THE
UNIVERSITY
OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

AN EARLIER FORM OF PETRARCH'S *CANZONIERE*

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

BY

RUTH SHEPARD PHELPS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

DECEMBER, 1924

I am glad of this opportunity to express my sense of obligation to Dean Ernest H. Wilkins of the University of Chicago, at whose suggestion I undertook this investigation, and by whose criticism and counsel I have greatly profited during its progress; and to thank the Library of Cornell University for the generosity with which, through the good offices of the University of Chicago, it has put at my disposal the riches of the Fiske Collection of Petrarchiana.

AN EARLIER FORM OF PETRARCH'S CANZONIERE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Chapter I. The Chigi Manuscript	6
Chapter II. The Arrangement According to Chronology. Table.	16
Chapter III. The Arrangement According to Form. Table.	219
Chapter IV. The Arrangement According to Content. Table.	221
Chapter V. The Application of the Threefold Principle. Joint Table.	225
Chapter VI. The Division into Parts	242
Chapter VII. The Composition and Arrangement of the Final Form of the Canzoniere	258
Chapter VIII. Conclusions	279
Bibliography	283

AN EARLIER FORM OF PETRARCH'S CANZONIERE

INTRODUCTION

To the true poet whatever touches him is matter for a poem. Everything he looks on stirs him more intensely than it would other people, and his looks go everywhere. A book, a jest, a friend, a landscape, a gift, a gesture of the loved one, above all an emotion, all such things, give him that moment of vivid sensation which it is the poet's extreme need to record and in recording beautify. Petrarch was preëminently such a poet; his sonnets and canzoni nearly all are evidently the immediate response to some episode of his outer or inner life, and during the years when Laura counted most it seems as if every episode must have forced its poem. Petrarch called these songs of his in the vernacular mere trifles, nugellas meas, but he was too good a judge to have been deceived as to their beauty, and the way he revised them over and over almost to the last moment shows he thought them worthy of his finest artistic retouching.

At some certain moment of his life there evidently came to him the idea of selecting a number of them and arranging them in an ordered collection, and with such work he busied himself at intervals to the end of his life. This idea we know he had begun to put into execution as early as

November 28, 1349, for in the autograph collection of drafts of poems, V. L. 3196,[1] appears the following entry (f. 13r) as a note to CCLXVIII: transcriptum non in ordine sed in alia papiro. 1349. novembris 28 mane.[2] And an entry made the following spring again attests that it was a growing and ordered collection (XXIII, f. 11v): post multos annos. 1350. Apl. 3. mane ... visum est et hanc in ordine transcribere.[3]

Three similar entries appear for the month of November, 1356:

(CCLXV, f. 101r, Collaz. Casanat.): Tr' in ordine 1356. dominico in vesperis. 6 novembris.[4]

(XXIII, f. 11r): Tr' in ordine post multos et multos annos. quibusdam mutatis. 1356. Iovis in vesperis. 10 novembris. mediolani.[5]

(CCLXVIII, f. 12v): Tr' in ordine aliquot mutatis. 1356. Veneris xi novembr. in vesperis.[6]

A very interesting entry for November 29, 1357, alludes to sending a copy of the collection as it was at

---

1. Il manoscritto vaticano latino 3196 autografo di Francesco Petrarca riprodutto in eliotipia a cura della Biblioteca Vaticana, Rome, 1895.
2. Carl Appel, Zur Entwicklung italienischer Dichtungen Petrarcas, Halle, 1891, 92.
3. Ibid., 76.
4. Ibid., 129.
5. Ibid., 71.
6. Ibid., 85.

that time to his friend Azzone da Correggio, Lord of Parma, and of the preparation of a similar copy for himself:

> (LXXVII and LXXVIII, f. 7r): Tr' isti duo in ordine post mille annos. 1357. Mercurii hora 3 novembris 29. dum volo his omnino finem dare, ne unquam amplius me teneant. et jam Jerolamus, ut puto, primum quaternum scribere est adortus pergamenum pro domino Azone, postea pro me idem facturus.[1]

Eleven years later he was still occupied with ordering his collection, for we find these two entries for the month of October, 1368:

> (CCVII, f. 15r): Tr' in alia papiro post xxii annos. 1368. dominico inter nonas et vesperas. 22 octobris. mutatis et additis usque ad complementum. et die lune in vesperis tr' in ordine membranis.[2]

> (CCCXXIV, f. 14r): Tr' in ordine post tot annos. 1368. octobris 31. mane.[3]

The latest entry of all on V. L. 3196 is for the following June:

> (CCXI, f. 5r): Mirum hoc cancellatum et damnatum post multos annos casu relegens absolvi et tr' in ordine statim. non obstante. 1369. Junii 22. hora 23. Veneris. pauca postea die 27 in vesperis mutavi. sive idem hoc ... erit(?).[4]

But we have other evidence that four years later, in the very year before his death, Petrarch was still sifting, collecting and rearranging his verses. In the letter[5] to

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 58.
2. Ibid., 101.
3. Ibid., 98.
4. Ibid., 51.
5. Francisci Petrarcae epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae, ed. Fracassetti, Florence, 1862 (to be referred to hereafter as "Fam., Frac."), III, 322-323; and for the date, Lettere di Francesco Petrarca, ed. Fracassetti, 1867 (to be referred to hereafter as "Fam., Frac. It."), V, 230-231.

Pandolfo Malatesta which accompanied the gift of a copy of his collection made at Pandolfo's request, he wrote on January 4, 1373:

> Nugellas meas vulgares, quae utinam tuis manibus, tuis oculis, tuoque iudicio dignae essent, per hunc nuntium tuum ad te familiariter venientes videbis. Non patienter modo, sed laete, non dubito, atque aliqua vel extrema bibliothecae tuae parte dignabere. In quibus multa sunt excusantionis egentia: sed benigni censoris iudicium subitura, veniam non desperant. In primis opusculi varietatem instabilis furor amantium de quo statim in principio agitur: ruditatem stili aetas excuset, nam quae legis magna ex parte adolescens scripsi. Si excusatio ista non sufficit, excuset me tuae petitionis auctoritas cui negare nil valeo. Non potes queri: habes quod petisti ... Plebeios apices, scriptorum raritas absolvat, qui huic fere studio nulli sunt; tarditatem scribentis inertia et bellorum fragor. ... Incorrectionem operis si qua erit, mea excuset occupatio, qua obsessus feci haec per alios revideri, quamquam ego ipse vix demum semel raptim oculo trepidante perlegerim. ... Sunt apud me huius generis vulgarium adhuc multa, et vetustissimis schedulis, et sic senio exesis ut vix legi queant. E quibus, si quando unus aut alter dies otiosus affulserit, nunc unum nunc aliud elicere soleo, pro quodam quasi diverticulo laborum; sed perraro, ideoque mandavi quod utriusque in fine bona spatia linquerentur: et si quidam occurret, mittam tibi reclusum nihilominus in papyro.

The final form of the collection, consisting of 366 poems, is represented by the famous partially autograph manuscript, V. L. 3195,[1] which is faithfully reproduced in

1. Pierre de Nolhac, Le canzoniere autographe de Pétrarque. Communication faite à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres par P. de Nolhac, Paris, 1886, and "Facsimilés de l'écriture de Pétrarque et Appendices au Canzoniere autographe," in Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, VII; Arturo Pakscher, "Aus einem Katalog des Fulvius Ursinus," in Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, X (1886), 205; (M. Vattasso), L'originale del Canzoniere de Francesco Petrarca. Codice vaticano latino 3195 riprodotto in fotografia a cura della Biblioteca Vaticana, Milan, 1905; (E. Modigliani), Il canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca riprodotto letteralmente dal cod. vat. lat. 3195, con tre fotoincisioni a cura di Ettore Modigliani, Rome, 1904.

most recent editions.

One manuscript, Chigi L. V. 176, preserves a shorter form of the collection consisting of 215 poems, arranged on a system strikingly similar, on its smaller scale, to that of V. L. 3195. This shorter form is clearly an earlier form, - identical, perhaps (though this can be but a matter of conjecture), with the form of which a copy was begun in 1357 for his friend Azzone. This earlier form of the collection has never been thoroughly examined as an independent work. To seek to understand the principle of its arrangement, and derive therefrom new light as to the arrangement of the final form, is the purpose of the present study.

CHAPTER I

THE CHIGI MANUSCRIPT

The Chigi manuscript known as L. V. 176 contains, as has been said, a portion of those poems of Petrarch's which constitute his Canzoniere as we know it in the published editions. According to the description of it by Enrico Narducci[1] in his catalogue of the Petrarch manuscripts preserved in the Roman libraries, it is the work of a fourteenth century scribe, occupies cc. 43v-78v of the manuscript, and is preceded by the rubric: Viri illustris atque poete celeberrimi francisci petrarce de Florentia rome nuper laureati fragmentorum liber incipit feliciter. It belonged in the sixteenth century to a Florentine, Jacobo Corbinelli by name, who was one of the many Italian exiles to take refuge at the court of Catherine de Médicis. He took the manuscript to Paris with him, where it was afterward acquired by Federigo Ubaldini, the first publisher of V. L. 3196,[2] who bequeathed it to the Chigi pope, Alexander VII.

That portion of the manuscript which is devoted to Petrarch and contains 215 out of the 366 poems of the

---

1. Catalogo dei codici petrarcheschi, Rome, 1874, 19-20.
2. Le rime di m. Francesco Petrarca estratte da un suo originale, ed. F. Ubaldini, Rome, 1642.

Canzoniere of the editions, is divided like the latter into two parts: The first part (43v-71r) includes with one exception 174 of the first 189 compositions as they stand in those numerous editions which follow the order of V. L. 3195; the second part (72r-78v), beginning as does V. L. 3195 with CCLXIV, I'vo pensando, consists of 41 poems arranged in the order of V. L. 3195. The first part presents a few variations from that order of the corresponding group: it contains one ballata, Donna mi viene, CXXI, which Petrarch afterward rejected, substituting another for it in his own handwriting in V. L. 3195; numbers CLVII, CLVIII, CLXVI-CLXVIII, CLXXIV-CLXXV, CLXXIX-CLXXXIII, and CLXXXVI-CLXXXVIII are wanting, and the order of the last six presents a deviation which can best be shown in the following tables:

Chigi L. V. 176		V. L. 3195
CLXIX	Amor Natura	CLXXXIV
CLXX	Questa fenice	CLXXXV
CLXXI	Amor mi sprona	CLXXVIII
CLXXII	Per mezz'i boschi	CLXXVI
CLXXIII	Mille piagge	CLXXVII
CLXXIV	Passa la nave mia	CLXXXIX

Or, beginning with CLXVI, the last of those poems which are identical in both manuscripts (except CXXI), all the differences can be shown thus:

V. L. 3195	CHIGI L. V. 176
CLVI	CLVI
CLVII	
CLVIII	
CLIX	CLVII
CLX	CLVIII
CLXI	CLIX
CLXII	CLX
CLXIII	CLXI
CLXIV	CLXII
CLXV	CLXIII
CLXVI	
CLXVII	
CLXVIII	
CLXIX	CLXIV
CLXX	CLXV
CLXXI	CLXVI
CLXXII	CLXVII
CLXXIII	CLXVIII
CLXXIV	
CLXXV	
CLXXVI	CLXXII
CLXXVII	CLXXIII
CLXXVIII	CLXXI
CLXXIX	

CLXXX	
CLXXXI	
CLXXXII	
CLXXXIII	
CLXXXIV	CLXIX
CLXXXV	CLXX
CLXXXVI	
CLXXXVII	
CLXXXVIII	
CLXXXIX	CLXXIV

As to the date of Chigi L. V. 176, the phrase rome nuper laureati suggests that it was written, or at least copied from one that was written, during the poet's lifetime, and not so very many years after 1341. Cesareo has discussed the evidence in Appendix I to his study[1] of the arrangement of the Canzoniere, after comparing the Chigi manuscript with the corresponding poems in V. L. 3196, and also with the arrangement in V. L. 3195, which we know to have been made under Petrarch's eye and in part by his own hand. From this comparison it appears that the Chigi manuscript contains certain poems in a form which they had not received, under their continual reworkings at the hands of the scrupulous poet, earlier than 1356-1359.

---

1. Su le Poesie volgari del Petrarca, nuove ricerche, Rocca San Casciano, 1898, 289.

For example, of CCLXVIII, Che debb'io far? we possess two versions in V. L. 3196, the one (13r)[1] dated November 28, 1349: transcrip. non in ordine sed in alia papiro, and the other (12v),[2] which is apparently the transcription mentioned in the first, of the same date, with dates of various revisions in 1350-1351. Written above the whole is the note: 1356. veneris XI novembr. in vespris. transcriptum in ordine aliquot mutatis. This canzone in the Chigi manuscript contains the corrections of the second version of V. L. 3196, and certain others still, noted by Cesareo,[3] which are probably those alluded to in the phrase aliquot mutatis.

XXIII presents a similar case. The latest annotations to this poem in V. L. 3196 are of the year 1356: Just before the envoy is the note (11v)[4]: 1356. novembr. 4 sero dum cogito de fine harum nugarum, and above the whole poem (10v)[5]: tr' in ordine post multos et multos annos quibusdam mutatis. 1356. Iovis in vespris, 10 novemb. Mediolani. And sure enough, the form of the canzone as transcribed in V. L. 3195, though evidently based upon the later of these versions,[6] differs even from it in certain particulars -

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 92.
2. Ibid., 85-86.
3. Cesareo, op. cit., 292.
4. Appel, op. cit., 79.
5. Ibid., 71.
6. Cesareo, op. cit., 292-293.

quibusdam mutatis. The form of XXIII in the Chigi manuscript is the same as that of V. L. 3195.

Then the sonnets concerning Laura's portrait by Simone Martini, LXXVII and LXXVIII, bear the following note (7r)[1]: transcripti isti duo in ordine post mille annos 1357 mercur. hors 3 novembr. 29, and in the Chigi manuscript they occupy the same respective places as in V. L. 3195, into which - or into the copy from which V. L. 3195 was made - they were copied, evidently for the first time (post mille annos), in 1357.

Lastly, the three sonnets, CLIX, CCC, and CCCIII, bear traces of corrections in V. L. 3196, which look to Cesareo[2] to be contemporary with this marginal note to the first of them (5v)[3]: hunc dedi Jacobo ferrariensi portandum Thomasio ... 1359 octobris 18, and this to the other two (3v)[4]: hos duos misi Thomasio simul cum illo. In qual parte del ciel (CLIX). These sonnets in the Chigi manuscript show the latest alterations.[5]

As there is only one poem (CCCIV) in Chigi L. V. 176 which stands after the last of these sonnets, Amor che meco, CCCIII, it is reasonable to suppose that the manuscript (or

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 58.
2. Cesareo, op. cit., 294.
3. Appel, op. cit., 52.
4. Ibid., 42.
5. Cesareo, op. cit., 294.

its archetype) was finished before the close of 1359. And conversely, as XXIII is fairly near the beginning of Part I, it may well have been begun in the early months of 1357.

But where was it made, by whom, and why? Even though it corresponds so closely, as far as it goes, to the text of V. L. 3195, it is evidently not a copy of it, because of the differences of content already noted.[1] Yet because of these similarities to V. L. 3195, we may fairly conclude that if it was not done under Petrarch's direction, it is a copy of one that was. Now of manuscripts transcribed in Petrarch's house during the years 1357-1359, we have knowledge of only one, the one he sent to his friend Azzone da Correggio. There is an allusion to the collection for Azzone in the marginal note to LXXVII and LXXVIII in V. L. 3196 (7r)[2]: 1357. mercur hora 3 novembr. 29 ... et iam Jerolamus ut puto primum quaternum scribere est adortus pergamenum pro domino Azone, postea pro me idem facturus. We are not to believe, however, that Chigi L. V. 176 is either the original collection which went as a gift to Azzone, nor yet the copy of it which Petrarch in the same note shows that he intended having made for himself, and this for the very simple reason that there are numerous errors in spelling and inaccuracies of transcription[3] which Petrarch would

1. Vide supra, p.7.
2. Appel, op. cit., 58.
3. Cesareo, op. cit., 296.

never have permitted or overlooked in work carried on under his own supervision. Moreover, the fragmentorum liber begins on the back of f. 34, the face of which is occupied by the last of a miscellany of works by Dante, Guido Cavalcanti and Boccaccio, which fills the first sheets of the Chigi manuscript, so that it is not in a form suitable for a gift to any friend, much less one intended for the Lord of Parma. But a copy of the collection made for Azzone, Chigi L. V. 176, may very well be; if so, it must represent the selection and arrangement made according to Petrarch's own taste, out of the verses he had by him in those years, 1357-1359.

Indeed it must do that in any case. Whatever the date and origin of the Chigi manuscript, we may rest assured that as Cesareo says,[1] it was not a casual assemblage of Petrarch's poems put together haphazard. We are precluded from thinking that by its striking resemblance to the corresponding groups in the first and second parts of V.L.3195, and by the fact that its second part begins, like that of V. L. 3195, with CCLXIV, I'vo pensando, and not, as do nearly all the editions, with Oimè il bel viso, CCLXVII. Since the authority of V. L. 3195 has been established by Pierre de Nolhac[2] and A. Pakscher[3] as in part at least an autograph

---

1. Cesareo, op. cit., 294.
2. Op. cit.
3. Aus einem Katalog des Fulvius Ursinus.

document, we must accept its arrangement, and that of Chigi L. V. 176 which departs from it by such small differences, as having been determined by Petrarch himself. But determined upon what principle?

This question has never been studied with reference to the earlier form of the collection. It has been studied, however, with reference to the final form of the collection, by several writers, - Carlo Appel,[1] Arthur Pakscher,[2] Lorenzo Mascetta,[3] G. A. Cesareo,[4] and Henry Cochin,[5] - whose main conclusions may be noted here.

Pakscher[6] was certain that the order of the poems in V. L. 3195 was rigidly chronological, and having established this hypothesis he proceeded to invalidate his conclusions by using it relentlessly to determine all doubtful datings. Appel[7] had conjectured the year before that Petrarch had used a criterion partly chronological and partly artistic. Cesareo[8] and Henry Cochin[9] were agreed that the Canzoniere

---

1. Die berliner Handschriften der Rime Petrarcas, Berlin, 1887.
2. Die Chronologie der Gedichte Petrarcas, Berlin, 1887.
3. Il Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca, riordinato, etc., Lanciano, 1895.
4. Su le 'Poesie volgari' del Petrarca, nuove ricerche, Rocca San Casciano, 1898.
5. La Chronologie du Canzoniere de Pétrarque, Paris, 1898.
6. Die Chronologie, etc.
7. Die berliner Handschriften, etc.
8. Op. cit.
9. Op. cit.

was conceived as a kind of mystical romance, arranged according to artistic criteria which occasionally transgressed the chronological order for various reasons. As Cochin[1] phrases it:

> J'y vois[2] exposée et solidement confirmée la thèse même que je soutiens ici: le recueil de Pétrarque est conçu comme un vrai roman amoureux et mystique.

Lorenzo Mascetta, author of a fifth work[3] concerned with the arrangement of the Canzoniere, rearranged 103 of the poems of the first part in an order of his own, designed to throw into relief the roman as he conceived it of the lives of Petrarch and Laura. This arrangement he copyrighted, a needless precaution. His fantastic conclusions, since he took no account of the Vatican manuscripts, are negligible, but we shall have occasion at times to quote the evidence he adduces in support of them.

We shall find reason later to believe that no one of these conclusions is wholly sound as applied to V. L. 3195. Many of the detailed considerations advanced by these writers will, however, be utilized, so far as they are in point, in the study of the principle of the arrangement of the earlier form - the Chigi form - of the Canzoniere, which we now undertake.

---

1. Op. cit., 28.
2. In Cesareo, "La nuova critica del Petrarca," in Nuova Antologia, CLII (March 16, 1897), 258.
3. Op. cit.

CHAPTER II

There are three kinds of evidence as to the date of composition of Petrarch's poems: First, the external historical evidence which can be assembled and brought to bear upon allusions in the poems to historic events or personages; secondly, the manuscript V. L. 3196, a kind of poetical note-book in which Petrarch set down the rough draught of many poems, and often also their later revisions, and made marginal notes in his own handwriting which give a number of invaluable dates of composition or transcription; lastly and most important, the indications as to date of composition to be found in the poems themselves. These last are of two kinds, exact and inexact: for example, in the second canzone (XXX, 28-29):

oggi ha sett'anni
Che sospirando vo,

the date is indicated, at least by the poet's intention, to the very day; but then there are many poems which contain only vague indications, such as non pur una volta (LXVIII, 14), mille fiate (XXI, 1), lunga esperienza (LXXXVI, 10), gran tempo è che (XXXIX, 4), and many others, which tell us no more than that certain poems were composed later than the earliest years of Petrarch's love for Laura. Or that certain others (CCCXXI, 8, CCLXXXVI, 2-3, CCXCII, 1-8, etc.)

were composed after her death. Many poems contain no time-references whatever. In this chapter the attempt is made to study and evaluate all indications of time, regarding the poems of the Chigi manuscript, which are definite enough to permit of a probable dating within a given year or short series of years. The vaguer indications, while noted in order in the body of the chapter, do not appear in the table at the end of it.

I. Voi ch'ascoltate.

All that we know for certain about the date of this poem is contained in two notes in V. L. 3196, which concern the transcription in ordine, - the order, that is, of V. L. 3195, the authoritative manuscript transcribed partly in Petrarch's hand. (And that of the Chigi manuscript, as described above, is for the most part identical with it.) The very first mention of the transcription in ordine is in a note (V. L. 3196 f. 13r) to CCLXVIII, Che debb'io far? which is the fifth poem in Part II, according to the arrangement in those manuscripts: transcrip. non in ordine sed in alia papiro, 1349. novembris 28 mane.[1] The other note in question (V. L. 3196, f. 11v) is appended to XXIII: 1350. aprilis 3. visum est et hanc in ordine transcribere.[2]

---

1. Appel, Zur Entwicklung, etc., 92.
2. Ibid., 76.

From these notes it is clear that the transcription *in ordine* had been begun before November 28, 1349, and that by April 3, 1350, twenty-one poems of Part I had been transcribed *in ordine* after I. Cochin,[1] to be sure, reminds us that the transcription began much earlier, cf. the note to XXXIV (V. L. 3196, f. 9v)[2]: *ceptum transcribi (et incep.) ab hoc loco 1342 Aug. 21, hora 6*; and we might mention also the one to XLIX (f. 9r)[3]: *transcriptum 13 febr. 1337. Capranica*; but as neither one of these mentions transcription *in ordine*, they cannot afford us any data with respect to I, which, as explained in the following paragraph, we take to have been composed when that transcription was projected.

Now for conjecture. It seems almost certain that I was written as a proem to the whole collection. As Mascetta[4] points out, it has many of the characteristics of a preface: it mentions previous works, which are already numerous, and popular enough to justify collection; it contains a sort of apology (for their contradictory style); unlike any other poem in the *Canzoniere*, it is addressed to the reader. So, as a preface is usually written the last thing before publication, this poem was probably composed at the time, whenever that was, that Petrarch first

---

1. *Op. cit.*, 40.
2. Appel, *op. cit.*, 68.
3. *Ibid.*, 66.
4. *Op. cit.*, 69.

conceived the idea of arranging his poems according to a given plan. Of course he may have conceived this idea, and written I in accordance with it, some time before he began to put it into execution; or he may have begun early to carry it out, and then put it aside because of interruptions; or the copying of the first twenty-two poems may have gone steadily and rapidly, up to April 3, 1350, in which case it would have been begun not long before November 28, 1349.

Mascetta[1] notes some interesting resemblances between I and the prefatory letter at the head of the Familiar Letters[2] which confides Petrarch's Latin prose compositions to his friend Socrate, and the first Epistola metrica[3] which accompanies the Latin verse which he sent to his other friend Barbato.[4] But for these we have no certain date, except that the letter to Socrate must have been written after Petrarch's losses of 1348[5]: Millesimus

---

1. Op. cit., 70-79.
2. Fam., I, 1, Frac. I, 13.
3. Francisci Petrarchae florentini, philosophi, oratoris et poetae clarissimi, reflorescentis literaturae latinaeque ... opera quae extant omnia, etc., Basle, 1554, III, 1330. To be referred to hereafter as "Basle 1554."
4. Sparsa poemata, sparsa quidem et neglecta, and Institui exiguam sparsi tibi mittere partem Carminis, cf. I, 1, rime sparse; Jamque arsisse pudet, cf. I, 12; Mens horret relegensque alium putat ista locutum, cf. I, 4.
5. And not long after, according to Mascetta, who quotes (loc. cit.): Eisdem [amicis] mox una pene omnibus ruina obrutis.

trecentesimus quadragesimus octavus annus est, qui nos solos atque inopes fecit; and besides, the similarity really proves nothing, inasmuch as Petrarch might easily have imitated I, and revamped its ideas in the letter and the metrical epistle.

Cesareo[1] decided for a very late date, 1356-1357, and Cochin[2] yields a qualified assent; but Cesareo himself had changed his mind by the time he included that article in his book[3] and sets it in 1348-1349. Mascetta decides for 1349.[4] But Pakscher,[5] because of the resemblance of the last three lines of I to the ideas of the Secretum (and for other reasons, connected with his belief that Chigi L. V. 176 is the alia papirus frequently mentioned in V. L. 3196), puts it back to 1342. But the date of the Secretum is not established, and besides, there is a poem (LXII) devoted to the idea of repentance that is self-dated as early as 1338.

It would be a great deal accomplished if we could at least determine whether I was composed before or after Laura's death, but even this we cannot do with certainty.

---

1. "Sull'ordinamento delle poesie volgari di F. P.," in Giornale storico, XIX (1892), 260.
2. Op. cit., 40.
3. Op. cit., 40-41.
4. Op. cit., 69.
5. Op. cit., 101.

At least, however, we can say that there is nothing in the poem that forces us to believe it was composed after.

Cesareo[1] makes something of the word 'vain' - vane speranze e'l van dolore - in 1, 6, but as Petrarch's hopes and griefs always had been vain as against Laura's invincibility, it was not necessary for death to make them so. The only other place (in CLXXXIV, 4), in which the words vane speranze occur, refers clearly to a time when Laura was alive and well, as contrasted with present illness; in the last lines, written in anxiety when Laura was ill, her lover says that if death cannot now be moved to pity,

> ben veggio or in che stato son queste
> Vane speranze ond' io viver solia.

Not that death is to render those hopes vain; they were vain hopes that he was wont to live on. The phrase van dolore is connected with vane speranze by the word fra, which, as Mascetta[2] observes, seems to put them on a par; grief for a loved one dead would hardly be called 'vain,' since it is too inevitable and right, whereas his love-pain he had hoped might move Laura, and as it did not, it was truly vain. Then Petrarch hopes that whoever has been a lover will understand his vane speranze e 'l van dolore, seeming to imply rather the lover's alternations of hope and despair

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. Loc. cit.

than grief for the dead, such as any human heart must sympathize with. And the first lines of CCCLXIV:

> Tennemi Amor anni vent'uno ardendo
> Lieto nel foco e nel duol pien di speme,

show clearly that he felt he had lived in mingled speranze and dolore while Laura was alive.

In one of the letters[1] likewise, he uses spes inanes[2] to mean fond or foolish hopes, hopes that a strong character would know how to dismiss: Ignorant homines quantum lucri est, spes inanes et fallaces perdere. On the other hand, in CCCXXIV (1-3), Petrarch refers to his hope as flourishing while Laura lived, and in XXXII, in speaking of his own death he says (9-10):

> Cadrà quella speranza
> Che ne fe' vaneggiar sì lungamente,

and then he will learn (14):

> E come spesso indarno si sospira.

On f. 14r of V. L. 3196, with the date 1348, septembris 1, circa vesperas, is the ballata, Amor quand' io credea, CCCXXIV of the Canzoniere, which F. A. Wulff[3] thinks was one of the first attempts which led the way to Che debb' io far? It represents, at any rate, part of Petrarch's earliest response to the news of Laura's death, and contains these

---

1. Fam., III, 2, Frac., I, 141.
2. Translated by Fracassetti, speranze vane, It., I, 406.
3. "Les premières ébauches de Pétrarque après le 19 mai, 1348," in Romania, XXXI (1902), 384.

lines[1]:

> (O) Ai, dispietata morte! (O) Ai crudel vita!
> L'una m'ha (posto) messo in doglia,
> E mie speranze in sul (fiore) fiorire (-a) spente,

and the opening lines as they stand today in the editions are

> Amor, quando fioria
> Mia spene e'l guidardon di tanta fede,
> Tolta m'è quella onde attendea mercede.

Carducci makes the most of these words in I that can be made of them, when he connects ragiono with vane speranze and piango with van dolore, observing a method of alternating, interwoven construction very characteristic of Petrarch. On the whole, it seems impossible to draw any final conclusions from these wordings.

The second and third lines of I seem to make it pretty clear that the collection of rime sparse as Petrarch conceived it when he wrote his prologue, was to contain only the earlier love-poems, the sighs of his primo giovenile errore. How early those would be, depends on what Petrarch meant by giovenile. Wherever he uses the word, it seems connected in idea (as it is verbally in CCVII, 11-13) with his primi anni. In XXIII, he is a little more specific; he says there (23) that he was already changing his giovenil aspetto when he met Laura (35), and we know that he first

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 98.

saw her on April 6, 1327. Nothing indicates that the collection was to include any of the poems commonly called *in morte*.

The fact that no word in I can be taken as referring certainly to Laura dead, takes on some significance from this other fact, i. e., that of the last hundred poems of the *Canzoniere*, beginning with *Oimè il bel viso*! if we except the concluding two purely religious poems, there are only three (CCCIX, CCCLI, CCCLV), which do not indicate specifically that Laura is dead, and even these three can be interpreted to mean that she is. In Carducci's commentary they are so interpreted. If Petrarch, when he composed his introductory poem, intended his collection to include one hundred poems bewailing the death of Laura, it is strange that it should not contain some allusion that should cover them as well as the

> sospiri ond'io nudriva 'l core
> In su'l mio primo giovenile errore.

So while it is impossible to come to any final conclusion as to the date of this poem, it seems a little more probable that it was composed before rather than after that day in May, 1348, on which Petrarch learned of Laura's death.

II. Per far una leggiadra.

No one can present any real evidence as to the date

of this, except such as is offered by its tone, which is playful and untouched as yet by love-sorrow. Cesareo[1] thinks it was written to another lady, prior to Petrarch's meeting Laura. Cochin[2] does not deny that this is possible, and agrees with him and Pakscher[3] that it is very early in any case, adding that the events referred to sound more recent than in the anniversary pieces.

Its light tone seems to fit very well with what Petrarch himself says of his earliest pieces in CXXV, 27-29:

> Dolci rime leggiadre
> Che nel primier assalto
> D'Amor usai,

and indeed the words primier assalto occur in II, though with a somewhat different meaning. On the whole, we may conclude II to be very early. If written for Laura, then probably in 1327-1328, before his feeling had begun to go deep, while the fera voglia was still quasi in erba (XXIII, 2-3); if for some other lady, then certainly before April 6, 1327.

III. Era il giorno.

Cesareo,[4] Cochin[5] and Pakscher[6] are agreed in setting III about as early as II. Mascetta,[7] with better

---

1. Op. cit., 217.
2. Op. cit., 40-41.
3. Op. cit., 88-89.
4. Loc. cit.
5. Loc. cit.
6. Loc. cit.
7. Op. cit., 101, 182.

judgment as it seems to the writer, puts it later, partly because of a simpler style, less full of conceits and simply narrative, but still more because love has now begun to cause the poet pain (10-11):

gli occhi ...
Che di lagrime son fatti uscio e varco.

In recalling the earliest memory of Laura, III resembles the anniversary pieces.

The day recalled is evidently Good Friday, - il giorno ch' al sol si scoloraro ... i rai, a supposition confirmed by the anniversary sonnet, LXII; but the date on which in the fly-leaf of his Virgil and in CCXI, 11-14, Petrarch states that he first saw Laura, was April 6, 1327, which was not Friday of Holy Week but Monday.[1] Now these two sonnets, II and III, seem to refer to two different occasions (which suggested to Cesareo that they celebrated two different ladies), because in the one Petrarch says he was on guard against love (though vainly):

Era la mia vertute al cor ristretta
Per far ivi e ne gli occhi sue difese (5-6),

whereas in the other he was quite unarmed against love's assault, being absorbed in thoughts appropriate to the day:

Tempo non mi parea da far riparo
Contra colpi d'Amor; però m' andai
Secur, senza sospetto (5-7).

---

1. A. Cappelli, Cronologia e calendario perpetuo, Milan, 156.

Francesco Flamini[1] suggests that these poems commemorate two meetings with Laura in Holy Week of 1327. The first, on the Monday, would have been in the Church of Santa Chiara, as stated in the note in the Virgil, at the first service of Holy Week; and since, as we do not need to be reminded, church played a great part in the worldly and social life of fashionable young men and women, we can imagine that an attractive youth such as Petrarch was would know that in going to church he was exposing himself to a battery of glances from elegant young beauties, and would be on his guard. Then, as there are several places in the Canzoniere which show that the innamoramento took place not in church but out of doors (LXVI, 32-33; CVI; CXC, 1-6), Flamini imagines a second meeting on the Friday of that week, taking place somewhere in the country[2] round about Avignon - perhaps in those hills mentioned in VIII, on a hunting party such as is there suggested. And Flamini brings plenty of evidence to show how frequent were gatherings al fresco of one sort or another in fourteenth century society in Provence.[3]

This discussion has no direct bearing on the date of

---

1. "Tra Valchiusa ed Avignon. La scena degli amori del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, Suppl. No. 12 (1910), 16.
2. Ibid., 20 ff.
3. Ibid., 124.

composition of these sonnets, though important for other aspects of the Canzoniere. We can only conclude that II was probably written soon after the episode it celebrates, and III much less early.

IV. Quel ch'infinita.

V. Quando io movo.

Cochin and Cesareo make no attempt to date these. Pakscher[1] puts them early. Their tone certainly indicates a very early stage of a love-affair, while everything about the loved one still seems marvellous and important; her name, her birthplace, even her relatives take on a glamour. Later, the poetic imagination has need of fresh episodes to stimulate composition; at first, the actual données are enough. These two poems are probably of 1328-1329.

(VI. Sì traviato.[2])

VII. La gola e 'l sonno.

Cochin, Cesareo and Carducci do not attempt to date this sonnet, or to establish the identity of its recipient. M. Morici[3] argues for its being Giovanni di San Vito, that

---

1. Op. cit., 89-90.
2. Titles enclosed in parentheses are of poems as to the date of which there is no evidence.
3. "Francesco Petrarca e Giovanni Colonna di San Vito (a proposito del son. VII del Canzoniere: La gola e il sonno e l' oziose piume)," in Giornale dantesco, VII (1899), 236.

brother of the elder Stefano Colonna who is supposed to have been Petrarch's correspondent,[1] and believes that the magnanima impresa of the sonnet was the religious life, which the latter had embraced and then found difficult.

The hindrances to the better life, as described in the sonnet according to Morici, are two, - love of ease and luxury, and love of money, - and there are three classes of men, - those ruled by the first of these, the turba intent upon the second, and the pochi compagni who pursue the altra via. Morici quotes Mascetta[2] as noting the resemblance between this classification and one made in a letter to Gerardo[3]:

> Videmus alios voluptatibus addictos, quae ingens et inaestimabilis turba est... Multos actuosae vitae studiis intentos cernimus, opem potentiamque sectantes. ... Paucos quidem sapientiae et contemplationi deditos audimus saepius quam videmus.

And in letters to this Giovanni Colonna, Fam. III, l. 13, and VI, l. 3, Petrarch is exhorting his friend to see the beauty and value of poverty. But in the passages Morici selects to quote from them he is hardly making the best of his own argument, since the quotation from III, l. 13: coenam ad auroram, prandium trahebat ad vesperam. Reliquum somnus habebat, purpureis accersitus stratis,[4]

---

1. But see discussion under CXIV for the question of the identity of this personage.
2. Op. cit., 347.
3. Fam. X, 5, Frac., II, 94.
4. Frac. I, 168.

chosen for its similarity to the first line of VII, is part of a fable which contrasts the effeminacy due to riches not with a poverty of industry, plain living and high thinking, but with a poverty of dirt and squalor; whereas he fails to make this pertinent quotation from VI, 3[1]:

> Tu illam [paupertam] fugiebas, illa te sequitur. Iamque attigit arripuitque votis optanda necessitas, quae te cogat implere quod debeas. Christi servus es; scis quid illi conveneris... Per inde mihi paupertatem defles, ... quasi non paupertatem Christi, sed Croesi divitias sis professus.

After all, the chief point of Petrarch's exhortation in both letters is not so much that poverty is desirable in itself, as a friend to philosophy and religion, as that it is an enemy to gout:

> haec est illa quae a philosophis frugalitas dicitur, voluntaria paupertas. Hanc tibi suadeo, hanc tibi unam viam corporeae salutis ostendo ... si pellere vis podagram, pelle delicias;

(and then, what really best fits Morici's point):

> si malum omne vis pellere, pelle divitias.[2]

And in VI, 1. 3,[3] the conclusion of his disquisition on poverty is: <u>Podagrae medicina optima paupertas est</u>.

However, assuming that Petrarch does mean to recommend poverty as a help to the spirit as much as to the body, can we agree with Morici that the <u>voluntaria paupertas</u> is really the <u>magnanima impresa</u> of the sonnet? I think not.

---

1. Frac. I, 328.
2. <u>Fam</u>. III, 13, Frac. I, 170.
3. Frac. I, 330.

The one allusion in the sonnet to poverty, in l. 10:

Povera e nuda vai filosofia,

is spoken by the turba in comment upon the preceding line:

Qual vaghezza di lauro? qual di mirto?

which Morici tries to isolate as an allusion by Petrarch to himself. That is, the crowd neglects poetry and philosophy because they involve poverty; there is no question of advising poverty in itself for the ascetic and monastic reasons implied in the phrase paupertatem Christi, to be found in the letter.

What constitute the magnanima impresa of the sonnet are unquestionably the lauro, mirto and filosofia conceived as one thing, as the literary and intellectual life, which Petrarch, as all the other commentators have believed, is encouraging his friend to persist in; for if the phrase benigno lume Del ciel might suggest the religious life, the line which closes the octave makes it clear that he means the other:

Chi vol far d'Elicona nascer fiume;

and it is not poverty, apparently, which he fears may prove discouraging, but the lack of companionship in the altra via. Poverty is involved in this type of life, Petrarch admits, but he is not here recommending it for itself. The central idea is quite different from that in the letters, yet it is upon a supposed similarity between them that

Morici's argument rests. And even if the likeness were considerable, there would still remain another serious objection in Petrarch's use of tu. Giovanni Colonna di San Vito was a much older and in rank a much more important man than Petrarch, who would hardly have addressed him with such familiarity.[1]

Giovanni Colonna di San Vito was out of Italy after 1331 for a long time, but had returned to take up his residence in Rome before Petrarch's visit in 1337, and it is after this visit, but before the coronation of 1341, that Morici would date this sonnet, but evidently on insufficient evidence.

(VIII. A pie de'colli.)

(IX. Quando'l pianeta.)

X. Gloriosa columna.

The arguments for the date of this must rest on the probabilities regarding whom the sonnet was addressed to and where it was written from. The earlier commentators are agreed that it was composed in the summer of 1331, at Avignon, in farewell to Stefano Colonna, the elder, who was about to leave the city. Of the later scholars, Cesareo[2] holds to 1331; Carducci and Pakscher[3] bring arguments for

---

1. See discussion under X.
2. Op. cit., 41-45.
3. Op. cit., 111-113.

setting it in 1330; Cochin,[1] with his usual caution, says there is no possibility of coming to a definite conclusion.

