessiourum quidem forma illud pati uelint. Vidimus licere dicere, meam unius operam, tuum solius studium: non tamen dicemus, meum Laurentii studium, suum Prisciani praedium, sed meum studium, qui sum Laurentius, praedium suum, qui est Priscianus. The text in A suggests that Aldus, contrary to Valla, believed that the construction of *tua discipuli interest* was legitimate. He would have found justification for this point of view, and a criticism of Valla, in Perotti who explained the form of the possessive adjective with *interest* and *refert* as modifying the noun *re* which is compounded with the verb *re-fert* and (apparently) *inter-re-est*. Thus the construction, *mea Platonis interest*, is the equivalent of *in re mea Platonis*. By analogy *tua Pyrrhi refert* is the equivalent of *res tua Pyrrhi fert*. Perotti also considered *interest* and *refert* as both personal and impersonal verbs and gives as an example of the personal use: *sermo tuus interest nostra*. Aldus clearly agreed with Valla that such a construction was erroneous. It is possible that the revision of the text of

48 *Opera* (Basle: Petri, 1540), p. 48.  
49 Ibid., p. 49.  
50 *Rudimenta grammatices* (Venice, 1480), pp. g6r-v. The same view is advanced in his *Cornucopiae* (Basle, 1526), p. 47.
9. A: K₃⁶; B: i₆⁶; C: m₇⁶; F: m₈⁶

Sed caue dicas, a me uult legi, a te uult seruiri mihi, me uult taedere tui, quia uult non unquam impersonale. quare autem non sit, in fragmentis nostris disputauimus.*

* disputabimus AB

This reference appears to be to the same part of the Fragmenta referred to in 8 (a) above. The context is a discussion of the syntax of incipit, potest, desinit, solet, debet, used impersonally, and volo. The construction Aldus has under consideration is of the type, a me incipit legi or a te potest satisfieri mihi. The inclusion of vult in this list and the erroneous construction which Aldus warns against here may be exemplified from Sulpitius Verulanus who gives the rule that if these verbs are joined with personal infinitives, they are used personally (ego volo amare te), but impersonally if joined with impersonal infinitives as in me vult delectare dormire.⁵² Aldus, citing the authority of Priscian (GLK, 3, 232), insists that volo must be used personally: nam persona uolens semper esse in nominativo debet, ut ego uolo a me benefici tibi, tuuis a te seruiri mihi, et ita in caeteris generis eiusdem. But oddly enough his list of impersonal verbs of the sixth species in the active voice still contains uult. Perotti on the other hand omits it entirely from his similar list.

10. A: k₃⁶; B: i₆⁶; C: m₈⁶; F: n₁⁶

Nos amabimus: nos amatamire, uel nos amatamurumesse, uel per participium, nos amaturos esse; et idem significant, ut ostendimus* in fragmentis; nos amabimur: nos amatamiri.

* ostendemus AB

The ancient grammarians regularly give the forms of the future infinitive as (active) amatam ire or amatamurum ire, (passive) amatam iri or amandum esse.⁵³ They are followed in this practice by the fifteenth century humanist grammarians like Perotti and Sulpitius Verulanus. The usage of the extant classical authors is of course different and, as Aldus


⁵² De arte grammatica (Venice: Christorphorus de Pensis, 1488), p. e₈⁶.

⁵³ Cf., for example, Priscian, GLK, 2, 475, 18-476, 6; Diomedes, id., 1, 352, 31; Donatus, id., 4, 361, 5 f.; Gellius, NA, 1, 7. Amaturumire, amatamurumesse, amatumiri, are written as single words to prevent, as Sulpitius says, their being taken as two words.
notes, employs the participle. Aldus writes here as though some grammarians had interpreted the construction of the future participle with the infinitive esse as having a different meaning from the other two constructions. But there seems to be no evidence of such a distinction in the ancient grammarians, and I have found no traces of it in later authors. Aldus must have cited in the *Fragmenta* texts, presumably from classical authors, in which the construction with the future participle is demonstrably a kind of future infinitive.

11. (a) A: k3\(^{-}\)4\(^{f}\); B: i6\(^{v}\); C: n1\(^{f}\); F: n2\(^{f}\)

Amandi, amando, amandum quae pars orationis sunt? libet respondere illud Horatii in poetica de uersibus elegis: grammatici certant, et adhuc sub iudice lis est. Aliquii enim neque nomina esse volunt, quia regunt transitu, neque uerba properat casus quos habent, neque participia, quia sunt sine tempore, neque aliquam ex octo orationis partibus, sed partem potius per se. Aliqui affirmant esse uerba participalia, aliqui uero nomina participia; sed et de gerundiis et de supinis abunde diximus* in fragmentis.

* dicemus AB

(b) Ibidem

Quam significationem habent? tam actiuam quam passiueam ab actiuis, communibus, et neutris ut aro; a caeteris uero quam eorum uerba. Non me latet quid Laurentius et alii senserint, quod nunc ne confundamus pueros, praetermittimus. In fragmentis enim mihi cum illis erit* hac de re certamen. Satis sit nunc unum exemplum ex Iustino: Athenis quoque missus erudiendi gratia, id est, ut erudiretur.