One thing we are sure of, it cannot be earlier than 1330, since Petrarch tells us himself (CCLXVI) that he had known Laura, whom he met in 1327, three years longer than he had known Giacomo Colonna. As for its having been written from Avignon, ll. 5-12 make it plain that the poet is writing from the country, to one who is apparently in the city. Now we know that Petrarch spent the summer of 1330 at Lombez in Gascony,[2] with Giacomo, its newly-made bishop. But Cesareo, whose arguments against 1330 have something of the parti pris, insists that the agreeable aspects of that happy summer consisted entirely in the company, and that the weather and their rustic neighbors were so disagreeable[3] that ll. 6-12 of the invitation would have been pure irony. Moreover, he says, Lombez was a city if a small one, and the friends would not there be really in villeggiatura, so he concludes for some rural spot in the vicinity of Avignon.[4]

---

1. Op. cit., 42.
2. Senil. XVI, 1: Oh! tempus rapidum! oh! fugax vita! quartus et quadragesimus annus est: nunquam puto laetior aestas fuit, dated April 27, 1374 (Frac., Senil., II, 469; Librorum Francisci Petrarche impressorum annotatio, Venice, 1503, to be referred to hereafter as "Venice, 1503.") Ad posteros: Sub collibus Pyranaeis aestatem prope caelestem, multa et domini et comitum jucunditate transegi. (Frac. I, 6.)
3. Senil. X, 2, Basle, 1554, 96, 2: Tolosam Garumnaeque alveum et Pyranaeos colles adii, caelo saepe turbido sed serenissimo comitate; Fam. I, 5 (Frac. I, 51): anni tempus ... adversum, et vepricosum iter... conversatio dura et multum nostris moribus aliena.
4. apud Avenionem.

Then Stefano, he reminds us, is not known to have been in Avignon in 1330, though Pakscher says[1] that he had to go there at the end of the summer, because Stefano, the elder, came to the curia in September; besides, Petrarch had not met him until after that summer,[2] and would never have written an invitation to a man whom he did not know.

As to this, as long as Petrarch uses the plural noi, it is not at all impossible that Giacomo should have made use of the pen of a visiting poet to write what could sound like a joint invitation to his father from them both; but on the other hand, the last word of the sonnet, scompagne, plainly indicates that the recipient had recently been with the writer. But such discussion presupposes that the recipient has to be old Stefano. Cesareo[3] says no other member of the family could be appropriately addressed as Gloriosa columna in cui s'appoggia Nostra speranza e 'l gran nome latino; and adds: dire che il gran nome latino s'appoggiava al vescovo di Lombez, quando in casa Colonna c'era Stefano il vecchio e c'era il cardinale G., via, metto pegno che sarebbe parso un po' troppo anche al P. Still, he did

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. Fam. V, 3, Frac. I, 255; Idem (Stefano) prorsus aspectu ... qui ante annos duodecim, dum eum apud Avenionem Rhodani primum vidi, dated November 29, 1343 (Frac. It., II, 14).
3. Loc. cit.

hear that great name; being youngest of three, the words nostra speranza are appropriate to him; and Petrarch was a friend, a guest and a poet. Then Petrarch addresses his friend, whoever it is, as tu; now he might possibly have addressed a sonnet to the old pater familias before he had met him, but it is inconceivable that he should have called him tu. Petrarch uses that form only to his intimates, to Sennuccio del Bene, to his brother Gerardo (if XCI be indeed addressed to him), to Giacomo Colonna, Geri dei Gianfigliacci, and one or two doubtful persons, in personifications such as Amore or the River Po (CLXXX), or when addressing the soul (XXVIII, LIII); voi he uses always to Laura and to personages of consequence like Pandolfo Malatesta or Orso dell'Anguillara, or to persons with whom he is but slightly acquainted, such as Stramazzo da Perugia and Antonio de Beccari of Ferrara. It is notable that he uses voi in CIII, which is addressed to some member of the Colonna family other than the Bishop of Lombez (since it is to a soldier); Giacomo may have been the only Colonna to whom Petrarch ventured to dar del tu.

Stengel, in his review of Carducci's Saggio,[1] suggests

---

1. "Rime di Francesco Petrarca sopra argomenti storici morali e diversi. Saggio di un testo e commento nuovo col rifronte dei migliori testi e di tutti i commenti a cura di Giosuè Carducci, Livorno, 1876," in Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, III (1879), 118.

that the sonnet was addressed to Giacomo from Lombez, in 1330, during a brief absence. Carducci objects against this that Petrarch rarely uses noi of himself alone; and Pakscher[1] reminds us that noi might well apply to Socrate and Lelio (the comitum, perhaps, of Ad posteros), with whom Petrarch became acquainted at Lombez.[2]

As for the allusions to bad weather, of which Cesareo makes so much, the poet is not altogether the same person as the letter-writer; the stately medium of Latin prose always makes him more circumspect in his statements, as Mascetta has remarked in another connection. In describing his summer in verse, he would almost certainly dwell not upon the adventitious and unpoetic element of bad weather, but on the beautiful and permanent ones of landscape and surroundings, which might still be counted on when the weather cleared.

This poem is, as Cochin[3] remarks, the first in which there is any allusion to Petrarch's relations to the Colonna family. It seems unlikely that with his inclination to versify all the smallest episodes of his life, he should have let that happy and memorable summer at Lombez go by without its tribute to hospitality and friendship. While a

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. Fam., Frac., I, 478.
3. Loc. cit.

large measure of doubt must remain, we may admit a probability that this sonnet dates from the summer of 1330.

(XI. Lassare il velo.)

(XII. Se la mia vita.)

(XIII. Quando fra l'altre.)

XIV. Occhi miei lassi.

This was evidently composed on the eve of a journey. As Cochin[1] notes, this is the first poem which does not speak of Laura as present or near by, so the allusion is probably to Petrarch's first absence from Avignon after he had become acquainted with her. It may refer to the summer of 1330, spent at Lombez.

XV. Io mi rivolgo in dietro.

This likewise seems to refer to a first absence, since the poet asks Love how he shall support life away from Laura (10-11). Later he had learned by experience that it was possible. This journey is presumably the one contemplated in XIV.

XVI. Movesi il vecchierel.

The only possible clue to the date of this is offered by the words <u>viene a Roma</u> (9) (spoken of the pilgrim who

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 43.

comes to venerate the "Veronica"), which Cesareo[1] takes to indicate that Petrarch wrote it on his first visit to the Eternal City in 1336-1337, believing that he must have used venire of the place he wrote from. So Cesareo puts it in his table as definitely dated. Cochin[2] thinks Cesareo's point important but not conclusive. Cesareo mentions two places where Dante seems to use venire of a place remote from the speaker (and it is easy to find others: Inf., II, 31, 137; IV, 17; XII, 19, 103, etc.), but says there is no such example to be found in Petrarch. VI, l. 12, however, seems to present one. Moreover, venire, as spoken by an Italian, might mean coming from anywhere else in Europe into Italy. Pakscher in his review of Cesareo's work,[3] cites Dante's lines, Par. XXXI, ll. 103-104, but fails to note that Dante is speaking there explicitly of the foreigner, which Petrarch is not. No date can be posited for this sonnet.

(XVII. Piovommi amare.)

(XVIII. Quand'io son tutto volto.)

(XIX. Sono animali.)

(XX. Vergognando talor.)

---

1. Op. cit., 45.
2. Op. cit., 44.
3. Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, XIV (1893), 174.

(XXI. Mille fiate.)

(XXII. A qualunque animale.)

XXIII. Nel dolce tempo.

There is the best of reasons for setting this canzone early. Petrarch himself, under date of April 28, 1351, wrote at the ending of the poem where it stands in V. L. 3196, f. 11v[1]:

> Explicit sed nondum correcta et est de primis inventionibus nostris. scriptum hoc 1351. Aprilis 28 Iovis nocte concubia,

and on November 10, 1356, he noted having transcribed it post multos et multos annos. So here we have Petrarch's own word for classing this poem among his earliest compositions, but the question is how early.

Pakscher,[2] because of its early position in the Canzoniere, and also because of its many retouchings and corrections,[3] places it about 1333, but Cesarec[4] sets it three years earlier. Besides certain arguments in relation

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 79.
2. Op. cit., 91-94, 130.
3. The poem is much annotated in V. L. 3196. It is preceded by the note: Transcripsi in ordine post multos et multos annos, quibusquam mutatis. 1356. Iovis in vesperis, 10 novembr. Mediolani. At l. 89: Post multos annos. 1350 Aprilis 3 mane, quia triduo exacto institi ad supremam manum vulgarium (vulgarem?) ne diutius int(er varias) curas distrahar, visum est et hanc in ordine transcribere, sed prius hic ex aliis papir(is) elicitam scribere. And before the envoy: 1356. novembr. 4 sero dum cogito de fine harum nugarum. Appel, op. cit., 71, 76, 79.
4. Op. cit., 47-48.

to Giacomo Colonna, and to the similar poem of Cino da Pistoia, Nel tempo della mia novella etade, which are purely conjectural, he has two that are more definite: (1) the words primis inventionibus, it seems to him, must refer to an earlier date than 1333, and (2) he thinks the style uncertain and wavering and the mythological allusions youthful. Cochin[1] recognizes the importance of the word primis, but draws attention also to phrases in the poem, such as molt'anni eran passati (22) and piansi molt'anni (143), which suggest considerable intervals of time. At the same time he minimizes the importance of these indications; he notes that V. L. 3196 shows[2] piansi molt'anni originally read gran tempo piansi, and concludes that Petrarch's time references are not to be taken as very exact. But on this point the present writer would express vigorous dissent; considering the exactitude of all Petrarch's habits, his care in noting the day and hour, not only when he composed, but when he merely corrected or copied, his poems, and remembering the careful internal dating of very many, it seems to the writer safer to draw the opposite conclusion, that in changing gran tempo to molt'anni Petrarch was rejecting a less accurate measure of time for a more accurate one.

---

1. Op. cit., 45-46.
2. Appel, op. cit., 78.

Mascetta[1] considers these references and others with minute care, and sets the poem very late indeed. Although he comes to the inadmissible conclusion that it is even too late to be included in his arrangement, which includes nothing (according to his belief) after February, 1341,[2] yet he has examined the internal evidence of XXIII to better purpose than any other commentator, and his arguments lend weight to any attempt to prove Cesareo's dating unduly early. We may disregard his point that primis refers to quality, not time (had Petrarch been referring to time, Mascetta declares he would have used the word rebus instead of inventionibus), but all of his arguments that are based upon his reading of the poem itself are worth quoting:

1. The elaborateness and solemnity of form.

2. Petrarch's love is known now (9-14); we are no longer at the point in his history indicated in XXXV, where he says that to wander through deserted places is his only protection against the manifesto accorger de le genti (1-6),

> mi credo omai che monti e piagge
> E fiumi e selve sappian di che tempre
> Sia la mia vita, ch'è celata altrui.

3. The long series of episodes.

4. Distrusts his memory now, which has been weakened by his sufferings (15-19).

---

1. Op. cit., 92.
2. Ibid., 476, ff.

5. Lasso che son! che fui! (30) perhaps indicates a long lapse of time since the days of his early immunity; Mascetta of course thinks it does; but it might refer only to the wide difference in himself, and not to any wide space of time required to work it.

6. Lines 38-40 indicate present maturity:

> Ei duo [Love and Laura] mi trasformaro in quel ch'i'sono,
> Facendomi d'uom vivo un lauro verde
> Che per fredda stagion foglia non perde.

The third of Mascetta's points prompts us to a careful examination of the periods referred to. It is possible to find eleven different ones in this narrative of Petrarch's relation to Laura thus far, to the time, that is, when he composed XXIII:

1. The innamoramento (21-39), which occurred near the end of his prima etade (1-3 and 21-23).

2. Petrarch's high hopes of immediate response to his feelings are disappointed (52-53):

> folminato e morto giacque
> Il mio sperar, che troppo alto montava,

and he is turned into a swan (60). That is, pain makes him a poet.

3. Laura accepts the declaration of his sentiments, once, with sympathetic understanding, but requires him never to speak of it again (72-74):

> Questa, che col mirar gli animi fura,
> M'aperse il petto, e'l cor prese con mano,
> Dicendo a me: di ciò non far parola.

4. But seeing her again, in altro abito sola, Tal ch'i' non la conobbi (75-76), - perhaps, that is, unusually frank and responsive, - he "told her the truth" (77).

5. And she, returning to l'usata sua figura, perhaps more dignified and self-contained, "turned him to stone" with her displeasure (79-80). In this episode Petrarch is imitating the myth recounted by Ovid[1] in which Bactus, having witnessed a theft on the part of Mercury, promises not to tell of it, and then presently tells Mercury himself, who has returned in disguise to test him, and turns Bactus to stone for his perfidy. The poem immediately preceding is one of the few in which Petrarch expresses his feelings for Laura with excessive directness, and utters an explicit and too daring wish, that may have been his "truth"; and it may have been a similar expression of his sentiments, made to her directly on finding her in altro abito sola, which roused her resentment and prompted her reproach (83):

I' non son forse chi tu credi.

The words he uses, Sfrenato ardire (143), to describe his second similar offense bear out this idea.

6. Petrarch pleads in verse for pardon (98-99).

7. But his humility, which he hoped might soften

---

1. Met., II, 685, ff.

Laura, apparently only irritates her (105-106). Wherefore he goes da poi lunga stazion di tenebre vestito (105-106), and grief turns him into a fountain of tears (113-117).

Gran tempo umido tenni quel viaggio (118).

8. Laura forgives and reinstates him (132-135).

9. He offends again (137).

10. Banished from her presence, he wanders through desert places (141-142), and confesses (143):

Piansi molt'anni il mio sfrenato ardire.

11. The puzzling episode, whether literal or symbolic, in which, after long banishment, he sees Laura in una fonte ignuda (150), and is turned, like Actaeon, into a stag and flees his dogs (157-160). This latest transformation, he says, like the first, endures to the time of writing.

Now how much time would it take for all these stages of emotion and changing relationship to develop and succeed each other? It is evident from the opening lines that his feeling did not at first become intense, but continued for a time in erba before becoming the fera voglia which was to give him torment. It takes time for a personal relation of the rarer sort to progress and unfold itself. Moreover, even after the tenth episode, and in consequence of it, Petrarch says piansi molt'anni. Perhaps the preceding episodes followed each other rather rapidly, with intervals

indicated by phrases like lunga stagion and gran tempo, which might refer to months merely, and then would have come this much longer time of exile from favour which he first indicated by gran tempo[1] and later changed to the more exact molt'anni. The other place in the poem where the phrase molt'anni is used (22) refers to the period between love's primo assalto, that is, his first boyish love-pangs, and his meeting with Laura. This meeting took place, we know, April 6, 1327, when Petrarch was twenty-three, so we may suppose molt'anni back of that to suggest about sixteen or seventeen as the plausible age for his first boyish love-affairs. Six or seven years after that would bring us to 1333-1334, but we must allow a year or two for the affair to develop as far as episode 10, after which he says he wept and bewailed himself in the desert places molt'anni.

There is a place in Petrarch's letters where likewise he breaks up his life into periods, but with the greater explicitness of prose. In a letter[2] of the year 1336,[3] to his friend and spiritual father, Dionisi da Borgo San Sepolcro, a member of a religious order, Petrarch refers to its being ten years since he began to love and three since he began to

---

1. Vide sup., p.40.
2. Fam., IV, 1, Frac. I, 193.
3. Frac. It., I, 491.

"love and hate," - or at least strive to hate,- and goes on to expand the idea of the struggle he has made against his love:

> Mihi quidem multum adhuc ambigui molestique negotii superest. Quod amare solebam, iam non amo: mentior: amo; sed verecundius, sed tristius. Iam tandem verum dixi. Sic est enim: amo quod non amare amem, quod odisse cupiam. Amo tamen, sed invitus, sed coactus, sed moestus et lugens, et in me ipso versiculi illius famosissimi sententiam miser experior:
>
> Odero, si potero; si non, invitus amabo.
>
> Nondum tertius annus effuxit, ex quo voluntas illa perversa et nequam, quae me totum habebat, et in aula cordis mei sola sine contradictione regnabat, coepit aliam habere rebellam et reluctantem sibi: inter quas iamdudum in campis cogitationum mearum de utriusque hominis imperio laboriosissima et anceps etiam nunc pugna conseritur. Sic per exactum decennium cogitatione volvebar. Hinc iam curas meas in anteriora mittebam, et quaerebam ex me ipso: Si tibi forte contingeret per alia duo lustra volatilem hanc vitam perducere, tantumque pro rata temporis ad virtutem accedere, quantum hoc biennio, per congressum novae contra veterem voluntatis, ab ostinatione pristina recessisti, nonne tunc posses, etsi non certus, at saltem sperans, quadragesimo aetatis anno mortem oppetere?[1]

We must suppose, especially since he was writing to a <u>frate</u>, and in view of his explicit intention to devote the next decade to the salvation of his soul, that <u>aliam voluntatem rebellem et reluctantem</u> to his love was the religious and ascetic impulse which was to be at strife with it more and more from now on to the end of his life.

Now there are two internally dated poems which corre-

---

1. Frac. I, 198-199.

spond rather closely in time to the periods Petrarch mentions in the letter to Dionigi: XXX, in which he says (28-29):

> Oggi ha sett'anni
> Che sospirando vo,

and LXII, in which occur the lines (9-10):

> Or volge, signor mio, l'undecimo anno
> Ch'i'fui sommesso al dispietato giogo.

XXX, written on the seventh anniversary of the meeting with Laura, or April 6, 1334, has not a tinge of "love and hate" or of religious feeling, and he states three times in it (6, 16-18 and 32-33) his expectation of loving her as long as he lives; LXII, on the other hand, which marks the eleventh (or possibly the tenth, according to the interpretation of volge), is a purely religious poem of repentance, in which Petrarch repudiates his love for Laura as having been an unworthy waste of time. No poem placed before XXX in the Canzoniere shows any trace of the mixture of love and hate, nor of the idea that religion is the enemy of his love, but then of course most of them are not positively dated as being earlier than XXX in composition. Between the two poems, however, are three which indicate the love and hate motif, - XLIV, XLV and XLVI, in which Petrarch shows irritation at Laura's continued invincibility and inaccessibility, and betrays a rather spiteful inclination to attribute them to mere coldness and vanity, - and if these three poems could be proved

to fall chronologically between XXX and LXII, it might suggest that Petrarch's repentance was partly forced, a result of his despair of being able to move Laura to requital. But there is one dated poem between XXX and LXII, and that is the canzone, L, in which while there is not a word of the usual praise or admiration or affection for Laura, Petrarch bewails his love for her as nothing but tyranny, slavery and torment; may not this be an expression of the "love and hate"? And he dates it (54-55):

> Ch'i'son già, pur crescendo in questa voglia
> Ben presso al decim'anno.

Then in LXII, at the end (or possibly the beginning) of the eleventh, he is in the full tide of repentance. Though of course there are many poems after LXII that are love-poems and nothing else, there is none before it in which the religious motive appears; and a measurable number in both groups are approximately, or accurately, datable.

What connection has all this with XXIII? Simply that XXIII gives a detailed narration of events in the history of Petrarch's love for Laura, which cover, as he says, molt'anni and more, in which there is no sign of "love and hate," or of religion or repentance, but only of love and sorrow. So, in view of the letter to Dionigi, it seems fair to set it within the first seven years of his love, and yet, by reason of the long history it covers, to put it very near the end

of those years.

XXX is dated April 6, 1334; supposing XXIII to have been written not very long before, that would allow a couple of years for the first eleven episodes, and nearly five for the molt'anni, which would indeed seem "many" out of the few grown-up years of a man of thirty. Then supposing the letter to Dionigi to have been written near the end of 1336, Petrarch could have been counting in his three years of love and hate all of 1335, most of 1334 and most of 1336, and then be speaking as accurately as we often do speak of time in our own past.

We may call it probable, then, that XXIII was written about 1333-1334, a date which, eighteen years later, after so many other poems had been written, may have seemed to justify primis inventionibus.

XXIV. Se l'onorata fronde.

There are no indications of time to be found. Only, since Petrarch refers to the poet's crown as a thing which his love, by distracting him from his devotion to the muses, has prevented his securing, we can be sure the poem is earlier than 1341, when he was crowned at Rome. And this reference to Laura as an obstacle on his road to fame seems to set XXIV definitely later than XXIII, in which his only preoccupations are his love for her and her emotional effect upon him.

XXV. Amor piangeva

XXVI. Più di me lieta.

These two appear to be addressed to the same person, but whether Giacomo Colonna or Cino da Pistoia is not settled. And whichever it may be, there is no indication as to date.

XXVII. Il successor di Carlo

Cesareo[1] sets back the date of this poem to 1333, from a much later one preferred by earlier commentators, by connecting it with the actual crusade of Philip VI of Valois and Pope John XXII, in 1334, instead of the one merely contemplated by the Emperor Charles IV and Urban V, in 1344-45. His arguments, which apply to both poems, are cited under XXVIII. Cochin[2] accepts his conclusions for both.

XXVIII. O aspettata in ciel.

This was written on the same occasion as XXVII, and probably addressed to Giacomo Colonna, then in Rome, begging him to lend his voice and his eloquence to the attempt to promote the crusade. Cesareo's arguments for connecting these two poems with the crusade of 1334 are as follows:

1. Charles IV showed small inclination for the crusade even before he was crowned in 1335, and less after it. His uncertain designs never justified the words (XXVII, 3):

Prese ha già l'arme per fiaccar le corna.

1. Op. cit., 48-50.
2. Op. cit., 46-47.

2. The itinerary indicated in the sonnet (XXVII, 8), as including Bologna and Rome. (But it is difficult to see why this might not apply equally well to a crusade that started from Germany as from France.)

3. The striking words of XXVIII, 33, le'nsegne cristianissime certainly are applicable to the king of France, who was always known as the "most Christian" king, as the Spaniard was the "most Catholic."

4. Germany and Bohemia would have been named in a far more specific way than in XXVIII, 45-46, if the enterprise had been led by a Bohemian sovereign called to be Emperor of Germany.

(XXIX. Verdi panni.)

XXX. Giovene donna.

Every one must agree with Cesareo[1] and Cochin[2] that at least by Petrarch's intention, the lines

oggi ha sett'anni
Che sospirando vo,

date this canzone as of April 6, 1334.

(XXXI. Quest'anima gentil.)

(XXXII. Quanto più m'avicino.)

(XXXIII. Già fiammeggiava.)

(XXXIV. Apollo, s'amor vive.)

(XXXV. Solo e pensoso.)

(XXXVI. S'io credesse.)

XXXVII. Sì è debile il filo.

Cochin[3] believes this poem was written during Petrarch's visit to Rome and Capranica in 1337. It is placed next to XXXVIII, which was addressed to Orso dell'Anguillara and written probably at Capranica. Great distance, he says, separates him from Laura (41-43):

Quante montagne et acque,
Quanto mar, quanti fiumi
M'ascondon que'duo lumi,

and he would actually have crossed the sea while en route to

---

1. Op. cit., 50.
2. Op. cit., 47.
3. Ibid., 48-49.

Rome. So Cochin is inclined to date this poem avec assez de sécurité, as of 1337.

XXXVIII. Orso, e' non furon mai.

Cochin[1] dates this also 1337 because addressed to Orso. He suggests that the whole sonnet may be only an aimplification and modification of ll. 41-42 and 98-104 of XXXVII. Carducci follows Cochin in accepting the date 1337.

XXXIX. Io temo sì.

Cochin[2] at the time he wrote his Chronologie connected this sonnet with the same journey, but changed his mind about it later. See the discussion under XL for his views, and for reasons for the probable date, 1337.

XL. S'amore o morte.

It is impossible to date this most interesting sonnet. Even if we could be sure to which of his works Petrarch was alluding (5-8), it would not help us much in the absence of certain knowledge of when his various works were composed. Cesareo's belief that it was not written until after 1348, and that amore (1) and tenace visco (3), which must refer to a living woman, cannot therefore mean Laura, we must reject as arbitrary and unfounded. His argument[3] for its being the

---

1. Op. cit., 49-50.
2. Ibid., 50-51.
3. Op. cit., 50-52.

Africa, Cochin,[1] who is not certain that the tela novella (2) refers to any of the works known to us, nor even (which seems excessive caution) that sermon[2] prisco (6) necessarily means one written in Latin, - dismisses as an "alluring hypothesis."

> I libri Rerum memorandarum, says Cesareo,[3] una raccolta di istruzioni morali accompagnate d'appunti storici, non son di tale importanza da meritar che il Petrarca ne sperasse quel suo tanto "scoppio" (8), e un libro di biografie storiche, come il De viribus illustribus, benchè il poeta ne facesse gran conto, non era certo lavoro a cui dovesse bisognare il soccorso delle opere di S. Agostino; nè il Petrarca avrebbe potuto "l'uno con l'altro ver accoppiarvi" (4).

So Cesareo concludes for the Africa, not only because of its great importance in Petrarch's mind, but also because of his certainty that by l'uno con l'altro vero accoppio Petrarch meant that combination of historic with aesthetic truth which is for Cesareo il più chiaro intendimento del poema.

A recent discussion by A. Foresti,[4] however, of XXXIX and XL together, throws fresh light upon the question of the tela novella (2), and offers a hypothesis for connecting the two poems with the return from the Roman journey of 1336-1337. First, as to XXXIX, he quotes Carducci as the

---

1. Op. cit., 51-52.
2. Sermon itself is reminiscent of Latin usage; cf. such phrases as sermo plebeius, sermo militaris, sermo cotidianus, sermo urbanus.
3. Op. cit., 52.
4. "Due sonetti di Francesco Petrarca al cardinale Giovanni Colonna," in Rivista d'Italia, XXIV (1921), 403.

one[1] among modern commentators who resurrected and gave support to the theory of Fausto da Longiano[2] that this sonnet was directed not to Laura (to whom, as Carducci says, it would certainly have sounded impolite), but to Cardinal Giovanni Colonna, excusing himself for his delayed return to Avignon (or where he feared he might meet Laura). Foresti opportunely quotes a letter from Petrarch to Olimpio, written May 19, 1349, inviting him with Socrate and Simpliciano to visit him at Parma, which shows how dependent they had all been in early days upon the Cardinal[3]:

> Etsi enim nobis ea servitus libertate qualibet gratior foret, quod illius viri optimi, et in eo statu minime insolentis, affectio merebatur, tamen esse sub altero, parere alteri, alieno vivere, videri possunt servitutis honestioris, verae autem libertatis utique non sunt.

Such dependence evidently lends point to the fede in the last line. The resemblance which has often been noted between the situation described in this sonnet and the one described in the Epistola metrica to Giacomo Colonna,[4] which Foresti considers dated by l. 167 as a year after Petrarch's return,[5] leads him to date XXXIX as of 1337. And

---

1. He seems unaware that G. Melodia takes this view in his Studi sulle Rime del Petrarca, Catania, 1909, 30, and that in reviewing that work, in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LV (1910), 140, Cochin confesses himself won over to it.
2. Commento, Venice, 1532.
3. Fam. VIII, 4, Frac., I, 427; Frac. It., II, 306.
4. I, 7, Basle, 1554, III, 1336.
5. But a still clearer dating may be had from ll. 44-45.

E. Proto,[1] in his review of Melodia's Studi, is of the same opinion. Only Foresti does not agree with Carducci that the sonnet was written from Vaucluse, but believes it was written immediately upon Petrarch's return to Avignon in the summer of 1337, very near the date of the letter to Tommaso da Messina[2]: Quo rursum dura necessitas nudius tertius applicui, which Foresti takes to mean, since the letter is dated August 18, that Petrarch had returned on the 16th.

The second line of XXXIX:

E gran tempo è ch'i' presi il primier salto,

Foresti rightly understands as one of Petrarch's careful indications of time, and would make the first "leap" to have been the journey of 1333, which took Petrarch to Flanders and Cologne. But Cochin would put it later. Of the primier salto he says[3]:

> Il ne peut s'agir des deux premiers voyages, 1330 et 1333, dans lesquels Pétrarque voyagea absolument dans les ordres des Colonna, et d'ailleurs le sonnet même suppose au moins deux voyages antérieurs.

(It is hard to see how it does.) The journey of 1343, he continues, would meet all conditions, were it not that by that time Petrarch had begun to cool towards the Colonna, so he decides for 1341, a year when we actually find Petrarch apologizing to the Cardinal for a delayed return, in a letter[4]

---

1. Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XV (1910), 225.
2. Fam. III, 2, Frac., I, 142; Frac. It., I, 407.
3. Loc. cit.
4. Fam. IV, 9, Frac., I, 219.

dated May 23, 1341.[1] And we know he did not even return when that letter promised: hyemis initio me videbis, because Fam. IV, 12, of January 5, 1342,[2] and Var. LVII, of January 31,[3] show him to have been still in Italy on those dates.

The date of XXXIX, then, would seem to depend upon our choice between these two important elements in the sonnet: the fact of a delayed return, which would connect it with the letter to the Cardinal of 1341, and the reason for that delay, which would connect it with the metrical epistle of 1337-1338. Which is the more essential? A careful reading of the poem will lead one to conclude, I believe, that Petrarch's reason for delay, - which is stated in the first line:

Io temo sì de' begli occhi l'assalto,

and is the occasion of the last, - is the essential subject of it. As for the fact which Cochin adduces, that the journeys of 1330 and 1333 were undertaken under the orders of the Colonna, that does not rule out the possibility that Petrarch welcomed the opportunity to absent himself from Avignon, and thought of the absence as profitable to him in the struggle against love which was already beginning. The letter to Dionigi of Borgo San Sulpicio, we remember, in

---

1. Frac. It., I, 526.
2. Frac. I, 223; Frac. It., I, 548.
3. Frac., III, 465; Frac. It., V, 455.

which he described his fight with himself, shows the time of "love and hate" to have begun by 1333-1334.[1] Moreover, there is really nothing in the sonnet to prevent our thinking that Petrarch wrote from Vaucluse, and that though returned from his long flight he had not dared to visit Avignon. This would make it unnecessary to believe with Cochin that it was the return from Italy which was so long deferred.

Now for Foresti's hypothesis, which seeks to connect XL with XXXIX, and consequently set its date near the same time. In ll. 5-7 of XXXIX, Petrarch says there is now no place so faticoso od alto that his will may not hereafter urge him up to it, in order that he may not encounter ch'i' miei sensi disperga, that is, Laura. This alto loco Foresti believes is a figure of speech indicating Petrarch's readiness now, against his natural instincts and preferences, to undertake offices, responsibilities, diplomatic journeys, any kind of arduous business which will keep him out of Laura's way; and such an undertaking Foresti conceives him to have found, before writing XL, in the literary work referred to in ll. 2-8 of that sonnet.[2] Of this new direction of his thoughts, - a consequence, Foresti suggests,

---

1. See the discussion under XXIII, p.46
2. It is perhaps worth recalling in this connection that Petrarch uses the words faticosa impresa for some of his literary work, in CXIX, 12. Melodia's suggestion (Studi sulle rime del Petrarca, Catania, 1909, 172) that the impresa is the virtuous life does not seem, in view of ll. 14-15, a happy one.

of the Roman sojourn among past glories, stimulating alike to his imagination and to his longing for fame, - and his present willingness to settle down quietly to literary and intellectual work at Vaucluse as a sufficient refuge from the torments of his love, Foresti fancies there is a hint in the same metrical epistle[1]:

> Non rura requiro
> Divitiasque patris, pondus grave celsa petenti,
> Vinclaque dura animi, et cunctorum alimentorum malorum:
> Cirraeas non tangat opes, neu nostra lacessat
> Ocia.

Foresti next proceeds to examine possibilities as to the tela novella, the new literary work alluded to in XL, 2. In the first place, he insists that it is only a superstition of the commentators, handed down from one to another, that the diletto padre (11) has to be St. Augustine; and in the second place, he thinks he has found, in Petrarch's own description of his habits of work in preparing De viris illustribus, a much better interpretation of l'un coll'altro vero than Cesareo's. The latter he wisely characterizes as lending to Petrarch conceptions and language appropriate neither to him nor to his time. In the preface to De viris,[2] Petrarch wrote:

---

1. ll. 10-14, Basle 1554, III, 1337.
2. G. Kirner, Sulle opere storiche di F. Petrarca, Pisa, 1899; P. de Nolhac, "Le 'de viris illustribus' de Pétrarque," in Notices et extraits de mss. de la Bibliothèque Nationale, XXXIV (1890), I, 110.

> Quedam enim que apud unum desunt, ab altero mutuatus sum, quedam brevius, quedam clarius, quedam que brevitas obscura faciebat expressius eoque clarius dixi. Multa enim ... preterii, multa apud alios carptim dicta coniunxi, et vel de unius, vel de diversorum multis historiis unam feci.

Moreover, this method of compilation from various authors, "controlled" by Petrarch's own taste and the spirit of his time,[1] and used in a work written in Latin, corresponds perfectly to ll. 5-6:

> Io farò forse un mio lavor sì doppio
> Tra lo stil de' moderni e'l sermon prisco.

Then this work was conceived before the Africa, and was the first to be undertaken by the poet in his solitude, newly athirst for glory; and being a work upon Roman worthies, it might well seem to him that it would make some stir in Rome (8):

> In fin a Roma n'udirai lo scoppio.

Now the author Petrarch rested on oftenest and imitated most was Livy. As de Nolhac says[2]:

> Les parties de l'histoire romaine où il a Tite-Live pour guide sont les seules où il soit vraiment à l'aise et se sente sur un terrain solide. Il l'abrège d'ordinaire beaucoup, sans altérer le caractère de son récit; y choisissant toujours, et comme d'instinct, les détails précis qui parlent à l'imagination: bien rarement il le développe et fournit sur le même sujet, et sans recourir à d'autres sources, un texte plus étendu que celui de l'auteur ancien. Toutes les fois que la chose lui est

---

1. Well illustrated by the life of Caesar cited by Kirner (op. cit., 68), in which Petrarch used Suetonius and Cicero with discernment and discretion.
2. Pétrarque et l'humanisme, Paris, 1892, 226-227. Foresti quotes, translating it into Italian, the 1907 edition, II, 13.

possible, il le contrôle par d'autres historiens et confronte leurs témoignages; il suit en cela l'exemple de Tite-Live lui-même, qui mentionne assez souvent les opinions de ses prédecesseurs; mais, s'il arrive à Pétrarque de faire bon usage de cette méthode, quand il invoque par exemple Florus ou Justin, il en abuse quelquefois, et on le voit s'attarder à comparer des autorités qu'il ne connaît même pas de première main, pour le seul plaisir de poser ou de discuter devant son lecteur une question de critique. Il met quelque complaisance, d'ailleurs médiocrement justifiée, à rapprocher de celle de Tite-Live sa propre façon d'utiliser les sources. ... En somme, et quoique Pétrarque se fasse quelques illusions sur les résultats de son travail, c'est bien une façon nouvelle de traiter l'histoire qu'il ramène dans le monde et il la doit bien à ce grand modèle.

So Foresti's conclusion is that the tela novella, thus literally "woven" out of many threads, was De viris illustribus, and that the diletto padre, whose works Petrarch was writing to borrow, was Titus Livy. He believes he has located the very copy!

Among the manuscripts identified by Pierre de Nolhac as having belonged to Petrarch's library is No. 5690, his copy of Livy,[1] which although he did not acquire it for his own very early, had been in his possession for some time before that, as is indicated by a note in his hand:

Emptus Avinione 1351
Diu tamen ante possessus.

Marginal notes indicate that this was the copy Petrarch used for the Africa, and that he had carefully studied the biography of Scipio, which is the longest, after that of Caesar,

---

1. Op. cit., 228-234.

in De viris. On f. 366v, is a short letter, evidently from the former owner, lending the manuscript to some one who had asked him for it. The letter is thus transcribed by De Nolhac[1]:

> Regratior vobis sinceris affectibus de iocalibus que misistis, que idcirco precipue recepi libentius, quia plena innuunt conseruate dilectionis affectum et euidentius probant integritatem vestre fidei nec absentia minui, nec lapsu temporis antiquari. Sed certe carissime, cum uos meum reputem, uestra per consequens reputo esse mea uel propria recognosco. Non est ergo necessaria interuenctio munerum, cum proprium improprie nec natura pronominis patiatur ut nostra esse uel dici ualeant nostriora.

De Nolhac believes this is a veritable letter, adding that it was not uncommon during the Renaissance to use the covers of manuscripts for correspondence between the lenders and borrowers of them; the allusion to distance and absence fits well with Petrarch's wandering habits in his youth; and Petrarch's allusion to having used the book long before he owned it points to him as the borrower. De Nolhac, then, accepts Petrarch as the borrower, but who, he asks,[2] was the lender?

> Qui donc serait ce bibliophile d'Avignon, assez ami de Pétrarque pour lui confier un volume aussi précieux, assez enthousiaste de Tite-Live pour en annoter les marges, ... assez âgé en même temps ou d'une situation assez élevée pour traiter Pétrarque en jeune homme et s'abstenir, en lui écrivant, de toute formule de politesse?

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. Op. cit., 232.

He concludes that all items correspond best with Raimondo da Soranzo, whose date of death is not known, but which was probably before 1351, so that Petrarch could conceivably have bought the Livy from his heirs.

But there is nothing in these items which would not also fit Cardinal Colonna, and Foresti has no hesitation in seeing in this letter an answer to Petrarch's sonnet XL, - which may have been accompanied, as he suggests, by a prose letter, according to Petrarch's frequent habit. The handwriting of the letter is the same as that of various topographical and interpretative notes in the margin, which may represent the Cardinal's familiarity with Rome. (The other notes reveal less erudition than Petrarch's, who sometimes corrects them.) The tone of the letter suits equally well with Petrarch's relation to him, and there is excellent evidence for believing that Par. 5690 actually belonged at one time to Giovanni Colonna. At the top of the first protecting leaf (verso), like a bookplate, is written in a strange hand the half-effaced note, transcribed by De Nolhac[1]: di (?) mes Giani chardinale d ... lona, which it is easy to fill out as: di messer Giovanni chardinale di Colonna.

Altogether, Foresti has made out an interesting and

---

1. Loc. cit.

ingenious case for the De viris, and for dating XXXIX as of 1337. The weak point in his discussion is the attempt to make this date serve also for XL. His argument depends upon a relation between XXXIX and XL, and that is made to hang upon a fanciful interpretation of alto Loco (XXXIX, 5-6), and an equally fanciful association between it and the tela novella (XL, 2) - a very tenuous thread. But the arguments concerning XXXIX are strong enough to justify us in accepting 1337 as its probable date.

(XLI. Quando del proprio sito.)

(XLII. Ma poi che'l dolce riso.)

(XLIII. Il figliuol di Latona.)

XLIV. Que' che'n Tesaglia.

XLV. Il mio adversario.

XLVI. L'oro e le perle.

These three poems are the first in the Canzoniere to speak of Laura with bitterness (XLIV, 9 and 13-14; XLV, 1-3 and 11; XLVI, 7-11). So according to Petrarch's own division of his first ten years of devotion, to be found in the letter to Dionigi,[1] they belong not earlier than 1334-1335. Certainly in April, 1334, he had no trace of "love-and-hate," if we are to judge by XXX (q. v.), though possibly an anni-

---

1. Vide supra, p. 45.

versary poem would necessarily be in softer mood.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that in these sonnets Petrarch is seeking a less uncomplimentary reason for Laura's invincibility and indifference to himself, and that wounded vanity was a parent to his "love-and-hate."

(XLVII. Io sentia dentro.)

(XLVIII. Se mai foco.)

XLIX. Perch'io ti abbia.

This is annotated in V. L. 3196, fol. 9r[1]: t' 13 Febr. 1337. capr. So we may agree with Pakscher,[2] Cesareo,[3] and Cochin[4] that that is the date of composition. Cesareo reminds us of the corroborating fact that Petrarch became Orso's guest near the end of 1336, and so might well have been still at Capranica in February of 1337.

L. Ne la stagion.

This canzone is dated with sufficient exactitude (53-54):

> Ch'i'son già pur crescendo in questa voglia
> Ben presso al decim' anno.

Cesareo,[5] Pakscher,[6] and Cochin[7] are in general agreement

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 66.
2. Op. cit., 95.
3. Op. cit., 52.
4. Op. cit., 53.
5. Op. cit., 53.
6. Op. cit., 95.
7. Op. cit., 53.

that the poem was written in February or March, 1337. Cochin thinks it was very shortly before April 6, and cites the words di poggio in poggio (76) as suggesting it was composed among the mountains, and perhaps therefore at Capranica. (But l. 42 might possibly be interpreted to mean that Laura is not distant.) They all take Ben presso al decim' anno without question to mean "nearly ten years"; but surely it is conceivable that Petrarch meant "nearly to the tenth year," that would be near the beginning of his tenth year of love for Laura, or the early spring of 1336. Mascetta takes it to mean this, being certain, with his usual dogmatism, that Petrarch's ordinals always mean ordinals, and his cardinals, cardinals.[1] This is by no means a certainty, - it would be convenient if it were; his use of the two is loose, so a doubt does remain. But we are sure of 1336 or 1337, and 1337 is probably right.

(LI. Poco era ad appressarsi.)

(LII. Non al suo amante.)

LIII. Spirto gentil.

If we could be sure to whom this canzone was addressed, we should probably have its date. The most important internal clues are l. 4:

---

1. Op. cit., 208.

Poi che sei giunto all' onorata verga,

which most critics take to mean that Petrarch was writing to a Roman senator; l. 3 and l. 100, which thus describe him:

Un signor valoroso accorto e saggio,...
Un cavalier ch'Italia tutta onora;

l. 102:

Un che non ti vide ancor da presso,

which explains that, whoever it was, Petrarch when he wrote the poem had never seen him; and l. 84:

Chè il maggior padre ad altr' opera intende,

which shows that some definite thing was at the time of writing engaging the attention and interest of the pope.

The two most important candidates today are Cola di Rienzo, who as tribune sought to rebuild the Roman republic in 1347, and Busone of Gubbio, who became senator in 1337; but before considering them in detail it may be well to review the arguments in favor of various others.

I. Filelfo believed it was Pandolfo Malatesta, saying in his Commentary[1]:

> In questa canzone il nostro poeta s'allegra del esser stato creato messer Pandolpho M ... il vecchio per sancta chiesa senator di Roma nel tempo che fu deliberato Gregorio XI si partisse d'Avignone e tornasse in Italia,

but Pakscher[2] makes against this the final objection that

---

1. Venice, 1513.
2. Op. cit., 40.

when this happened, which was in 1374, Pandolfo had been dead a year.

II. Franc. Labruzzi[1] proposed Paolo Annibaldi, and argued in his favor that he was a cavaliere and signore (3 and 100), and a senator, and not personally known to Petrarch, and that when he was deputy of the people in Rome with Buccio Savelli in 1335, the pope's attention was centred on the visione beatifica. Against these claims, D'Ancona[2] showed that he was never a senator, and both D'Ancona and Pakscher[3] are alike certain that l'onorata verga (4) must refer to one who was. And Cesareo[4] makes the following solid objections to Annibaldi's claims:

1. Annibaldi's name is not on any manuscript.

2. Labruzzi's argument that there is correspondence between this canzone and the epistola metrica, II, 14, written after Petrarch had known Annibaldi in Rome, in 1337, is met by the fact that in that case the epistola would have been written two years after Annibaldi would have gone out of office, not having in the least met Petrarch's expectations, whose lines: agnosco Romani principis ingens Propositum if addressed to him in such circumstances would have seemed mere irony.

3. Annibaldi was co-deputy with one of the Savelli,

1. "Un altro pretendente alla canzone Spirto gentil," in Rivista europea, Rome, 1879.
2. "Del personaggio al quale è diretta la canzone del Petrarca: Spirto gentil," in his Studi di critica e letteria, Bologna, 1880.
3. Op. cit., 41.
4. Op. cit., 61-63.

whose shield bore a lion, so, as D'Ancona[1] had pointed out, there would be great impropriety in ll. 71-73:

> Orsi, lupi, leoni, aquile e serpi
> Ad una gran marmorea colonna
> Fanno noia sovente et a sè danno,

and in calling upon him to eradicate le male piante.

4. The Annibaldi's own shield bore two lions!

5. They boasted descent from Hannibal, a fact well known to Petrarch, since he referred to it in the Epistola metrica. Then his allusion to Hannibal in l. 67, as an example of cruelty, his only explicit one, would have been very unlike Petrarch's tact.

III. Ad. Borgognoni[2] proposed Stefano Colonna the elder, whose possible candidacy Cesareo[3] disposes of as follows:

1. Stefano was elected in 1339, and Petrarch had known him since 1331, so he could not have written of himself in respect to him: Un che non ti vide mai (104).

2. He was elected against the will of the pope, who afterward forced him to resign. It would accordingly have been both impolite and impolitic for Petrarch to have set l. 83 immediately before l. 84:

> Ogni soccorso di tua man s'attende:
> Che 'l maggior padre ad altr' opera intende.

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. La canzone Spirto gentil, Ravenna, 1881.
3. Op. cit., 53-54.

And Pakscher[1] reminds us that Borgognoni[2] himself was one of the earliest adherents to the theory that the spirto gentil was Busone.

The candidacy of the elder Stefano has had a champion in the present century,[3] who proposes his appointment of 1328 with the following arguments:

1. Petrarch's admiration of the senior Stefano Colonna in the letter Ad posteros fits perfectly what is said in the canzone.

2. The whole tone of LIII is that of youthful enthusiasm. (The tone would not suggest immaturity to most critics, and thirty-three is still young enough for enthusiasm.)

3. In 1323, Bertoldo Orsini and Stefano Colonna were vicarii, and in 1326 Stefano together with Napoleone Orsini forced the undesirable vicario Jacopo Savelli to resign. This action was rewarded by the people with the ordine della cavalleria, an honor on which the Pope congratulated Stefano. (But such honors do not make him a senator, which Stefano became afterward in 1339, or justify the words onorata verga, which suggest official position.)

4. Petrarch did not know Stefano personally until 1331.

---

1. Op. cit., 61.
2. La domenica del capitan Fracassa, No. 4, Jan. 26, 1885.
3. Italia Mortillara, "Sul personaggio a cui è diretta la canzone del Petrarch Spirto gentil," in her Studii di critica letteraria, Palermo, 1910, 17.

5. The conditions at Rome while Ludwig of Bavaria was combatting the pope John XXII were exactly as described in the fourth stanza.[1]

6. All Italy knew and honored Stefano Colonna. (The converse of this is the strongest argument against Busone. His claims to contemporary recognition, stated farther on,[2] may for some incidental reason have seemed especially noteworthy to Petrarch.)

7. In 1337, the year of Busone's election, Petrarch addressed to Benedict XII an epistola metrica[3] in which occur the lines: Te sine nulla manent dulcis solatia vitae; Tu vitae spes una mihi baculusque cadenti ... how then could he have said at the same time in good faith to Busone:

> Io parlo a te, però ch' altrove un raggio
> Non veggio di vertù?

(The epistola expresses personal, the canzone national and political feeling. Besides, a poet must be allowed some laxity in the matter of enthusiastic expression. And Petrarch makes express exception of the pope in l. 84, on a

---

1. La quarta strofe è tutta una pittura delle condizioni di Roma durante lo scisma. Alla gente è negato il cammino ai templi, chiusi o per la diserzione dei preti o per gl' interdetti del pontefice, e che eran convertiti in spelonche di ladroni, poichè l'antipapa stesso non si faceva riguardo di spogliare gli altari e le statue dei santi per saziare l'avidità di Luigi. Il popolo invoca pietà, di ogni lato, non sapendo dove rivolgersi, tra le violenze dell' imperatore, i disordini del clero e i fulmini del pontefice. Op. cit., 28.
2. p.83.
3. I, 2, Basle 1554, III, 1331-32.

ground which by no means excludes the possibility of his being worthy of praise.)

8. As for the unlikelihood that Petrarch should have written the canzone before visiting Rome, Al Cian dico: perchè dovette esser composta la canzone quando il Petrarca aveva già visitato Roma?[1] He could very well have known conditions there by hearsay, and evidently did, since he wrote to Giacomo Colonna at Lombez in 1337:

> È appena incredibile (?) quant' io mi strugga di vedere quella città, quantunque abbandonata sia e ridotta non altra che l'ombra dell' antica Roma.[2]

(To this it may be replied that there is nothing in this passage to indicate that Petrarch was not referring to the outward aspect of Rome alone; and while he could have known conditions by hearsay, they would hardly have stirred his emotions so, and it is emotion that produces poetry. In 1337 Petrarch saw and suffered inconvenience from conditions in his own person. The description would have been only too appropriate at almost any time.)

9. Ludwig's attacks and the accusations of heresy could be l'altr' opera on which the pope was intent. (But

---

1. Op. cit., 22.
2. This letter is evidently Fam. II, 9, Frac. I, 125: Credi non posset quantum urbem illam, desertam quamvis et veteris effigiem Romae, spectare cupiam; of which the above is a more faithful translation than Fracassetti's (It., I, 375): Non è da credersi quanto in me sia il desiderio di contemplare quella città, che sebben deserta, dell antica Roma è l'effigie.

would the pope's troubles be properly called opera?)

IV. De Sade,[1] Salvatore Betti supporting him,[2] Carducci in his Saggio,[3] and Tommaso Casini[4] all favor Stefano Colonna the younger. Casini's summary of their arguments[5] is quoted by Carducci in his edition of the Rime.[6] Against these arguments, Pakscher[7] brings the following:

1. In 1335, the year Stefano was made senator, the opera on which the pope would be intent would be the visione beatifica, and there is nothing in the canzone that would seem to refer to it.

2. Although Platina's Ecclesiastical History declares that Colonna was chosen by the pope, D'Ancona proved by Theiner[8] that it was in 1337 that the pope chose senators, when he named Jacopo da Gabrielli and Busone di Gubbio.

3. The allusion to the baronial families, so far from an argument for Stefano, is an argument against him, because it would be superfluous and absurd to ask a Colonna

---

1. Mémoires pour la vie de François Pétrarque, Amsterdam, 1764-1767, I, 61, N. x.
2. "Lettera a Ferd. Ranalli," in Giornale arcadico, CXXXV, reprinted in Scritti vari di Salvatore Betti, Florence, 1856.
3. Livorno, 1876.
4. Manuale della Letteratura italiana, Florence, 1886.
5. Ibid., I, 61-62.
6. Florence, 1899, 82-83.
7. Op. cit., 58-61.
8. Codex diplomaticus domini temporalis S. Sedis, Rome, 1862, II.

to help a Colonna. As D'Ovidio put it,[1] Sarebbe come se un poeta ghibellino avesse raccomandato a Farinata, reduce vittorioso in Firenze, di tenere della parte degli Uberti!

5. Petrarch is supposed to have known all the Colonna: me in familiaritem perduxit reverendissimi fratris sui Johannis fratrumque omnium.[2] To which Cesareo[3] adds the following:

1. De Sade's document, Annales avenionenses politici, no one has ever been able to find.

2. Monaldeschi's Annales, quoted by De Sade, D'Ancona[4] showed to be apocryphal.

The Vite of Platina, quoted likewise by De Sade, if authentic, would make Stefano deputy in 1338, and Petrarch certainly knew him in 1337.

V. The chief supporters of Cola di Rienzo are first, naturally and humanly enough, all his biographers, Zefirino Re,[5] Fr. Papencordt,[6] and Ferd. Gregorovius[7]; Tommaso Gabrini,[8] who professed to be his descendant; and Bulwer

---

1. In La domenica del capitano Fracassa, 1875, No. 8.
2. Senil., XVI, 1, Frat., II, 461, Venice, 1503.
3. Op. cit., 53.
4. Op. cit., 72.
5. In his appendix to Vita di Cola di Rienzo scritta da un autore del secolo XIV, Florence, 1854, 301.
6. Cola di Rienzo e il suo tempo, tr. Gar, Turin, 1844.
7. Geschichte der Stadt Roma in mittel Alter, Stuttgart, 1867, VI, 262, ff.
8. Commento sopra il poemetto Spirto gentil che il Petrarca indirizzò a Niccolò di Lorenzo tribuno, Rome, 1807.

Lytton, who wrote a play about him. Even the Romance scholars, - D'Ancona,[1] Bartoli,[2] Fr. Torraca,[3] V. Cian,[4] and, much more hesitantly, Gaspary,[5] - who approach the question from the literary and linguistic side, have probably been influenced unconsciously by the purely human feeling that, Cola being the greatest Roman of Petrarch's time, it was appropriate that Petrarch should have addressed to him one of his two greatest odes. Pakscher[6] has well summarized the arguments in favor of Cola:

1. The tradition, dear to sixteenth-century commentators, and supported by the two manuscripts which bear his name: Laur. pl., XLI, 14: Achola di Rienzo da Roma tribuno, and Bibl. Nat., 557, which are both of the fifteenth century, and hence not very early.

2. The evidence to be gleaned from Petrarch's letters, which we cite along with Pakscher's vigorous discussion of them[7]:

a. In Var. XLVIII,[8] Petrarch makes allusion to a poem

---

1. Op. cit.
2. Storia della letteratura italiana, Florence, 1884, VII, 127.
3. "Cola di Rienzo e la canzone 'Spirto gentil' di Francesco Petrarca," in Discussioni e ricerche letterarie, Livorno, 1888.
4. Ancora dello 'Spirto gentil' di messer Francesco Petrarca, nota, Turin, 1893.
5. Geschichte der italienischen Literatur, Berlin, 1885, I, 403-480.
6. Op. cit., 41-52.
7. Ibid., 43-52.
8. Frac. III, 422.

he contemplates writing to Cola, and Cola's supporters conclude that this poem must be LIII. The letter begins:

> Primum ne tibi, vir magnanime, pro tantarum rerum gloria, an liberatae patriae civibus pro tuis erga illos meritis et felicissimo successu libertatis gratuler, incertus sum. Utrisque pariter gratulor, utrosque simul alloquor, neque quos tam coniunctos rebus ipsis video, sermone disiungam. Sed quibus interim verbis utar in tam repentino tamque inopinato gaudio? Quibus votis exultantis animi motus explicem? Usitata sordescunt, inusitata non audeo. Furabor me tantisper occupationibus meis, et Homerico stilo dignissimos cogitatus, quod penuria temporis hortatur, tumultuaria complectar oratione.

And it ends:

> Caeterum quod soluta oratione nunc attigi, attingam fortasse propediem alio dicendi genere, modo mihi, quod spero quidem, et cupio, gloriosi principii perseverantiam non negetis. Apollinea fronde redimitus disertum atque altum Helicona penetrabo; illic Castalium ad fontem, Musis ab exilio revocatis, ad mansuram gloriae vestrae memoriam sonantius aliquid canam quod longius audietur.

Pakscher readily agrees with Papencordt[1] that this is the promise of a poem, but not that the promised poem is the <u>canzone</u> in question. Papencordt quotes <u>Fam.</u>, VII, 7, of November 29, 1347,[2] in support of his belief:

> et hanc mihi quoque durissimam necessitatem, exime, ne lyricus apparatus tuarum laudum, in quo, teste quidem hoc calamo, multus eram, desinere cogatur in satyram.

But Pakscher (who is certainly right in translating <u>multus eram</u>, not: <u>io avveva detto alcerto le molte cose</u>,[3] but "I

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 342.
2. Frac., I, 372.
3. Z. Re, <u>op. cit.</u>, 337.

was very busied,"[1]) says this phrase does not refer to a finished work, and that the superfluous phrase, teste hoc calamo, shows that the poem was not yet known. Now if Petrarch had not completed his poetic tribute to Cola by the end of November, 1347, then he never completed it, because by that time the tribune's star was declining, and he had failed to realize Petrarch's wish: modo mihi, etc. The phraseology is too solemn, he thinks, Apollinea fronde, Musis, etc., to refer to a canzone in Italian, and even a Latin epistle would hardly deserve the words Homerico stylo; the work referred to is more likely, in Pakscher's estimation, to be an epic poem, like Africa, the closing lines of which declare Petrarch's intention to write a modern Roman history: cuncta renarret Quae clausa sub mente gerit.

b. Then there is the supposed similarity between LIII and this so-called epistola hortatoria (Var. XLVIII). Papencordt and Fracassetti both feel that this is considerable, but Torraca, though a partisan of Cola, thinks that whereas the hortatoria is concerned with Rome alone, the canzone involves the larger conception of all Italy. Pakscher makes the same distinction, but conversely, saying it is the canzone that does not look beyond Rome. He bases his argument

---

1. Cf. Senil., XVI, 1, Frac., II, 460; Venice, 1503; in which Petrarch says Giacomo Colonna first invited him into Gascony, seu vulgari delectatus stylo meo in quo tunc inveniliter multus eram.

on making Roma (the nearer word, l. 20) and not Italia (l. 11, in the preceding stanza) the antecedent of neghittosa (23), and on the words popol di Marte (26), and all the allusions after the second stanza, in which it is easy to show by an abundance of quotation that there is question only of Rome. And it is Rome, we may add, that is called upon (103) to give him thanks. Whereas in the hortatoria, Petrarch exults for both:

> Libertas in medio vestrum est, qua nihil dulcius nihil optabilius nunquam certius quam perdendo cognoscitur. Hoc tamen grandi bono ... fruamini, gratias agentes talium munerum largitori Deo, qui nondum sacrosanctissimae suae Urbis oblitus est[1];

and of Italy, of which he speaks so hopelessly in the canzone (15-17), he says in the letter: Italia, quae cum capite aegrotante languebat, sese iam nunc erexit in cubitum.[2] And in writing of Cola to Fr. Bruni,[3] Petrarch said: in illo viro ultimam libertatis italicae spem posueram. After all, the difference is perhaps not so great as Pakscher would have us think, even though Torraca,[4] in the sentence he quotes with derision,

> Bisogna ammettere che il Petrarca potè scrivere l'epistola e la canzone l'una dopo l'altra, senza depor la penna; potè passare a volta a volta dalla prima alla seconda e vice versa,

---

1. Frac. III, 423.
2. Ibid., 431.
3. Fam., XIII, 6, Frac. II, 237.
4. Op. cit., 34.

is perhaps exaggerating. Still, we know Petrarch often reworked his old material and used it again, and it is quite possible that a canzone written in 1337 to one man he might have worked over in 1347 into a letter directed, in somewhat similar circumstances, to another.

And Cesareo[1] contributes something to this discussion of the hortatoria. Its tone, he reminds us, is that of a sudden burst of joy at the news of the Roman revolution of 1347; it exults in the accomplishment of the very things the canzone hopes for. So it is not easy to believe that they were written at the same time, to the same man; much less, that, as Cian insists,[2] the canzone was written first. Fatto con tanta accortezza, wrote Cian, l'eccitamento non poteva non produrre mirabili effetti sull'animo del futuro tribuno. Precisely, replies Cesareo; futuro. Then how, if it were written first, and to Cola, could Petrarch have written 11. 4, 18-19, and 99? And why would it praise things not accomplished, but merely hoped for (25, 36, 42, 46, 68, 75, 83)? Instead of the lungo odio civile mourned in the canzone (48), we read in the hortatoria: Deleatur, oro, de medio vestrum civilis furoris omne vestigium[3]; and Cola is addressed, not merely as one of whom much is hoped (25), but thus:

---

1. Op. cit., 56-61.
2. Op. cit., 34.
3. Frac. III, 437.

> Salve, noster Camille, noster Brute, noster Romule, seu quolibet alio nomine dici mavis, salve, Romanae libertatis, Romanae pacis, Romanae tranquillitatis, auctor. Tibi debet praesens aetas quod in libertate morietur, tibi posteritas quod nascetur.[1]

If the canzone had been directed to Cola before the revolution and tribunate, then what could be the significance of the phrases, onorata verga (4), ben locato offizio (39), and a le tue braccia (18)? Moreover, such words are hardly applicable at all to a man who had come into power by revolution.

3. The advice to rally to the support of the gran marmorea colonna (72) was inappropriate as offered to Cola, since the Colonna had killed his brother. Also, in 1347, Petrarch had cooled a good deal toward the family, and was writing against them in Ecl. V. Even in the hortatoria, he wrote:

> Decoris vestri fortunarumque raptores, libertatis eversores dinumerate ... Hunc vallis spoletana, illum Rhenus aut Rhodanus aut aliquis ignobilis terrarum angulus misit.[2]

Now the Colonna came from the shores of the Reno, and there are other similar compliments to them in the same epistle.

4. Even Cian has to admit the seriousness of the objection against Cola that lies in the words: Un che non ti vide mai. Petrarch did know Cola, and not merely casually.

---

1. Frac. III, 433.
2. Ibid., 424.

In a letter to him[1] we read:

> Dum sanctissimum gravissimumque sermonem repeto, quem mecum ante religiosi illius ac veteris templi fores nudius tertius habuisti, concalesco acriter ... Adeo mihi divine praesentem statum, imo casum ac ruinam rei publicae deplorare, adeo profunde digitos eloquii tui in vulnera nostra dimittere visus eras, ut quoties verborum tuorum sonus ad memoriam aurium mearum redit, saliens moeror ad oculos, dolor ad animum revertatur.

And in one to Fr. Nelli[2]:

> Loquor enim ardentius ... moestus ut vides, ut qui in illo viro ultimam libertatis italicae spem posueram, quem diu ante mihi cognitum dilectumque, post clarissimum illud opus assumptum colere ante alios mirarique permiseram.

Torraca[3] tried to make the phrase read: Uno che sinora ti vide da presso a quel modo che uom s'innamori d'altri per fama, which, if it means anything, it is hard to see means anything different. Anyhow, it has been well disposed of by Carducci's indignant arguments.

Cian[4] imagines the canzone to have been written somewhat differently at first, and then changed because of Petrarch's timidity, after Cola's fall. To this, Cesareo makes several rejoinders:

a. This is a dangerous way to argue, and may lead in any direction.

b. Even if the tone of the canzone had been lowered, would that have involved altering every allusion to things

---

1. App. litt., II, Frac. III, 504.
2. Fam. XIII, 6, Frac. II, 237.
3. Op. cit., 54.
4. Op. cit., 36, ff.

done, so as to make them refer to things merely expected?

c. Why have we no knowledge of the first form, especially since Baroncelli used it in an oration to the Florentines? We have the canzone to Azzo, which Petrarch excluded from the Canzoniere, and others. Though, as Cian says, if we have not the first redaction of any other poem, that is because, much as Petrarch revised his works before sending them forth, he never went back over them afterward.

d. What would have been the use of toning down the canzone pro bono pacis, as Cian imagines he did, after the first form had been made known to every one in Italy?

e. If Petrarch did tone down the canzone, then why not also Ecl. V, Var. XXXVIII, XL, XLII, and the terrible XLVIII itself? As he wrote in the same letter to Nelli[1]: Etsi enim delere illa valde velim, non potero, in publicum egressae mei iuris esse desierunt. Was this not equally true of the canzone?

VI. Now for Busone, who was appointed senator by the pope in 1337, together with Jacopo de Gabriellis.

1. First, as Bartoli[2] was the one to discover, in 1885, his name appears on several manuscripts:

a. Ashburnam 478, the one discovered by him: Mandata a Messer Busone da Gobbio essendo senatore di Roma.

---

1. Frac. II, 235.
2. Domenica del capitan Fracassa, 1885, No. 2.

b. Ricc. 1100: Canzone di messer Franciescho petracchi a messer Busone, and Laur. XLI, 16: Busone dagobbio eletto senatore, both announced by Papa.[1]

c. Palat. 189: messer busone daghobbio essendo eletto senatore di Roma, and a Cod. marcianus: a un senatore amizissimo del Petrarca, both announced by F. D'Ovidio.[2]

2. There are no points in the canzone at variance with Busone, that have to be explained away. If the praise seems a little too high for him, that, as Cesareo remarks, was characteristic of Petrarch's style, and cites XXVIII and CIII as examples of his magniloquence.

3. Bartoli was converted from support of Cola.

4. Busone's personal fitness was considerable. He came of a distinguished family, so was a cavaliere and signore, and his ancestors were at the head of various cities. He was Podestà of Arezzo in 1316 and 1317, and later of Viterbo, Lucca, and Todi, and in 1327 was Captain of the People at Pisa. He was the author of verses, a student of antiquity, and books were dedicated to him. L. Pieretti[3] studied all the uses of the phrase spirto gentil in the Canzoniere, and found it always to be used of donne, poeti, letterati, spiriti contemplativi, whereas men of

---

1. Fanfulla della domenica, May 30, 1886.
2. Ibid., May 2, 1886.
3. "Cola di Rienzo e Bosone da Gubbio," in Rassegna italiana, Sept.-Oct., 1885.

action are anime leggiadre or magnanimi spirti. Busone, then, who is known to have been in some degree a man of letters, would by rare exception have been both spirto gentil and signor valoroso. It would not be strange if Petrarch should have felt special hopes of a "scholar in politics."

5. These facts, and especially his connection with Arezzo, must have made him well known by reputation to Petrarch. Pakscher conjectures he was a Ghibelline, from whom Petrarch may have hoped for help for the Colonna. It has been objected that Petrarch said nothing of Busone elsewhere, either in Italian or Latin, but Cesareo meets this by reminding us first of other important persons, such as Cino, to whom he seems to have written but the one poem, and Geri Gianfigliazzi, his correspondence with whom we know of only through V. L. 3196; then adds pertinently that in 1337 Petrarch knew Busone only by fame, and by the time his year of office had expired, Petrarch's hopes of him had been disappointed.

6. At any rate, the allusion to the Colonna makes no difficulties. Never was Petrarch more intimate with them than in 1337.

7. In 1337, Rome seems to have been in exactly the state described in LIII. That was the year of Petrarch's

visit to Rome (so he knew what conditions were), and Giovanni Colonna, according to Pakscher,[1] advised him against coming.[2] He had to wait several weeks at Capranica, till the Colonna sent a strong military escort to take him to Rome. From there he wrote[3]:

> Pastor armatus silvis invigilat, non tam lupos metuens quam raptores. Loricatus arator, hastam ad usum rustici pugionis inverterus, recusantis bovis terga solicitat. Auceps retia clypeo tegit; et piscator hamis fallacibus haerentem escam rigido mucrone suspendit; quodque ridiculum dixeris, aquam e puteo petiturus, rubiginosam galeam sordido fune connectit. Denique nihil sine armis hic agitur.

In May, 1337, one of the Savelli plundered a church and burned its dependencies, as mentioned in one of the pope's letters.[4] And the feud between the Colonna and the Orsini was exacerbated by the pontificate of Benedict XII. He was concerned for the public welfare, and a truce was

---

1. Op. cit., 68. But Pakscher's implication that the advice was given because of dangerous conditions of travel is certainly disingenuous. The real reason was a fear lest Petrarch's illusions about the Eternal City should be shattered by a visit: Solebas enim, memini, me a veniendo dehortari, hoc maxime praetextu, ne ruinosae Urbis aspectu, famae non respondente atque opinioni meae ex libris conceptae, ardor meus illa lentesceret.
2. Fam., II, 14, Frac. I, 134.
3. Fam., II, 12, Frac. I, 131.
4. IIII Kal. Mart. Pontificatus anno tertio (Theiner, No. 36): Nuper ad apostolatus nostri noticiam est deductum quod Iacobus de Sabello de Urbe dyabolico spiritu instigatus, equitum et peditum suorum in hac parte complicum exercitu congregato ... ecclesiam sancti Angeli in Firopiscium, ut in predam converteret res et sacra ipsius ecclesie ornamenta ... et plures alias ipsius ecclesie domos ausu sacrilego ignis incendio concremando.

finally effected through the Bishop of Embrun.[1]

8. The only strong argument against Busone, according to Cesareo, is the fact that he was but one of two senators called in 1337, whereas the canzone evidently refers to one only, but he says there is nothing against our believing that Petrarch thought ill of Jacopo. At any rate, as Pakscher remarks, it apparently never occurred to any of Petrarch's contemporaries that he could be writing LIII to Jacopo. And Pakscher cites Villani[2] as judging him very unworthy. When appointed capitano della guardia e conservadore di pace by the Florentine Signory in 1335, he has this to say of him:

> Il detto Jacopo stette in signoria uno anno facendo aspro uficio, facendosi molto temere a' cittadini grandi e popolani ... E poi più altri per simile modo a morte giudicò, e condannò quasi tutti i comuni e popoli di contado per cagione di ritenere sbandito a diritto e a torto come gli piacque. E così menando rigido e crudo il suo uficio molte cose illecite e di fatto fece in

---

1. Dudum id audientiam nostri apostolatus fide digne relatione deducto, quod hostis humani generis, pacis emulus et cunctorum malorum inventor inter nonnullos nobilis et magnatus Urbis, praesertim de domibus Ursinorum et Columpnensium adeo gravis dissentionis suscitare materiam, ipsosque, sicut odiosis rancoribus studuerat commovere, quod ad invasiones offensas mutuas iamdudum processerant, seque ad similes vel peiores, nisi salubribus obviaretur remediis, accingebant: nos considerantis attente, quod ex hiis lapsus rerum, personarum excidia et animarum amirius plangenda pericula, ex quibus gravibus offenderetur altissimus, opprimeretur innocentes et pauperes status que eiusdem Urbis turbaretur pacificus, possent sequi. Theiner, XLIII, 22. And similarly, in Papal bulls XI, XX, XXI, etc.
2. Milan, 1803, XI, 39.

> Firenze a petizione di coloro che l'aveano chiamato e che reggeano la città, e ancora per non licito guadagno. Poi compiuto l'anno se n'andò ad Agobbio ricco di molto danari.

Moreover, Pakscher takes Jacopo to be the son of that Cante de Gabriellis who was a Guelf, had a hand in the exilings of 1302, and drove out a number of Ghibellines from Gubbio in 1315. In that case, as it was not unusual for the pope in choosing two senators, to select one from each party, Busone might have been a Ghibelline, and so more congenial to Petrarch's hopes and beliefs. Pakscher's conjecture certainly receives support from Busone's political connection with Arezzo and Pisa, the Ghibelline cities.

Cochin[1] reviews the arguments of Cesareo, but while he admits the difficulty involved in l. 102, the only objection he considers serious, he continues to believe stoutly in Cola, although he does not feel that the evidence is strong enough to permit him to date the canzone.

However, for the purposes of the present study, with no argument of weight against Busone, and with the evidence of the manuscripts and various consonant circumstances strongly in his favor, we shall take LIII as dated with considerable probability, 1337.

LIV. Per ch'al viso d'Amor.

The last line of this sonnet may be taken as an

---

1. Op. cit., 54-55.

allusion to middle life under the metaphor of midday. In two other lines Petrarch uses the same metaphor, of the length of a day for the length of human life:

> E questa, ch' anzi vespro a me fa sera (CCXXXVIII, 33).
> E compiei la mia giornata innanzi sera (CCCII, 8).

And E. Proto[1] instances several examples of the use of this metaphor in the letters: in Fam., VIII, 4[2]:

> a primo ad ultimum, quamvis longissimae, vitae diem totum simul mente complectere;

and Fam., XXIII, 12[3]:

> Breve est iter ... Advesperascit, mihi crede: dum confabulamur ... transit dies non sentientibus nobis. Respiciamus ad solem.

It occurs also in CXC (4 and 12).[4]

If, then, we may conceive Petrarch as remembering with a poetic literalness, like Dante, that "the years of our life are three score and ten," "midday" would be the age of thirty-five, and the date of this sonnet would be 1339, or thereabouts - quasi a mezzo il giorno. Cesareo[5] dates it in this way as shortly before 1339, and Cochin[6] as about that year. Moschetti, reviewing Cochin,[7] remarks

---

1. "Per un madrigale del Petrarca," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XVI (1911), 97.
2. Frac., I, 429.
3. Frac., III, 220.
4. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that in the sestina CCXIV Petrarch uses the space of a day to indicate a quite different length of time, possibly five years.
5. Op. cit., 67.
6. Op. cit., 55-57.
7. Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, VI, (1898), 127.

that the parallel circumstances to those in Inf. I, - the wood, the danger to the poet's spiritual welfare and the rescue, - contribute a good deal of weight to the belief in a relation between mezzo il giorno and nel mezzo del cammin.

E. Proto[1] puts the poem a little earlier, in 1336, making a parallel between Augustine's conversion as related in the "confessions," and the experience recorded in this poem. The year 1336 was a year of crisis, as we know, - the year of the ascent of Mt. Ventoux, and of the flight to Rome to escape the entanglements of love, as described in the epistola metrica to Giacomo Colonna.[2] In the letter to his friend Father Dionigi,[3] Petrarch describes the ascent of Mt. Ventoux, and the effect upon him of opening the "Confessions" on the summit, and coming by chance upon these words:

> Et eunt homines admirari alta montium, et ingentes fluctus maris, et latissimos lapsus fluminum, et oceani ambitum, et gyros siderum, et relinquunt se ipsos.[4]

In Fam., II, 9,[5] to Giacomo Colonna, he shows himself aware of a similarity between his own history and Augustine's,[6]

---

1. "Per un madrigale," etc.
2. I, 7, Basle, 1554, III, 1336.
3. IV, 1, Frac. I, 193.
4. Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi opera omnia ... opera et studio monachorum ordinis Sancti Benedicti e Congregatione S. Mauri, Paris, 1836, Bk. X, viii, 15, I, 298.
5. Frac. I, 119.
6. Ibid., 123.

and the following passage from the First Dialogue[1] of the Secretum confirms the impression that he feels a relationship:

> aliquale tamen inter procellas meas (Petrarch is the interlocutor), fluctuationis tuae vestigium recognosco. Ex quo fit ut quotiens Confessionum tuarum libros lego, inter duos contrarios affectus, spem videlicet et metum. ... legere me arbitror, non alienam, sed propriae meae peregrinationis historiam;

and above:

> Novi, equidem, illiusque ficus salutiferae, cuius hoc sub umbra contigit miraculum immemor esse non possum.[2]

Proto cites two passages from the "Confessions," which he associates with the madrigal:

> Erravi et recordatus sum tui. Audivi vocem post me, ut redirem. ... Et nunc ecce redeo, aestuans et anhelitus,[3]

and

> Silvescere ausus sum, variis et umbrosis amoribus[4];

and he thus sums up the parallel:[5]

> Adunque il Petrarca comincia dal ricordare quel capitoletto[6] delle Confessioni in cui Sant' Agostino rammenta l'entrar della sua adolescenza nella "selva" degli amori, e il suo vaneggiar per le vie delle corruzioni carnali, disperso lontano da Dio; indi ci narra come fosse colpito profondamente e profondamente turbato dalla lettura, non certo casuale, di un brano di

---

1. Basle, 1554, I, 377.
2. The famous episode recounted in Conf., Bk. VIII, xii, 8, op. cit., I, 267.
3. Op. cit., Bk. XII, x, 10, I, 358.
4. Op. cit., Bk. II, 1; I, 151.
5. Op. cit., 113.
6. II, 1, op. cit., I, 161.

quel libro, succedendo a lui, quello che, certo per volere di Dio, era successo altra volta a Sant' Agostino e Sant' Antonio. Ond' egli, da quel momento, cerca di ritrarre il passo dal suo cammino e ritornare sulla via della virtù. Questo è il fatto reale, che egli riproduce nel madrigale; e, seguendo la forma immaginosa usata dal gran Santo d'Ippona, per ricordar la conversione, il Petrarca intese di riprodurre poeticamente quel celebre episodio della vita di Sant' Agostino.

Scattered through the various passages quoted from the "Confessions" and the Secretum are several phrases that remind us of these in the poem: the ficus salutifera matches the bel faggio (7); the umbra and the amoribus umbrosis recall the ombra of the same line; silvescere ausus sum is very reminding of l. 6:

Ahi quanti passi per la selva perdi!

as is Erravi et recordatus sum. Audivi vocem post me is closely paralleled by l. 5:

Udii dir alta voce di lontano,

while the last two lines and a half reproduce and amplify the words: Et nunc ecce redeo, aestuans et anhelitus:

e rimirando intorno
Vidi assai periglioso il mio viaggio,
E tornai n' dietro.

These resemblances certainly establish a parallel strong enough to make us believe that it was the experience of 1336 that Petrarch was describing in LIV, but we cannot feel so sure that that was the date of composition of the madrigal. Yet there is a finality about the last line

which suggests it may have been written while he was still too much under the influence of it to have begun to waver and while he was still avoiding the temptations of Laura's presence. Quasi a mezzo giorno must be not long before 1339, if the metaphor means what we suppose it to mean. A conservative probable dating, then, would be 1337-38.

LV. Quel foco ch'i'pensai.

Cochin[1] remarks that l. 2, with its allusion to freddo tempo and l'età men fresca, refers to a time at least much later, certainly, than that of the innamoramento.

(LVI. Se co'l cieco desir.)

(LVII. Mie venture.)

LVIII. La guancia che fu già.

This sonnet is dated in V. L. 3196 (f. 16v)[2]: Ad dominum Agapitum cum quibusquam munusculis quae ille non potuit induci ut acciperet. Die Natali mane. 1338. T'. Only the 8 is now legible, but Beccadelli and Ubaldini, who read 1338,[3] are thus confirmed by the Casanatense 984.

(LIX. Perchè quel che mi trasse.)

LX. L'arbor gentil.

There is no way of dating this. Cochin[4] thinks it

1. Op. cit., 56.
2. Appel, op. cit., 109.
3. Op. cit., 57.
4. Ibid., 57.

belongs many years after the innamoramento. As it is a narrative covering several stages of Petrarch's love, it is interesting to put it beside XXIII. A sudden change in Laura's sentiments, at a moment when he was perhaps over-confident, - securo me di tali inganni (5), - suggests comparison with the two times of his offending described in XXIII (77 and 137-138); but if they do refer to the same episode, then XXIII would have to be placed a good deal later than we placed it, for the first line of LX says he loved her molt'anni while still in high favor, while in XXIII (143) he tells of having wept molt'anni after his offense. Twice molt'anni, even taking them at the shortest possible computation, can hardly be compressed within seven years.

LXI. Benedetto sia 'l giorno.

This cannot be dated. Cochin[1] believes it to be an anniversary sonnet, written in springtime, and some time after the innamoramento, because of the words tutte le carte Ov' io fama le acquisto (12-13).

LXII. Padre del ciel.

This is a dated sonnet (9-10):

> Or volge, signor mio, l'undecimo anno
> Ch'i'fui sommesso al dispietato giogo.

---

1. Op. cit., 57-58.

There is a grain of doubt possible, whether volge may not refer to the beginning as well as to the end of the eleventh year, but Cochin[1] says explicitly that he believes it to refer to a completed year, while Pakscher[2] and Cesareo[3] accept the date as on or near April 6, 1338, without raising the point. We can certainly accept 1338 as probable.

(LXIII. Volgendo gli occhi.)

LXIV. Se voi poteste.

Ubaldini read on V. L. 3196 the annotation, now effaced, but supported by the Casanatense, f. 16r[4]: 1337. Novemb. 16. processi hic scribendo. Pakscher[5] in the interests of his theory, so as not to have to accept a sonnet of 1337 as placed after the dated sonnet, LXII, of 1338, prefers to believe that Ubaldini misread 7 for 8. Cesareo[6] laughs at this notion, saying that a comparison of V. L. 3196 with the Casanatense reveals Ubaldini as an exact reader and copyist. Cochin[7] wonders whether the date be that of composition or only of transcription. In any case, we can be sure, as he says, that it was written before November 17, 1337.

---

1. Op. cit., 58.
2. Op. cit., 95.
3. Op. cit., 68.
4. Appel, op. cit., 108.
5. Op. cit., 96.
6. Op. cit., 68.
7. Op. cit., 59.

LXV. Lasso che mal.

There is no indication to go by, except that it is evidently not in the earliest stages of Petrarch's love (1, 3-4, 12-13).

LXVI. L'aer gravato.

Cochin[1] notes a similar indication (34-35) that this cannot be very early.