* cum illis est C

The differentiation of the gerund from the gerundive and the determination of their correct usage was (and still is) an arduous and lengthy business for the grammarians. The initial stage in the recovery of the classical usage by the humanists was the separation of the grain from the chaff in the ancient grammarians whose divergent views are summarized by Aldus in passage (a). The first major effort was made by Lorenzo Valla in his *Elegantiae* (I, 27). It is evident that the subject does indeed admit of abundant discussion though what Aldus’ particular contribution may have been in the *Fragmenta* is by no means clear. The point in passage (b) on the *significatio* of the gerund on which Aldus takes issue with Valla\(^{54}\) is, I think, the following. Valla, in partially distinguishing the gerund from the

\(^{54}\) Among the *alii* who follow Valla is certainly Perotti, who may well be the only person Aldus actually has in mind here despite the plural. Perotti in his *Rudimenta grammatices* and even more so in his *Cornucopiae* takes phrases and illustrations virtually verbatim from Valla.
gerundive, establishes the rule that gerundives have a passive meaning when joined with nouns, but that gerunds, though sometimes passive, are usually active. After illustrating this rule in the accusative and ablatival cases, he concludes his treatment with an example of a typical soloecism:

Quidam uero indoctus hac aetate scribere ausus est: Iamiam urbs in periculo capiendi est, pro eo quod est, urbs iam in periculo est ne capiatur, siue hostis parum a dest a capienda urbe. Qum semper sine substantiue gerundium accipiatur actiue, aut si a neutro uenit, neutraliter: nisi aliquando, ut ostendimus, in ablativo.

Aldus’ citation from Justin is evidently intended to justify the use of the gerund in the genitive case with a passive meaning. Presumably the Fragmenta offered other examples from ancient authors.

12. A: k5\textsuperscript{v}r; B: j7\textsuperscript{v}r; C: n1\textsuperscript{v}r; F: n3\textsuperscript{v}r

In fragmentis grammaticis ostendam supinum in um accipi etiam passiue, ut contumelia factum itur, id est datur opera ut fiat contumelia; et in u active, ut surgo cubitu, id est a cubatione.

Here again Valla may illustrate what Aldus has in mind. In Elegantiae I, 29, Valla says that the supine in -um is active, the one in -u is passive. Since he does not notice any exceptions, he could be read as laying down a universal rule. Much of Valla’s energy in the two chapters on the supine (28 and 29) is spent on distinguishing the supine from fourth declension verbal nouns, criticizing Priscian’s statements about the differences between supines and gerundives, and on censuring the erroneous usage of contemporary writers and teachers. An instance of this last is furnished by Sulpitius Verulanus who illustrates the supine thus: eo doctum discipulos; et eo doctum a praeceptore. Dignum doctu: id est, dignum ut doceat vel ut doceatur. Sulpitius remarks that the supine of transitive verbs can be used with an active or passive meaning. Valla, however, chides the view that the supine can be indiscriminately employed with an active or passive significance. This is clearly the point at issue. In the section on supines in the Latin Grammar Aldus says flatly that supines in -um are active, those in -u are passive, and interprets several examples in this light. However, the reference to the Fragmenta shows that he had other views also. Presumably his discussion of supines in the Fragmenta ranged over all the questions concerned with this form similar to Valla’s treatment in the Elegantiae. Valla’s study was undoubtedly the starting point

---

\textsuperscript{55} Justin, 17, 3, 11; cf. Kühner-Stegmann (above, note 51), II, i, 728 f., who cite no other examples of this use except the passage in Justin.

\textsuperscript{56} (Above, note 30), e8\textsuperscript{v}r.
of Aldus’ own discussion since his section on the supine in the Latin Grammar has several things in common with Valla and suggests close familiarity with the two chapters in the *Elegantiae.*

13. (a) A: h2r; B: g4r; C: k5r; F: k5r


* Significat—uellent. add. F

(b) A: h5r; B: g8r; C: l1r; F: l1r

Mutuor aris atus sum per togliere imprestito. Sed est potius deponens et mutuo neutrum, de quibus (ut dixi) dicemus in exercitamentis.

As noted above these are the only places where the *Exercitamenta Grammatices atque Utriusque Linguae Fragmenta* is referred to with the abbreviated title *Exercitamenta Grammatica* or *Exercitamenta* by itself. It is possible, of course, but unlikely that the *Fragmenta* and the *Exercitamenta* were separate works. The use of the adjective *grammatica* with both nouns and the similar form of reference suggest rather that they are different ways of designating the same work. However, there is no apparent reason why Aldus preferred the short title *Fragmenta* to *Exercitamenta.*

Both of the above passages occur in the midst of lists of verbs. Passage (a) is in the middle of a list of active verbs of the third species. The principal parts of mutuo are given together with the meaning in Italian and a gloss (quod non redditur idem) which serves to distinguish its meaning from that of commodo. The sentence, Sed de mutuo abunde dicemus in exercitamentis grammaticis, is in effect parenthetical. Similarly, passage (b) occurs in a list of passive verbs. The sed both introduces the parenthetical reference and also indicates that Aldus does not accept this view of mutuor which he believes to be a deponent verb. The explanation added in F states the gist of the question: mutuo and mutuor both mean “receive.” The addition indicates that in 1514 or at whatever time between 1508 and 1514 Aldus inserted this comment in the text of the fourth edition of the Latin Grammar, the prospects for the publication of the *Fragmenta/Exercitamenta* were still remote.

*Mutuo* and *mutuor* were active and passive respectively in medieval

---

57 Both cite Quintilian, 1, 4, 29, and use several of the same illustrations: miserabilis uis, optimum factu, iucunda cognitu, obscoenum aspectu, homo dignus amatu.
Latin and usually meant "to lend" and "to be lent" as Aldus indeed glosses them in these two passages. This semantic development and differentiation in usage seems to have begun in the late Latin period.\(^58\) In the classical period, however, both verbs mean "to borrow." The deponent mutuo is the standard form; mutuo is very rare in the extant literature. This meaning and the use of the two forms of the verb is also supported by the grammarians; Priscian includes mutuo: mutuor in his list of verbs which have the same meaning in the active and passive voice (GLK, 2, 396, 13). The classical usage, especially of mutuor, thus conflicted with fifteenth century usage. The humanists tried to reconcile the two.

Valla distinguishes mutuo: mutuor from foenero: foeneror, and defines mutuo as meaning mutuō dare and mutuor as mutuō accipere (Elegantiae V, 25). Perotti rightly criticizes Valla's description of the syntax of these verbs, but still subscribes to the same view of their active and passive meaning. He states in his Cornucopiae: Mutuo, et mutuor ita differunt, quod qui pecuniam dat mutuo, is mutuare dicitur; qui uero accipit, is pecuniam mutuatur.\(^59\) Both Valla and Perotti are of course describing contemporary rather than classical usage. An attempt to combine the two can be seen in Sulpitius Verulanus' Grammar. In his first edition he says mutuo has the same construction as solo uo with the accusative and dative as in mutuo pecunias tibi. Neither solo uo nor mutuo can be used in the passive voice with a personal subject. Mutuo is therefore a deponent and takes the accusative and ablative as in mutuor nummos a te.\(^60\) He thus classifies mutuo as a neuter verb (that is, a verb without a passive) like aro and mutuor as a deponent. However, in his revised edition he notes that this is a modern usage: mutuo as recentiores utuntur per prestare cose che se restituischono simili.\(^61\) Sulpitius seems to have shifted his view somewhat in the light of Perotti's statements in the Cornucopiae (p. 704, 48 ff.).

Aldus evidently follows the earlier position of Sulpitius in construing mutuo as a neuter verb and mutuor as a deponent. But he must also have been more concerned about classical than contemporary usage. The two texts cited in the addition in F were probably taken from his discussion in the Exercitamenta/Fragmenta. The sentence from Caesar (B.C., 3, 60, 5) shows that mutuor is a deponent. But the main point at issue was whether mutuo meant "lend" or "borrow." The citation from Valerius Maximus

\(^58\) Cf. TLL, VIII, 1732, v. mutuor.


\(^60\) (Paris, n.d.), p. e5v.

\(^61\) (Venice, 1489), p. e4v.
proves it meant "borrow." Aldus presumably then demonstrated the
correct classical usage of these verbs in the *Fragmenta*.

C. Pronunciation

14. (a) B: l4⑩; C: o7⑩; F: o8⑩ (not in A)

Quanquam ήτα duplex ε psilon, sicut ωμέγα duplex omicron esse existimo,
et non i, sed e sonare debere. Quare dictiones graecas, in quibus est η litera,
perperam nunc pronuntiandi ostendemus in fragmentis grammaticis.

These two sentences, inserted in the middle of a paragraph on the
decision of Greek words in Latin, are the earliest datable indication of
Aldus' scholarly interest in the correct pronunciation of Greek and the
first evidence that this subject will be treated in the *Fragmenta*. The
significant factor is that he views the contemporary (Byzantine) pron-
nunciation as erroneous (*perperam*).

(b) C: c6⑩; F: c6⑩

Quanquam η non i sed e longum pronuntiasse antiquos graecos existimo.
constant enim η ex duplici ε ε sicut ω ex duplici oo. Sed et de his in fragmentis.

(c) C: aa8⑩; F: &7⑩

Quod si dixeris in quibusdam e supradictis mutari η in e longum, respondeo
antiquos graecos sic pronuntiasse ήτα, ut nos e longum in Penelope, gram-
matice, Aristoteles. Sed de hoc multa in fragmentis nostris.

(d) C: y1⑩; F: x7⑩

Perperam igitur puto haec nomina scribi per iōτα, erroremque inde natum,
quia aetate nostra ήτα et ιότα eodem sono pronuntiantur. quanquam ne
hoc quidem probo. Sed de hoc in fragmentis nostris.

(e) D: i 4⑩

Quoniam Acinaces Graece άκινάκης dicitur. Suidas, 'Άκινάκης μικρὸν δόρυ
περσικῶν, non Acinacis imprimendum, ut erat in exemplaribus, sed Acinaces
iusissimus.62 Et puto natum errorem, quia nunc Graeci ήτα, non e longum,
sed i pronuntiant, quanquam et ipsi meo iudicio perperam. η enim non i,
vede longi sonum habere debet. Sed de hoc alius erit tractatus. Hinc para-
clitum dicimus illos imitati, cum et nobis et Graecis paracletus dicendum
est. παράκλητος enim scribitur Graece.63

62 At Horace, C., 1, 27, 5: lucernis Medus acinaces. The MSS, which all modern
editors follow, read acinacis. The text actually printed in the Aldine edition is acináce! The
acute accent on the short a, which violates the rules of the Latin accent, is doubtless also
the result of Aldus' orders. He states in his Latin Grammar (C:aa8) that the Greek accent
should be kept on Greek words in Latin. Aldus similarly had Monaeses printed for Monaesis
at C., 3, 6, 9, which he then construes as a nominative singular.