LXVII. Del mar tirreno.

LXVIII. L'aspetto sacro.

LXIX. Ben sapev'io.

As Cesareo's ingenuity[2] discovered a way of dating LXIX, and as there is reason for connecting LXVII and LXVIII with the same journey, whenever it was, it is easiest to consider these three together. In V. L. 3196 (9r), against LXIX, is the note read by Appel[3] as: Transc. id. te. (idem tempo), but which Cesareo[4] took to be id. tt. (idem titulus), discovering a numerative C. above this note which could be matched with an A. and a B. on the same leaf,[5] each attached to a dated sonnet. A stands beside Più volte il dì (a sonnet not included in V. L. 3195, or the editions of the Canzoniere), which is dated in V. L. 3196[6]: 4 novembr. 1336

---

1. Op. cit., 59.
2. Op. cit., 68-70.
3. Op. cit., 67.
4. Loc. cit.
5. Appel, op. cit., 66.
6. Ibid., 66.

reincepi hic scribere. B is set against XLIX,[1] which, as we have seen, is dated: 13 febr. 1337 capr.

Then ll. 7-8 of LXIX:

notai là sopra l'acque salse
Tra la riva toscana e l'Elba e Giglio,

seem to refer to the same journey by water from Provence his landing from which he is evidently describing in LXVII, 1-2:

Del mar tirreno a la sinistra riva,
Dove rotte del vento piangon l'onde.

And this allusion to rough water, and the one in LXIX, 10,

Agitandomi i venti e'l cielo e l'onde,

Cesareo connects with Petrarch's letter,[2] which thus alludes to his voyage near the end of 1336: Veni tandem, ut vidisti, hyeme, bello, pelagoque tonantibus, and with the famous Ep., I, 7[3]:

Diffugio, toto vagus circumferor orbe
Adriacas, Tuscasque ausus sulcare procellas,

when he was fleeing from love, on that same journey, as in LXIX, 9: I'fuggia le tue mani (Amor).

To sum up Cesareo's evidence, then: (1) These three sonnets all refer clearly to a journey, LXVIII in the first line makes a pretty plain allusion to Rome:

L'aspetto sacro della terra vostra,

---

1. q. v.
2. Fam., IV, 6, Frac. I, 213; Frac. It., I, 512.
3. Basle, 1554, III, 1337.

and Petrarch's well-known tendency to group poems having to do with the same subject[1] makes it very likely that these three poems all refer to the same visit to Rome. (2) That it is not the journey of 1341 is suggested by the absence of any allusion to the laurel crown. (3) The numerative lettering, which evidently associates one of these three with poems known to have been composed during the journey of 1336-1337, receives strong corroborative evidence from letters describing a stormy journey in those same waters, and referring to the same occasion.

Cochin[2] accepts Cesareo's arguments, adding his belief that this journey to Rome was a period of great literary fertility, encouraged perhaps by Petrarch's hosts, Orso dell'Anguillara and the Colonna, and the suggestion that the friend addressed in LXVIII may have been Giacomo Colonna, who is known to have been in Rome in 1337.

All in all, we may take it as very probable that these three sonnets were written in 1336-1337.

LXX. Lasso me.

There are no definite indications. Cochin[3] reminds us that it must be later than XXIII, since its last line is the first of that canzone, and that it cannot be in the

---

1. Cf. Chapter IV.
2. Op. cit., 59-61.
3. Ibid., 62-63.

earlier stages of his love for Laura, because of the words in l. 12: ho sospirato sì gran tempo.

LXXI. Perchè la vita è breve.

LXXII. Gentil mia donna.

LXXIII. Poi chè per mio destino.

There are no indications in these three poems, except such general ones as show them not to be among the earliest: LXXI, 14-15, 37-39; LXXII, 11-15; etc.

LXXIV. Io son già stanco.

LXXV. I begli occhi.

And there are no time-indications in these two, except that, as Petrarch asks in the one and answers in the other the question, why he does not tire of loving and writing of Laura, these likewise cannot be very near the beginning of their relation.

LXXVI. Amor con sue promesse.

Petrarch is apparently fleeing from love for the second time, after having been once recaptured (1-8). Cochin[1] thinks the poet may be alluding to a second journey away from Avignon, but will not risk even a hypothesis. In this cautiousness we do well to imitate him, only noting

---

1. Op. cit., 63-64.

once more that he must be well beyond the time of the innamoramento.

LXXVII. Per mirar Policleto.

LXXVIII. Quando giunse a Simon.

The important note to these two sonnets in V.L.3196 has already been quoted[1] in another connection, and only the part relating to the date need be repeated here: Tr' isti duo in ordine post mille annos. 1357. Mercur. hora 3. novembr. 29.[2]

Simone Martini, the Sienese painter,[3] was in Avignon much or most of the time from 1339, when Benedict XII summoned him, until 1344, when he died there,[4] and in the interval he probably made a long stay, or, as Cochin[5] believes, several stays. His wife seems to have remained some years after his death.[6] Now if in 1357, as Cesareo[7] notes, these sonnets seemed so ancient to Petrarch that he felt as if he were transcribing them post mille annos, it is likely that they were written near the beginning of this period. This

---

1. p.3.
2. Appel, op. cit., 58.
3. Vasari, Vite, ed. G. Milanesi, Florence, 1878, I, 547; G. Milanesi, Documenti per la storia dell'arte senese, Siena, 1854, I, 216, cited by Cochin.
4. Necrologio di San Domenico di Siena, cited by Milanesi; Vasari, op. cit., 557, n. 1.
5. Op. cit., 67.
6. Documenti, 244.
7. Op. cit., 70.

"ingenious conjecture" Cochin[1] accepts, and adds the useful reminder that while Petrarch was absent from Avignon through most of 1341, part of 1342 and 1344, he was there or near there through all of 1339 and 1340. A. Foratti[2] likewise accepts Cesareo's dating. Nino Quarta[3] sought to prove that Simone was at Avignon near the beginning of 1337, and sustain the thesis of F. Wulff[4] that the portraits reached Petrarch in 1336; Wulff says it is "necessary to admit" this, and believes the portraits were the famous ministri of Love of LXIX, 12[5]; but there is no proof of it at all, whereas P. Rossi[6] has shown that Simone did not go to Provence until after February 8, 1339. We may take it as probable for these two sonnets, then, that they were composed about 1339-1340.

LXXIX. S'al principio.

This is self-dated in the first two lines:

> S'al principio risponde il fine e'l mezzo
> Del quartodecimo anno ch'io sospiro,

and we are certainly safe in agreeing with Pakscher,[7]

---

1. Op. cit.,67.
2. "I sonetti del Petrarca per il pittore di Laura," in La Rassegna, XXVIII (1920), 33.
3. Studi sul testo delle Rime del Petrarca, Naples, 1902, 56.
4. Petrarca i Vaucluse, Lund, 1910.
5. "La prima crisi del Petrarca sulla fine dell'anno 1336 (attestata dai fogli 1, 7-8, 9-10 e 16 del Vat. lat. 3196," in Rivista d'Italia, VII (1904), ii, 102.
6. "Simone Martini e il Petrarca," in Bullettino senese di storia patria, XI, 1, 2, cited by Cochin.
7. Op. cit., 123.

Cesareo,[1] and Cochin[2] in assigning it to the spring of 1340.

LXXX. Chi è fermato.

LXXXI. Io son sì stanco.

LXXXII. Io no fu'd'amar voi.

LXXXIII. Se bianche non son.

These four poems are plausibly treated as a unit by Cochin[3]; they indicate a weariness, if not of loving at least of love's pain, and a longing for religious conversion, with some allusions to the passage of time (LXXX, 10, 13; LXXXI, 1-2; LXXXII, 1, 3-4; LXXXIII, 9). So they do not belong to the earliest period, although the allusion to white hair (LXXXIII, 1) is not significant, as Cochin[4] reminds us by quotation from one of the letters[5]: canos aliquot ante vigesimum quintum annum habui.

(LXXXIV. Occhi, piangete.)

(LXXXV. Io amai sempre.)

LXXXVI. Io avrò sempre in odio.

Petrarch has survived his happier time (1-4), and has learned something per lunga esperienza (10), so this cannot be very early.

---

1. Op. cit., 70.
2. Op. cit., 68.
3. Ibid., 68-69.
4. Ibid., 69.
5. Fam., VI, 3, Frac., I, 324.

(LXXXVII. Sì tosto come aven.)

LXXXVIII. Poi che mia speme.

Petrarch's hope is lunga a venir troppo (1), so some time must have passed since it first began.

LXXXIX. Fuggendo la pregione.

According to the second line, Love had held him prisoner molt'anni, so again we are not very near the beginning of the love for Laura. Moschetti, in his review of Cochin's Chronologie,[1] thinks both this and the preceding sonnet were written after the conversion.

XC. Erano i capei.

This sonnet seems to be defending Laura's former beauty in spite of the fact that it has now somewhat declined (4, 13), so some years must have passed since 1327.

XCI. La bella donna.

Pakscher,[2] Cesareo,[3] and Cochin[4] all agree with Carducci's belief that this sonnet was written to Petrarch's brother Gerardo, on the death of his lady. Gerardo entered the monastic life at Montrieu in 1342,[5] and Carducci[6] had

---

1. Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, VI (1898), 121.
2. Op. cit., 126-127.
3. Op. cit., 70-72.
4. Op. cit., 73-74.
5. Fam., X, 3, Frac., II, 66; Frac. It., II, 496.
6. Saggio sul Petrarca, 101-102.

believed that the sonnet must have been composed before that; Cesareo brings forward evidence for making the earlier date more precise. In a letter[1] Petrarch tells of going in 1338 with Umberto Delfino to visit the cave of Ste. Beaume, a shrine of Mary Magdalen, accompanied by Gerardo, who announced his intention of becoming a monk. And in Fam., X, 4,[2] he refers to that occasion: Ibi enim in hoc sancto proposito, de quo multa mecum prius agitaveras, Deo cor lubricum sublevante, firmatus es. Gerardo then had thoughts of this decision even before the pilgrimage; would his lady have been living in 1338, when he made it? Cesareo is sure not, because he believes that Gerardo's desperate state of mind as described in Fam., X, 3,[3] indicates a grief then recent, which must have preceded the resignation and calm of the final decision to forsake the world:

> Juvenili aetate revocasti eas, morte quidem, ut spero, illis utili, nobis necessaria. Et tamen, o caeca mens mortalium! quoties questi sumus quasi ante tempus accidisset quod cum summo vitae nostrae discrimine trahebatur, aut quasi salutare aliquid intempestivum sit! Quot suspiria, quot lamenta, quot lacrimas in ventos effudimus, et more phreneticorum medico nostro insultantes, manum tuam repulimus, lenimen optimum nostris vulneribus adhibentem.

So Cesareo would date this sonnet 1337, and Cochin[4] agrees: On ne se trompera pas beaucoup en proposant la date de 1337.

---

1. Sen., XV, 15, Frac., II, 451; Venice 1503.
2. Frac., II, 88; Frac. It., II, 496, for date, 1348.
3. Frac., II, 72.
4. Loc. cit.

Foresti, however,[1] believes that the pilgrimage was made not in 1338 but in 1337, and in that case the argument of Cesareo and Cochin would push the date of XCI back to 1336. Foresti cites the same letter[2] they do to prove his date; it is addressed to Philippe de Cabassoles, and recalls that the visit to the cave was toto ante decennio quam in rure tuo positus solitariae vitae libros inscriberem. Cochin and Cesareo do not explain how it is that this constitutes a dating for the pilgrimage, but Foresti, believing the Vita solitaria to have been written in 1346,[3] thus builds up his case for setting the toto decennio ante back to the autumn of 1337. In Var. XV,[4] surely of May 24, 1371,[5] he writes to his friend Francesco Bruni concerning his one friend left in the curia, Cabassoles: Solus ipse dominus Sabinensis tribus et triginta annis in eodem proposito erga me mansit; 33 years from 1371 evidently leaves 1338, and so De Sade understood it, but Foresti argues that Petrarch, writing in May, 1371, of an event which took place late in the year 1337, might properly say 33, as the

---

1. "Postille di cronologia petrarchesca: I. Alla spelonca della Sainte-Beaume nell'autunno del 1337," in La Rassegna, Ser. III, Vol. IV (XXVII, 1919), 108.
2. Sen., XV, 15.
3. We know from the dedicatory letter that it was written in Lent, and at Philip de Cabassole's country retreat - "in rure tuo" - near the entrance to Vaucluse (Basle 1554, I, 255).
4. Frac., III, 335.
5. Frac. It., V, 257.

34 years would not be up until several months later. He quotes also from this letter to Philippe de Cabassoles, - assuming it to be of the same year, 1371, as Sen. XV, 14, to Philip, which precedes it, - the statement: quartus et trigesimus annus ex quo acta sunt haec, which would be good supporting evidence, if the date were certain.[1] Foresti's chief point, then, is to date the beginning of their friendship in the autumn of 1337. This he does by quoting Var. 64, in which Petrarch refers to its beginning about the time of his first establishment at Vaucluse,[2] and the following phrase from Sen. XV, 15: cum quo eo tempore familiaritas recens erat, to the effect that the expedition to the cave, where he wrote a poem to Philip, took place early in it. Now the first letter we have from Avignon after Petrarch's return from Rome in 1337 is the one to Tommaso da Messina, dated August 18, 1337; and as he first went to Vaucluse in that summer, it must have been not long after this date; and it was presumably before the year was out that he made the acquaintance of De Cabassoles, whose castle was near by. Foresti explains the phrase toto ante decennio (as used by Petrarch as referring to 1337 instead 1336) by saying that Petrarch was probably mistaking De

---

1. His reference to Basle 1554, 1042, is evidently erroneous, but the letter can be read in the edition of Venice, 1503.
2. Frac., III, 484.

vita solitaria in his recollection for De ocio religioso[1]; but a simpler explanation is that Petrarch in counting days or years usually included the current one in his count.

Even if Foresti is right in all these contentions, still he is making too much depend upon the word recens, in the phrase quoted. Even if the friendship did not begin until late in 1337, and even if the pilgrimage was made while the friendship was recens, still six months (or until some time in the early part of 1336) would not look like a long time across the space of so many years as had intervened before the date of Sen. XV, 15. Certainly decemnio points to February or March rather than an autumn month, since we know Petrarch was counting back from Lent. We may still accept 1337 as the most probable date.

XCII. Piangete, donne.

Cesareo[2] cites the documents quoted by V. Ciampi[3] from the archives at Perugia, to prove that Cino died at the close of 1336. They are a will, dated December 23, 1336: an inventory ch'io Schiatta oe fatto de beni che mr.

---

1. This is of course to make a very considerable assumption do as an argument; still it is true that Petrarch did associate these two works in his mind, as witness the opening of another letter to Philip, Sen. XIII, 11 (Basle 1554, II, 1024).
2. Op. cit., 72.
3. Vita e memorie di messer Cino, Pistoia, 1826, Introd., ix.

cino lasciò a franciescho di mino suo nipote, dated January 28, 1337; and a commission

> fatta da messer Giovanni Charlini e da Schiatta al maestro Cellino chellavora in S. Giovanni ritondo d'uno allavello di marmo senese, e a Siena si de lavorare, per la sepoltura di m. Cino, bello e magnifico.

Then the inscription on the cenotaph,[1] though of later origin, gives the same year.

Pakscher,[2] in the interests of his theory, rejects these dates (saying that the stone-cutter might easily have cut MCCCXXXVI for MCCCXXXXI, and that had he had any accurate information he would not have omitted the month and the day), and questions the authority of Ciampi's documents. We have not the original inventory, only a copy by Pandolfo Arfaroli, and Pakscher cites V. Capponi[3] to prove that the latter is untrustworthy. However, we know that Pakscher is always prejudiced when his hypothesis is in question, and Cochin[4] accepts Cesareo's dating.

We may safely say that this poem was probably written early in 1337.

---

1. Quoted by Pakscher, op. cit., 123:
   Cino eximio iuris interpreti
   Bartolique praeceptori dignissimo
   Pop. Pist. Civi suo B. M. fecit.
   Obiit. A. D. MCCCXXXVI.
2. Op. cit., 123-124.
3. Bibliografia pistojese, Pistoia, 1874, 31.
4. Op. cit., 74.

(XCIII. Più volte Amor.)

(XCIV. Quando giunge.)

(XCV. Così potess'io.)

(XCVI. Io son de l'aspettar.)

(XCVII. Ahi bella libertà.)

XCVIII. Orso, al vostro destrier.

Cochin[1] supposes this sonnet to be addressed to Orso dell'Anguillara, and imagines that the tourney or joust, or whatever the occasion may have been that Orso was obliged to absent himself from, to have been too unimportant (since we have no other knowledge of it) for Petrarch to have known of it unless he had been near by. For this reason Cochin connects this poem with Petrarch's sojourn with Orso, or in his vicinity, during the Roman journey of 1336-1337. We may accept his dating as probable.

XCIX. Poi che voi ed io.

Cesareo[2] thinks this was addressed to Gerardo on learning of his pious resolve, and that the sonnet fits in a general way with all that we know of the situation; the <u>più felice stato</u> (14) he takes to refer to religious peace, and notes the intimate form of address, <u>Frate tu vai</u> (12). He dates the sonnet accordingly a little before 1342.

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 75-76.
2. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 72-73.

B. Wiese, in reviewing Cesareo's work,[1] agrees that the poem is addressed to Gerardo, but thinks it must have been before he entered the religious life, on account of its hortatory tone; Petrarch would not, he says, have given such advice to one who had already taken the step.

Cochin,[2] although he calls this hypothesis _séduisante_, sees valid objections. For one thing, Petrarch addresses the recipient of his letter as _voi_, who is represented as replying with the phrase beginning _Frate_; now if XCI was directed to Gerardo, then Petrarch would have probably used _tu_ to his brother. Cochin does not think this argument final, but, in such a formalist as Petrarch, weighty. (The present writer would be inclined to think it final.) Cochin suggests as a possible addressee for this letter Giovanni Colonna of San Vito, to whom Petrarch wrote _Fam._, III, 13[3] on the occasion of his entering the order of the Preaching Friars, and several other moral letters: _Fam._, II, 5-8[4]; III, 13; VI, 2-4.[5] There are definite resemblances which Cochin points out between XCIX and these letters: between ll. 2-5 and _Fam._, II, 7:

> damnum certum sub ambigua spe ... Abduc igitur omnem spem, omne desiderium averte ab his fallacibus bonis. Incipe unum solum et verum et summum bonum opperiri[6];

---

1. _Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie_, XVII (1893), 324.
2. _Op. cit._, 76-80.
3. _Frac._, I, 132.
4. _Ibid._, 107.
5. _Ibid._, 310.
6. _Ibid._, 115.

and between the last four lines of XCIX and Fam., II, 8:

> licet vulgus insaniat, sunt tamen nobis aliquanto magis sobrii consultores ... Nec te moveat vita mea quotiens epistolas meas legis, nec in frontem respexeris ista suadentis.[1]

Wiese's objection would seem to apply even more entirely to Colonna, who we know was already a Dominican, were it not that the letters, which were certainly addressed to him, were conceived in the same tone.

But all of Cochin's argument can now be transferred to another personage, for whom we have one fairly exact date, the useful one of his death. V. Rossi[2] has disposed of the rather shadowy figure of Giovanni di San Vito and substituted that of the Giovanni Colonna who was a Dominican and wrote Liber de viribus illustribus and Mare historiarum. He was older than Petrarch,[3] so the latter might well have addressed him as voi,[4] while the other could very well have addressed Petrarch as tu. And being a Dominican, the invocation Frate would be not unbecoming. This friend died about the beginning of 1344.[5] So we can say that XCIX was probably written before 1344.

---

1. Frac. I, 118.
2. Di un Colonna corrispondente del Petrarca, Rome, 1920. See discussion under CXIV.
3. Fam., II, 7, Frac., I, 112.
4. Besides, he belonged to the great family with only one of whom Petrarch was on terms of familiarity.
5. Cf. p.123.

C. Quella fenestra.

Cochin[1] thinks this is probably another of the anniversary sonnets, and Cesareo[2] noting that it refers to the spring of the year (10-11):

> E la nova stagion che d'anno in anno
> Mi rinfresca in quel dì l'antiche piaghe,

remarks that it cannot be the spring of 1341, since in that year Petrarch left for Naples in February.

CI. Lasso ben so.

This sonnet is self-dated in ll. 13-14:

> La voglia e la ragion combattuto anno
> Sette e sette anni.

Pakscher,[3] Cesareo,[4] and Cochin[5] all take this as meaning the year 1341, and doubtless the spring of that year; but Cochin agrees with Cesareo in believing that although an anniversary poem it is hardly to be considered as having been written on April 6, 1341, that is only two days before the coronation on the 8th. Cochin makes this the occasion to say he does not think it necessary to believe in any given case that an anniversary poem was composed on the anniversary day, that it could be days, or even months, after the exact day, - but not years.

---

1. Op. cit., 80.
2. Op. cit., 73-74.
3. Op. cit., 122.
4. Op. cit., 73.
5. Op. cit., 80.

(CII. Cesare, poi.)

CIII. Vinse Annibal.

Pakscher,[1] Cesareo,[2] and Cochin[3] all agree with Carducci[4] in connecting this sonnet with two letters addressed to the younger Stefano Colonna, of which one[5] shows great similarity of wording and idea:

> Potuisti, vir fortissime, vincere: scito, sapientissime vir, uti victoria. Ne quis unquam nostrum tibi possit obiicere quod, Cannensi quondam die, Maharbal Hannibali.

And the other[6] confirms Stefano's identity, and mentions the poem in Italian:

> De universo rerum tuarum statu quid sentirem breve quiddam tibi, bellacissime vir, materno pridem sermone conscripseram, ut posset militibus et tuis innotescere, tecum in partem laboris et gloriae profecturis,

and

> Novissime per nuntium Stephani senioris, magnanimi patris tui, quo plures virtuti stimulos incuterem, scripsi oratione soluta et libera; quam si habes, nihil est quod mutem.

Both these letters, however, are undated. Cesareo,[7] however, accepts the date 1333, and thinks with Carducci[8] that the sonnet may refer to Stefano's victory over Bertoldo and Francesco

---

1. Op. cit., 82-84.
2. Op. cit., 74-75.
3. Op. cit., 81.
4. Saggio, 7.
5. Fam., III, 3, Frac. I, 142.
6. Fam., III, 4, Frac., I, 146.
7. Loc. cit.
8. Saggio, 16-17.

Orsini, in May, 1333, with which Fracassetti[1] connects them:

Che trovaron di maggio aspra pastura (6).

And his conclusion is supported by Cochin.[2] The only opposing argument is Pakscher's,[3] founded on his hypothesis of a perfect chronological order which this dating seriously infringes.

Quel medesmo
Che vuol provarsi, non altri, il ti giura.

CIV. L'aspettata virtù.

All critics and commentators are agreed in thinking that this sonnet was addressed to Pandolfo Malatesta. Carducci[4] thought it was written in 1348, Pakscher[5] because of its position insists on 1341, while Cesareo,[6] the only one who tries to produce new evidence (since Carducci as well as Pakscher argues from position), elects for a very much later date, 1356. The only clues lie in Pandolfo's possible age at the time this sonnet was addressed to him. In the first place, we do not know for a certainty when he was born, but Cesareo assembles what information we have: Pandolfo was the son of "Guastafamiglia" Malatesta and the

---

1. It., I, 412, 415.
2. Loc. cit.
3. Loc. cit.
4. Saggio, 169-170.
5. Op. cit., 125.
6. Op. cit., 75-77.

brother of Galeotto, "l'Ungaro," Lord of Rimini, who was born in 1327.[1] Cesareo conjectures that Pandolfo was a little older, and Litta,[2] he says, thinks 1325 probable; Cochin[3] accepts this date as established. In 1343, in fact, when he was about eighteen, Pandolfo put down a rebellion at Fano with some success of military strategy. If we accept Carducci's date of 1348, then it would be this youthful exploit to which Petrarch refers in the first two lines:

> L'aspettata virtù, che'n voi fioriva
> Quando Amor cominciò darvi battaglia.

But Cesareo thinks the age of twenty-three (in 1348) much too young to justify the following line:

> Produce or frutto che quel fiore agguaglia,

and connects the sonnet with the year 1356, when Pandolfo was named captain of cavalry by Galeazzo Visconti, in which capacity he took part brilliantly in a campaign against Charles IV, which Petrarch[4] refers to in a letter, and was in the battle of Magotto on the Ticino.

The second line of the sonnet evidently indicates a very early age[5] and may well refer to the exploit at Fano,

---

1. C. Clementini, Raccolta istorica della fondatione di Rimino, Rimini, 1617, II, 71.
2. Famiglie celebri italiane (Malatesta), tab. V.
3. Op. cit., 82.
4. Senil., I, 6, Frac. Sen., I, 56.
5. Cf. XXIII, 21-40.

but Cesareo does not give it great importance and thinks twenty-three too young for the praise of present accomplishment in the sonnet; moreover, there is no particular achievement known as belonging to the year 1348 which can be connected directly with Pandolfo, and Carducci can only cite the evidence of Meneghelli[1] to show that it was a prosperous time for the Malatesta family:

> Giacchè la fortuna, come dice il Muratori, non si mostrò mai tanto propizia alla famiglia dei Malatesta quanto in quell'anno. In fatti nel 1348 ebbero il dominio di Ascoli, fecero prigione Mogliano signor di Fermo dopo averne sconfitto l'esercito e s'impadroniron d'Ancona.

In all these activities Pandolfo may well have borne a brilliant part which has not been individually recorded by the historians.

But Cesareo has another reason against this year: Petrarch had not yet met Pandolfo Malatesta in 1348, and Cesareo thinks he would not in that case have addressed him so familiarly as Pandolfo mio (12), when after nearly twenty years of friendship he still began a sonnet to Cardinal Colonna, Signor mio caro (CCLXVI); whereas in 1356 Petrarch had visited Pandolfo while the latter was ill, and Pandolfo had visited him, and Visconti's captain had given fine proof of himself as a soldier.

---

1. Annotazioni di Anton. Meneghelli, Padua, 1819.

Cochin[1] discusses all Cesareo's points and reminds us that the two had been in correspondence for long before they met in 1356, and that Pandolfo had commissioned a painter to make a portrait of Petrarch long before having seen him.[2] (And he might have added that a more familiar address might have seemed more fitting towards a prince twenty years his junior, than to a Cardinal, his senior, and a Colonna.) Cochin is disposed to give more weight to the episode of Fano than Cesareo, and hence to Carducci's date, and thinks the poem might have been addressed without more than the usual admitted hyperbole to a very young man who was a prince. He comes, however, to no conclusion.

(CV. Mai non vo' più.)

(CVI. Nova angeletta.)

CVII. Non veggio ove scampar.

This sonnet is self-dated in lines 5-8:

gli amorosi rai

. . . . . .

Risplendon sì ch'al quintodecim'anno
M'abbaglian più che'l primo giorno assai.

Pakscher[3] and Cesareo[4] take this to indicate the year 1342, but Cochin,[5] evidently thinking that al quindecim'anno means

---

1. Op. cit., 81-82.
2. Sen., I, 6, Frac., Sen., I, 55; the note on Iconographie, in De Nolhac, Pétrarque et l'humanisme, Paris, 1907, II,
3. Op. cit., 83-84.
4. Op. cit., 77.
5. Op. cit., 83.

at the beginning of that year, dates the sonnet April 6, 1341. The present writer inclines to agree with Pakscher and Cesareo, since otherwise we must suppose that Petrarch wrote two anniversary sonnets for the same day,[1] or at least that he let two dated sonnets in honor of the same day have a place in the Canzoniere; that seems inartistic, and consequently unlike Petrarch.

(CVIII. Avventuroso più.)

(CIX. Lasso, quante fiate.)

(CX. Perseguendomi Amor.)

(CXI. La donna che'l mio cor.)

CXII. Sennuccio, i' vo' che sappi.

This was evidently composed before 1348, since it gives Sennuccio an exact account of the poet's situation with relation to Laura at the moment. Even if we admit with Cesareo[2] that Petrarch continued to write of Laura as still living in certain poems composed after her death, he would not have written quite in this tone, and certainly not within the year and a half which intervened between her death and Sennuccio's.

CXIII. Qui dove mezzo son.

Flamini,[3] arguing against Laura's being a valchiusana,

1. Cf. CI.
2. Op. cit., 118-121.
3. Op. cit., 75.

has drawn attention to the likenesss between this sonnet and the letter, Var., XIII,[1] apologizing to Guglielmo da Pastrengo for having gone to Avignon to see him, and come away again hurriedly, without seeing him. He describes the perils of the papal city in a way to suggest that

> la tempesta e' l vento
> C'hanno subito fatto il tempo rio (3-4),

were metaphorical. And indeed this would not be the only time he used this same metaphor for the evil aspects of Avignon; in Fam., V, 1,[2] we read:

> ad fontem Sorgiae ... notum procellarum animi mei portum, quo heri ad vesperam solus fugi, cum mane Rhodani ad ripam rumor moestissimus me invenisset.

And in Fam., XIII, 6[3]:

> Babylone ultimo digressus, ad fontem Sorgiae substiti, notissimo mearum procellarum porto.

In the letter to Guglielmo he confesses his weakness in being drawn back again and again to Avignon, in spite of knowing its evils, from which he has once more fled:

> Subegerat me sibi pridem vita lautior ea quae in urbibus agitur, et in ea urbe potissimum ubi tu nunc es. Illic multos per annos quas miserias, quosve labores pertulerim infelix, non epistolae brevis opus est: quibus tandem exagitata mente cernens nullam nisi in fuga libertatis spem relictam, ... profugi et eripui meipsum periculis quacumque patuit via: ... Sed quanta est duratae consuetudinis vis! Saepe adhuc infaustam mihi civitatem repeto, nec ullius unco necessitatis tractus, ultro in laqueum redeo, et ex portu

---

1. Frac., III, 328.
2. Frac., I, 251.
3. Frac., II, 234.

> totiens naufragium passus, relabor in pelagum, quibus urgentibus flatibus incertum est. Mox omne mei ius eripitur, mihi undique ventorum, rabies, undique fluctus et scopuli, 'coelum undique et undique pontus,' postremo mors undique ... Quod itaque me his proximis diebus videre nequiveris, scito nullam causam fuisse aliam, nisi curae veteres ... iam carcerem, iam catenas et verbera ... evasi.[1]

These quotations make the figurative explanation seem as plausible as the fiero tempo con pioggia e vento which Carducci believed to be the occasion of the poet's flight from Avignon; but remembering how Petrarch liked to connect Laura's presence or absence with changes in the weather (XLI-XLII), we can accept a literal meaning too, as does Proto.[2] This letter was written probably in 1338,[3] the period when Petrarch was consciously striving to avoid the temptations of the world and Laura, as we know from the letter to Dionisi describing the spiritual crisis on Mt. Ventoux.[4]

CXIV. Da l'empia Babilonia.

The clues to the date of this sonnet lie in the first line and the last three. The possibilities of the first line have been thoroughly worked by Cesareo, who was at great pains to prove in connection with the so-called

---

1. Frac., III, 328.
2. Review of Melodia's Studi sulle Rime del Petrarca, in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XV (1910), 242.
3. Frac. It., III, 236.
4. Fam., IV, 1, Frac., I, 193.

"Babylonian sonnets" (CXXXVI-CXXXVIII)[1] that Petrarch's real hatred of Avignon did not begin till about 1352, and that he never called it "Babylon" before that date; as he has to admit that poems of so late a date are out of place in Part I, he expresses the belief that they were put there for artistic reasons. But it is difficult to prove a negative proposition, or to assume that Petrarch cannot have used the opprobrious term "Babylon" once or twice, some time before his increased bitterness led him to make it an almost invariable synonym for Avignon.

Cochin[2] gives considerable weight to Cesareo's main argument, yet does not think it impossible that Petrarch should have had acces of anger against the papal court before 1352, and adduces certain letters which expressed much earlier a bitter resentment against its transference from Rome:

> Avenionem ubi te nunc ac genus humanum Romanus Pontifex detinet,[3]

and

> mox in rupe horrida tristis sedet Avenio, quam nunc Pontifex maximus Romanus, propriis sedibus desertis, obstante, ut arbitror, natura, caput orbis efficere nititur, et Laterani immemor, et Silvestri.[4]

---

1. Op. cit., 89-100.
2. Op. cit., 86-88.
3. Fam., I, 4, Frac. I, 48; dated 1333, Frac., It., I, 282.
4. Fam., VI, 3 (Frac. I, 335), written probably before 1350, and if Rossi's contention is correct (v. u.), then before 1344.

As for the due persone of the closing lines,

> Sol due persone cheggio; e vorrei l'una
> Co'l cor ver' me pacificato, umile,
> L'altro co'l piè, sì come mai fu, saldo,

the allusion to Laura as the first of them seems unmistakable. Whose heart else could he desire to have pacificato, umile, toward him? And if he is still hopeful of a change in it, if its state can still be the object of a wish, then Laura is evidently still living, and it is not yet 1348. Cesareo does not face this question at all, and to the possibility that the allusion is to Laura opposes only an impatient gesture; there is no reason, he thinks, for believing that Laura was still living when the poem was written, and he ridicules the idea that every two persons the poet longs for must always be assumed to be Laura and the Cardinal Giovanni Colonna, just because of their association in CCLXIX.[1]

The truth is that Cesareo is often far from impartial. Pakscher's unsound method of establishing his hypothesis of a rigidly chronological order was justly irritating to him, but it frequently drove him to defend a different conclusion too warmly, and to strive to build up a case against Pakscher instead of coolly confining himself to an examination of the evidence. Pakscher had posited

---

1. Op. cit., 100-101.

for this poem, on very insufficient evidence, the date 1342,[1] and Cesareo cannot help preferring a conclusion that would make Pakscher as wrong as possible. In the matter of conclusions preference is fatal to accuracy. For one who is not concerned to prove any one wrong (as Cochin never is), it is difficult not to feel, in the light of other passages too numerous to quote and too familiar, that these words refer to Laura, and to Laura living.

The last line presents many difficulties. Who is the other person whom Petrarch, in the general indifference to all else which the sonnet describes, misses and longs for, of whom he says:

. . . . vorrei . . . .
L'altro, co'l piè, si come mai fu, saldo?

(The alternate reading, l'altra, since it would agree with persona, can equally well refer to a man.) In the first place, as to the meaning of saldo, Carducci accepted the interpretation, in which we follow him, that it referred to the gout; he assumed also that it was to his friend Cardinal Giovanni Colonna that Petrarch was wishing relief from it, and most of the earlier commentators believed the allusion was to Cardinal Colonna even when they took saldo to refer to political or military security. There was, however, another Giovanni of the Colonna family who was a

---

1. Op. cit., 119-120.

friend of Petrarch and suffered from the gout. This was the recipient of the eight letters[1] from Petrarch that are discussed by Vittorio Rossi,[2] and whom he identifies with the Dominican Giovanni Colonna, author of Liber de viris illustribus and Mare historiarum. He was older than Petrarch (II, 7), who consoled his old age with a little treatise on illustrious longevities (VI, 3), and with his comedy Philologia, written to raise his friend's spirits (II, 7); Petrarch also had occasion to sympathize with his sufferings from the gout: domum tuam, amice, podagram subintrasse audio (III, 13).[3] This Colonna died about 1344; in XXIII, 12, Petrarch tells of seeing him for the last time, Prenestina sub arce, October, 1343, nec ita multo post ille obit.[4]

In the absence of any evidence that Cardinal Giovanni had the gout, it is conceivable that l'altro was the Dominican friend of these eight letters.

A. Foresti[5] argues from this same group of letters that this sonnet must be addressed to their recipient,

---

1. Fam., II, 5, 8; III, 13; VI, 2-4, Frac., I, 107, 168, 310.
2. In Di un Colonna corrispondente del Petrarca, Rome, 1920.
3. Frac., I, 169.
4. Frac., III, 221; It., V, 67.
5. "Postille di cronologia petrarchesca. III. Di Valchiusa in sull' aprirsi della primavera 1342," in La Rassegna, Ser. III, Vol. IV (1919), 113.

noting the likeness to the sonnet especially of Fam., VI, 3, from which he quotes this passage. Set beside CXIV, the similarities are immediately apparent.

> Videbis quem desideras optime valentem, nullius egentem rei, nil magnopere de fortunae manibus expectantem. Videbis a mane ad vesperam solivagum, herbivagum, montivagum, fontivagum, silvicolam, ruricolam, hominum vestigia fugientem, avia sectantem, amantem umbras, gaudentem antris rosøcidis, pratisque virentibus, execrantem curas curiae, tumultus urbium vitantem, abstinentem liminibus superborum; vulgi studia ridentem, a laetia moestitiaque pari spatio distantem; totis diebus ac noctibus ociosum, gloriantem musarum consortio, cantibus volucrum et lympharum murmure; paucis servis sed multis comitatum libris; et nunc domi esse nec ire, nunc subsistere, nunc querula in ripa, nunc tenere in gramine lassatum caput et fessa membra proiicere et (quae non ultima solatii pars est) neminem accedere nisi perraro, qui vel millesimam vaticinari possit suarum particulam curarum. Ad haec modo obnixum defixumque oculis tacere: modo multa secum loqui, postremo se ipsum et mortalia cuncta contemnere.[1]

Whether the friend to whom these letters were addressed was Giovanni Colonna di San Vito, Lord of Gensano, as Foresti thinks, or the Dominican author of Hauvette's argument, does not after all matter for the dating of this sonnet (since whichever he was, he died in 1344), if only we can find enough evidence that it was not directed to Cardinal Giovanni. There is no real evidence of its being addressed to him, except his association with Laura in CCLXVI, and the consequent assumption that they are the sol due persone in CXIV. In favor of the other Giovanni Colonna

---

1. Frac., I, 335.

are two solid pieces of evidence: the fact that we know the latter to have had the gout, and the several similarities between the letters addressed to him and this sonnet.

We may safely conclude that Cesareo was certainly mistaken in putting the sonnet after 1348, and that it was probably written before 1344.

(CXV. In mezzo di due amanti.)

CXVI. Pien di quella ineffabile.

This is the first piece to make certain mention of Vaucluse (though CXIII and CXIV would appear to have been written from there):

> In una <u>valle chiusa</u> d'ogni'ntorno
> Ch'è refrigerio de' sospir miei lassi,
> Giunsi sol con Amor (9-11).

Therefore, Cochin says,[1] it must be posterior to 1337. But as Petrarch went first to Vaucluse in the summer of that year, and as the allusion is not only to the valley but to his leaving Avignon where Laura was and coming to the valley upon a special day (<u>nel dì</u>, etc., l. 3):

> Lassai quel ch' i' più bramo (5),

and <u>Giunsi</u>, the suggestion certainly is that he has come rather recently. Add to that the probability that an event of such importance as his first adoption of a beautiful new

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 88.

country retreat might well prompt a poem, and remembering his poet's habit of quick literary response to episodes that concerned him, we shall not go far wrong in thinking this may have been written that very summer. We can safely say that it dates from 1337 or very shortly after.

CXVII. Se 'l sasso.

D'Ovidio[1] has shown with arguments which satisfy Carducci that the steep bolder side of the height which shuts Vaucluse in is towards the valley (that is, towards Rome), and the more gently sloping side towards Avignon. Petrarch's conceit is that if the gentler slope were on his side, his thoughts would have easier ascent on their way to Avignon and Laura.

Cesareo[2] argues that this sonnet is to a friend of the poet's, and written after Laura's death, which would set it so late as to invalidate still further Pakscher's hypothesis of an invariable chronological arrangement. Cesareo does not believe Petrarch would ever refer to Avignon as <u>be' luoghi</u> (13), since even in connection with Laura he speaks bitterly of it, as in CCLIX:

> Ma mia fortuna, a me sempre nemica,
> Mi resospinge al loco, ov'io mi sdegno
> Veder <u>nel fango</u> il bel tesoro mio.

---

1. "Questioni di geografia petrarchesca, memoria letta all'Accademia," in <u>Atti dell' Accademia di Scienze morali e politiche di Napoli</u>, XXIII, 35.
2. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 101-103.