63 The example of *paracletus* which is not elsewhere used by Aldus for any purpose may
have been suggested to him by Erasmus who was working and living with Aldus at the
time the Horace edition was going through the press in the winter and early spring of
15. (a) (A?)64; B: a6v; C: b1v–2r; F: b1v–2r

Ex uocalibus quot fiunt diphthongi? quinque.* ae, oe, au, eu, ei,† ut aestimo, coepi, aula, eurus, orphi. Sed ei graeca est, quae apud antiquos in frequen-
tissimo usu fuit, nunc autem pene exoleuit.‡
Quot scribuntur et proferuntur? duae. au et eu, ut audio, euge. Quot scribuntur et non proferuntur? tres.§ ae, oe, ei,|| ut Caesar, Phoebus, omneis. Quanquam mihi non ita uidetur; non enim ita pronuntiasse antiquos credimus. Sed de his dicemus in fragmentis nostris grammaticis.#

(b) C: y6r; F: y5r

Heu et hei diphthongi sunt, ut eheu quam pingui macer est mihi Taurus in eruo, et Hei mihi qualis erat. Ubi quia cum pronuntiamus hei, utraque uocalis simul sonat, admonemur et graece et latine diphthongos prope omneis perperam aetate nostra pronuntiari, ut obiter et hoc dixerim.

The view stated in the 1501 Rudimenta that there are only four diphthongs is derived from Priscian (GLK, 2, 37, 13 f. and 40, 10–15) and Servius (GLK, 4, 423, 30–32).65 But the ancient grammarians also mentioned the fifth diphthong, ei, at least in connection with the interjection hei.66 Aldus, however, after surveying these multifarious statements in the grammarians and other authorities like Quintilian and Gellius, evidently came to a positive conclusion about the existence and correct orthography and pronunciation of the ancient diphthongs and especially the fifth diphthong ei. His efforts to revive its use in contemporary Latin is a striking example of the combination of scholarship and zealous practical endeavor that is the peculiar characteristic of Aldus’ humanism.

1509. The sentence, hine etc., looks very much like an afterthought or addition to the original text. Erasmus had recently edited Valla’s Annotationes in Novum Testamentum (1505) which were in fact the foundation of his own future annotations on the New Testament. Valla had commented on the false accentuation of paracletus (or rather paraclitus) in Latin, in his note on John, 14:22. Erasmus may well have drawn this point to Aldus’ attention. It was subsequently to become the place where Erasmus himself started the disputation which was eventually to be turned into his De Recta Latini Graecque Sermonis Pronuntiatiome Dialogus; see note 23 above.

64 These pages are missing from the Venice copy of A; however, it is most likely that A had the same text as B.
65 Cf. Diomedes, GLK, 1, 427, 14 f. and Terentianus Maurus, id., 6, 338, 418–422.
The first version of the Latin Grammar while acknowledging the former existence of the diphthong \( ei \) accepts the view that it is now obsolete. The revised version, however, notes that it was very widely used in antiquity (\textit{in frequentissimo usu}). This notion comes of course from statements in the grammarians and not from any external evidence of ancient orthography. Diomedes, for example, says: \( ei \), cum apud veteres frequentaretur, usu posteritatis explosa est \((GLK, 1, 427, 15)\). More significant perhaps for Aldus was the use made by the grammarians of this diphthong in their explanations of morphology and the orthography of particular classical authors. Priscian, for instance, employs the phonological development of \( ei \) into long \( i \) to account for certain verb forms which he says the ancients \((antiqui)\) used to pronounce with the diphthong \( ei \).\(^{67}\) That Aldus understood Priscian to be referring to authors of the classical period may be inferred from his treatment of Catullus 64. 319: Catullus, Vellera urgati custodebant calathisci, custodebant pro custodiebant per \( ei \) diphthongum melius scribitur more antiquo \((C: \text{r2})\). The diphthong \( ei \) was also discussed by the grammarians as a way of writing long \( i \). Priscian says: i quoque apud antiquos post e ponebatur et \( ei \) diphthongum faciebat, quam pro omni \( i \) longa scriebant more antiquo Graecorum \((GLK, 2, 37, 9-11)\).\(^{68}\) Quintilian throws some light on this statement. In his discussion of orthography he remarks that \( e \) and \( i \) were used as the Greeks used \( ei \) to distinguish cases and number \((1, 7, 15-17)\). He quotes some lines of Lucilius to illustrate this practice which Quintilian himself criticizes as unnecessary and inconvenient. Gellius mentions Nigidius Figulus as employing a similar spelling \((N.A., 13, 26, 4)\).\(^{69}\)

These two perspectives would appear to Aldus to be combined in a passage like Priscian on the endings of the nominative and dative-ablative plural of second declension nouns: veteres enim i finalem, quae est longa, per "\( ei \)" diphthongum scriebant \((GLK, 2, 298, 4 \text{ f.})\). This passage could be put together with Priscian's account of the accusative plural of the \( i \)-stem nouns \((\text{ibid.}, 358, 3-362, 2)\) and in particular with the statement \((358, 3-7)\): inveniuntur tamen quaedam in "\( is \)" solam productam terminantia hunc casum Graeca, quae etiam nominativo similiter in "\( is \)" desinunt: "hae Sardis has Sardis," item "Alpis," "Syrtis,"

\(^{67}\) GLK, 2, 452, 24 ff., 454, 23-25, 557, 16-20.

\(^{68}\) The subject was disputed extensively among the grammarians; cf. Victorinus, GLK, 6, 8, 14 ff., 17, 21 ff., 66, 24 ff.; Ter. Scaurus, \textit{id.}, 7, 18, 23 ff., 32, 21 ff.; Velius Longus, \textit{id.}, 7, 55, 27 ff., 77, 1 ff. There is no way of knowing which, if any of these authors and texts were known to Aldus.

\(^{69}\) Aldus would have read Gellius in the text presented in part by the MSS OXII and in part by Q. This is clear from the Aldine edition of 1515, edited by Johannes Baptista Egnatius, where the text gives forms like \textit{magnei, amiciet}. 
"Trallis," quae apud Graecos in supra dictis casibus as diphthongum habent finalem. It is easy to see how Aldus could have applied this statement about the ancients' use of ei for long i to the declension of nouns and have concluded that the correct classical form of the accusative plural of words like tres, omnes, fontes was treis, omneis, fonteis. This conclusion seemed to be confirmed by statements such as that of Terentianus Maurus in his De Syllabis (GLK, 6, 338, 461-466):

"eitur in silvam" necesse est E et I conectere:
principalini namque verbo nascitur, quod est eo.
sic oveis plureis et omneis scribimus pluraliter:
non enim nunc addis E, sed permanet sicut fuit;
lector et non singularem nominativum sciet
vel sequentem, qui prioris saepe similis editur.

It must have been considerations like the above which underlay the remarks in the letter to "Students" which Aldus placed at the end of the edition of Virgil which he published in April 1501. He begins by saying:

Si quisquam est, qui accusandi casus in is per ei diphthongum miratur excusos typis nostris, id a nobis consulta factum ne sit nescius, tum quia facere ad eruditionem uidebatur, tum etiam, ut imitarentur antiquos, qui dandi etiam, et auferendi casus in is, sedem accusandi per ei diphthongum scripsisse leguntur, ut uieis, officieis, captiueis, pro uieis, officiis, captiuis. Sed hi nunc penitus exoleuerunt. Accusatiuos autem eorum tantum nominum, de quibus Priscianus meminit ad recti, patriique casus differentiam per ei scribere operae pretium ducimus. Praesertim in Poetis Plauto, Lucretio, Catullo, Vergilio, et antiquis caeteris. Nam in aliis nondum ausim propter Criticos.

"Learning" (eruditio) and "imitation of the ancients" (ut imitaremur antiquos)—these are Aldus' motives. The reference to Priscian is evidently to the passage in GLK, 2, 358, noted above; the statement on the dative- ablative endings is an inference from other passages in Priscian.70 As is clear from the changes in spelling in successive editions of the Latin Grammar, Aldus adopted himself the orthographical practices he recommended. He had a special type for this diphthong cast for his fonts, and introduced rules like the following into the third edition of the Grammar:

(i) C: c4

Quare dixisti hos fonteis? quia quae genitium pluralem in ium faciunt, accusatium eiusdem numeri in eis mittunt per ei diphthongum, ut hos fonteis, has parteis et partes, hos et has omneis, treis.71

70 The actual linguistic facts are set out in R. G. Kent, The Forms of Latin (Baltimore, 1946), pp. 27, §224, 32, §237, and 46, §268.

71 Someone apparently raised an objection to this practice, because Aldus adds to this passage in F: quanquam A. Gellius lib. xii. capite xix docet testimonio Probi Valerii, qui
(ii) C: r8ρ

sed quīs et accusatiui in is, tum ut differant a nominatio singulari, tum etiam, ut diphthongo longos esse significetur, per ei melius scribuntur, quod et antiquos fecisse legitimus.

There is to be sure no explicit testimony that all these matters were reviewed in the *Fragmenta*. But as will be clear below, it seems unlikely that no mention at all was made of them in connection with the larger problem of the correct pronunciation of the diphthongs.

16. Cd: aa3v; Fd: aa3v

\[\text{AΛ αι nunc}^* \text{ facit ae, olim}^+ \text{ puto omnes diphthongi pronuntiabantur, ut 'ΑΛΙΙΣ, αιγις aegis.}\]

* nunc add. Fd  † olim ... pronuntiabantur add. Fd

The earliest editions of the *De litteris Graecis* (1495, 1497, and 1501) have here only AΛ αι facit e ut 'ΑΛΙΣ, αιγις aegis. An edition which was published without date as an appendix to Lascaris' *Erotemata* (also without date), but probably in 1502 or 1503 first gives ae instead of e as the Latin equivalent of αι. Similarly Μαία (page m3v) is transliterated as maea though it is mea in the earlier editions. Consistency, however, is not found. On page m3v ψελλίζομαι is transliterated psellizome, but changed to psellizomae in Fd. The difficulty Aldus had in imposing his own views upon his own texts is amply illustrated by the treatment of eta in the *De litteris Graecis*. The passage given above as No. 14 (f) from Fd appears in the earlier editions thus: Η γ facit i longum ut ΦΝΗ, φινη phini. In Fd the text and the pronunciation are revised, but not the example which is still printed as phini! A comparison of the texts of the *De litteris Graecis* could suggest either a certain amount of confusion in Aldus' mind over the sounds of Greek or even a lack of sincerity on his part. The variations and the inconsistencies really arise from the difficulty of preparing the copy for the compositor and then of course seeing that he follows it. All of the editions of the *De litteris Graecis* after the *editio princeps* in 1495 were set in type from marked up copies of a previously printed version. Aldus had to squeeze his comments and revisions into this text as best he could.