Flamini, however,[1] thinks be' luoghi refers not to Avignon but to Laura's country retreat. But even admitting that it does mean Avignon, an observation of Flamini's[2] made in a different connection meets Cesareo's objection:

> È chiaro, che nell' epistola metrica al vescovo di Lombez[3] dilecta urbs, riferito ad Avignone, ha semplice valore di perifrasi, per dire 'città ove solevo incontrare la mia diletta.'

So be' luoghi, by a similar periphrasis, could mean the places frequented or dwelt in by Laura, oltre le belle bella.

But Cochin,[4] writing without any particular thesis to defend or oppose, but expressing himself with unwonted heat,[5] finds it impossible to accept Cesareo's arguments on account of ll. 5 and 6:

> I miei sospiri più benigno calle,
> Avrian per gire ove lor spene è viva,

in which are the words sospiri and spene so frequently used of Laura. He thinks it impossible it should not refer to Laura, and to Laura living. The reference to Vaucluse in

---

1. Op. cit., 125.
2. Ibid., 14.
3. I, 7, Basle, 1554, III, 1337.
4. Op. cit., 88.
5. Dans ce sonnet, comme dans le sonnet 91, P. donne à Avignon le nom de Babel. Ici encore, Cesareo voudrait reculer la date jusqu'à 1351 ou 52, mais son raisonnement me paraît encore plus inadmissible; P. parle de ses "soupirs" qui veulent aller "où leur espérance est vivante." Cesareo suppose que ces expressions s'appliquent non à Laure, mais à un ami quelconque. Cela est vraiment impossible, surtout lorsque nous avons vu cent fois P. employer ces expressions de soupirs et d'espérance en parlant de ses amours.

the first line,

Se 'l sasso ond' è più chiusa questa valle,

shows us it is certainly as late as 1337, and a kind of casualness in the allusion suggests habitual acquaintance with it, not a recent arrival.

CXVIII. Rimansi a dietro.

This sonnet is dated in the first line:

Rimansi a dietro il sestodecim'anno.

The sixteenth year is completed, evidently, since April 6, 1327, so we are quite safe in agreeing with Cesareo[1] that it was written in April, 1343, or at any rate with the cautious Cochin,[2] who assigns it to the spring of that year.

CXIX. Una donna più bella.

Most of the commentators, including Carducci, Cesareo, Pakscher and Cochin, believe that this poem has some connection with receiving the laurel at Rome in 1341, because of the lines (103-105)

Di verde lauro una ghirlanda colse
La qual con le sue mani
Intorno intorno a le mie tempie avvolse,

and that the two ladies mentioned in it are Glory and Virtue. The main question is whether it was written before or after

---

1. Op. cit., 77.
2. Op. cit., 88.

the coronation. Pakscher[1] believes that it is after, but we must not forget that that conclusion agrees better with his chronological hypothesis. Carducci does not commit himself on this point, and the other two both set it before.

Cesareo[2] argues that the intended obscurity near the end of the canzone, to which Petrarch himself makes allusion in the envoy, means that the coronation is not yet known to the world, but is soon to be announced:

perchè tosto spero
Ch' altro messaggio il vero
Farà in più chiara voce manifesto.

It was in September, 1340, that Petrarch received the invitation from both Paris and Rome, and in February he set sail from Marseilles for Naples, where he submitted to the interrogation by King Robert, and arrived at Rome April 6, to be crowned on the 8th by Orso dell'Anguillara, who was then senator. Cesareo believes the poem was written at the close of 1340 or the beginning of 1341, and thinks he finds the germ of it in a letter to Giovanni Colonna, written in September, 1340, to ask advice about accepting the coronation:

> Scio quidem in rebus humanis fere omnibus nihil solidi inesse. Magna, ni fallor, in parte curarum actuumque nostrorum umbris eludimur. Tamen, ut est animus iuvenum gloriae appetentior quam virtutis, cur non ego ...?[3]

---

1. Op. cit., 128-129.
2. Op. cit., 77-81.
3. Fam., IV, 4, Frac., I, 211.

Cochin[1] agrees with these arguments,[2] and believes the canzone to date from the beginning of 1341. We can accept a probable date of 1340-41.

CXX. Quelle pietose rime.

This sonnet denies the rumor of his death to a friend who has written pietose rime about it. There was such a rumor spread abroad in Italy in the last months of 1343, when Petrarch was at Naples as spokesman for Clement VI to Queen Giovanna, and Antonio de' Beccari of Ferrara wrote a canzone to mourn his demise. Carducci assumes this sonnet to have been prompted by that canzone; so does Cesareo;[3] and both cite a letter in which he refers to the incident:

> Vigesimus annus est, ex quo Clementis imperio Petri in solio tunc sedentis, Neapolim profectus, dum ibi aliquantulum tempus tero, per Liguriam Venetiamque omnem atque Aemyliam, defunctus publice nunciatus sum, additusque mendacio, me intra Siciliam obiisse, de qua re amicus ille, tunc noster, non mali vir ingenii sed vagi, carmen illud flebile texuit, quod audisti, qui ut vides, me ad ipsam quam deflevit mortem, in certum quo spatio antecessit.[4]

Cochin,[5] however, is not satisfied that the rumor

---

1. Op. cit., 88-89.
2. Which he finds still further confirmed by G. Melodia, in Studi sulle rime del Petrarca, Catania, 1909, as he states in his review of this work, in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LV (1910), 140.
3. Op. cit., 81.
4. Sen., III, 7, Basle 1554, II, 858. For the date of this visit to Naples, see Fam., Frac. It., II, 34.
5. Op. cit., 89.

mentioned in CXX is the one the letter describes. The sonnet evidently refers to a dangerous illness:

> gli estremi morsi
> Di quella ch' io con tutto 'l mondo aspetto
> Mai non senti', ma pur senza sospetto
> In fin a l'uscio del suo albergo corsi;
> Poi tornai 'ndietro, perch'io vidi scritto
> Di sopra 'l limitar, che'l tempo ancora
> Non era giunto al mio viver prescritto,

and we have no evidence whatever of Petrarch's having been ill in 1343. Cochin thinks it more likely that the reference is to an illness of which the poet makes mention in another letter[1]:

> febris adfuit, qua duce, laetus usque ad ipsum limen mortis accessi. Sed cum transire vellem, in foribus scriptum erat: noli adhuc: nondum venit hora tua.

The verbal resemblances and the same metaphor of "Death's door" do certainly establish a strong presumption that this illness of 1341, induced by grief over the death of his friend Thomas Caloria of Messina, is the one mentioned in the sonnet. Moreover, the words senza sospetto, "without fear," agree perfectly with Petrarch's saying in the letter[2] that he had wished to die after Thomas did.

> Post Thomam meum, fateor, mori volui, nec potui. Speravi, sed elusus sum ... infelicissimis rumoribus affecto, et optima mei parte amissa, vitam sine illo vere solitariam atque anxiam peroso, peropportuna febris adfuit ... laetus ad ... limen mortis accessi.

On the other hand, the circumstances described in the letter

---

1. Fam., IV, 11, Frac., I, 222.
2. Loc. cit.

quoted by Cesareo could hardly have happened twice,[1] and are in perfect consonance with the canzone. Carducci relates both letters to the sonnet, and considers that it was written in 1343, but that the allusion is to the illness of 1341. This view has common sense and our knowledge of human nature to recommend it; a vivid experience, and especially a sorrow, still seems very recent after two years, and the poetic appropriateness of being able to reply to Antonio's apprehensions, "No, I did not die, but I was very near it recently," might easily have prompted Petrarch to telescope his dates. We may accept 1343 as the probable date of CXX.

CXXI. Donna mi vene.

This is the madrigal found at this point in Chigi L. V. 176, for which in V. L. 3195 Petrarch substituted the other madrigal Or vedi, Amor. There is no way of dating it.

CXXII. Dicesett' anni.

This sonnet is self-dated in the first two lines:

---

1. The false rumor of Petrarch's death, to be sure, was frequently repeated, but it is unlikely that a friend wrote a poem upon the supposed event more than once. In Sen., IX, 2, he wrote: vix fluxit annus quo non saltem semel meae mortis fama revixerit. Mirum, cum et ego valetudine corporis hactenus semper fere prosperrima, et mediocri sorte rerum usus sim, et talia nonnisi de potentioribus fingi soleant, quorum mors momenti aliquid rebus possit afferre (Basle 1554, II, 945), and in Sen., XIII, 7: hoc biennio infirmus, et saepe pro mortuo habitus (Basle 1554, II, 1018).

Dicesett' anni ha già rivolto il cielo
Poi che 'n prima arsi,

and we can agree with Pakscher,[1] Cesareo,[2] and Cochin[3] in assuming that it was written in April, 1344.

(CXXIII. Quel vago impallidir.)

CXXIV. Amor, fortuna.

The eleventh line affords the only clue:

E di mio corso ho già passato il mezzo.

We can safely follow Cochin[4] in agreeing with Cesareo[5] that, remembering how firmly the Middle Ages held man's middle age to begin at the half of three-score years and ten, and that Petrarch appears to have used the same idea in LIV, this sonnet was presumably composed after 1339.

CXXV. Se'l pensier che mi strugge.

This canzone is in many respects similar in idea to the one following, the famous Chiare, fresche e dolci acque. It is in part addressed to a natural scene full of memories of Laura, and recalls one in particular:

Odil tu, verde riva,
E presta a'miei sospir sì largo volo,
Che sempre si ridica
Come tu m'eri amica.
Ben sai che sì bel piede

---

1. Op. cit., 96.
2. Op. cit., 81.
3. Op. cit., 90.
4. Ibid., 90.
5. Op. cit., 82.

Non toccò terra unqu' anco,
Come quel dì che già segnata fosti ...
Ovunque gli occhi volgo,
Trovo un dolce sereno
Pensando: qui percosse il vago lume.
Qualunque erba o fior colgo,
Credo che nel terreno
Aggia radice, ov' ella ebbe in costume
Gir fra le piagge e 'l fiume,
E talor farsi un seggio (49-73).

But this song has a touch of the "love and hate," of which there is no trace in CXXVI:

Se forse ogni sua gioia
Nel suo bel viso è solo
E di tutt' altro è schiva (46-48).

E. Sicardi[1] argues that these songs were written in farewell to Vaucluse, before departure on a journey, and Cochin[2] is in full agreement with him. This would date the poems as later than 1337.

CXXVI. Chiare, fresche e dolci acque.

See CXXV.

Sicardi[3] believes that on the day which Petrarch is recalling with such emotion, Laura confessed in words her love for the poet, and cites in support of his theory l. 11:

Ove Amor co' begli occhi il cor m' aperse,

---

1. "Dell'angelico seno e di altri luoghi controversi nella canzone diel Petrarca Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXX (1897), 227.
2. Op. cit., 90.
3. "Ancora della Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXXII (1898), 457.

as well as the climax of the stanza Da be' rami which describes her, and ends with the words(non per anco ben considerate): Qui regna Amore. As for the setting of the poem, he says: Che scena del quadro immortale sia Val chiusa non è chi dubiti.[1]

Flamini doubts it, however. An important part of his thesis[2] is that Laura was not only born in the country near Avignon, but had a villa there, and that the valley of the Sorgue and the Durance was the scene of Petrarch's meetings with her and of his love. This theory is in conformity with many lines of the Canzoniere[3] which have led Mascetta Caracci[4] and Nino Quarta[5] to the same general conclusion (though with the greatest differences of important detail), and is supported by citations showing that all his life long Petrarch had felt as he expresses himself in CCXXXVII (25-26):

> Le città son nemiche, amici i boschi
> A' miei pensier.

In Fam., II, 12,[6] for example, addressed to Cardinal Colonna from Capranica, and consequently of 1336 or 1337, when the

---

1. "Dell' angelico seno," etc.,229.
2. "Tra Valchiusa ed Avignon," etc.
3. Cf. IV, CXIII, CXXV, CLXII, CLXXXI, CCXLII, CCXLIII, CCLXXXVIII, CCCI, CCCV, CCCXX, CCCXXI.
4. Op. cit.
5. Studi sul testo delle Rime del Petrarca, Naples, 1902.
6. Frac., I, 130-132.

countryside bristled with armed men and bandits, and no one walked abroad for pleasure, he wrote:

> Peropportunum curis meis locum ... nactus sum in regione romana ... Paulatim cognitus loci situs ... Locus ignobilis fama, nobilioribus cingitur locis ... Hinc, illinc, colles innumeri, altitudine nec accessu difficili ... quantum potest in rebus omnibus consuetudo; fragore militum et stridore lituum caeteris in arcem concurrentibus, me saepe per hos colles vagum videas ... Omnes me cum admiratione respiciunt ociosum, intrepidum et inermem.

And he finds another argument in CCLIX, 9-11:

> Ma mia fortuna, a me sempre nemica,
> Mi risospigne al loco ov' io mi sdegno
> Veder nel fango il bel tesoro mio.

<u>È ammissibile</u>, he asks,[1]

> ch' egli avrebbe chiamato sfortuna l'esser risospinto da Valchiusa ad Avignone se era questo il luogo consueto de' suoi ritrovi con la bella dama, se non ve n' era un altro ben più degno di lei?

In <u>Fam.</u>, X, 3,[2] there are allusions to the many love-poems written in the early days at Avignon, and in XXIII, which was written almost certainly not later than 1333¾, if so late,[3] Petrarch says explicitly that one of the first consequences of his love was that it turned him into a poet:

> Ond' io presi con suon color d'un cigno.
> Così lungo l' amata rive andai,
> Che volendo parlar cantava sempre (60-62).

So Flamini concludes[4] that many of the poems which have

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 163, n. 3.
2. Frac., II, 172.
3. <u>Vide sup.</u>
4. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 140.

hitherto been thought of as written from Vaucluse, simply because they referred to the lovely valley landscape, may date from the ten years 1327-1337, before the visit to Rome, before the change of heart alluded to in the letter to Frate Dionigi of Borgo San Sepolcro,[1] while Petrarch's feeling was fresh and young and more spontaneous. Among such poems he would place CXXV and CXXVI.

While admitting the principle that the more vivid poems must come from the more vivid moments of feeling, and accepting Flamini's general thesis that the countryside as well as Avignon was the scene of Petrarch's relation with Laura, there is of course no way of applying it with any accuracy to a given poem. Many allusions to Vaucluse, to be sure, are unmistakable, but the absence of such allusions can now be thought, with Flamini's arguments in mind, to prove nothing at all. They make it seem possible, at least, that CXXV and CXXVI, if written before going on a journey, may have been in farewell not to Vaucluse but to the amorosa reggia (CXIII) somewhere in the valley of the Sorgue and the Durance. We do not have to accept Flamini's carefully supported conjecture that he has found the exact spot (on the Sorgue, near Gadagne), in order to accept his general view, that the amorosa reggia, - the scene, near

---

1. Vide supra, p.45.

water, of so many enchanted memories, - was neither Avignon nor Vaucluse, but somewhere in the neighboring countryside. It may have been before the Roman journey of 1336, when Petrarch was going partly to escape love, and when his departure may have seemed to himself part of a final break with old habits justifying the words parole estreme. We can hardly share Cochin's certainty that CXXVI dates from after 1337.

CXXVII. In quella parte.

This is a song written in absence:

In quella parte dove Amor mi sprona
  Conven ch' io volga le dogliose rime (1-2).
Poi che la dispietata mia ventura
  M'ha dilungato dal maggior mio bene (15-16).

It is tempting to conjecture that this is the absence prepared for in the two immediately preceding canzoni of farewell, but there are no certain indications of any kind, except such as show that we are a long way from the beginning of love:

Parmi vedere in quella etate acerba
La bella giovene ch' ora è donna (21-22).
Veggio lei giunta a' suoi perfetti giorni (28).

Sicardi[1] considers this poem an epilogue to CXXVI, just as he believes CXXV a prologue to it.

---

1. "Dell' angelico seno," etc.

CXXVIII. Italia mia.

This canzone addressed by Petrarch to the rulers of Italy to awaken them to the miseries of her war-torn state and to the evils of foreign mercenary soldiery, offers few direct clues to its date, only such general indications as:

> E'l Po dove doglioso e grave or seggio (6);
> Nè v'accorgete ancor, per tante prove,
> Del bavarico inganno (65-66);
> Di che liexi cagion che crudel guerra (11);
> Che fan qui tante pellegrine spade? (20);
> Non far idolo un nome
> Vano, senza soggetto (76-77).

The theory of many of the older commentators, accepted by Muratori, Tassoni and Leopardi among others, connected this canzone with the descent into Italy of Ludwig of Bavaria and his soldiers in 1328, but Carducci successfully refuted it in his Saggio, substituting for it De Sade's[1] date of 1344-45, when Petrarch was caught in the siege of Parma. He believed it to have been written at Selvapiana. Most critics accepted his arguments, including Pakscher,[2] Cesareo[3] (who added the conclusive arguments against 1328 that Petrarch was not in Italy at all during that year, but in Provence where he had been recalled by his father's death), and Cochin,[4] who thinks Cesareo's conclusions may

---

1. Mémoires pour la vie de François Pétrarque, Amsterdam, 1764, I, 66, N. xi.
2. Op. cit., 75-86.
3. Op. cit., 82-89.
4. Op. cit., 91-92.

safely be accepted without further examination.

Carducci's arguments are summarized in his edition of the Rime,[1] and need not be repeated at length here; they draw attention to the great number of the lords of Northern Italy involved in the affair at Parma, - "Estensi e Gonzaga, Visconti e Scaligeri, Pepoli e Ordelaffi, Parma, Reggio, Ferrara, Mantova, Milano, Verona, Bologna, Ravenna," - and to the fact that Petrarch makes allusion to their numbers in a letter[2] to Barbato of Sulmona:

> Ad Parmam bellum constitit. ... Circumsistimur; et magnis non Liguriae tantum, sed prope totius Italiae motibus intra unius urbis ambitum coarctamur.

The anxiety here expressed seems to justify the words doglioso e grave. German mercenaries were employed on both sides; and that Petrarch when at Selvapiana, his "Italian Helicon," felt himself to be on the banks of the Po is proved by lines in the Epistola metrica to Barbato (II, 17)[3]: Dulcis amice, vale:

> me dextera regis
> Ripa Padi laevumque patris latus Apenninini
> . . . . . .
> Nunc reducem expectant. Planaeque umbracula Silvae
> (15-17)

Only D'Ancona was dissatisfied with this explanation. He said[4] that at Parma Petrarch could not be said to be

---

1. Florence, 1899, 202-204.
2. Fam., V, 10, Frac., I, 283; Frac. It., II, 51.
3. Basle 1554, III, 1358.
4. "Il concetto dell'unità politica nei poeti italiani," in his Studi di critica e storia letterarie, Bologna, 1880.

upon the River Po, and that he was not at that time doglioso; he proposed instead the year 1370, when Petrarch was at Ferrara and suffering from age and sickness. But these arguments are easily disposed of. As to the river, the context certainly shows that Petrarch was making sweeping geographical allusions which should cover in a general way all Italy (1-6);

> Italia mia . . . . . .
> Piacemi al men ch'i' miei sospir sian quali
> Spera' Tevero e l' Arno
> E'l Po dove . . . or seggio.

That is to say, Southern Italy, Central Italy, and Northern Italy where I now am. Zumbini[1] combatted D'Ancona's argument that the idolo, a nome vano, could possibly mean the Empire, which Petrarch venerated; D'Ovidio[2] objected that Petrarch is not likely to have composed what is almost his most beautiful canzone at the age of sixty-six, and sick and infirm into the bargain; and the death blow was given to D'Ancona's date by Cesareo,[3] who cited evidence from the Vatican manuscripts, which were not accessible when D'Ancona wrote. The canzone Ben mi credea (CCVII) is the first composition in V. L. 3195 transcribed there by Petrarch himself; according to his note in V. L. 3196[4] he transcribed

---

1. "L'Impero," in his Studi sul Petrarca, Naples, 1878, 213-241.
2. "Sulla canzone Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Nuova Antologia, Ser. III, XIII, XCV 11 (1888), 247.
3. Loc. cit.
4. Tr' in alia papiro post xxii annos. 1368. dominico inter nonas et vesperas. 22 octobris. mutatis et additis usque ad complementum. et die lune in vesperis tr' in ordine membranis. (f. 15r). Appel, op. cit., 101.

it October 23, 1368, whereas CXXVIII stands 79 compositions ahead of it in V. L. 3195, copied there by the hand of the scribe. So it was certainly composed some time before the autumn of 1368.

The dating 1344-45 seemed to be satisfactorily established. Then C. Steiner[1] and E. Proto[2] published studies which from different points of view reopened the whole question. To consider Steiner's first, he took his departure from the date suggested by Gesualdo,[3] which had scarcely been reconsidered since his time, as it would force us to admit into Part I a poem written in 1354, or six years after Laura's death, and the legend of the division in vita and in morte was tenacious. Cesareo[4] is accepted by Steiner as having demonstrated that L'aspettata virtù (CIV) was

---

1. "Per la data della canzone Italia mia," in Padova in onore di Francesco Petrarca, MCMIIII, II, Miscellanea di studi critici e ricerche erudite, Padua, 1909, 95. But it was evidently in print some time before that, because in an article published early in 1906, "La fede nell'impero e il concetto della patria italiana nel Petrarca," in Giornale Dantesco, XIV (1906), 32, he refers to it as already accessible.
2. "Per la data della canzone Italia mia del Petrarca a proposito di una recente pubblicazione," in Giornale Dantesco, XIV (1906), 168.
3. Espozione di G. Andrea Gesualdo, Venice, 1540.
4. Op. cit., 75-77, 89-104, and 112: Poesie scritte di certo dopo il 1348 si trovano nella prima parte, which Steiner quotes from the article in the Giornale Storico della letteratura italiana, XX, 107.

written in 1356, and the "Babylonian Sonnets" (CXXXVI-CXXXVIII) in 1352-53; and while his proofs do not seem to us as final as they do to Steiner, still Petrarch's division of the Canzoniere puts into Part II one poem (CCLXVI, self-dated 1345) which was certainly composed before Laura's death, and another (CCLXIV), which probably was, so the traditional order no longer is of binding force. And another scholar, Antonino Dispenza,[1] working independently, was likewise emboldened by Cesareo's conclusions to resuscitate Gesualdo's theory. Their arguments both overlap and supplement one another.

Steiner agrees with Carducci that the line about the Po makes Parma impossible. In 1354, to be sure, Petrarch was at Milan which is no better; but Steiner suggests that he may very well have retreated again to S. Colombano al Lambro, where we know he was in October, 1353, before his famous embassy to Venice, and which he thus describes in a letter[2] to Guido Settimo:

> Alpes quae nos a Germanis dirimunt [cf. CXXVIII, 33-35], nivosis a tergo iugis sunt nubes coelumque tangentes: ante oculos Apenninus et oppida innumera ... et Padi ripae ... Padus ipse sub pedibus ingenti ambitu pinguia rura discriminans.

Now Petrarch always loved the country as we know, was always

---

1. "Sulla data della canzone Italia mia del Petrarca," in Rassegna Pugliese, XXII, 221, the work that prompted Proto's. Dispenza's study I have not been able to see.
2. Fam., XVII, 5, Frac., II, 443.

looking for a sylvan solitude and had not yet found an Italian Vaucluse; so why, asks Steiner, may he not have gone back in the autumn of 1353 after his disappointment at Venice to S. Colombano, of which he wrote to Guido Settino[1]: Nusquam memini et loco tam modice tumenti tantum et tam nobile terrarum spectaculum vidisse. Being disappointed, doglioso and grave are appropriate, and in the second letter to Andrea Dandolo[2] he describes himself as Italiae metuens ... moeroris ... plenus. But this sojourn is pure conjecture.

The neme vano Steiner explains by a modification of D'Ancona's argument; not the Empire, which he agrees with Zumbini in thinking Petrarch venerated almost as much as Dante did, but the German usurpation of Roman glory, the German Empire, was to Petrarch a vain thing. But the weight of Steiner's argument rests on two other points: the aptness of the allusions in the canzone (which Carducci did not admit) to the actual political conditions in Italy in 1354, and the remarkable resemblances (which Gesualdo had noted) between Italia mia and Petrarch's two letters to the Doge Andrea Dandolo, begging him to establish peace. Venice and Genoa were at war; Milan was allied with Genoa,

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. Fam., XVIII, 16, Frac. II, 505-507.

and on the side of the Venetians were ranged Scaligeri, Estensi, Padua, Mantua, Faenza.[1] If at Parma, as Carducci says, fought the Grande Compagnia of Mercenaries under Guarnieri, Duke of Urslingen (who wore upon his breast the formidable legend, Duca Guarnieri signore della compagnia, nemico di Dio, di pietà e di misericordia), there were still more of them engaged in 1354. Venice employed the compagnia of Fra Moriale, now captained by Corrado di Lando of Suabia, which had been laying waste Umbria and Tuscany and were threatening the Modenese. According to Muratori,[2] she employed 30,000 men, and in 1354 had horsemen from Austria, Styria, Friuli and Carinthia.

To prove the resemblance between the canzone and the letters to the Doge, Steiner quotes three pages of parallel passages, 27 in all,[3] of which I select a few of the most striking.

1. Italia mia, ben che 'l parlar sia indarno (1).

inefficax tractator pacis ... Quanta tecum ... verba feci ... Nequidquam tamen ... Multis verbis perditis (XVIII, 16, Frac. I, 506).

---

1. Romanin, Storia documentata di Venezia, Venice, 1855; Muratori, Ann. d'It., anno 1354; Matteo Villani, Croniche, Trieste, 1858, 115, 130; Frac. It., IV, 148.
2. I Libri commemoriali della republica di Venezia, II, 227.
3. Op. cit., 100-103.

2. Doglioso e grave or seggio (6).

Italiae metuens in qua, fateor, mea quoque temporalis salus includitur ... Moeroris pudoris ac pavoris plenus abscessi. Sortem enim publicam lugebam (l.c.).

9. Che in cor venale Amor cercate o fede (9).

Insani qui in venalibus animis fidem quaerimus quam in propriis fratribus desperamus (XI, 8, Frac., II, 132) venale genus ac foedifragum et insolens (XIV, 5, Frac., II, 295).

13. Ben provvide natura al nostro stato
Quando dell'Alpi schermo
Pose fra noi e la tedesca rabbia (33-35).

Alpes et maria quibus nos moenibus natura vallaverat (XI, 8, II, 132). A quibus bene nos ... ipsarum iugis Alpium solers natura secreverat (XVIII, 16, Frac, II, 510).

22. Non far idolo un nome
Vano, senza soggetto (76-77).

et nescio unde prodeunte fastidio nostrarum rerum in admirationem rapimur externarum (XI, 8, Frac., II, 132). Nudo vobis cum nomine bellum est. Corpora viva vicistis, umbrasne timebitis? (XIV, 6, Frac., II, 302.)

27. I' 'vo gridando: Pace, pace, pace (122).

Quid autem pace iucundius? (XI, 8, Frac., II, 127) Non belli amator sed pacis suasor (l. c., 133).

On the other hand, if Italia mia was composed in 1344-45, its subject is isolated among the writings of those

years. Only two of the letters[1] mention the Parma war, and those do not contain any of the sentiments expressed in the poem; V, 10 even praises the defenders of the city,[2] among whom must be counted 700 Germans. Petrarch never had a word to say against the mercenaries before 1351,[3] and 1342-47 was a period rather poor in political references.

Where Dispenza duplicates Steiner it is useless to quote him, but he makes some other points worthy of note. That Petrarch could properly call himself grave in 1354 is proved by Fam., XII, 7, of February, 1352[4]: nec desperem pigro etiam magisterio senectutis doctior ac melior fieri; and the words or seggio Dispenza thinks refer to a settled habitation at last at Milan, where he was to stay from 1353 to 1361 after the years of restless wandering. But one of his heaviest guns is his statement that from 1343 to 1347 there were hardly any mercenaries left in Italy.[5] After 1328 various Italian rulers employed them until in 1342 Guarnieri organized his Grande Compagnia, which proceeded to pillage and intimidate Tuscany, Romagna and the Modenese and make themselves intolerable generally, until the Lombard

---

1. Fam., V, 10, and VI, 9, Frac., I, 283,352.
2. non quod animus nostris desit, quod saepius animosa eruptione testati sunt, I, 283.
3. Steiner, op. cit., 104.
4. Frac., II, 186, Frac. It., III, 146-7.
5. Ricotti, Storia delle compagnie di ventura in Italia, II, 37. Dispenza's arguments and citations are quoted from Proto's discussion of them (op. cit.).

princes finally made up a purse to get rid of them. So on April 12, 1343, Guarnieri paid off his soldiery and disbanded them, and most of them went home to Germany not to return till 1347, when they came back with Ludwig of Bavaria.

His other strongest argument is the parallel he makes (independently of Steiner, whose work seems to have been inaccessible to him, to Jorio, and even to Proto), between the canzone and the letters XVIII, 16, and XXIII, 1.

After the Doge replied to Petrarch's letter of 1351 that the war with Genoa was a just war and would be prosecuted, and after Petrarch's speech to the senators as Visconti's ambassador to Venice likewise failed, in November, 1353, Petrarch tried once more in the spring, in the second letter to the Doge, written from Milan May 28, 1354.[1] The canzone is not to be ascribed to the year of the first letter, 1351, because that letter makes comparatively little of the question of mercenaries, while the canzone makes no mention of the two republics. The second letter, more vigorous in condemnation of the mercenaries though still chiefly concerned with the affairs of Venice and Genoa, shows plainly enough what will be Petrarch's discouragement

---

1. Fam., XVIII, 16, Frac. It., IV, 148-149.

if the Doge should refuse again:

> Alioquin omnia videns Deus Christus mihi, et praesens in omne aevum epistola testes sint ... quod in perniciem Italiae non modo non pergis auctore Francisco, sed pro viribus reluctante, teque, quando aliud nequit, alto suspirio et magnis animi gemitibus revocante.[1]

Despair, however, which Dispenza feels in the canzone, is not yet present in the letter, because Petrarch has not given up hope of the Doge's consent. But despair must have been the consequence of the Doge's second refusal; so Dispenza sets beside this second letter to Dandolo the letter Ad ignotum,[2] the opening words of which: Loquor quia cogor ... Et scio me nequidquam loqui, and the invocation to all the great Romans of the past who had driven barbarians and invaders from Italian soil, establish a considerable resemblance which convinces Dispenza (and Raffaella Jorio[3] also) that the two must be contemporaneous:

> O gloriose Camille, qui nostro sanguine despumantem Transalpinam rabiem in ipsis adhuc fumantis patriae cineribus extinxisti ... O summe virorum Scipio, qui Hannibalem septimum decimum annum iam Italiae incumbentem hinc vi detractum in propria patria, ... confregisti ... O Mari ... qui barbaros in Italiam irrumpentes ipsis eorum in finibus tanto impetu superasti.[4]

Proto approaches the problem of Italia mia from an entirely new angle. There have been many explanations of the words nome vano; D'Ancona believed it meant the Empire

---

1. Fam., XVIII, 16, Frac., II, 512.
2. Fam., XXIII, 1, Frac., III, 179.
3. Vide ultra, p.153.
4. Frac., II, 179-180.

(an opinion refuted by Zumbini), and Carducci and others settled down to the idea that it referred to a false but helpless sense of German invincibility, a kind of "inferiority complex"; but Proto believes that Petrarch by this phrase meant Fortune, and he quotes a series of passages from the letters in support of this idea.

> Haec inter quaero fortunam, de qua sermo est, nihil invenio praeter nudum nomen ... fortunam per seipsam nihil esse, fortunam ipsam nihil esse dicentibus assentiri cogor.[1]

> I nunc, et negare, aude magnum aliquid esse fortunam... Ludo tecum, Barbate carissime. De fortuna enim iudicium meum tenes: formidabile nomen est (Fam., V, 10, Frac., I, 285).

> Vides eam, de qua omnis fere mortalium sermo est, nihil esse Fortunam (Fam., VIII, 1, Frac., I, 415).

> de eventu viderit fortuna: sed quid loquor? Nihil illam esse didici praeter nudum nomen (IX, 15, Frac., II, 55).

> Caeterum sive illa nihil sive aliquid est, nam Dea procul dubio non est, et rursus sive illa suis viribus, sive nostra ignavia potens est, quoniam quibus solis obstari illi poterat, arma rationis obiecimus (Fam., XIX, 9, II, 535).

Proto accepts all the arguments of Dispenza and Steiner against the date 1344-45, and contributes one of his own: Petrarch in his autobiographic letter to Guido Settimo of 1368,[2] recalls that the first he ever heard of

---

1. Sen., VIII, 3, Basle 1554, I, 926.
2. Quintus et vigesimus annus est ex quo auribus primum nostris horrisonum hoc nomen (societas) intonuit (Sen. X, 2, Frac., II, 104, 107. Basle 1554, II, 965.) Fracassetti says, p. 108, that Petrarch was mistaken in this, that the annalist of Milan says it was 1340 (Rerum italarum scriptorum, XVI, f. 718).

the compagnie was in 1343, and Proto thinks that in that case Petrarch would not so early as 1344-45 have spoken as if the bavarico inganno were a matter of long experience - tante prove. Proto argues from the historical situation against every year in turn from 1354 to 1359 (in 1355, for instance, he says Petrarch was too much taken up with his relations with the Emperor to have been in writing mood), and is sure on the other hand that it cannot have been written in 1361, which he takes as a terminus ad quem, because in 1361 the terrible Compagnia Bianca brought the pest into Italy, and Petrarch would certainly, Proto believes, have made some mention of this new outrage of the foreign soldiery. For the same reason he thinks XXIII, 1, cannot be of 1361, when Fracassetti dates it, but of 1360; also because if the Ignotus to whom it was addressed was, as Proto believes, the Emperor Charles IV, then Petrarch would be addressing him as he would not have done, in September, after certain letters exchanged with him in March, 1361. This letter is so similar to XXII, 14, of February 27, 1361, that Proto feels no hesitation in ascribing it to September, 1360. As between 1359 and 1360, Proto is for 1360. Petrarch in that year was doglioso e grave; the bruise made by his volume of Cicero had grown serious,[1]

---

1. vulnus illum Ciceronianum de quo ludere solebam, ludum mihi vertit in luctum. Var., XXV, to Boccaccio, August 18, 1360, Frac., III, 367, It., V, 306.

and he was robbed in his house[1]; Muratori shows 1359-60 to have been terrible years, with Cardinal Albornoz back and war in Northern Italy, and the Hungarians and Germans of the Grande Compagnia sacking and pillaging; while as for the allusion to the Po, Petrarch might have been in Pavia, where he wrote Var., XLVI,[2] June 29, which Fracassetti dates 1360.[3] If the letter published by Novati[4] be genuine, written in the name of Beatrice Visconti to Frate Iacopo Bussolari, Petrarch thought of the river in connection with Pavia:

> Così la città ticinense capace in altri tempi di alimentar ... innumerevoli eserciti ... mercè il territorio ubertoso, cui crescon amenità il Po e il Ticino.

Then in October, 1360, Petrarch went as the Viscontis' ambassador at the head of the wedding party which escorted Giovan Galeazzo Visconti to be married to Isabelle, the daughter of Jean, King of France, and at a banquet discoursed of Fortune in the manner recounted in XXII, 13[5]:

> ut qui uno verbo expedire sententiam meam possem: credere me scilicet et semper credidisse dicentibus, nil omnino aliud quam nudum et inane nomen esse Fortunam, tametsi in communi sermone populum sequi, et saepe Fortunam nominare, solitus coloratius aliquid dicens, ne eos, qui illam Deam seu rerum humanarum dominam opinantur atque asserunt, nimis offenderem.

---

1. Fam., XXII, 12, Frac., III, 153.
2. Frac., III, 421.
3. It., V, 394.
4. "Il Petrarca e i Visconti," in Rivista d'Italia, July, 1904, 151.
5. Frac., III, 160.

This quotation crowns Proto's argument. Putting it beside these two passages from the canzone:

> Voi, cui Fortuna ha posto in mano il freno
> De le belle contrade (17-18),
>
> Non far idolo un nome
> Vano, senza soggetto (76-77),

we see the same double attitude towards Fortune expressed in them. He dates CXXVIII, accordingly, 1360.

Raffaella Jorio,[1] who accepts Proto's interpretation of nome vano, believes the resemblance in certain respects already noted between CXXVIII and Fam., XXIII, 1, might be used in the opposite sense, to establish a new date for XXIII, 1, setting it ahead to 1354, the date she accepts for Italia mia. But Proto notes that there are letters in Book XXII of a later date than 1354, and cannot believe that a letter in any book is of earlier date than the earliest in the preceding book.[2] But we cannot be as categorical as this: Fracassetti's datings are not all impeccable; they were worked out too long ago, too many new facts are coming to light all the time, and letters must be redated now and then. (Indeed Proto in the same breath is proposing to change the dating of XXIII, 1, by a year.) And Raffaella

---

1. La canzone Italia mia del Petrarca; della sua data e breve commento, Bologna, 1912.
2. Nel libro seguente non si ha nessuna lettera di data anteriore a quella più antica del libro precedente. Op. cit., 179.

Jorio adduces an article by F. Forcellini[1] which proves that the letters to Zenobi in Books XII and XIII, which Fracassetti dated 1352, belong to 1349, while the latest letter in Book XI is of 1350. But she uses Proto's interpretation to support the date 1354. Citing the passage he quotes from XIX, 9, she notes that if the idolo and nome vano be indeed an allusion to Fortune, then Petrarch is certainly recommending reason in the succeeding lines as the best resource against her:

> Non far idolo un nome
> Vano, senza soggetto,
> Che 'l furor di là su, gente ritrosa,
> Vincerne d'intelletto,
> Peccato è nostro e non natural cosa.

But in XIX, 9, he admits that there is no weapon against Fortune; whether her power come from her own strength or from our ignorance and folly, nothing can bend or change her. Now this is evidently a stage of thinking or experience beyond that expressed in the canzone, where he still had hope; the letter was written April 24, 1355[2]; therefore the canzone was composed before that, and because of its general similarity of content, not long before.

Here is a considerable array of new material which

---

1. "Zenobi da Strada e la sua venuta nella corte di Napoli. Contributo alla cronologia dell'epistolario del Petrarca," in Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane, XXXVII, Fasc. aprile maggio giugno, 242.
2. Frac. It., IV, 194.

all falls in very well together. Two plausible reasons are presented for making the later date, 1354[1] or 1360, more probable than Carducci's dating of 1344-45: the historical consonance is even greater, and there is a wealth of prose writing which expresses the ideas of the canzone (even if Proto's interpretation of nome vano be not accepted), whereas for the earlier date there is practically none. The only strong argument these writers anticipate against it is the fact that it would put so late a poem in the First Part. To that it may be answered that the division at the year 1348, the arrangement in vita and in morte, was never Petrarch's own, that there is good ground for thinking that the "Babylonian Sonnets" were as late as 1353, at least it has not been proved that they were not; and the subject of Italia mia is such that it could not go into the Second Part as far as we are able to understand its principle, since every poem of purely secular, political or impersonal interest is in Part I.

These considerations are very far, however, from satisfying the veteran critic and scholar F. Torraca,[2] who has spoken the latest word, and perhaps the last word, on this question of the date of CXXVIII. He attacks both

---

1. This is the date accepted by V. Rossi, Storia della letteratura italiana per uso dei licei, 7th ed., Milan, 1917, I, 210.
2. "Su la canzone Italia mia di Francesco Petrarca," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XXIII (1918), Nos. 7-12, 145.

lines of argument, the meaning of nome vano and the parallels between letters and canzone, and draws quite different conclusions as to the historical evidence concerning the mercenary soldiery. Quoting the passage in Fam., XXII, 13, cited by Proto, and the one cited by Jorio from XIX, 9, which reveal Petrarch's double attitude towards Fortune, - his conscious use of the word sometimes in the vulgar sense of power or goddess, and his own certainty of her emptiness and nothingness, - Torraca points once more to the lines:

> Voi, cui Fortuna ha posto in mano il freno
> De le belle contrade.

Here Petrarch is making explicit allusion to Fortune in the "vulgar" sense; would he then later in the same poem introduce without warning an ambiguous allusion to Fortune in the other sense? Torraca is sure he would not; in the letters Petrarch is contrasting his own two attitudes, where this would be to use both alternately without distinction. Moreover says Torraca, this interpretation of nome vano is meaningless in the context; it is in the stanza beginning:

> Nè v'accorgete ancor, per tante prove,
> Del bavarico inganno? (65-66),

and the idea would thus be: "Have you not learned yet how untrustworthy the Bavarians are? ... Well, then, do not trust Fortune." A non sequitur, truly, Then Petrarch gives his reason for not trusting to the nome vano:

Chè 'l furor di là su, gente ritrosa,
Vincerne d'intelletto,
Peccato è nostro, e non natural cosa.

Then, says Torraca, if it be not a natural thing, the conclusion might properly be that it was due to the caprice of some mysterious power. (But this argument on the second half of the context deliberately ignores the definite assumption implied in Peccato è nostro, and must consequently be disregarded.) Besides, even if nome vano did refer to Fortune, it would not be necessary to connect the canzone chronologically with the letters, since Petrarch said he had always felt the same way about it: Credere me scilicet et semper credidisse.

The other arguments of Proto, reinforced by Jorio, which Torraca attacks he tabulates as follows:

I. In the letter Ad ignotum, XXIII, 1, Petrarch shows the stessa sfiducia, anzi ancora più inoltrata.

II. Several lines of the canzone are closely paralleled by passages in the letters.

III. In 1360 Petrarch really was doglioso e grave. It will be convenient to number his arguments under these headings.

I. Torraca denies that there is any real despair at all in the canzone. The words parlar indarno of the opening line must be read together with the following line: A

le piaghe mortali, and then the meaning is similar to that of the opening of Petrarch's letter of condolence to Cardinal Colonna on the death of his brother Giacomo, in which he recognizes the uselessness of words to help suffering[1]:

> Urget dolor, hortatur charitas ut scribam aliquid: sola desperatio profectus dehortatur. Credo enim, recentissimum adhuc animi tui vulnus talibus anxiliis non egere. Vincet dolor, vincet amor, cedet desperatio. Insitae devotionis imperio, damnatum saepius et abiectum revertor ad calamum.

Had Petrarch truly despaired, he would not have prayed God to change the hearts of the rulers, nor asked the rulers themselves to have pity; and the lines quoted by Machiavelli in the Principe (93-96), with the declaratives prenderà, fia, and non è ... morto, are definite and hopeful.

II. Besides the phrase parlar indarno, Torraca considers several of the other parallels made by Steiner and Jorio (who adds a few more to his, though not any better or more effective ones),[2] although he does not mention Steiner's article.

1. The allusion to the Alps as a screen against the barbarian Carducci[3] had already pointed out to be a classic invention, to be found in Cicero, Pliny and Juvenal; and the passage in XXIII, 1, alludes to various historic descents from the north, whereas in the canzone Petrarch

---

1. IV, 12, Frac., I, 233.
2. Op. cit., 8-11.
3. Saggio, 109, Rime, 195.

speaks of the foreigners as established in Italy: or ... s'annidan (39-41). And in one of the passages cited by Steiner (XVIII, 16), where Petrarch refers to the natural barrier of the Alps, he adds: quod in ore semper habeo,[1] so this need not be contemporaneous with the canzone.

2. The passage in XI, 8:

> si in vosmetipsos, quod nedum spectare sed ominari horreo, victricia nunc arma convertitis, haud dubie vestris propriis manibus saucii perimus, vestris propriis manibus spoliati ... imperium maris amittimus,[2]

cannot be set beside the proprie mani of the canzone (31), because in the letter Petrarch was addressing Venice and Genoa while in the canzone he meant by nostre all Italy.[3]

3. Even the passages relating to the mercenaries have no validity for Torraca, because he is convinced that Petrarch's allusions are not to the independent highly organized compagnie, which developed under condottieri after 1342,[4] but to foreign soldiers directly in the pay of Italian princes, a part of their own dependencies and armies.

---

1. Frac., II, 510.
2. Frac., II, 125.
3. It may be well to quote here the sentences preceding this in XI, 8, on which evidently Torraca was basing his objection: Surgitis nunc ad arma duo potentissimi populi, duae florentissimae urbes, duo, ut dicam breviter, Italiae lumina (loc. cit.).
4. Guarnieri's compagnia was formed after the peace between Florence and Pisa, signed October 9, 1342. Storie pistoresi, ed. by Barbi, in the New Series of Rerum Italarum Scriptores, quoted by Torraca.

Qual più gente possede (26).

This distinction between the compagnie and the gente posseduta is the base and center of Torraca's argument. The phrase Italiam saltem tuam nova praedonum manu miserabiliter inquinatam[1] Torraca takes as referring to the compagnie, of which Petrarch wrote as already quoted in the letter to Barbato in 1368.[2] In the second letter to the Doge, the allusions to foreign mercenaries are to the compagnie and apply to Venice directly.[3] Petrarch's offer of peace-making had failed because, as he wrote[4]:

> Accesserat ab Aquilone quaedam novarum rerum aura pertenuis, quae licet adversus id quo intendebam flaret, perfeceritque quod timui;

that is, Charles of Bohemia was coming to the support of Venice. And when he did come, he brought with him only 300 soldiers, which would not be tante pellegrine spade! The allusion might well apply to the compagnie, because about May, 1354, or a little earlier (and the date of XVIII, 16, is May 28, 1354), Venice invited Fra Moriale to take his company into Lombardy to oppose the Archbishop al soldo loro.[5]

---

1. Fam., XXIII, 1, Frac., III, 180.
2. Vide sup., p.150.
3. Quousque enim miseri ... barbarica circumspiciemus auxilia? ... noli committere ut florentissimam tuae creditam custodiae Rempublicam ... opulentissimam atque pulcherrimam Italiae partem externorum ac famelicorum praedam facias luporum. Fam., XVIII, 16, Frac., II, 506, 510.
4. Loc. cit., 506.
5. M. Villani, III, 89, 96, 110.

If Petrarch is referring in the letter to the soldiers of Charles, then they were too few; if to the compagnia of Fra Moriale, then those were not gente posseduta; in either case the reference is to the affairs of the Republics, not to Italy as a whole. And the same objection holds good in regard to that quotation about the mercenaries which Torraca considers the best: Insani qui in venalibus animis fidem quaerimus. He thinks this cannot refer to the Germans settled in Italy as part of the men-at-arms of the various lords (as he is convinced the canzone does), because Petrarch was writing to the Doge of Venice, and Venice had asked help of the King of Aragon,[1] and had asked Germans of the King of Hungary, - such soldiery as Petrarch alludes to in Fam., XIV, 5[2]: principibus ... qui infando et inhumano commercio sanguinem suae gentis parva pecunia vendiderunt.

But while Torraca believes that these arguments destroy the theory of these recent writers that Italia mia belongs very much later than had been believed by the many who accepted Carducci's dating, he does not therefore return to that date, 1344-45, whose only good claim to his

---

1. Quanto autem cum dolore ... audivisse me putas recens vobis cum Aragonum rege foedus initum? Ergone ab Italis ad Italos evertendos Barbarorum regum posciuntur auxilia? Fam., XI, 8, Frac., II, 131.
2. Frac., II, 295.

mind lies in the line about the Po, which fits Selvapiana. But Petrarch had been once before at Selvapiana, after his coronation at Rome,[1] and that is where and when Torraca believes the canzone was written. Again it will be convenient to list his arguments.

1. The tranquillus dulcis annus at Selvapiana was a serene and productive period. Petrarch at that time resumed the Africa and worked on it with success, wrote two epistolae metricae, the consolatoria to Cardinal Colonna, and Torraca is inclined to think other works. He might well have quoted Luigi Marsili,[2] a contemporary and friend of Petrarch's, who says Italia mia was composed a Parma o in quelli paesi, a phrase equally applicable to either sojourn at Selvapiana.

2. In the letter to Barbato describing the escape from Parma[3] are many vivid and poetic details of which there is no trace in the canzone.

3. The Grande Compagnia was founded in 1342, and Torraca is sure Petrarch's allusions are to the earlier situation of the foreign soldiery, when it belonged directly to the Italian princes.

---

1. Epistola metrica to Barbato, II, 17. Cf. A. Foresti, "Postille di cronologia petrarchesca. IV. Peregrinando tra le rovine con fra' Giovanni Colonna di S. Vito nell' aprile del 1341," in La Rassegna, Ser. III, Vol. IV (1919), 120.
2. Comento a una canzone di Francesco Petrarca per Luigi de' Marsili, Bologna, 1863.
3. Fam., V, 10, Frac., I, 283.

4. There is a sense of surprise in the line,

Che fan qui tante pellegrine spade?

which points to the earlier period, when the foreign mercenaries were still a novelty. How could Petrarch have been surprised at them in 1344, when he had travelled twice from Naples to Parma, once from Parma to Trent, and had made two stays of a year each at Parma?

5. The line,

Di che lievi cagion che crudel guerra,

is inapplicable to the Parma war, because only two years earlier Petrarch had thought the liberation of Parma by Azzo da Correggio worthy of a canzone[1] in which Azzo is compared to Cato, Fabius and Decius,[2] whereas while Petrarch was at Selvapiana the first time there was a war between Pisa and Florence to which it does apply. Pisa had 1000 German soldiers from Luchino Visconti, and 500 from Padua, Mantua, Reggio and Parma,[3] and the latter at least must

---

1. Quel c'ha nostra natura in sè più degno, not in the Canzoniere, but to be read in A. Solerti, Rime disperse di Francesco Petrarca, Florence, 1909, 191.
2. E ricorderei (says Torraca) dalla canzone per la liberazione di Parma, le importune nostre some, il faticoso calle, le sparse genti afflitte, le piaghe della bella contrada di Trevigi, l'opra di gradire, colui che'l suo proprio sangue sparse, le vene scarse, la patria, che va riposando le sue parti stanche, la pietà superna - imagini, locuzioni, epiteti, che riappariscono nella canzone Italia mia. (Op. cit., 169.)
3. G. Villani, XI, 131.

have passed through Parma on their way to Lucca; if Petrarch did not himself see them, which is unlikely, he must have heard of them. And it was a cruel war on slight occasion.

> Nell' agosto di quell'anno 1341, cominciarono le ostilità tra Pisa e Firenze per il possesso di Lucca. Mastino della Scala poi che Azzo da Correggio gli aveva sottratto Parma, "la quale a lui era la chiave di potere entrare a sua posta in Toscana e per quella forma mantenea la città di Lucca" (G. Villani, XI, 127), pensò di vender quella al miglior offerente che fu Firenze. I Pisani vollero guadagnare per forza ciò, che non avevano ottenuto per danaro. Per questa cagione, la quale un poeta consigliere di pace poteva bene simulare di giudicare lieve, cominciò veramente una crudele guerra, durata undici mesi. Il 2 ottobre - narrano le Storie pistoresi - dalla mattina per tempo sino a mezzo giorno, si combattette "senza riposo la battaglia più crudele e più aspra che fosse per grandi tempi innanzi in Italia." Sconfitti i Fiorentini, i Pisani stringono l'assedio intorno alla Città, "per modo che vettovaglie non vi si può mettere, nè persona non vi puote entrare, nè uscire che non sia preso o morto. E tutti quelli che erano presi erano dimozzicati, così femmine come uomini e fanciulli innocenti; a cui tagliavano le mani, a cui li piedi, a cui cavavano gli occhi, facendone maggiore strazio che far si possa" (Storie pistoresi, 103). Gli assediati, che si difendevano con armi insolite, cannoni e tuoni di ferro ad proicendas pallas de ferro (Bongi, Bandi lucchesi nel secolo XIV, Bologna, 129), resistettero a lungo; ma prima furon costretti a "cacciare le bocche disutili," e allora "molti Lucchesi che uscivano dalla città furono presi da'Pisani del campo, e tagliate loro la mano e'l piede, tratti loro gli occhi, ed in tutto guasti della persona" - poi, il 6 luglio, 1342, aprirono le porte al nemico. Tutte le guerre sono crudeli, ma quella fu atrocissima.

6. German mercenaries were employed. There were 200 Germans in Lucca, paid first by Mastino and later by the Florentines,[1] and after their defeat the Florentines engaged

---

1. Bonghi, op. cit., 328.

over 2,000 of them.[1]

7. There had already been opportunities to observe the bavarico inganno. As Torraca says, quoting Villani,[2] Germans in the Pisan army di dì e di notte fornivano Lucca di ciò che bisognava; Germans of the Florentine army rubarono tutto il campo di Firenze; one reason for the defeat of the 2nd of October was that messer Gianni della Bellina di Borgogna, ch'avea l'insegna reale, non volle andare contro l'insegna di messer Luchino. And Petrarch, as Torraca says, must have heard all about these matters. He came from Marseilles to Naples in March to be examined by King Robert; he was crowned at Rome on April 8; he was at Pisa April 20, at Parma May 23. Just at that time negotiations were in progress between Robert, Florence, Luchino Visconti and other lords of Lombardy, Romagna, Tuscany and Umbria, for a league contra Bavaros et complices ipsius, and on April 1 Matteo degli Albizzi was sent by Florence to Naples to conclude them. The Act was signed June 7. Barrili and Barbato, Petrarch's good friends, were both there, and Barrili was a special friend of the King. They must certainly have informed Petrarch of it.

Besides, Azzo da Correggio, who came from Avignon with Petrarch, arranged at Naples with King Robert and the

---

1. G. Villani, XI, 139.

ambassador of Visconti to take Parma from Messer Mastino.[1] Then Azzo, who accompanied Petrarch to Rome, went secretly to Florence (which Petrarch could not enter), negotiated with the Commune, and then went on to Milan to ask and receive support for Messer Luchino, and thence went with them and with Petrarch to Parma. An arrow aimed at that time contra Bavaros would certainly not have displeased Petrarch's friend Azzo!

Notwithstanding this alliance, the Florentines after their defeat of October 2, sent at the suggestion of Mastino two ambassadors to Ludwig of Bavaria at Trent, who

> attentarono per tal modo, che egli mandò a Ferrara, e poi alla nostra oste, più de' suoi baroni con da 50 cavalieri, la maggiore parte di corredo; infra gli altri caporali vi fu il duca di Tecchi e il suo Luvomastro col suo grande suggello, e il Porcaro conte, promettendo, se il nostro comune voleva ricevere il duca di Tecchi per suo vicario con larghi patti, che farebbe partire tutti i Tedeschi del campo de'Pisani, incontanente che vedessono quel suggello e romperebbero l'oste de'Pisani, e tornerebbero dal lato nostro.[2]

Tecchi and i baroni del Bavaro reached Lucca on the 9th of May, 1342,[3] and Petrarch had probably not left Parma by then.

8. Torraca offers a new explanation of the nome vano. Other things, he says, have been called that by other

---

1. Storie pistoresi, 100; G. Villani, XI, 127.
2. G. Villani, XI, 138. Quoted by Torraca, op. cit., 169.
3. G. Villani, XI, 140.

authors known to Petrarch; Carducci cited some cases,[1] and Torraca instances some more,[2] and Petrarch himself called the King of Aragon inane nomen,[3] and the city of Luini has become nunc nudum et inane nomen.[4] So the words do not have to mean Fortune alone, and Torraca takes them in the canzone to mean fidelity. This interpretation receives strong confirmation, as he believes, from a passage in the Africa, where his father's shade tells the young Scipio how it came about that his brother met defeat. The Carthaginians for money led the auxiliary Celtiberi to desert Rome, an example, says Scipio's father, which generals would always do well to remember, so as not to put trust in foreign troops. Once Scipio tried in vain to dissuade them, talking of God, of honor and justice, but with such oath-breakers it was all in vain:

Obiicit ille deos, jus, fas: at inania verba.

---

1. Boethius, De cons., ph. pr. IV: Praetura magna olim potestas, nunc inane nomen est; Ovid, Am. III, 3: Aut sine re Deus nomen est frustraque timetur; and Tasso, G.l., XIV, 63: Nome e senza soggetto idoli sono Ciò che pregio e valore il mondo appella (Rime, 199).
2. Horace, Epist., I, xvii, 41; Ars poetica, I, 443; and Boethius, III, pr. vi, V, pr. 1 (inanem vocem). Horace asks: aut virtus nomen inane est, and Boethius: quam sit inane quam futtile nobilitatis nomen, quis non videat?
3. So says Torraca, op. cit., citing Fam., XIV, 6. If Petrarch does not say quite that, he at least says: Nolite regium nomen horrere (Frac., II, 301), and Nudo vobis cum nomine bellum est. Corpora viva vicistis, umbras ne timebitis? (Frac., II, 302.)
4. Fam., V, 3, Frac., I, 255; Frac., II, 301; XIV, 6.

Torraca's arguments as given above can be reduced to two major destructive ones, and three constructive. The studies of Steiner, Dispenza, Proto and Jorio had rested on the similarity between the canzone and various letters of 1351-1361, - a similarity greatly increased by the new conception that the nome vano means fortune, - and resulted in a very late date for Italia mia, varying from 1354 to 1360. Torraca undermines this conclusion by (1) pointing out the inconsistency of using the idea of fortune in two different senses without distinction, in the same poem, and (2) nullifying the relation between the allusions to foreign soldiery in the letters and in the canzone by the sharp distinction he makes between compagnie and gente posseduta. The letters refer to the former, Italia mia to the latter.

In the one case Torraca substitutes a new interpretation of nome vano, and in the other a new date, while the foreign mercenaries were still all gente posseduta; while instead of the resemblances between the canzone and those later letters, he indicates other resemblances between CXXVIII and the consolatoria to Giovanni Colonna and the canzone for the Liberation of Parma. And his dating substitutes a situation which fits the words Di che lievi cagion che crudel guerra, for one which does not.

While his conception of nome vano has no direct

bearing upon the date of CXXVIII, yet a successful substitute for the idea that it means Fortune would destroy a vital argument for the later date; and there is another point to be made in support of Torraca's suggestion, a good artistic reason for Petrarch's meaning "good faith" by the nome vano. Even in his letters he shows a strong artistic sense of unity in the parts; there are few if any afterthoughts or digressive returns to a subject once treated in an earlier part of his letter; his paragraph structure while not apparent to the eye is clear to the mind. This is still more noticeable in the canzoni, where the division is both structural and visible. Every stanza of a canzone has marked unity of subject; it is useless to adduce illustration, as any canzone will reveal this artistic principle to the student of Petrarch. Now the stanza in which appear the words nome vano is devoted to the idea of German treachery; it begins

> Nè v'accorgete ancor, per tante prove,
> Del bavarico inganno?

and the next thought is:

> Peggio è lo strazio, al mio parer, che 'l danno.

The strazio is explained at the end of the stanza as being:

> Chè 'l furor di là su, gente ritrosa,
> Vincerne d'intelletto.

But the strazio, if Italy is outwitted by the northern

barbarian, is her own fault;

Peccato è nostro, e non natural cosa,

if she continue to spend her own blood freely, while the foreigner in her pay

alzando 'l dito co' la morte scherza.

What then is the remedy? Petrarch is clear on that point - get rid of them:

Sgombra da te queste dannose some.

If you are bound to them in any way, fear not to break faith with those who, per tante prove, have already broken faith with you:

Non far idolo un nome
Vano, senza soggetto.

Good faith as regards them is an idle word, without basis.

And if the question of bad faith is the central idea of this stanza, it is also announced immediately, along with the matter of the foreign soldiery in general, as the subject of the whole poem. The first stanza is general, calling the attention of Italy and Heaven to Italy's sufferings by the wars of her rulers, but the second becomes specific; the very first words after the invocation to the rulers of Italy are:

Che fan qui tante pellegrine spade? ...
Vano error vi lusinga ...
Che 'n cor venale amor cercate o fede.

Allowing some lines for poetic expansion and ornamental

wording, there is the whole subject of the canzone stated immediately, and the vicinity of the words fede and vano is not without significance. The exhortation in which the phrase nome vano occurs is the climax of the poem, a direct call upon the Latin sangue gentile for remedial action. The rhetorical climax of beauty and eloquence, to be sure, are in the lines quoted by Machiavelli in the Principe (93-96), but that glorious result can only follow the action Petrarch calls for in the line:

Sgombra da te queste dannose some.

To Torraca's suggestion of the date 1341-42 the proponents of 1354-60 would certainly retort that there were not enough mercenaries then in Italy to justify the words tante ... spade and diluvio:

Oh diluvio raccolto
Di che deserti strani
Per inondar i nostri dolci campi! (28-30)

They would point to later years when for hundreds of German soldiers in Italy in 1341-42, there were thousands. But against this stands Torraca's distinction between the two kinds of mercenary soldiery, and the sense of surprise, of unwelcome novelty, felt in the line:

Che fan qui tante pellegrine spade?

And there is also this large element of human good sense in Torraca's view: that he sets himself not so much

to see what period in the history of the German mercenaries in Italy best fits this or that line in the canzone, as to find the time in Petrarch's life when their growing importance would have struck him first and most sharply. Petrarch had not our present perspective upon the fourteenth century, he could not look at the years from 1341 to 1368 and select the one in which there were the greatest number of pellegrine spade in Italy; but he would certainly have been deeply impressed by the first ones he knew of, and Torraca has amply shown that there were plenty to be seen in 1341, and that Petrarch must have known it. And it was Petrarch's habit, as it is the habit of every lyric poet, to make poetic response pretty directly to the stimulus of new events.

Another criticism which his opponents might make against Torraca's theory is that to add Italia mia to the other works written, or conceived and begun, during this stay at Selvapiana would be to make 1341 a preposterously productive period. But it is true that poets are liable to such periods, and that a time of intense intellectual stimulus and happiness, such as the second Roman journey undoubtedly must have brought, can greatly accelerate their powers.

On the whole, in the present state of our knowledge,

we may accept 1341-42[1] as the most probable date for CXXVIII.

CXXIX. Di pensier in pensier

From the envoy it is evident that Petrarch is writing from Italy, and expects soon to return to Provence:

> Canzone, oltra quell' 'alpe ...
> Mi rivedrai ...
> Ove l'aura si sente
> D'un fresco et odorifero laureto.

Cochin[2] thinks it probable that it was written in 1345; hardly from Parma, on account of the allusions to mountains (53-55), though he does not consider this objection final. But Verona would do very well. We know that Petrarch was at Verona June 16, 1345,[3] and at Avignon on December 19[4]; this would agree with the indications in the poem which fit the suggestion of an early return. Sicardi[5] thinks this absence is the one lamented in CXXVII.

CXXX. Poi che 'l camin.

Cochin,[6] who takes CXXVIII to be dated from Parma in 1344-45, thinks that this poem so near it in the Canzoniere, alluding as it does to mysterious shafts of envy,

---

1. E. Carrara, "Italia mia," in La Cultura, III (1923), 2, Dec. 15, p. 60, is inclined to agree with Torraca's dating.
2. Op. cit., 92.
3. Fam., XXIV, 3, Frac., III, 263.
4. Fam., XXIV, 4, Frac., III, 268.
5. "Dell' 'angelico seno," etc.
6. Op. cit., 92-93.

may be connected with the difficulties which forced Petrarch to leave Parma February 11, 1345. But this, as he says, is pure hypothesis. The only sure indication is that he is remote from Laura (13).

Sicardi[1] believes this poem gives the reason for the absence mourned in these poems, and that Laura had repented of the confidence he believes her to have made on the occasion described in CXXVI. Flamini[2] sets it a good deal earlier. He connects this and CXXVI with the period described in XXIII, when Petrarch was out of favor, a period ended as he believes before Petrarch had to seek escape in flight in 1336.

CXXXI. Io canterei d'Amor.

There is no indication as to this, except that Petrarch refers to himself as no longer young:

> Non rincresco a me stesso anzi mi glorio
> D'esser servato a la stagion più tarda (13-14).

(CXXXII. S'amor non è.)

CXXXIII. Amor m'ha posto.

There is one slight allusion to the passage of time; Petrarch has had long experience of love:

---

1. Op. cit.
2. Op. cit., 47.

Da gli occhi vostri uscio 'l colpo mortale;
Contra cui non mi val tempo nè loco (5-6).

(CXXXIV. Pace non trovo.)

CXXXV. Qual più diversa e nova.

As Cochin[1] notes, this canzone, being written at Vaucluse (92-94), must be later than 1337.

CXXXVI. Fiamma dal ciel.

This sonnet and the two following, known as the "Babylonian" sonnets against the Roman curia at Avignon, are best considered together. Pakscher[2] agrees with Carducci that they were written during the pontificate of Clement VI (1342-1352), and decides for the year 1345 as best suiting their position. A better suggestion is that with which he supports his belief, namely, that in 1345 Petrarch returned to Avignon after absence, and might have been freshly impressed with the iniquities of the papal court.

Cesareo[3] is so struck with their similarity to the letters Sine titulo that he believes they must be contemporary, and his first task accordingly is to date those letters. He presents the following arguments for putting

1. Op. cit., 93.
2. Op. cit., 82.
3. Op. cit., 89-100.

them in the fifties:

I. In the preface to the Sine titulo[1] Petrarch refers to his Eclogues in a manner to indicate that the latter were well begun:

> Ea me pridem cogitatio induxit ut bucolicum carmen poematis genus ambigui scriberem, quod paucis intellectum, plures forsitan delectaret;

and as the Eclogues I, V and VIII,[2] addressed respectively to Gerardo, Cardinal Colonna and Cola di Rienzo, were written about 1347,[3] the Sine titulo must be later.

II. It is Nos. V-XIX of the Sine titulo in which the allusions to Avignon are pointed and bitter, and since, Cesareo assumes, these letters are arranged chronologically, the fifth cannot be earlier than the fourth, which appeals to the Romans on behalf of Cola in prison in 1352. The fifth, moreover, refers to Petrarch's return to Avignon as rather recent:

> Geminus mihi Parnassus, alter in Italia est, alter in Galliis, qualis exulantium late Pieridum duplex domus: in Ausonio Helicone foelicior fui:
> dum fata deusque sinebant,
> ut apud Maronem illa miserabilis amans ait ... nunc me Gallicus orbis habet, et occidentalis Babylon, qua nihil informius sol vedet.[4]

---

1. Basle 1554, II, 787.
2. Padova in onore di Francesco Petrarca, MCMIV, I. Il Bucolicum Carmen e i suoi documenti inediti. Edizione curata ed illustrata da A. Avenna, Padua, 1906, 95, 114, 132.
3. For the dates of these eclogues, see Frac. It., the note to Fam., X, 4, II, 498; to VII, 5, II, 181; and to Var., XLII, V, 368.
4. Basle 1554, II, 793.

III. There are relations between the Sine Titulo and certain of the Familiar Letters for which we have dates.

1. Fam., XII, 8, is a fragmentary form of Sine titulo, V, and is dated by Fracassetti April 1, 1352.[1]

2. In Fam., XIII, 5, of August 9, 1352,[2] Petrarch excuses himself for his return to Avignon:

> Vocatus ad curiam veni, curiam hanc quae de Roma nihil praeter nomen retinet; et veni omnium quae erga me agerentur ignarus, nunquam, si quid mihi creditur, venturus sciens. Et quid, inquies, igitur te trahebat? Profecto nil aliud quam charitas amicorum.

And this is similar to the following passage from Sine titulo, 8:

> Haec et his similia te suadente, quid responderem aliud non erat, nisi me charitate victum amicorum, notas ad miserias reverti. Dicebam haec nec mentiebar, nec dum me charitatis illius poenitet, sed an libertatem meam ... poeniteat incertus sum.[3]

In both letters, also, allusion is made to an office which was offered Petrarch in the curia; in Sine titulo, 8, his friend seems to reprove Petrarch:

> Quae te tui immemorem trahit ambitio? ... curiae laqueos expertus totiens, non ignoras in quos ubi semel incideres, absolvi non poteris cum voles.[4]

And in Fam., XIII, 5, is the statement that Petrarch has refused it.

IV. Cesareo makes no attempt to say when or to whom

---

1. Frac. It., III, 151.
2. Frac. II, 226; Frac. It., 225.
3. Basle 1554, II, 795.
4. Loc. cit.

Sine titulo 14, 15 and 16 were written, but it is known that 17 and 18 were addressed to Francesco Nelli of SS. Apostoli, Florence, who had gone to Avignon on ecclesiastical business for the abbey of S. Salvi, and were in answer to two of his which are dated respectively September 8, 1357, and Easter Sunday, 1358.[1] The nineteenth Cesareo thinks was perhaps addressed to Nelli on his return to Florence, so that the letters referring with bitterness to Avignon would run from 1352 to 1358.

Cesareo's next problem is to establish a close relation between the letters Sine titulo and the "Babylonian" sonnets, for which he adduces these arguments:

I. The striking similarity in subject matter and phraseology between these sonnets and the Sine titulo, which Cesareo makes evident by a set of parallel columns.[2] His comment is that it would be possible to reconstruct the sonnets out of the letters.

II. The fact that there are no malign allusions to Avignon before 1351, and no outburst of hatred before 1352. Quite the contrary, indeed; Fam., VIII, 3,[3] of May 18, 1348, and Fam., VII, 1,[4] to Barbato, of September 11, 1347, praise Provence and Vaucluse with no word of Babylon, and

---

1. Fam., XII, 5, Frac. It., III, 139.
2. Op. cit., 94-95.
3. Frac. It., II, 306.
4. Frac. It., II, 165.

Petrarch says he would like to spend the rest of his life there because of its associations with Laura. There is nothing like that in the letters of 1352-57.

III. The use of the word Babylon to designate Avignon, which does not appear anywhere in the letters or other Latin works before 1351.

1. We find it first in the letter of June 1, 1351, to Boccaccio[1]:

> Duo ibi sunt, fateor, adversa animo; et quod ab Italia locus abest, ... et quod vicina est nimis Babylon haec occidentalis, rerum pessima Ereboque simillima.

After that allusions are frequent; and Petrarch often dates his letters super flumina Babylonis. The name occurs in the letter to Aretino dated the 20th of the same month,[2] in Fam., XII, 4,[3] of January 13, 1352; in Fam., XII, 9,[4] of April 1, 1352; in Fam., XII, 11,[5] June 1, 1352; in Fam., XIII, 6,[6] August 10, 1352; in Fam., XIII, 8,[7] of 1352; in Fam., XVI, 10,[8] April 28, 1353; in Sen., VI, 6,[9] 1359; and Sen., X, 2,[10] 1368.

---

1. Fam., XI, 6, Frac. II, 119; Frac. It., III, 47.
2. Fam., XI, 9, Frac. It., III, 69.
3. Frac. It., III, 138.
4. Frac. It., III, 154.
5. Frac. It., III, 160.
6. Frac. It., III, 236.
7. Frac. It., III, 262.
8. Frac. It., III, 456.
9. Frac., I, 345.
10. Frac., II, 107.

2. Babylon is mentioned also in Eclogues VI and VII, which are dated by allusions to certain cardinals elected in 1351, and to Clement VI, who died in 1352; and in the Epistola poetica to Francesco Nelli (Miraris quae causa), which Fracassetti dates 1352, or shortly before.[1]

3. As Cesareo lays great stress upon this argument from the word Babylon, he has to take into account the fact that it is used of Avignon in two sonnets which are placed earlier in the Canzoniere, CXIV and CXVII. He anticipates this objection, and meets it by striving to prove that these were both written after Laura's death.[2]

Cochin[3] is not at all satisfied with Cesareo's arguments for the late date, although admitting the striking resemblances the latter has established between these sonnets and the letters Sine titulo. He concedes that perhaps the great explosion of fury did not begin until 1351-52, but reminds us of the expressions, milder it is true but still showing real aversion to Avignon, which have already been quoted under CXIV. And there are still others in the letters to Cola of 1347, the year of Petrarch's rupture with the Colonna family and of his return to Rome after Cola, the year when Cochin thinks his anger broke against

---

1. Fam., XII, 5, Frac. It., III, 137-138.
2. For his arguments, see the discussion under these two heads.
3. Op. cit., 93-95.

the papal city.

M. Morici[1] in discussing VII, quotes Mascetta[2] with approval as thinking the first line of that sonnet:

La gola e 'l sonno e l' otiose piume,

must refer to Avignon, because of its similarity to the lines in CXXXVI:

Di vin serva, di letti e di vivande,
In cui lussuria fa l' ultima prova (7-8).

And as he thinks he has proved the date of VII to be about 1339, he believes we have here an uncomplimentary reference to Avignon as early as that date, and offers this evidence in corroboration of Cochin, whom he cites. But Morici's whole argument rests upon too insecure a foundation[3] to make it possible to use it in support of any other. The question of the word "Babylon" Cochin considers a mere detail, and cites other satirical plays on words; in the Sine titulo, for example, Quid hinc humanitatis,[4] of 1347. This argument could hardly be dismissed thus easily, however, if it were not possible to show that CXIV and CXVII were almost certainly written at least three years before the earliest mention of Babylon in prose.

---

1. "Francesco Petrarca e Giovanni di San Vito," etc.
2. Op. cit., 349-350.
3. See discussion under VII.
4. O tumide ... surgens Sorga. O Rhodanus rodens omnia!... O Avinio cuius vinea ... cruentam profert vindemiam, etc. Basle 1554, II, 787.

Cochin alludes to Petrarch's insistence upon the luxury and magnificence of the papal constructions: le torri superbe (CXXXVII, 10) and alzi le corna (CXXXVIII, 10), which he thinks may likewise refer to towers; now according to Cesareo's hypothesis, says Cochin, we should have to see in these lines allusions to the ramparts of Avignon, commenced by Clement VI in 1350 and continued by Innocent VI in 1352, but they can apply equally well to the palace of the popes, the famous Tour de Trouilles, which was left almost finished by Benedict XII in 1342 and was completed by Clement.

Cochin does not think it possible to accept Cesareo's dating as certain, a conclusion in which we must concur. Half of his argument falls to the ground when we decide that Petrarch twice used the word Babylon as a synonym for Avignon in poems written before 1348; moreover, E. Carrara[1] says that Petrarch's hatred of Avignon certainly began earlier than Cesareo is willing to admit. He cites Var., XLXIX,[2] dated: Data in inferno viventium, xviii Januarii, and probably written in 1347[3]; and the third letter Sine titulo, addressed to Cola. The other half rests on the

---

1. "I commenti antichi e la cronologia delle ecloghe petrarchesche," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXVIII (1896), 123.
2. Frac., III, 438.
3. Frac. It., V, 418.

likeness in subject matter between letters and sonnets. Cesareo remarks that it is so considerable that we could if need be reconstruct the latter out of the former, but that is an argument that works both ways. Petrarch may just as well have written the sonnets first, and used the ideas again in prose, and this will seem the more likely procedure if we remember that poetry is always the direct fruit of emotion. Now, two dates have been suggested when Petrarch's attitude toward Avignon was tinged by feeling; Pakscher thinks he was shocked at what he saw on his return in 1345, and Cochin reminds us of the break with the Colonna in 1347 and the departure for Rome. But when he returned to Avignon in 1345, he was returning to the place where his love and his friend dwelt, and there would be much softness in his feeling towards it; whereas in 1347, he was leaving a spot which had now at least one painful personal association, and was returning to Rome, the antithesis of Babylon, the city which must above all other places make him deplore the Babylonian exile.

We can accept no date as quite probable, but it is not too much to say that 1347 is not improbable.

CXXXVII. I'avara Babilonia.

See CXXXVI.

CXXXVIII. Fontana di dolore.

See CXXXVI.

CXXXIX. Quanto più disiose.

The unusual number of clues in this sonnet has not led as yet to any definite dating of it. Cochin,[1] assuming that Egitto (11) must mean Babylon (the Middle Ages, he says, recognized two Babylons, of which one was in Egypt), and consequently Provence, concludes that the Jerusalem contrasted with it must be Italy. And he understands

quella valle aprica,
Ove 'l mar nostro più la terra implica (6-7),

to mean Naples. But "valley" is certainly a singular word to use to describe that city; and it is hard to see how Petrarch's heart, which is going with his departing friends (8), can follow a <u>camin dritto</u> into Italy while he himself goes <u>da man manca</u> into France. This could only be if he were going by sea, which is of course the way he oftenest did go, and thought of himself as already on shipboard. Moschetti believes this was the case; in his edition of the <u>Rime</u>,[2] he expresses the opinion that Petrarch meant the Gulf of Genoa, that his friends having gone with him as far as the border of France turn back into Italy as he sets

---

1. <u>Op. cit</u>., 96-97.
2. Milan, 1908.

sail for Marseilles, and that Petrarch is making his "geographical orientation" from the sea, which he has just mentioned. But certainly at the moment of parting, which he is recalling in the poem, they would still be ashore, and if one is facing northwest then the south is to one's left.

Carducci puts mar nostro in the accusative case, and decides that il mar nostro d'Italia is nowhere more completely surrounded by land than in the Gulf of Venice, or perhaps the Adriatic. Any city on the eastern shore might then be the point where the friends took leave of each other, but if we take Egitto to signify Avignon, then it would certainly be Petrarch who took the right-hand road. But it is just as correct, and more natural, to take mar as a nominative: "where our sea most overlaps the land."

Proto, likewise, in reviewing the Carducci-Ferrari edition of the Rime,[1] thinks the confronto con Orazio forces us to conclude for the Adriatic,[2] and would connect this sonnet with the flight from Parma, when Petrarch, longing for Vaucluse, had to go da man manca to Bologna. But an allusion to the Adriatic as a geographical indication for Parma would certainly be far-fetched!

A recent ingenious suggestion is that of A. Foresti,[3]

---

1. Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VII (1902), 139, 212.
2. Op. cit., 229-230.
3. "Un saluto e un sospiro di Francesco Petrarca alla certosa di Montrieux," in Emporium, XLVIII (1918), 21.

who thinks the allusion is to the monks at Montrieux, of whom his brother Gerardo had become one, and whom Petrarch visited in 1347. The phrase dolce schiera amica (2) is applicable, as Foresti remarks, to the friendly brotherhood of a monastery, and very similar to the phrase ille grex angelicus which he quotes from Fam., XVI, 9,[1] where Petrarch is praising these same Carthusians, and which Fracassetti translates by schiera.[2] Then in the Epistola metrica, III, 3, addressed to Guglielmo Pastrengo in the spring of 1346, are the lines:

> Hic unus cum pace dies exactus Aventi
> Vix totus, tot me laqueis, tot curia curis
> Implicat, id meritum quin vincula nota libenter
> Infoelix, tritaque iugum cervice recepi,[3]

which bear considerable resemblance to the opening lines of CXXXIX:

> Quanto più disiose l' ali spando
> Verso di voi, o dolce schiera amica,
> Tanto fortuna con più visco intrica
> Il mio volare, o gir mi face errando.

And still more marked is the resemblance to a letter from Petrarch to Gerardo,[4] written from Capri, September 22, 1348[5]:

> Ille [Gerardo] quidem evolavit, ego nullo iam laqueo tentus [since Laura is dead], sed visco consuetudinis pessimae delinitus, alas explicare nequeo, et ubi vinctus fueram, solutus haereo.

---

1. Frac., II, 392.
2. It., III, 449.
3. Basle, 1554, III, 1361.
4. Fam., X, 3, Frac., II, 73.
5. Frac. It., II, 496. Foresti cites it as of 1349.

The visco seems to be in Avignon. Then Foresti quotes Cochin[1] to prove that Montrieux lies in a fair valley (and even Baedeker[2] advises the eight-mile walk from Solliès-Pont to Montrieux along the "smiling valley" of the Gapeau), and thinks Egitto "undoubtedly" means Avignon, where Petrarch may have stopped on his return from the certosa before repairing to Vaucluse where he wrote De ocio religiosorum. He imagines Gerardo and some others of the good brothers going part way with Petrarch to speed him on his journey; and it is certain that, as Avignon lies to the northwest of Montrieux, their road as they returned to their monastery would be to the right while Petrarch's would lie to the left.