The first edition which appeared in 1495 presents a thoroughly Byzantine pronunciation, which suggests that Aldus may not yet have come to hold his new views on this subject, and in particular on the pronunciation of eta. A slight change occurs in the 1497 *Breuissima Introductio* through the

---

Aeneida manu ipsius Vergilii legit, urbis accusatium pluralem, per i literam scribi debere. sed de huiusmodi accusatiuis multa in annotationibus nostris in Vergilii opera scripsimus.
addition of *e longum* after *Ita* in the Table of Letters; however, this is only ancient grammatical doctrine and need imply nothing about pronunciation. But there is a somewhat more subtle change when the phrase *η* _mutatur in e longum ut pνευλότη* _penelōpe* (1495) becomes *η* *e longum etc. in 1501*. The statement that *η* is also changed into *ae diphthongum ut κήρη* [*κήρός 1501] _caera scήnη_ *scena_ _skνυνότηγ_ _scenopethegia* [sic] _ήθική_ _aethica* is not altered until 1514 when Aldus inserts the qualifying phrases _ut quidam volunt_ (presumably not himself) before _in ae diphthongum and quibus ipse non accedo_ after _aethica_. Similar minor changes or additions dealing with some of the other vowels are scattered throughout the treatise and indicate a change in Aldus' views about the pronunciation of Greek. However, not every reference to the contemporary Byzantine pronunciation gets corrected. Great caution must therefore be used in drawing any inferences from this particular work about Aldus' views. Nevertheless, it is abundantly clear that a shift in his point of view is taking place sometime around 1500–1501.

17. (a) Vergilius. Venice: Aldus, April 1501


(b) C: *aa7v*-8r*; F: &6v* 7r*

[The Latin rules for accentuation are not observed because of] Idiomate, cum graecum vocabulum, nulla nec temporis nec literarum facta mutatione, ad nos uenit. Tunc enim seruat accentum graecum, ut Tegéa, Neméa, Créusa, Aréthusa, Amaryllis, Amaryllida, Coridón, Simoéis, Arcádes, Cíclopé, Cíclopás, Penelópe, Pentecosté, Aristotéles, Demothénes, et id genus quam plurima ... [cf. No. 14 (c)] ... In Aristotélis autem, aristótélem, aristótèle accentus est in antepenultima, quia latine declinantur. Comoediá autem, Tragoediá, Sóphiá, symphóniá, et similia mutant accentum, cum corrípitur ultima. Graece enim _καμψίδια, τραγῳδία, σοφία, συμφωνία_* dicitur. Nos comoediá, tragoediá, sóphiá, symphóniá, ultima correta.

---

72 Similarly the note in 1495 (A7r) on the meaning of the abbreviations IHS—*η* cum sit ita graeca uocalis quae apud nos in *e longum* frequentius commutatur ut *ΠΣΩΤΣ* IESVS—becomes in 1501: cum sit *η* *πُα* graeca uocalis, quae est e productum tam apud nos, quam apud Graecos, ut *ΠΣΩΤΣ* IESVS.

73 Two examples: the comment, *η* cum *i* subscripto facit *i longum* ut *τυ* *μοι* *μι* *τι* *μ* _musi_, remains unchanged in all editions. The name of the Greek letter *Ν* is transcribed *Gni* in the 1495, 1497, 1501 and undated (ca. 1502) editions; this is changed to *Ni* (l) in the 1508 edition.
The edition of Virgil with the letter addressed to the Studiosi from which passage (a) is extracted was finished in April 1501. The second edition of the Latin Grammar which does not contain Book IV and the discussion of accents did not appear until February 1502 (1501 Venetian style). It seems unlikely that Aldus would have published the second edition of the Latin Grammar without Book IV or at least without the passages on accents (a regular part of an Ars Grammatica) if this material was already written and at hand. The reference in passage (a) then is probably not to the discussion of the Greek accent as it was to appear later in the third edition of the Latin Grammar, but to a more contemporary treatment. Moreover, the remarks on the Greek accent in the Latin Grammar do not constitute an answer to the question, why I, Aldus, think Aristoteles, etc. should be pronounced with a Greek instead of a Latin accent. It thus seems more likely that the phrase, alibi ostendemus, is a reference to the Fragmenta. That the Fragmenta contained a discussion of the effect of accents upon vowel quantity is evident from No. 18 below. How extensive this discussion may have been and to what degree it may have been related to the treatment of accents in Book IV of the Latin Grammar cannot of course be determined from the surviving evidence. But it does seem likely that the Fragmenta included a detailed treatment of the effect of the (stress) accent on the contemporary pronunciation of both Greek and Latin, the nature of the accent in the two languages with ample illustration from the ancient grammarians, and probably an exhortation to restore the correct pronunciation of the ancients.