But there are objections to this interpretation also. The camin dritto could be taken fairly to mean the "straight road"; in that case the friends would be continuing in the same direction they were going, while Petrarch turned aside to the left. The situation as regards the sea is almost too similar, as between Avignon and Montrieux, for ll. 6 and 7 to have very much point, although in informal verse between friends, in which allusions are sure to be caught, indications do not have to be so sharply made. (But on the other hand, this poem was chosen for the final collection,

---

1. Le Frère de Pétrarque, Paris, 1903.
2. "Southern France," Leipsic, 1902, 458.

to be read by everybody.) Both places lie near the Gulf of Lyons, which Sicardi[1] thinks (rightly in our opinion, and Salvo-Cozzo in his edition[2] agrees with him), is where the mar nostro più la terra implica, or as he paraphrases it, s'interna fra la terra. And although Montrieux is much nearer the Mediterranean, just there the shore makes a bend outward in a broad cape with Toulon and Hyères on its tip, whereas it bends inward directly south of Avignon in the Bay of Marseilles. But Sicardi puts a colon after aprica, so according to him the valley does not have to be associated with the sea, as it does in Carducci's reading, in Mestica's and Moschetti's. Sicardi throws the 7th and 8th lines into one sentence:

> Ove 'l mar nostro più la terra implica
> l' altr' ier da lui parti'.

But Sicardi's punctuation, although Salvo-Cozzo accepts it, seems inadmissible, because while ove 'l mar, etc., is a good general indication of the whereabouts of a valley, it is altogether too vague for a rendezvous or a parting.

Another objection lies in the word amore, to which Carducci gives the capital which shows he takes it in its restricted sense. It would mean love of Laura, then, not brotherly love among the monks of Montrieux. And indeed

---

1. "Francesco Petrarca. - Le rime di su le originali, commentate da Giosue Carducci e Severino Ferrari," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXXVI (1900), 173.
2. Florence, 1904.

very few of the more than 300 cases of its use in the Canzoniere can be understood to mean anything else. Charitas amicorum is the phrase Petrarch uses for love of friends in the letter Fam., XIII, 5, already quoted, and in dedicating De ocio religiosorum to this very brotherhood, Sodalitati magnae Carthusiae, he uses it of their affectionate care of him:

> Unum quoque continuum obsequium et charitas, non illa communis quam in Christo cunctis hospitibus exhibetis, sed singularis quidem atque praefervida me sollicitum habebat.[1]

So even a singularis and praefervida affection between friends is not amor. In the sonnet [CCLXVI], 9, he distinguishes the two kinds sharply:

> Carità di signore, amor di donna.

In the Trionfo della Fama, I, 25, there is a different contrast:

> L' un di vertute, e non d' Amor mancipio,

as also in CCCXV, 9-10:

> Presso era 'l tempo dove Amor si scontra
> Con Castitate.

In XXVIII, 42-43, caritate is love for God, and amor is human love. Still, we cannot forget CXXVIII, 25:

> Chè in cor venale amor cercate o fede,

although in Trionfo d' Amore, II, 19,

---

1. Basle, 1554, I, 331.

Altra fede, altro amor,

romantic love is meant. In II, 8, there is amor di saper, and in IV, 55:

Padre m' era in honore, in amor figlio;

while in the canzone Alla Vergine (CCCLXVI) amor is twice used of religious emotion (4, 19). And in LXXXI, 12, amor is certainly not love of Laura; Carducci quotes Castelvetro, apparently with approval, as thinking it means love of study.

These cases perhaps justify Foresti's reading, and if we reject them and take the sonnet to mean that the friends (and Petrarch's heart) were faring towards Laura, - in which case his heart, d' Amore scorto, would be "guided" by the spirit of love in Dante's sense, rather than literally "escorted" by the friends, - then we are admitting that in a sonnet immediately following the "Babylonian" three, Petrarch refers to Avignon as Jerusalem. And Egypt would have to be his beloved Italy, which is just as strange. But there is another, less explicit and more mystical, way of interpreting these words; from the Paduan edition of 1472, Carducci cites this manuscript note: Hoc adagium ecclesiasticum est, quia ipsi ponunt Hierusalem pro felicitate et Aegyptum pro miseria. So in writing to the monks who had recently been his hosts, the word would be a graceful

compliment; on the other hand, felicity lies where Laura is, and however much her lover may suffer in her vicinity he always mourns absence from her. But in a letter to his brother, congratulating him upon his better choice of the religious vocation, Petrarch apparently uses Jerusalem to indicate the monastic life as distinguished from the secular; Babylon does not seem here to mean Avignon, although he has been recalling the years of their frivolous youth there, but rather the res pereuntes of worldly life:

> Sed ineffabilis Dei pietas gressus tuos interea pedetentim revocabat ad rectum iter, et satietate rerum pereuntium praeceps illud desiderium castigabat, ut scilicet diversis aetatibus utrobique incola, quid interesset inter Babylonem atque Ierusalem expertus agnosceres.[1]

This would be similar to Dante's use of the same contrast[2]:

> Gli è conceduto che d' Egitto
> Venga in Jerusalemme,

and in Psalm CIV, 23, Egypt evidently means earthly (hence worldly) life: Et intravit Israel in Aegyptum; and 43: Et eduxit populum suum [ex Aegypto] in exultatione. In the dedication to the Carthusians of De Ocio, Petrarch says of his visit: Veni ego in paradisum, vidi angelos Dei in terra,[3] which has a slight similarity to Hebrews XII, 22: Sed accessistis ad ... Jerusalem celestem, et multorum millium Angelorum frequentiam. Here are perhaps no striking single

---

1. Fam., X, 3, Frac., II, 72. Foresti quotes part of this same sentence, but assigns it to De vita solitaria.
2. Par., XXV, 55-56.
3. Loc. cit.

similarities, but a cluster of vaguely related associations of the ideas of angels, heaven, Jerusalem, contrasting with the idea of an inferior type of life symbolized by Egypt, which are quite sufficient to justify a poetical allusion. In the light of them, camin dritto and man manca might be thought to have a moral significance.

But who are meant by nostro in the last line -

> Chè per lungo uso già fra noi prescritto
> Il nostro esser insieme è raro e corto?

Foresti says nothing on this point, but if nostro refers to Petrarch and his friends it would be a supporting argument, since in the dedication to the Sodality he eloquently laments the temporis spatium, the breve tempus ad explicandum that he had with them; but does it mean the friends? Carducci thinks so, while saying that most commentators think it means Petrarch and his heart. His heart is the nearest antecedent, certainly, and the only one in the sestet, and Petrarch was a formalist. If it means that his heart and he are used to being apart, then Amor must surely mean love of Laura, with whom in a hundred fanciful lines his heart is said to be, when it is not in his own keeping.

On the whole, Foresti's theory is the most plausible and attractive, and is the only one that would give us a definite date, but it hardly justifies us in accepting the date of this puzzling sonnet as settled.

(CXL. Amor, che nel pensier.)

(CXLI. Come tal ora.)

CXLII. A la dolce ombra.

Cochin,[1] noting that this is a poem of springtime, thinks it probably an anniversary sonnet. Years have passed, at any rate, since the beginning of love, and the lover has had time to change (27-30).

(CXLIII. Quand' io v' odo.)

(CXLIV. Nè così bello.)

CXLV. Pommi ove 'l sol.

The time-indication is in the last line:

Continuando il mio sospir trilustre.

Cesareo[2] and Cochin[3] both date the sonnet accordingly 1342, fifteen years after the innamoramento. But it is not impossible that Petrarch meant that three lustra were completed but not yet four, and intended a date between fifteen and twenty years from 1327. A recent Italian poet has used the word evidently with that meaning; Guido Gozzano[4] describes two young girls, one as seventeen years old and the other thereabouts, and then refers to their bei sogni trilustri.

---

1. Op. cit., 97.
2. Op. cit., 104.
3. Op. cit., 97.
4. I Colloqui, Milan, 1919, 89, 95.

CXLVI. O d'ardente vertute.

There is no indication, save that the poet has ruled tante carte already, for poems to Laura.

(CXLVII. Quando 'l voler.)

CXLVIII. Non Tesin, Po.

This sounds, as Cochin[1] says, as if written by the Sorgue, and if so must be posterior to 1337.

(CXLIX. Di tempo in tempo.)

(CL. Che fai, alma?)

(CLI. Non d'atra.)

(CLII. Questa umil fera.)

(CLIII. Ite, caldi sospiri.)

(CLIV. Le stelle il cielo.)

(CLV. Non fur mai Giove.)

(CLVI. I' vidi in terra.)

(CLVII. [CLIX.] In qual parte.)

(CLVIII. [CLX.] Amor et io.)

(CLIX. [CLXI.] O passi sparsi.)

(CLX. [CLXII.] Lieti fiori.)

(CLXI. [CLXIII.] Amor, che vedi.)

(CLXII. [CLXIV.] Or che 'l ciel.)

(CLXIII. [CLXV.] Come 'l candido piè.)

---

1. Op. cit., 97-98.

(CLXIV. [CLXIX.] Pien d'un vago.)

(CLXV. [CLXX.] Più volte già.)

(CLXVI. [CLXXI.] Giunto m'ha Amor.)

(CLXVII. [CLXXII.] O invidia.)

(CLXVIII. [CLXXIII.] Mirando 'l sol.)

(CLXIX. [CLXXXIV.] Amor, Natura.)

(CLXX. [CLXXXV.] Questa fenice.)

(CLXXI. [CLXXVIII.] Amor mi sprona.)

CLXXII. [CLXXVI.] Per mezz' i boschi.

The journey described in this sonnet and the next must be, as Cesareo[1] and Cochin[2] agree with De Sade[3] in thinking, the same one referred to in Fam., I, 4[4]:

> Arduennam sylvam ... visu atram atque horrificam transivi solus et (quod magis admireris) belli tempore; sed incautos (ut aiunt) Deus adiuvat.

That Petrarch was ever at any other time alone and unarmed in the Wood of Ardennes in time of war, does not appear from any of his works, and there is small likelihood of its having happened to him twice in his lifetime. The letter was written in the summer of 1333,[5] and we may accept that as the approximate date of the sonnet.

CLXXIII. [CLXXVII.] Mille piagge.

See CLXXII.

(CLXXIV. [CLXXXIX.] Passa la nave mia.)

---

1. Op. cit., 104-105.
2. Op. cit., 100.
3. Mémoires pour la vie de François Pétrarque, Amsterdam, 1764-1767, I, 215.
4. Frac., I, 47.
5. Frac. It., I, 282.

CLXXV. [CCLXIV.] I' vo pensando.

This is the poem with which the second part of the Canzoniere begins in both V. L. 3195 and the Chigi manuscript L. V. 176; a great deal depends consequently upon our ability to assign a date to it.

In the first place, was it written before or after Laura's death? We must certainly agree with Cesareo[1] and Cochin[2] in thinking it was before. When Petrarch speaks (46-47) of the possible day of Laura's relenting,

Che per nostra salute unqua un giorno non vene,

the present tense of vene must refer to a future still possible; and in l. 77 he says:

E'l lume de'begli occhi, che mi strugge.

These present tenses are harder to explain away than the preterites porse (37) and durò (46), which contrast with or (48), and may be merely contrasting the time when Petrarch thought of nothing but Laura with now when he is occupied also with thoughts of death and salvation.

Both Cochin and Cesareo, however, while believing the poem to have been written before Laura's death, connect it with 1348, the year of the pest, accepting, - Cesareo without reserve and Cochin with slight hesitation, -

---

1. Op. cit., 107.
2. Op. cit., 120.

Gaspary's theory[1] which connects [CCLXIV] with the Epistola metrica, Ad se ipsum.[2] Cochin thinks the similarities in thought between these two works of Petrarch which Gaspary cites could be matched in many other parts of the Canzoniere, except the idea of the fear of death, which he admits appears for the first time in this canzone, and can be thought to connect it with the Epistola metrica, qui a été certainement composée à l'occasion de la peste de 1348.[3] He believes that [CCLXIV], although written before Laura's death, was associated in his mind, at least at the moment when he established his division between the first and second parts, with la grande révolution morale qui suivit la mort de Laure. So he dates it 1347 or 1348. And in the course of the last twenty-five years the hesitation he felt about accepting Gaspary's theory which relates it to the Epistola metrica must have vanished, because in a recent popular work[4] on Petrarch he gives I'vo pensando the heading: La chanson de la grande peste,[5] which would put it, as does Cesareo,[6] in 1348. Cesareo seems to feel that he brings supporting evidence to Gaspary's theory when he re-

---

1. Storia della letteratura italiana, tr. Zingarelli, Turin, 1887, I, 487-488.
2. I, 14, Basle 1554, III, 1341.
3. Cochin, quoting Gaspary with approval, op. cit., 120.
4. F. Pétrarque, Préface et traduction, Paris, 1921.
5. Op. cit., 70.
6. Loc. cit.

minds us of the note in V. L. 3196 to [CCLXVIII], Che debb'io far? which reads: Transcript' non in ordine sed in alia papiro 28 novembr. 1349. Since [CCLXVIII] is the fifth poem in a second part of which [CCLXIV] is the first, it must have been transcribed before November 28, 1349, e però probabilmente composta nel 1348.[1] But it does not follow. The date of transcription gives only a terminus ad quem for a date of composition, and this date is very near the end of 1349.

Pakscher and Appel, for different reasons, set the canzone much earlier. Pakscher[2] notes the striking resemblance between the ideas expressed in I'vo pensando and the Secretum, and taking the Secretum as dated 1342,[3] he sets the canzone near the same time. Appel[4] arrives at his early dating by arguments based on form and prosody.

Their early dates have recently received support from Henri Hauvette,[5] who assigns the Epistola metrica, of whose date Cochin was so secure, to a period eight years before:

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. Op. cit., 99-102.
3. Following Gaspary, op. cit., I, 543, and Körting, Petrarcas Leben und Werke, Leipzig, 1878, 649.
4. Die berliner Handschriften, 61.
5. "La date de la Canzone de Pétrarque, I'vo pensando," in Études italiennes, III (1921), No. 2, 112.

> Un suggestif rapprochement entre la Canzone et l'épître en vers latins Ad se ipsum (I, 14) du même Pétrarque a été fait jadis par A. Gaspary. La situation est identique: une terrible épidémie désole l'Italie, et confond dans la même mort le noble et le plébeien; Pétrarque tremble; il sent que la mort le guette; il songe à son salut, mais ses aspirations chrétiennes ont encore à lutter contre toutes ses passions. M. Cochin a fait bon accueil à ce rapprochement (Chronologie, 120). M. G. A. Cesareo s'est montré beaucoup plus affirmatif (Su le poesie volgari di F.P., 107); je partage tout à fait leur manière de voir. Seulement l'épître I, 14 n'est pas de 1348; elle date de 1340. C'est Boccace qui nous l'apprend, Boccaca qui, copiant de sa main cette épître, l'a fait précéder du titre que voici: De generali mortalitate que fuit per totam tusciam et potissime in Florentia anno Christi MCCCXL, indictione VII (Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist., Rome, t. XIV, 109, et le fac-simile).[1]

Hauvette goes on to say that the manuscript[2] in which Boccaccio copied several of the Latin epistles and assembled various facts about Petrarch dates from a time back of 1350, when the two great Tuscans first met. His texts and his information, Hauvette believes, he gathered while at Naples, probably in 1348, from persons like Barbato da Sulmona who had known Petrarch there in 1341 and 1343. Boccace ne pouvait pas alors confondre l'épidémie de 1348 avec celle de 1340! And in further support of his belief Hauvette appositely quotes Giovanni Villani[3]:

> Nel detto anno 1340, all'uscita di marzo ... incontanente cominciò grande mortalità, che, quale si ponea malato, quasi niuone scampava e morinne più che il sesto dei cittadini ...; e durò questa pestilenza fino al verno seguente. E più di quindici mila corpi morti se ne sepellirono nella città.

---

1. See also D. Magrini, Le Epistole metriche di Francesco Petrarca, Rocca S. Casciano, 1907, 96, who likewise assigns I, 14 to the year 1340.
2. Laurent., XXIX, 8.
3. Cronica, XI, 113.

From which Hauvette draws the two sure conclusions that there was a great pest in Italy in 1340, and that this is the epidemic to which the Epistola metrica, Ad se ipsum, relates.

When it comes to connecting this pestilence and this epistle with I'vo pensando, Hauvette is far less confident, yet he brings forward some excellent evidence in support of it, which it will be convenient to list:

1. The emotions expressed in [CCLXIV] are as applicable to a pestilence in the one year as in the other, but that of 1348 could at best only renew those felt first, with pristine intensity, during the one of 1340. (This is a powerful argument, if more were needed, remembering the immediacy of Petrarch's literary response to external events, for connecting the Epistola metrica with the first pest within his experience.)

2. The thoughts of conversion, and all the opposing thoughts arising from his love of the world and his love of Laura, were expressed at length in the Secretum, which Hauvette, writing in 1920-21, still considers as dated 1341-1342.

3. The year 1341, the date of the coronation on the Capitol, marks the moment when the love of glory had the most power over Petrarch's heart. (And yet even then,

writing CXIX, Petrarch put virtue above glory (59-72) and says that glory is un' ombra (99), ideas in consonance with I'vo pensando.)

4. At that same time, his love poems indicate unusual agitation, as we can judge from LXXIX, written in the quartodecimo anno ch'io sospiro (2), or between April, 1340, and April, 1341, which contains the lines (3-7):

> Più non mi po scampar l'aura nè 'l rezzo
> Sì crescer sento 'l mio ardente desiro,
> Amor. . . . . .
> Sotto 'l cui giogo già mai non respiro (3-5),

and ends:

> Che la morte s'appressa e'l viver fugge.

5. And the sonnet CI, which is self-dated 1341, is a kind of sketch of the same theme as the subject of I' vo pensando: the poet speaks of the inexorable pursuit of death, quella ch' a null' uom perdona (2); of the fragility of the joys of this world:

> rapidamente n' abbandona
> Il mondo e picciol tempo ne tien fede (3-4);

and of the struggle his heart has made against his longing:

> La voglia e la ragion combattut' hanno
> Sett e sett' anni (12-13),

although the last two lines express a certainty as to the outcome which is absent from the last line of the canzone, and there is no mention of fame.

6. None of the Rime which we can place with certainty as belonging to the years 1347-1348 alludes to this inward conflict, which Petrarch was analyzing in 1340-1342; CCXII and CCXXI, which are self-dated 1346-1347, contain only "elegant antitheses upon the poet's fruitless efforts to touch his lady's heart." A reflection of Pakscher's is pertinent here, who remarks that by 1344 Petrarch had taken a position upon certain vital questions and had mastered his passions, and that we can really date a new period from about that year. He quotes the Epistola ad posteros[1]:

> Mox vero ad quadragesimum annum appropinquans, dum adhuc et caloris satis esset et virium, non solum factum illud obscoenum, sed eius memoriam omnem sic abieci, quasi nunquam foeminam aspexissem.

7. Petrarch's preoccupations in 1347-1348 were quite different.[2]

> C'est le moment où Pétrarque, parti d'Avignon pour rejoindre Cola di Rienzo à Rome, se détourne de son chemin à partir de Gênes, gagne Parme. Puis, pendant deux ans, se déplace constamment, de Parme à Verone, à Ferrare, à Padoue, à Mantoue, avec retours à Verone et à Parme, jusqu'au moment où, en 1350, il gagne Rome pour le jubilé. A ce moment, son coeur est tourmenté par d'autres soucis que la gloire et l'amour: une paix relative est entrée dans sa conscience de chrétien; il se préoccupe de l'éducation de son fils Giovanni; à son attention s'imposent les problèmes de la politique italienne; après l'échec de Cola di Rienzo, Pétrarque addresse sa première lettre à l'empereur Charles IV.[3]

---

1. Frac., Fam., I, 3.
2. Hauvette, op. cit., 114.
3. Fam., X, 1, Frac., II, 57; Frac. It., II, 452.

8. [CCLXIV] expresses for the first time in the Canzoniere the dismay of the poet, while still absorbed by his two earthly passions, at the idea of imminent death, which threatens him directly (5, 18, 89, 117-118, 127-128, 134); it is the record of the terror he felt at this scourge suddenly unloosed among men, and of his meditations upon it. The first occasion he had for such meditations was during the pestilence of 1340.

Yet even if we accept all of Hauvette's arguments, which is not difficult, what year do they indicate for the composition of the canzone? It hardly seems as if even the epistle, which Boccaccio says was written concerning the pest of 1340, could have been composed in that year, because Petrarch was in Provence throughout 1340 and could have learned of events in Tuscany only by letter and hearsay; the danger would not have seemed immediate enough to have prompted such reflections. Could it have been in 1341? In that year he would have heard of it from eyewitnesses, since the memory of it would still have been intense; Villani says the pestilence lasted into the winter of 1340, and as Petrarch left for Rome in February, 1341, he may very likely have come upon its traces himself. This would bring the canzone very close to the time of receiving the laurel crown; if near that date, was it before or

after? Lines 55-58 indicate an intense susceptibility on the subject, not such a satisfied certainty as must have followed for a time at least upon the sure and public honors of the coronation:

> un pensier dolce et agro ...
> Preme 'l cor di desio, di speme il pasce.

It would seem as if the desio and speme of glory should have been quieted for a while after the event of April on the Capitol; and only during the period of anxiety, uncertainty and unsatisfied ambition, while he was still only hoping to deserve the crown, could they have been so importunate as to compete with his wish for salvation. The moment an intense ambition is satisfied, we almost forget the torment of uncertainty which went before.

These are questions that can only be solved by conjecture. But after all, the time when the news of the pestilence of 1340 reached and stirred Petrarch has importance not so much for the canzone as for the epistle, which was his first literary response to the impression it made upon him; the canzone is concerned rather with the triple struggle in him between the religious impulse - newly stimulated by the thought of imminent death - and his two secular loves, for glory and for Laura. LXII, as has been noted, shows the strife between religion and Laura; XXIV

and XL betray a fear that the devotion to Laura would be a hindrance on the road to glory; in no other poem do we find all three motives at odds with each other. This is perhaps another argument for setting [CCLXIV] near the year 1340, when the fear of death first smote the poet, and the year 1341, when the hope of literary fame was uppermost in him. Especially when we remember that self-dated sonnets of both those years betray the inward strife against his love.

We can at least say that there is now as much ground for believing that [CCLXIV] dates from 1340-1341 as there was before for connecting it with the year 1348, and even more. The strongest presumption for the later date rested on Gaspary's argument which connected [CCLXIV] with the epistle Ad se ipsum, and that foundation has now been removed eight years away. Even the cautious Hauvette sums up the question thus:[1]

> De tout cela il ressort que sans qu'on puisse s'arrêter à une conclusion positive, l'inspiration de la célèbre Canzone I'vo pensando paraît très probable dès 1340-1341 avant le couronnement.

CLXXVI. [CCLXV.] Aspro core.

The Casanatense collation of V. L. 3196 gives us what is presumably the date of composition of this sonnet.

---

1. Loc. cit.

In that manuscript (f. 101r)[1] it bears the following note:

> 1350. Sept. 21 martis hora 3 die mathei apostoli. propter unum quod leggi padue in cantilena arnaldi danielis: A man prians fafrancha cors suffers.

Cochin[2] and Cesareo[3] alike accept this as the certain date of composition.

CLXXVII. [CCLXVI.] Signor mio caro.

This sonnet is self-dated, and as Pakscher[4] says, doubly dated, in the last three lines:

> Un lauro verde, una gentil colonna,
> Quindeci l'una, e l' altro diciotto anni,
> Portato ho in seno e già mai non mi scinse.

As Petrarch first knew Laura in 1327 and Cardinal Colonna in 1330, the date of this sonnet is evidently 1345.

CLXXVIII. [CCLXVII.] Oimè il bel viso!

This sonnet, at least by intention, as Cochin says,[5] is of 1348 or 1349.

CLXXIX. [CCLXVIII.] Che debb'io far?

This canzone is much annotated in V. L. 3106, and was evidently the object of many revisions. The note to the first version (ff. 13r, and 13v) is[6]: Transcript' non in ordine sed in alia papiro. 1349. Novembr. 28 mane. The

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 129.
2. Op. cit., 122-123.
3. Op. cit., 108.
4. Op. cit., 99.
5. Op. cit., 124.
6. Appel, op. cit., 92.

second has the note (f. 12v)[1]: Tr' in ordine aliquot mutatis 1356. - Veneris xi Novembr. in vesperis. 1349 Novembr. 28 inter primam ac tertiam. Videtur nunc animus ad haec expedienda pronus propter sonitia de morte Sennucij et de Aurora quae his diebus dixi. et erexerunt animum. So the poem was evidently composed by the 28th of November, 1349, and the transcription in alia papiro, alluded to on f. 13r is probably the one we find under the same date on f. 12v.

Cochin[2] believes the alia papiro to be f. 12v, which gives a further series of retouchings to the poem, dated May, 1350,[3] and December, 1351,[4] with the note of the transcription in ordine, 1356. As we can see from the second note quoted under date of November 28, 1349, Petrarch had recently set himself to work again, and had produced two sonnets: now a work which had so many revisions afterwards must have existed in some fragmentary state at least before the day on which it could be copied, even if not yet in ordine, so Cochin would date Che debb'io far? if not in 1348 then during the first two-thirds of 1349. Cesareo[5] thinks 1348.

F. A. Wulff[6] concludes from a study of f. 14r of

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 85.
2. Op. cit., 124-125.
3. Appel, op. cit., 86.
4. Ibid., 85.
5. Op. cit., 107.
6. "La canzone Che debb' io far? selon les manuscrits autographes de Pétrarque (Vat.Lat.3196 & 3195)," in Lund University, Årsskrift, XXVIII (1901), Afd. I,1, and "Les premières ébauches de Pétrarque après le 19 mai 1348," in Romania, XXXI (1902), 384, which is a postscript to the former.

V. L. 3196, that this canzone may have been begun as early as May, 1348. At the top of that page is a fragment of ballata, S'amor vivo è nel mondo, which Wulff agrees with Appel[1] in believing to be an earlier form of envoy to [CCLXVIII], and also with Quarta,[2] in thinking it was written in 1348. The basis for this dating is the assumption that a poem which stands ahead of another on a given page of V. L. 3196, was composed earlier than that other. This earlier envoy to [CCLXVIII], if such it is, is at the top of a page on which is found, separated from it only by another fragment of ballata, the ballata Amor, quand'io credea (earliest form of Amor, quando fioria, CCCXXIV), with its date, already quoted: 1348. septembris. 1. Other arguments are the two facts: 1) that in Amor quand'io credea there are several phrases[3] which recall phrases in the canzone,

---

1. Op. cit., 99.
2. "Frammenti di rime nel V. L. 3196," in his Studi sul testo delle Rime del Petrarca, Naples, 1902. He thought it was written to Sennuccio.
3. in sul fiorire, che se n'è gita Seguir non posso, M qual è la mia vita ella se' 'l vede. The word gita, however, which seems especially convincing to Wulff, was almost a commonplace in just this use, and is found in context almost identical (in idea) in the canzone Li occhi dolenti, in Vita nuova, XXXI (Opere di Dante, S. D. I., Florence, 1921, 41, l. 13); in Cino's canzone upon the death of Beatrice (D'Ancona e Bacci, Manuale della letteratura italiana, Florence, I, 400, l. 7); and in Giacomino Pugliese's upon the death of his lady: Mortte, perchè m'ai fatta (Monaci, Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli, Città di Castello, 1912, 92, V, l. 13).

and 2) that Appel says[1] that the ink on f. 14r is very like that of 13v, on which is part of the earlier version of Che debb' io far?, from which the transcription was made November 28, 1349. Wulff does not believe, however, that stanza V, at least, could have been composed before Cardinal Colonna's death on July 3, 1348, because during the Cardinal's lifetime Petrarch would hardly have said that two things related to Laura (his visions of her and her name) constituted del viver mio l'una colonna and l'altra, thus excluding the honored friend Colonna.

Wulff's reasoning can be supported by a fact to be deduced from V. L. 3196,[2] namely, that Petrarch began his copy of S'amor vivo at a point on the page which left a good two inches and more of space above it, where there was room afterward for several lines of date notations bearing later dates,[3] leaving still more than an inch between these and the fragment of ballata above them, Occhi dolenti. And although the envoy in question is written in at the very top of the page, strung out across it in only two lines (though the rhymes vai and troverai, fori and dolori show there are really probably five, and so Appel[4] prints them), still there is no

1. Op. cit., 99.
2. Il manoscritto vaticano latino 3196 ... riprodotto, etc., op. cit.
3. Vide ultra, p. 272.
4. Op. cit., 97.

appearance of crowding. There is a half-inch of space above it, and over an inch below, between it and Occhi dolenti. It is quite conceivable that Petrarch left both spaces for possible additions that were to occur to him later, and that Amor quand' io, which stands last on the page, was written down last. But it is not susceptible of proof, though Appel's statement[1] that the ink and handwriting are very similar is corroborative.

All we can be sure of is that [CCLXVIII] was finished by November 28, 1349, but Wulff's suggestion cannot be disproved. Nor is it in any wise unlikely.

CLXXX. [CCLXIX.] Rotta è l'alta colonna.

Cardinal Colonna died July 1 or 3, 1348, less than two months after Laura, and this sonnet sounds as if the double loss were still rather recent. This year and the one following saw the death of so many of Petrarch's intimates that it seems fair to conclude that a single poem celebrating these two, the first ones to go if also the most precious, may have been composed before fresh sorrows had come to distribute his grief more widely. Pakscher[2] and Cochin[3] both put it within the year 1348.

---

1. Op. cit., 99.
2. Op. cit., 119.
3. Op. cit., 126.

CLXXXI. [CCLXX.] Amor, se vuo' ch' i' torni.

This is much annotated in V. L. 3196.[1] On f. 12r, above the passage of the first 75 lines (with a lacuna between 31 and 46), - that is to say, stanzas 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the final form, - is the note:

> 1350. mercurii. 9. Iunii. post vesperos volui incipere, sed vocor ad cenam: proximo mane prosequi cepi. Hanc transcripsi et correxi et dedi Bastardino. 1351. die Sabati xxv. martii mane rescribo iterum rescripsi eam xxviii martii mane et illam etiam sibi dedi.

Above all this: Transcript' in alia papiro 135 ... (which Uhaldini read as 1351). Aprilis 20. sero. per me, scilicet per Bastardinum: at prius. Mestica[2] connects at prius with the two foregoing notes, which follow it on the manuscript; the Casanatense lacks the third.

Pakscher[3] thinks incipere means not "begin to write" but "begin to correct"; he thinks no poet would say he sat down to write a poem in such businesslike fashion. He offers an analogy in CCCXXIV, which occupies a later place in the Canzoniere than its date[4] would demand, because of corrections and an ending added later, in 1356. But Pakscher, of course, is preoccupied with explaining how [CCLXX], dated 1350, comes to be placed after [CCLXIX], which is

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 81.
2. Rime, 387.
3. Op. cit., 103-104.
4. September 1, 1348; see discussion under [CCLXVIII].

self-dated (though not quite definitely) 1348.

The simplest way to interpret the note is to assume that incipere means "begin to write," and so Cochin[1] evidently takes it, since he understands the notes to mean that Petrarch began this canzone June 10, 1350 (proximo mane), and corrected and copied it between March 25 and April 20, 1351.

Wulff, however,[2] believes the poem to have been begun, at least, much earlier. The four stanzas which constitute its first redaction, are found on the recto of a leaf (12) on the verso of which is that part of Che debb' io far?[3] which was transcribed from there November 28, 1349; it does seem a reasonable conjecture that the poet used the face of a sheet before using its back. There is no evidence against this dating; only the sentimental objection that it would put Petrarch's confession to a second love just so much nearer the death of his first. And for this, we cannot refuse him the high precedent of Dante.

CLXXXII. [CCLXXI.] L'ardente nodo.

The first two lines show this to be after 1348:

L'ardente nodo ov' io fui d' ora in ora,
Contando anni vent' uno interi, preso.

---

1. Op. cit., 126-128.
2. Le Développement de la canzone Amor, se vuoi, de Pétrarque, selon le ms. Vat. lat. 3196, fol. 12 recto, Lund, 1905.
3. q. v.

If, as is probable, the lady whose death this sonnet mentions is the same who is celebrated in [CCLXX], then the sonnet was written after June 10, 1350.

(CLXXXIII. [CCLXXII.] La vita fugge.)

(CLXXXIV. [CCLXXIII.] Che fai? che pensi?)

(CLXXXV. [CCLXXIV.] Datemi pace.)

(CLXXXVI. [CCLXXV.] Occhi miei.)

(CLXXXVII. [CCLXXVI.] Poi che la vista.)

(CLXXVIII. [CCLXXVII.] S'amor novo.)

CLXXXIX. [CCLXXVIII.] Ne l' età sua.

The last line dates this, though a little indefinitely:

Oh che bel morir era <u>oggi è terzo anno</u>!

Although Leopardi thought this meant "two years ago," the third year beginning today (a meaning of which the words are susceptible), some commentators agree with Biagioli, quoted by Carducci: <u>È un compendio di 'oggi è il terzo anno compiuto</u>.' Cesareo[1] and Cochin[2] take the date intended to be April 6, 1350. Mestica and Salvo-Cozzo say nothing on this point; Moschetti[3] observes that it may be either 1350 or 1351.

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 109.
2. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 128.
3. <u>Rime</u>, 318.

(CXC. [CCLXXIX.] Se lamentar augelli.)

(CXCI. [CCLXXX.] Mai non fu' in parte.)

(CXCII. [CCLXXXI.] Quante fiate.)

(CXCIII. [CCLXXXII.] Alma felice.)

(CXCIV. [CCLXXXIII.] Discolorato hai, Morte.)

(CXCV. [CCLXXXIV.] Sì breve è 'l tempo.)

(CXCVI. [CCLXXXV.] Nè mai pietosa madre.)

(CXCVII. [CCLXXXVI.] Se quell' aura.)

CXCVIII. [CCLXXXVII.] Sennuccio mio.

Sennuccio died in the autumn of 1349, and this is undoubtedly the <u>sonnet de morte Sennuccij</u> referred to in the note to [CCLXVIII] in V. L. 3196, under date of November 28, 1349. (See discussion under CLXXIX.)

CXCIX. [CCLXXXVIII.] I' ho pien.

As this sonnet refers to Vaucluse (2-3):

mirando il dolce piano
Ove nacque colei,

and to Laura's death (5), it must have been written during Petrarch's one visit to Provence after that event, 1351-1353.

(CC. [CCLXXXIX.] L' alma mia fiamma.)

(CCI. [CCXC.] Come va 'l mondo!)

CCII. [CCXCI.] Quand' io veggio.

This is apparently the sonnet de aurora referred to in the note to [CCLXVIII], dated November 28, 1349.

CCIII. [CCXCII.] Gli occhi.

Cochin[1] is struck with the similarity between l. 12:

Or sia qui fine al mio amoroso canto,

and the note in V. L. 3196 (f. 7r)[2]: dated November 3, 1357: Volo his omnino finem dare, ne unquam amplius me teneant. But he admits that Petrarch may have made this resolution more than once. The parallel is interesting but not conclusive.

(CCIV. [CCXCIII.] S' io avesse pensato.)

(CCV. [CCXCIV.] Soleasi nel mio cor.)

(CCVI. [CCXCV.] Soleano i miei penser.)

(CCVII. [CCXCVI.] I' mi soglio accusare.)

(CCVIII. [CCXCVII.] Due gran nemiche.)

(CCIX. [CCXCVIII.] Quand' io mi volgo.)

(CCX. [CCXCIX.] Ov' è la fronte.)

CCXI. [CCC.] Quanta invidia.

This sonnet and the two following are on two sides of the same leaf (f. 3)[3] of V. L. 3196, but in this order:

---

1. Op. cit., 130.
2. Appel, op. cit., 58.
3. Ibid., 40-42.

CCXII, CCXIII, CCXI. CCXI is marked R S, which Cochin[1] reads as <u>responsio supra</u>, and believes CCXIII is really a reply to CCXI. Then CCXII, which stands first of the three in the manuscript, would be a good prologue to the other two. Having indicated this arrangement (CCXII, CCXI, CCXIII) on V. L. 3196, Cochin thinks Petrarch forgot it when these poems came to be transcribed to 3195. He would assign all three to the same period, the last stay at Vaucluse, to which CCXII directly alludes.

CCXII. [CCCI.] Valle, che de' lamenti.

As this is Vaucluse, and after Laura's death (13), it must date from the sojourn 1351-1353.

CCXIII. [CCCII.] Levommi il mio penser.

See CCXI.

CCXIV. [CCCIII.] Amor, che meco.

This is evidently written at Vaucluse, so can be dated 1351-1353.

(CCXV. [CCCIV.] Mentre che 'l cor.)

---

1. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 131.

The following table lists those poems in Chigi L. V. 176 to which the foregoing discussion justifies our assigning a probable date.

TABLE

Part I.

I. Before 1348.
II. 1327-28.
IV. 1328-29.
V. " "
X. 1330.
XXIII. 1333-34.
XXIV. Before 1341.
XXVII. 1333.
XXVIII. "
XXX. 1334.#
XXXIX . 1337.
XLIX. "
L. 1336-37.
LIII. 1337.
LIV. 1337-38.
LVIII. 1338.
LXII. 1338.
→LXIV. By Nov., 1337.##
→LXVII. 1336-37.
→LXVIII. " "
→LXIX. " "
LXXVII. 1339-40.
LXXVIII. " "
LXXIX. 1340.
→XCI. 1337.
→XCII. "
→XCVIII. 1336-37.
XCIX. Before 1344.
CI. 1341.
→CIII. 1333.
→CIV. 1348 or 1356.
CVII. 1342.
CXIV. Before 1344.
→CXVI. 1337-38.
→CXVII. After 1337.
CXVIII. 1343.
→CXIX. 1340-41.
CXX. 1343.
CXXII. 1344.
CXXIV. After 1339.
→CXXVIII. 1341-42.
CXXXV. After 1337.
CXXXVI. 1347-58.
CXXXVII. " "
CXXXVIII. " "
→CXLV. 1337-42.
→CLXXII. 1333.
→CLXXIII. "

Part II.

→CLXXV. 1340-41.
→CLXXVI. 1350.
→CLXXVII. 1345.
CLXXVIII. 1348-49.
CLXXIX. " "
CLXXX. 1348.
CLXXXI. 1350-51.
CLXXXIX. 1350-51.
→CXCVIII. 1349.
CXCIX. 1351-53.
→CCII. 1349.
CCXI. 1351-53.
CCXII. " "
CCXIII. " "
CCXIV. " "

#Italicized dates are of self-dated poems.

##Numbers marked with an arrow are of poems which are out of chronological order.

Upon examination of this table, three facts are immediately apparent: 1) that those poems which are self-dated with exactness are arranged in an order rigidly chronological[1]; 2) that there is a general chronological trend discernible in the arrangement of the other poems; 3) that this general order is frequently infringed. The infringements are as follows:

1. LXIV, LXVII, LXVIII and LXIX are earlier than LXII.

2. XCI, XCII and XCVIII are earlier than LXXIX.

3. CIII is earlier than CI.

4. CIV is later than the poems which follow it.

5. CXVI is earlier than CVII.

6. CXIX is earlier than CXVIII.

7. CXXVIII is earlier than CXXII.

8. CXLV, CLXXII, CLXXIII and CLXXV are earlier than CXXII.

9. CLXXVII, CLXXVIII, CLXXIX and CLXXX are earlier than CLXXVI.

10. CXCVIII is earlier than CLXXXIX.

11. CCII is earlier than CXCIX.

---

1. Even of those self-dated less exactly, - LIV, CXLV and CXXIV, - only one, CXLV, can be said with certainty to be out of chronological order.

CHAPTER III.

THE ARRANGEMENT ACCORDING TO FORM

The following table reveals the extent to which verse-form was probably a criterion of arrangement in the poems of the Chigi manuscript. It contains 179 sonnets, 21 canzoni, 6 ballate, 5 sestinas and 4 madrigali, but the different forms are neither classified by themselves in groups, nor are they distributed so as to make an exact pattern on the order of the Vita nuova. Petrarch seems to have desired an elastic arrangement which, while avoiding a too-perfect and conscious symmetry, should yet assure variety. It is noteworthy that the closing group of each part is much larger than any other group save one.