18. Cd: aa6r; Fd: aa6r


* ut nunc nos pronuntiamus] pronuntiamus add. Fd

These sentences are added to the penultimate section, De diphthongis improprie, of the De literis Graecis. They are thus a comment on both the immediate subject of the Greek diphthongs and their Latin equivalents in loan words and on the larger question of correct pronunciation which was obviously crystallized for Aldus in the contemporary sounds of the Greek vowels. Aldus seems clearly bothered by the issue of correctness. He is just not interested in recovering the ancient sounds, but in demonstrating the errors in contemporary pronunciation of Greek and Latin alike and in
revealing the sources of those errors such as the effect of improperly used accents. These sentences were added to the 1508 version of the De litteris Graecis. As Drerup noticed, the future participle *disputaturi* implies that the *Fragmenta* are still in the process of being written. The next datable reference in No. 19 below suggests that the work is close to or already complete.

19. E: &2v–3v

Hoc loco non uidetur silentio praetereundum, quod de *aē* diphthongo hic scribitur usus verbis: *nār thēseī *makkra elláttow *éstī *tīs *fūsēi *makkros. *ępēi kai *tō *a *fūsēi *makkran, *meižōn *ésti *tīs *aē *diphthōγγου *tīs *ēχουσής *tō *ē *ekφωνούμενον. *o *nār *pouīw *ērγουν *dūo *στρατιωτῶν, *iaχυρότερός *ēstīn *ēkeīnōn. Quandoquidem uel hinc colligi potest actate nostra, et maiorum ab hinc annos octingentos, ac plus eo, perperam diphthongos omnis, et pronuntiari, et pronuntiatum esse, uidelicet *ē *natura longum maius esse *aē diphthongo, quae, *i *quod pronuntietur, habeat, perperam, ac barbarae eam nunc proferimus, cum e legimus; nam et *aē, et *i in ea sonum habere suum debent confusum in unam syllabam, ut ab *aē incipias, et in *i desinas, quemadmodum in *oū, et *ē diphthongis facimus. Praeterea diphthongos omnis proprias hoc modo pronuntiandum esse, patet ipso nomine. Diphthongos enim dicitur, quod duas phthongos hoc est sonos, et uoces habeat: id quod et Terentianus ait hoc trohaicis:

*Porrō uocalem scuta, uim tenet uocalium,*
*Et sonos utrosque iungit; unde diphthongos cas*
*Graeciae dicunt magistri, quod duae iunctae simul*
*Syllabam sonant in unam, uique gemina prodictae.*

At si *aē, oē* et *eī i, oū ulegas, ut nunc barbarae legimus, non diphthongos, sed monophthongos proponenti undis facies, cum sonum utrisque quae in diphthongo propra est uocalis iungere debeas in unam syllabam. Nam *i* in omni diphthongo propra *ekφωνούμενον* dicitur in Grammaticis contra *āνεκφωνούμένον* in diphthongo impropra. Atqui si *aē* e sonat, nec *a* nec *i* profertur. *ū* etiam in *oū* diphthongo *ekφωνούμενον* quemadmodum in *oū*, et *ē* diphthongis, esse debet, ut ab *oū* paruo incipias, et desinas in *ū*. Sonum autem *oū* diphthongi idest in, et nunc male proferimus, *ū* uocalem apud antiquissimos habuisse existimo. Signum est, quod nunc quoque quod Graeci *ē* nos duo dicimus, et quod illi *oū*, *μος, θυλη, ρωμυλος*, nos sus, mus, Thule, Romulus dicimus, et alia id genus sexcenta.

*Eodem modo η, et ὅ, et ζ, et ὅ non recte prostantiamus. Nam η et ε, proximum, ac penē eundem sonum habere debent, hoc est e ut η pröferas clarius, et sub palato, ζ uero minore sono in guttur. Exempli gratia, ut η*

74 There is no trace of this topic elsewhere in Aldus' surviving writings, but Erasmus devoted considerable space to it in his *De Recta Pronuntiatio*; cf. his *Opera Omnia* (Leiden, 1703), I, 939E–949B.

75 (Above, note 20). The future remains unchanged in subsequent editions of the *De literis Graecis.*
proferas ut e latine loquens in dictione debes, ε uero, ut e in dictionibus hisce uulgaribus: chē dīcē, chē pāne mangia, chē uino bēue. cum barbare loqueris, ut nunc uulhus. Sic o magnum praferendum, ut o in dictione bōnō cum latine nunc loquimur. Nam apud antiquos nostros o breue, et o longum non eundem sonum habuisse existimo. O uero paruum, ut o in eadem dictione bono, si ut uulhus dixeris: e bōnō hōmō, et miō amicō. Sic eas litteras pronuntiari debere Terentianus praecipit, cum dicit:

Litteram nanque ε uidemus esse ad ητα, proximam, Sicut ơ et ]|[ uidentur esse uicinæ sibi.

Temporum momenta distant, non sono natuiitas.

η praeterea non i sed ε longum sonare debere ostendit etiam Eustathius, in Homerum inquiens βη μυητον της των προβατων φωνῆς. Idem βη βη φωνῆς προβατων σημαντικον. Kai φέρεται παρ’ αὐλὸς διονυσίω χρήσις κρατίνου τουμάτη· ὁ δ’ ἥλιθος ὕσπερ προβατων βη βη λέγων βαδίζει. Oues uero non ui ui, ut nunc βη βη barbare pronuntiamus. Sed be be balant, et est balant pro belant à βη mutatione η in a dorice, ut μήτηρ mater. Vnde et id colligimus, β sic pronuntianandum ut b apud nos profertur, non ut u consonans, uel F. digamma Aeolicum. Alpha igitur, et beta et graecis ipsis dicendum, ut nos dicimus, non alpha, et ueta: id, quod ex hebreis acceptum est, qui alpha, et Beth non uith dicunt. Sed de his in fragmentis nostris longe plura. Ubi etiam γ, λ, ν, sequente ζ uel u, uel ει, uel οι perperam à graecis nunc pronuntiari ostendimus, sicut apud nos, et diphthongos omneis, et c, et g, sequente i et e, et ti sequente uocali.

Sed de his in fragmentis nostris longe plura: the passage above is the longest and most comprehensive statement left by Aldus of the contents of the Fragmenta, at least on the subject of pronunciation. It exists solely by the accident of Aldus’ poor planning of the presswork for the 1512 edition of Constantine Lascaris’ Erotemata and sundry other Greek grammatical treatises printed with it. Latin translations were made, largely by Aldus himself. The Greek texts and the Latin translations were printed in separate gatherings in such a way that they could be bound together with the Latin translation facing the Greek original. Aldus ran out of material to fill all of the pages in three of these gatherings (γ, δ, and η) so he used these pages for a list of errata. But the situation is best described in Aldus’ own words:

Quoniam hae duae pagellae, in medio huiusce quaternionis, uacuae, et non scriptae superfluissent, nisi quid aliu in ipsis excudendum curassem (nihil enim erat e regione, quod interpretari oportet, ut in reliquis factum uides) placuit, ut in ipsis, et in iis, quae id genus sequuntur in medio duorum, qui deinceps sequuntur quaternionum, errata corrigenda adnotarentur, quae in his de graecarum proprietate linguarum tractatibus partim inter impressionem, partim exemplarium deprauatorum culpa, facta animaduertimus. Iaque celeriter uix non credas, quam si occupatus. non habeo certe tempus non modo corrigendis, ut cuperem diligentius, qui excusi
emittuntur libris cura nostra, summisque die, noctuque laboribus, sed ne perlegendis quidem cursim, id, quod, si uideres miseresceret te Aldi tui, quae tua est humanitas, cum saepe non uacet uel cibum sumere, uel aluum leuare. Interdum ita distinemur, utraque occupata manu, atque coram, id expectantibus impressoribus, quod habetur in manibus, tum importune, rusticque instantibus, ut ne nasum quidem liceat emungere. o provinciam quamdurissimam! diuinabam equidem id futurum, uix eam aggressus, cum in fronte eius libri, quae κανωνίσματα appellantur κίχω κέει αὐτῆ κακὸν scrip-simus, quod sic nobis malum creaturi essemus, ut turdus sibi. Sed creauerim, si sic iuvero: ea est haec nostra provincia. . . . Inter errores, qui corrigendi sunt, quaedam obiter dicturi sumus, quae, ut puto, non displicebunt, ut uel in erroribus prosim.  

The approximately two pages of comment on pronunciation are thus obiter dicta as Aldus seeks to benefit his readers even in the midst of errors. The impact they, or rather the ideas and assumptions incorporated in them and communicated orally through the discussions in the Aldine Academy, had upon the history of classical scholarship and upon education has yet to be fully explored. But that is another task. I will conclude this one by noting that the motives which Aldus voices in the middle of the hurry-burly of the printing shop are the same ones which seemingly inspired his first publishing venture in Greek grammar. In the preface to the 1495 edition of the De literis Graecis Aldus Manucius Romanus greets the studious and says inter alia:

Omnem enim uitam decreuimus ad hominem utilitatem consumere. Deus est mihi testis nihil me magis desyderare quam prodesse hominibus, quod et anteacta uita nostra ostendit ubicunque uiximus et ostensurum speramus (quando id uolumus) indies magis quandiu uiximus in hac lachrymarum ualle et plena miseriae. Dabo equidem operam ut quantum in me est semper prosim. Nam etsi quietam ac tranquillam agere uitam possimus, negotiosam tamen eligimus et plenam laboribus. Natus est enim homo non ad indignas bono uiro et docto uoluptates, sed ad laborem et ad agendum semper aliquid uiro dignum. Non torpeamus igitur non uitam in otio uentri somnoque reliquisque uoluptatibus indulgentes transeamus ueluti 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 tamen multis uerbis dixi amore incredibili erga omnis homines incitatus meo.  

76 Sig. y4v.  
77 A task initiated in the twentieth century by Ingram Bywater, The Erasmian Pronunciation of Greek and Its Predecessors (London, 1908). Drerup's discussion of Aldus in his monumental history of the school pronunciation of Greek (above, note 20) is regrettable marred by numerous errors.  
The voice of Italian humanism sounds clear and strong. It is our misfortune that we have today only these scanty fragments of what was surely Aldus' most original work, but they are enough to attest his ingenuity and his persistent industry. Whatever it was that frustrated the author's expectations, the publisher's promises which echo in these prefaces are not devoid of meaning and sincerity.
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