TABLE

I.

10 sonnets
ballata
2 sonnets
ballata
7 sonnets
sestina
canzone
4 sonnets
2 canzoni
sestina
6 sonnets
canzone
12 sonnets
canzone
sonnet
madrigale
canzone
madrigale
ballata
3 sonnets
ballata
3 sonnets
ballata
2 sonnets
sestina
3 sonnets
4 canzoni
6 sonnets
sestina
→24 sonnets
canzone
madrigale
12 sonnets
canzone
sonnet
madrigale

3 sonnets
5 canzoni
5 sonnets
canzone
6 sonnets
sestina
6 sonnets
ballata
→25 sonnets

II.

canzone
3 sonnets
canzone
sonnet
canzone
→34 sonnets

CHAPTER IV.

THE ARRANGEMENT ACCORDING TO CONTENT

We come now to the consideration of the extent to which content served Petrarch as a criterion of arrangement in the poems of the Chigi manuscript. In the first place, we shall remember that I is certainly an introduction or prologue to the whole collection, and has its position because of its nature, and that Part II begins with a poem which sets the key of that part as one of meditation upon death and religion, a key maintained almost without variation to the end. This indication of a broad, general classification according to subject matter, dividing the collection into two parts, leads us to look for groupings and associations of single poems within the two main divisions. The following table shows their grouping according to a few broad classifications of subject-matter,- love, friendship, politics, fame, religion and sorrow.

Part I.

Number of poems.	Subject.
1	Prologue
5	Love
2	Friendship
1	Love
1	Friendship
13	Love
3	Friendship
2	Politics
9	Love
2	Love, addressed to friends

Number of poems	Subject
1	Friendship
12	Love
1	Politics
1	Love and repentance
3	Love
1	Friendship
3	Love
1	Religion
4	Love
3	Love and travel
6	Love
1	Love, addressed to a friend
2	Laura's portraits
2	Love
1	Religion
9	Love
1	To brother, on his lady's death
1	The death of Cino da Pistoia
5	Love
2	Friendship
3	Love
2	Friendship
3	Love
1	Friendship
3	Love
3	Friendship
4	Love
1	Glory and virtue
1	Friendship
1	To another lady
6	Love
1	Politics
2	Love in absence
5	Love
3	Politics
1	Friendship
2	Love
1	Love and religion
1	To some one who reminds him of Laura
1	Friendship
27	Love
2	Travel
1	Love and despair

Part II.

Number of poems.	Subject.
1	Love, death, fame
1	Love and complaint
1	Friendship
2	Mourning Laura
1	Mourning Laura and Cardinal Colonna
2	A new love
15	Mourning Laura
1	Mourning Sennuccio del Bene and Laura
17	Mourning Laura

This table reveals at a glance three facts which suggest a principle of arrangement according to content: All the poems in Part II, except two, are devoted to religion, the idea of death, and Laura lost on earth but an aid to aspiration from her place in Heaven; all those concerned with purely earthly matters, whether politics, travel or friendships on earth, are to be found only in the First Part; there is a visible tendency to make small groups or clusters of poems having to do with a common subject.

Such a tendency, though it had not been worked out in detail, had not escaped the notice of Petrarch scholars, in studying the Canzoniere as found in V. L. 3195. It was first noted by Cesareo,[1] in his endeavor to disprove Pakscher's[1] hypothesis of an invariable chronological order,

---

1. The views of both these critics on this question are quoted at length in Chapter V.

and Cochin[1] has long been convinced that here we have the best clue to variations from the chronological order:

> Il faut donc chercher, et ne pas se lasser de chercher, dans le Canzoniere, des groupes de poèmes, des sortes de chapitres, si je puis dire.

For the arrangement and ordering of such "chapters," whose intention is clear from the table, Petrarch seems to have made use of the same double criterion as for the arrangement according to form. The table shows two principles at work, - the principle of association, which creates little groups and clusters of poems upon similar subjects, and the principle of variety, which has avoided putting all those on a given topic into one group. Groups of love-poems and groups of friendship-poems[2] will be seen alternating with considerable regularity throughout the first part, with the poems on other subjects (these being much fewer among those selected for preservation) strung here and there more widely separated from each other.

---

1. Review of G. Melodia, "Studi sulle Rime del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LV (1910), 140.
2. "Friendship-poems," as considered in the present study, are poems written to or about a friend, even though their subject is love of Laura.

CHAPTER V.

THE APPLICATION OF THE THREEFOLD PRINCIPLE

The conclusion from the last three chapters must be in agreement with Cochin's observation[1]:

> C'est qu'il y a un ordre et une suite voulue dans les Rimes de Pétrarque; c'est là une vérité que je me réjouis fort de voir aujourd'hui partout reconnue.

and it seems probable that Petrarch observed, though with much elasticity, a threefold principle in arranging the poems in Chigi L. V. 176. With a collection of poems that are prevailingly autobiographical, we might expect to find them arranged chronologically; this would be the natural order, as Pakscher has remarked,[2] and that Petrarch had such an arrangement in his mind is clear from the fact that a series of 13 self-dated poems appears in that order without deviation. He set at the beginning those poems which narrate the beginning of his love, and in the latter part those which speak of Laura's death and his sorrow (though this narrative order, following the course of events, is not always the order of composition). The other poems, too, in many cases have been found to stand in an order which more or less exactly represents the chronological

---

1. "Giovanni Melodia. - Studi sulle rime del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LV (1910), 140.
2. Vide ultra, p.226

order of their composition. Many deviations from this order are equally apparent, and these seem to be due to artistic reasons to be sought in the form and content of individual poems.

It will be useful to see how these conclusions are paralleled by those of various Petrarch scholars as to the system of arrangement in V. L. 3195. It should be clearly understood that the critics now to be quoted are discussing not the earlier form of the collection which is the subject of this essay, but the later and final form in V. L. 3195. The earliest form of these views is Pakscher's, who in his review of Cesareo's book[1] has summarized his arguments for an undeviating chronological order in a form which it will be convenient to quote[2]:

> Mehrere Umstände machten es nun in hohem Grade wahrscheinlich dass es chronologisch war. Es ist das natürliche Prinzip bei der Herausgabe von Gedichten, die vom Dichter selbst viele Jahre später erfolgt, natürlich besonders bei einem Dichter, der solchen Werth darauf legt, der Nachwelt den Gang seiner geistigen Entwicklung zu überliefern, dass er zuerst dan Gedanken einer Autobiographie gefasst hat (epistola ad posteros). Zweitens ist auch bei der Anordnung der Briefe Petrarcas offenbar das chronologische Prinzip in erster Linie massgebend gewesen. Drittens und hauptsächlich: wozu hätten alle die Zahlen, die der Vat. 3196 enthält und die wahrscheinlich auf den Zetteln, der ersten Niederschrift, noch viel haüfiger waren (Denn wie hätte Petrarca sonst zum Beispiel von dem Son. O bella man im Jahre 1368 genau sagen können: occurrit hoc ante xxv annos, wenn er es nicht notirt habe?) dienen

---

1. Op. cit.
2. Litteraturblatt, XIV (1893), No. 5, 171.

sollen, als um einen solche chronologische Anordnung (daher auch der Ausdruck transcriben *in ordine*) zu ermöglichen? Dazu kann noch viertens, dass der *Canzoniere* eine Reihe von Gedichten enthält, welche die Jahreszahl deutlich ergeben, und da diese an einem chronologischen Faden aufgereiht sind, so muss man nothwendig annehmen, dass Petrarca auch die zwischen ihnen stehenden chronologisch ordnen wollte. Diese Gründe berechtigten mich allerdings, in der Stelle, die ein Gedicht im Vat. 3195 annimmt, ein Indicium für seine Abfassungszeit zu sehen, ein Indicium, das bei einer Reihe von historischen Gedichten durch andere Umstände bestätigt wird.

The first of these arguments, namely, that the chronological order is the natural order, holds true of the general underlying chronology already admitted, but not of such invariable observance of it as Pakscher was contending for. Of the second, we are not so sure today, in the present state of Petrarch studies, as Pakscher was; certain letters are being redated from time to time, which reveal deviations from the chronological order he believed established.[1] The third, by which Pakscher set so much store, only reveals Petrarch as a methodical poet who often forgot to be methodical, since only a portion of the poems in V. L. 3196 bear dates, and these are as often dates of transcription as of composition. As for the notation concerning *O bella man*, there may have been a date on the original draft in many individual cases yet not in all, or there may have been a definite circumstance enabling the

---

1. *Vide supra*, p.153.

poet to date many an individual poem, at least within a year. The fourth argument is the strongest, and has been noted above.[1] Cesareo, in the very work[2] Pakscher was reviewing, had said:

> La ricerca del criterio secondo il quale dal poeta furon disposto le Poesie volgari, non può aver quel carattere di determinatezza, che deriva soltanto dalla luce de' documenti e de' fatti. Il Petrarca non lasciò detto come e perchè ordinasse a quel modo le sue rime; anzi c'è più d'un indizio per ritenere che; se una legge ei si prefisse, non si fece scrupolo a quando a quando di violarla, sia per accrescere la raccolta d'un qualche componimento condannato da prima e poi rimaneggiato ed assolto sia per far luogo a componimenti i quali secondo quella legge, andavano esclusi; sia per ragioni affatto particolari, che a nessuno è dato d'indagare e d'intendere. ... E non a torto si può sospettare che il Petrarca considerasse le rime quasi frammenti d'un lavoro più vasto in lingua volgare, ch'egli forse avrebbe compiuto, se non fosse stato sempre tanto persuaso dell'eccellenza e della bontà del latino. . .
>
> Or se il Petrarca nell'ordinamento delle sue lettere in prosa, alle quali attribuiva tanta importanza, non potè in tutto e per tutto seguire il prestabilito principio della cronologia, che dovremo pensare delle Poesie volgari, opera per sè stessa frammentaria; che non richiedeva una rigorosa osservanza di qualsivoglia principio; che non era tenuta dal suo autore nel conto dell' altre opere?
>
> Questo per dire, che la ricerca del criterio a cui s'attenne il Petrarca ordinando le rime va intesa in senso un po' largo; giacchè noi stessi siamo persuasi che il poeta, se si fece una legge, mantenne anche il diritto d'eluderla, quando un' altra convenienza glielo consigliasse.

This other <u>convenienza</u> we have already looked for in the form and in the subject matter, in which last, indeed,

---

1. <u>Vide supra</u>, p.153.
2. <u>Op. cit.</u>, 121-122.

Cesareo had not omitted to seek it[1]:

> Un altro principio costante, e non davvero casuale, nella disposizione delle rime, sta nel raggruppamento di quelle che si riferiscono a uno stesso avvenimento, a una stessa impressione, in somma a uno stesso stato d' animo del poeta. Di fatto si trovano assieme tra loro le rime per la Crociata, quelle per Simon Martini, le due canzoni del fiume, i sonetti delle Ardenne, i sonetti del viaggio a Roma, i sonetti a rime eguali dell' arrivo e della partanza di Laura (Quando dal proprio sito, Ma poi che 'l dolce riso, Il figluol di Latona), i sonetti del guanto, i sonetti dei presagi, i sonetti contro Avignone, e via seguitando.[2] Forse qua e là qualche strappo a codesto principio si troverebbe; come ho detto, il Petrarca non sopportava l' eccessivo rigor d' una legge, anche fatta da lui; ma tutti gli esempi citati bastan, credo, a provare come la legge fosse: e, in questo caso, l' intendimento del poeta fu d' armonia estetica e psicologica; forse gli parve, e a ragione, che i componimenti ispirati da una stessa occasione, si sarebber, vicini, rilumeggiati e rilevati a vicenda, e ciascuno avrebbe guadagnato in bellezza e in efficacia.
>
> Non senza cura studiosa sembran anche disposti il prologo e l' epilogo, non soltanto di tutta la raccolta, ma e di ciascuna delle due parti di essa.[3] Il son. Voi ch' ascoltate si capisce che fu immaginato quando gran parte delle Poesie volgari era già stata composta; ma pure i tre o quattro sonetti seguenti sembran messi lì quasi per avviare una storia d' amore. In que' componimenti si contengono le notizie generali: la cagione dell' innamoramento (son. II) e la data di esso (son. III); la patria (son. IV) e il nome dell' amata (son.V); ora a me non par verisimile che un uomo ami davvero così ordinatamente, com' ei farebbe raccontando una storia d'amore; e il pensiero di premetter quei dati di fatto

---

1. Op. cit., 126-127.
2. Also, the three canzoni and a sonnet to Laura's eyes (LXXI, LXXII, LXXIII, LXXV); the three sonnets (not in the Chigi manuscript) to Laura's hair, beginning respectively L'aura serena, L'aura celeste, and L'aura soave (CXCVI, CXCVII, CXCVIII); the three on Laura's illness and recovery, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIV; the two pairs of farewell and absence: CXXIII-CXXIV, CXXVI-CXXVII; and others to be mentioned later.
3. That is, of course, of the entire collection as it appears in V. L. 3195.

alle sue dichiarazioni galanti non può venirgli, se non quando, in un posterior periodo dell' amore, ei consideri i suoi versi affatto oggettivamente, affatto esteticamente, come opera d'arte e non come mezzo di persuasione amorosa. L'innamorato non ha alcuno bisogno di cominciare a raccontare alla sua amica il come, il quando e il perchè dell' amore, e il nome e la patria di lei: codesto è un bisogno del poeta, il quale rittornando dopo alcuni anni su' suoi versi d' amore, ch' ei vuol dare in pubblico, teme che appunto il pubblico non possa gustar bene l' opera d' arte senza un po' di notizie preliminarie.[1]

Cochin likewise believes strongly in this principle of arrangement in groups brought together because of kinship in subject matter:

Or, on ne pourra admettre que Pétrarque ait pu perdre de vue les événements mêmes de son histoire amoureuse, et un instinct devait le porter à classer ensemble, au moins à larges traits, les pièces qui se rapportaient aux débuts de ses amours, ensemble aussi belles qui se rapportaient aux rigueurs de Laura, aux voyages que ses chagrins d' amour lui faisaient entreprendre, à la fuite de sa jeunesse, et ainsi de suite. Ce n'était pas la chronologie qui lui imposait cet ordre, mais la logique et la nature même des choses. Aussi, tout en admettant de nombreuses exceptions, je pense qu'il y a dans le Canzoniere un ordre général vaguement conforme à l'ordre des temps.

On conçoit combien cette affirmation comporte de restrictions. De ce que le poète devait instinctivement placer telle pièce, par le genre même de son sujet, parmi les pièces se rapportant à telle ou telle période des amours, il n'en résulte pas que toutes les pièces traitant du même sujet, et rapprochées à cause de cela, aient nécessairement été composées au même moment. Nous avons vu, par un exemple frappant, que le poète ne se refusait pas à l'occasion le plaisir de composer un poème après coup sur un sujet autrefois aimé. Il faut en conclure seulement que nos affirmations ne pourront

---

1. See the discussion in Chapter II of IV and V for a different view as to the poetic inspiration of such poems, which does not, however, affect the main point of their being grouped according to subject.

que très rarement être absolues. Mais, il faut pourtant bien le dire: quelque remarquable que soit l'exemple du Sonnet 226,[1] un fait semblable est, par sa nature même, exceptionnel; nous n'avons pas le droit d'en tirer des conséquences outrées, d'autant qu'il est le seul de ce genre dont nous ayons la preuve. Assurément il ne faut jamais mettre en oubli ce que nous savons des habitudes de Pétrarque et des retouches tardives qu'il fit subir au Canzoniere; mais il ne faut pas exagérer les faits que nous fournissent les documents; ils nous prouvent assurément un remaniement littéraire profond, mais seulement par exception la composition de pièces nouvelles, intercalées entre les anciennes pièces du Canzoniere. Il ne faudrait pas arriver à croire non plus que le Canzoniere n'est qu'une vaste fiction, et a été tout entier composé longtemps après l'époque à laquelle il semble s'appliquer. ... La vérité est, assurément, que l'immense majorité des pièces du recueil a pour origine une rédaction primitive contemporaine des différents incidents des amours de Pétrarque.[2]

A. Gentille[3] is essentially in agreement with this point of view:

Il Canzoniere del Petrarca non è una semplice raccolta di poesie liriche, come quella del Tasso, ma forma un complesso organico, ordinato dal poeta in sul tramonto della sua vita, secondo un principio morale, psicologico è estetico. E c'è anche ordine cronologico, nel senso che il Petrarca evitò, dove non ci fosse bisogno, di spostare le poesie dal luogo che naturalmente occuparono secondo il tempo di composizione; ma subordinò anzitutto l'ordinamento del Canzoniere a un concetto morale, escludendo dalla seconda parte che è comunemente intitolata in morte di ma donna Laura, tutti i componimenti nei quali risonasse una eco dell'agitazione della vita, perchè vi fosse ritratto il distacco del poeta dalle cose terrene; il quale rivolgimento morale culmina nella canzone alla Vergine, che chiude il Canzoniere.

---

1. See discussion under CLXXVI.
2. Op. cit., 30-31.
3. 'Chiare, fresche e dolci acque,' una canzone del Petrarca commentata, Trieste, 1904.

As is Flamini[1]:

> Il fatto è, che il criterio secondo il quale appaiono ordinate le Epistole metriche, se prevalentemente sembra essere il cronologico, per effetto d'altri criteri, logici ed artistici, a cui il poeta ottempera, va soggetto ad eccezioni tali che la regola ne vien quasi annullata. ... Lo stesso pressappoco accade, com' è noto, per le rime del Petrarca.

These various scholars, then, with the exception of Pakscher, have come to the same conclusions regarding the principle of arrangement of V. L. 3195 that are here proposed regarding that of Chigi L. V. 176, except that none of them suggests form as a possible criterion, but only chronology and content.

The joint table at the end of this chapter makes it easier to consider the relative importance of all three criteria, and Petrarch's apparent method of applying them. Looking again, in the light of it, and of these various observations, at the infringements of chronological order listed at the end of Chapter II, it becomes possible to hazard some suggestions as to Petrarch's motives for them.

The first four poems listed as out of that order[2] are seen to fall within a group of 14 poems of love. LXIV is one of two sonnets, and LXVII, LXVIII and LXIX constitute a group of three sonnets standing between a sestina and a canzone.

---

1. Op. cit., 87.
2. Vide supra, p.

XCI and XCII are both poems of friendship and death, unconnected with anything near them, and fall within the first large group of sonnets. They are the 11th and 12th of the 24.

XCVIII is one of another pair of friendship-poems inserted between poems of love, though these two are not so closely allied in subject. It is the 18th of the 24 sonnets.

CIII and CIV, one so much earlier and the other so much later than the poems near them, are still another pair of friendship-poems, and are further associated by being each upon a martial subject; and the fact that both of them mention the names of famous ancient generals (Hannibal in one, and Caesar among others in the other) may have determined their position next CII, which mentions Caesar and Hannibal. Moreover, they are the last two in the group of 24 sonnets, a rather miscellaneous group within which fall also the last five infringements of chronological order just discussed.

CXVI is one of a group of four love-poems, and is set next to CXVII, which like itself makes mention of Vaucluse. They are the 10th and 11th, respectively, of 12 sonnets.

CXIX is a poem unrelated in subject to any other. No reason for its being out of chronological order is dis-

cernible, except that, as a canzone, it interrupts a series of 19 short poems, sonnets and madrigali.

CXXVIII, one of only four political groups or units, is separated by only seven love-poems from the three "Babylonian" sonnets. LIII, likewise, is separated by only 24 poems of love or friendship from the two about the Crusade. But on the other hand, LIII and CXXVIII are divided from each other by the space of 67 poems, so that there are two units of political poems near the beginning of Part I, and two near the end of it, Il successor di Carlo being the 26th poem after the first, and Fontana di dolore the 35th before the last. Moreover, CXXVIII is one of a group of five canzoni.

CXLV is the first of a series of 27 love-poems, and stands third in a group of six sonnets which divide a sestina from a ballata.

ClXXII and ClXXIII immediately precede the last poem of Part I, and make with it two of the last three in a series of 25 sonnets.

ClXXV, a poem of meditation upon death and religion, opens a Second Part which is full of such poems. Like the poem which opens Part I, it owes its position to its character and not to its date of composition. And its form, as a canzone, and one of the longer ones, also entitles it to

a striking position.

CLXXVI, which is later than those which follow it, and CLXXVII, which is earlier than some which precede it, are a problem from every point of view.[1]

CXCVIII, a single friendship poem mourning the death of Sennuccio del Bene, and alluding also to Laura in Heaven, is inserted, presumably for variety's sake, between two groups of poems of love and sorrow for Laura (to which it is also related in subject), one consisting of 15 poems and the other of 17. Considered according to form, it is seen to be the 17th in a series of 34 sonnets.

CCII is one of the 17, and no reason is discoverable for its being out of chronological order. Nor would there be any for its being in it; its subject is such that its chronological position would have no significance, while it is in perfect harmony with that of the others in its group. It is separated by only three poems from CXCVIII, which we suppose, from the note appended in V. L. 3196 to ~~Che debb' io far?~~,[2] to have been written at the same time.

This examination seems to sustain the hypothesis already stated more than once, of a general fundamental

---

1. Vide ultra, p.248.
2. q. v.

arrangement by chronology, which is violated at will by the poet for aesthetic considerations involving form and content. In both respects, poems seem to be grouped according to likeness, but also so as to secure variety and contrast. It is noteworthy how often the poems whose position out of the chronological order has attracted our attention, are placed in the middle, or else at one end, of the groups in which they stand. Thus XCI-XCII and CXCVIII are in the exact middle of their respective groups; CXLV is in the middle of its group of 6 sonnets, and inaugurates its group of 27 love-poems; CIII-CIV are the last two in theirs; CXVI-CXVII, CXXVIII and CLXXII-CLXXIII are the last but one, respectively, of theirs. XCVIII, however, the 18th of 24 sonnets, and CXIX, a canzone with 13 short poems to one side of it and 5 to the other, are an exception to this apparent principle, though their positions have some analogy with each other. LXIV alone constitutes half a group according to form, while LXVII-LXIX make an entire one.

So many examples certainly suggest that Petrarch was aware that these poems which infringe a general chronological order were special cases; that he had such a general order, and knew when he was violating it; and that he disposed such violations according to an artistic plan.

JOINT TABLE

	Date	Form	Content
I.	Before 1348	Sonnet	Prologue
II.	1327-28	"	Love
III.		"	"
IV.	1328-29	"	"
V.	"	"	"
VI.		"	"
VII.		"	Friendship
VIII.		"	"
IX.		"	Love
X.	1330	"	Friendship
XI.		Ballata	Love
XII.		Sonnet	"
XIII.		"	"
XIV.		Ballata	"
XV.		Sonnet	"
XVI.		"	"
XVII.		"	"
XVIII.		"	"
XIX.		"	"
XX.		"	"
XXI.		"	"
XXII.		Sestina	"
XXIII.	1333-34	Canzone	"
XXIV.	Before 1341	Sonnet	Friendship
XXV.		"	"
XXVI.		"	"
XXVII.	1333	"	Politics
XXVIII.	"	Canzone	"
XXIX.		"	Love
XXX.	1334.	Sestina	"
XXXI.		Sonnet	Laura's illness
XXXII.		"	Love and death
XXXIII.		"	Laura's recovery
XXXIV.		"	"
XXXV.		"	Love
XXXVI.		"	"
XXXVII.		Canzone	Love in absence
XXXVIII.		Sonnet	To a friend, of Petrarch's love
XXXIX.	1337	"	" " " " " "
XL.		"	Friendship
XLI.		"	Laura and fair weather
XLII.		"	" " " "
XLIII.		"	" " " "

XLIV.		Sonnet	Love
XLV.		"	"
XLVI.		"	"
XLVII.		"	"
XLVIII.		"	"
XLIX.	1337	"	"
L.	1336-37	Canzone	"
LI.		Sonnet	"
LII.		Madrigale	"
LIII.	1337	Canzone	Politics
LIV.	1337-38	Madrigale	Love and repentance
LV.		Ballata	Love
LVI.		Sonnet	"
LVII.		"	"
LVIII.	1338	"	Friendship
LIX.		Ballata	Love
LX.		Sonnet	"
LXI.		"	"
LXII.	1338	"	Religion
LXIII.		Ballata	Love
LXIV.	By Nov.,1337	Sonnet	"
LXV.		"	"
LXVI.		Sestina	"
LXVII.	1336-37	Sonnet	Love and travel
LXVIII.	"	"	" " "
LXIX.	"	"	" " "
LXX.		Canzone	Love
LXXI.		"	"
LXXII.		"	"
LXXIII.		"	"
LXXIV.		Sonnet	"
LXXV.		"	"
LXXVI.		"	Love, addressed to a friend
LXXVII.	1339-40	"	Laura's portraits
LXXVIII.	"	"	" "
LXXIX.	1340	"	Love
LXXX.		Sestina	"
LXXXI.		Sonnet	Religion
LXXXII.		"	Love
LXXXIII.		"	"
LXXXIV.		"	"
LXXXV.		"	"
LXXXVI.		"	"
LXXXVII.		"	"
LXXXVIII.		"	"
LXXXIX.		"	"
XC.		"	"
XCI.	1337	"	Friendship and death
XCII.	"	"	" " "

XCIII.		Sonnet	Love
XCIV		"	"
XCV.		"	"
XCVI.		"	"
XCVII.		"	"
XCVIII.	1336-37	"	Friendship
XCIX.	Before 1344	"	Friendship and religion
C.		"	Love
CI.	1341	"	"
CII.		"	"
CIII.	1333	"	Friendship
CIV.	1348 or 1356	"	"
CV.		Canzone	Love
CVI.		Madrigale	"
CVII.	1342	Sonnet	"
CVIII.		"	Friendship
CIX.		"	Love
CX.		"	"
CXI.		"	"
CXII.		"	Friendship
CXIII.		"	"
CXIV.	Before 1344	"	"
CXV.		"	Love
CXVI	1337-38	"	"
CXVII.	After 1337	"	"
CXVIII.	1343	"	"
CXIX.	1340-41	Canzone	Glory and virtue
CXX.	1343	Sonnet	Friendship
CXXI.		Madrigale	To another lady
CXXII.	1344	Sonnet	Love
CXXIII.		"	"
CXXIV.	After 1339	"	"
CXXV.		Canzone	"
CXXVI.		"	"
CXXVII.		"	"
CXXVIII.	1341-42	"	Politics
CXXIX.		"	Love in absence
CXXX.		Sonnet	" " "
CXXXI.		"	"
CXXXII.		"	"
CXXXIII.		"	"
CXXXIV.		"	"
CXXXV.	After 1337	Canzone	"
CXXXVI.	1347-58	Sonnet	Politics
CXXXVII.	" "	"	"
CXXXVIII.	" "	"	"
CXXXIX.		"	Friendship
CXL.		"	Love

CXLI.		Sonnet	Love
CXLII.		Sestina	Love and religion
CXLIII.		Sonnet	To one who reminds him of Laura
CXLIV.		"	Friendship
CXLV.	1337-42	"	Love
CXLVI.		"	"
CXLVII.		"	"
CXLVIII.		"	"
CXLIX.		Ballata	"
CL.		Sonnet	"
CLI.		"	"
CLII.		"	"
CLIII.		"	"
CLIV.		"	"
CLV.		"	" and Laura's grief
CLVI.		"	" " " "
CLVII.		"	"
CLVIII.		"	"
CLIX.		"	"
CLX.		"	"
CLXI.		"	"
CLXII.		"	"
CLXIII.		"	"
CLXIV.		"	"
CLXV.		"	"
CLXVI.		"	"
CLXVII.		"	"
CLXVIII.		"	"
CLXIX.		"	"
CLXX.		"	"
CLXXI.		"	"
CLXXII.	1333	"	Travel
CLXXVIII.	"	"	"
CLXXIV.		"	Love and despair

PART II.

CLXXV.	1340-41	Canzone	Love, fame, death, religion
CLXXVI.	1350	Sonnet	" and complaint
CLXXVII.	1345	"	Friendship and love
CLXXVIII.	1348-49	"	Mourning Laura
CLXXIX.	" "	Canzone	" "
CLXXX.	1348	Sonnet	" " and Colonna
CLXXXI.	1350-51	Canzone	New love
CLXXXII.		Sonnet	" "
CLXXXIII.		"	Mourning Laura
CLXXXIV.		"	" "

CLXXXV.		Sonnet	Mourning	Laura
CLXXXVI.		"	"	"
CLXXXVII.		"	"	"
CLXXXVIII.		"	"	"
CLXXXIX.	1350-51	"	"	"
CXC.		"	"	"
CXCI.		"	"	"
CXCII.		"	"	"
CXCIII.		"	"	"
CXCIV.		"	"	"
CXCV.		"	"	"
CXCVI.		"	"	"
CXCVII.		"	"	"
CXCVIII.	1349	"	Mourning	Sennuccio and Laura
CXCIX.	1351-53	"	Mourning	Laura
CC.		"	"	"
CCI.		"	"	"
CCII.	1349	"	"	"
CCIII,		"	"	"
CCIV.		"	"	"
CCV.		"	"	"
CCVI.		"	"	"
CCVII.		"	"	"
CCVIII.		"	"	"
CCIX.		"	"	"
CCX.		"	"	"
CCXI.	1351-53	"	"	"
CCXII.	" "	"	"	"
CCXIII.	" "	"	"	"
CCXIV.	" "	"	"	"
CCXV.		"	"	"

CHAPTER VI.

THE DIVISION INTO PARTS

A most important part of the problem of the arrangement of the poems in Chigi L. V. 176 is the question of its division. It clearly falls into two parts. And first, physically: the poems from Voi ch' ascoltate through Passa la nave mia occupy ff. 43v-71r (or rather, thirteen lines of 71r) of the manuscript,[1] while I'vo pensando (which is followed without a break by the succeeding poems through to the end on f. 78r) is on f. 72r. A blank page, 71v, and a good portion of 71r, thus separate Passa la nave mia from I' vo pensando.[2] This latter poem begins, besides, as does Voi ch' ascoltate, with a large ornamental initial.[3] Secondly, there is a difference in subject matter: Part II contains only three friendship poems, and these are also partly for Laura and two of them for Laura dead; and it contains no political poems whatever, although we know that the years after 1348 were years of intense political interest and activity for Petrarch, - the years of the letters Sine titulo, of the acquaintance with the Emperor Charles IV, of the ambassadorships to Venice and Paris. The

---

1. Mestica, Rime, 268.
2. In V. L. 3195 they are separated by 7 pages left blank by Petrarch, ff. 49v-52v.
3. Mestica, op. cit., 363; Vattasso, op. cit., viii.

exclusion from the Second Part of all the poems which Petrarch may be assumed to have written on such matters during those years must, of course, be by intention.

By its positive character as well as by its negative, the subject matter of Part II is different from that of Part I, and we must suppose intentionally so. It begins with I'vo pensando, the poem which shows the struggle in the poet's soul between love, religion and fame (and alludes to Laura as if still alive); the poem which follows it is a complaint of Laura's coldness in the old key of lover's despair, although it was apparently composed two years after she was in her grave[1]; the third is a serene and gracious tribute to love and friendship, to Laura and Cardinal Colonna together, dated in the year 1345; but of the remaining 38 poems, - the first of which is Oimè il bel viso! (CCLXVII in the editions), - although two were written about a later love and one upon the death of Sennuccio, yet every one of them refers to the death of Laura. Here is a Second Part, then, composed of 41 poems, of which the first three clearly imply that Laura is still living, but the other 38 explicitly allude to her death. If it began three poems further on, with Oimè il bel viso! (CLXXVIII),

---

1. Vide supra, p.206.

then there would evidently be the dramatic dividing line of Laura's death, assumed to be such by so many editors of the Canzoniere as a whole.

Most Petrarch scholars are now won over to this belief that we must abandon the traditional division which makes Part II begin with Oimè il bel viso! and which justified the legendary captions to the two parts: In vita di Madonna Laura and In morte di Madonna Laura, found in most editions and accepted down to the time of the rediscovery of the Vatican manuscripts.

Mestica's edition of the Rime[1] was the first to reject the traditional division and revive this other which has the authority of the autograph manuscripts, of Chigi L. V. 176, and of Laurenziano, XLV, 17, and of the earliest printed editions, and to offer an explanation of the original one:

> In questa mia Edizione ricomparisce il Canzoniere, qual è dato dal Codice originale, con le poesie d' ogni genere unite insieme e raccolte in due Parti, distinta la seconda dalla prima, non per l'avvenimento esteriore e accidentale della morte di Madonna Laura, ma per un fatto intimo del poeta stesso: la sua conversione morale, che nel 1343 diede a lui occasione di comporre in latino il Secretum, e quindi in poesia volgare la Canzone I' vo pensando, con cui appunto, nel Codice originale, la Parte seconda à principio. Ma ciò, infine, si raccoglie, come ò detto, anche da alcune delle

---

1. Florence, 1896.

edizioni più antiche, cominciando dalla prima che risale al 1470.[1]

Cesareo accepted Mestica's theory, and developed it a little more fully:

> Salta subito agli occhi che, mentre nella prima parte delle Poesie volgari son intercalate rime eroiche come la canz. Spirto gentil, i sonetti a Orso, il son. Vinse Annibal, il son. L'aspettata vertù, e altri; o ammonitive e incitative come il son. Il successor di Carlo e la canz. O aspettata in ciel; o civili come la canzone all' Italia; o satiriche come i sonetti contro Avignone;- nella seconda parte son tutte rime d'argumento morale, religioso e funereo. Noi ci siamo ingegnati di dimostrare come alcune rime della prima parte, d'argomento amoroso e non amoroso, si debbano riportare dopo il 1348; ora poi domandiamo se può parer verisimile che realmente il poeta dopo il 1348 non iscrivesse altri versi italiani che malinconici o mistici, e negasse d'un tratto la lode in volgare a tutt' i suoi amici, re, principi, capitani e prelati che esaltava eloquentemente in latino con le lettere in prosa, con l'epistole in versi, con l'ecloghe, con le dedicatorie e i richiami degli altri scritti. ...
>
> Forse nell' anno 1348, l'anno terribile della pestilenza, credè il poeta, stupefatto e smarrito per la morte di Laura e d'alcuni fra' suoi piu cari amici, di poter liberarsi finalmente da' legami terrestri, e darsi per sempre a' più casti pensieri dell'eterna beatitudine. ...
>
> Passato quel primo momento di paura e di fervor mistico, il Petrarca non dirò che tornasse l' uomo di prima, ma nè pure si diè tutto a' pensieri ascetici, come qualcuno potrebbe credere. Qualche tempo dopo, come s' è visto, avea già volto l'animo a un nuovo amore[2]; di lì a non molto anche lodava le geste del suo amico Pandolfo, e asettava d'invettive terribili la corte avignonese.[3] Ma nel corpo delle Poesie volgari

---

1. Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca. Cenni sulla ragione dell'opera, Florence, 1896, vii.
2. Cf. [CCLXX] and [CCLXXI].
3. If we cannot share Cesareo's certainty that the "Babylonian" sonnets were written after 1348, we cannot disprove it; while for the sonnet to Pandolfo 1356 remains as probable a date as 1348; and even if referable to the earlier year, it may have been composed after Laura's death.

par che si studiasse, per amore della progression psicologica e morale, di nascondere d' allora in poi qualunque rivolta e qualunque vittoria della sua parte umana contro la parte spirituale: di fatto, nelle rime dette in morte di Laura, il poeta si mostra sempre tutto raccolto in meditazioni di preghiera e di morte, tutto intento alla perfezione celeste. E un tal proponimento è posto a effetto con tanto scrupolo, che chi ravvicini le rime in morte di Laura al carteggio e a' versi latini in quel torno, non riesce quasi a raffigurare nel malanconico e pio poeta dell' une, il caldo eloquente, battagliero agitatore e ammonitore degli altri. Forse appunto per questo la seconda parte delle rime volle conchiusa il poeta con la canz. Vergine bella, un componimento a fatto religioso e morale.[1]

But Carducci, three years later, did not venture to depart from the old division, even with the weight of Petrarch's own choice evidently against it. As he says[2]:

Quindi il Mestica per fede all' originale e all' edizione padovana accolse la nuova divisione delle rime in due parti, distinte non per l' avvenimento esteriore della morte di Madonna laura ma per un fatto intimo al poeta stesso. Non osammo seguirlo, tenuti dal rispetto alla quasi religiosa consuetudine, non abbattuta, ci pare, da poche parole di più tardo tempo e raschiate e da una serie di fogli serbati bianchi forse a trascrivervi le rime che occorressero nuove o nuovamente corrette, come il P. usò nel codice mandato del 1373 a Pandolfo Malatesta.

We may readily concede that poche parole di più tardo tempo e raschiate need not be held to have any great authority, but it is strange that Carducci did not admit the importance of the illuminated initial of I' vo pensando in Chigi L. V. 176, Laur. XLI, 17,[3] and V.L. 3195, and of

1. Op. cit., 122-126.
2. Prefazio, xxiii.
3. E. Proto, "Francesco Petrarca. - Le rime di su gli originali, commentate da G. Carducci e S. Ferrari," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VII (1902), 139, 212.

the pages left blank between (CCLXIII) and (CCLXIV). No doubt they were left so for the purpose he mentions, a purpose Petrarch explicitly stated in the letter to Pandolfo Malatesta[1]; but would not such pages have been left at the end of Part I, rather than just three poems short of the end? It seems certain that they would, and that we may accept their position as significant unless those three poems evidently constitute a unit and a fitting close. This they noticeably fail to do. While I'vo pensando might as fittingly close Part I (on the old theory) as open Part II (on the new), since it is notably a climactic poem, the other two are so incongruous with it that their position next it has long been a knotty problem in itself.

Pakscher and Cochin, as well as Cesareo, had accepted this division before Carducci decided against it, and of later editors of the Canzoniere, Moschetti,[2] Salvo Cozzo and Scherillo agree with them and Mestica; and although this arrangement brings certain problems in its train, no one has followed Sicardi[3] in throwing them all overboard.

---

1. Vide supra, p.4.
2. Although Moschetti is not really convinced that Petrarch intended any division into parts. See "Henry Cochin. - La Chronologie du Canzoniere de Pétrarque," in Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, VI (1898), 131, and "Mussafia Adolfo. - Dei codici vaticani 3195 e 3196 delle Rime del Petrarca," in Rass. bibl., IX (1901), 120.
3. Vide ultra, p.251.

The great objection to accepting the division into parts as indicated in V. L. 3195 is the fact that it throws into Part II the two sonnets Aspro core and Signor mio caro [CCLXV], [CCLXVI], the one a complaint against Laura's cruelty, in the old key of so many of the songs in Part I, and the other a tribute of love and friendship to Cardinal Colonna and to Laura. This latter poem is self-dated 1345, and would be a good argument against the old division In vita and In morte if its celebration of an earthly friendship were not equally incompatible with the new theory of division. It proves too much. Cesareo remarked this inconsistency in his book in 1898[1]:

> Che le due famose canzoni I' vo pensando e Vergine bella fossero state elette con opportuna significazione, quella ad aprire, questa a conchiudere la seconda parte delle Poesie volgari, ove l' ascensione amorosa dell' anima al Cielo è cercata rappresentare, appunto come nella prima il tumulto de' sensi, non parmi che possa parer dubbio ad alcuno. E non mi fermo su questo luogo se non per domandare come mai possan trovarsi, dopo la canzone introduttiva alla seconda parte, que' due sonetti Aspro core e selvaggio e Signor mio caro, i soli in tutta la raccolta, i quali contrastino con quello studio d' una certa unità quasi di poema, determinata particolarmente nei prologhi e negli epiloghi, che si riscontra per tutto il volume. Sarà stato un capriccio? un errore di trascrizione? una convenienza materiale che a noi riesce troppo oscura e lontana? Io non ne so nulla.

Nine years later he believed he had found a solution.[2]

---

1. Op. cit., 127-128.
2. "Per la giusta collocazione di due sonetti," in Miscellanea di Archeologia, storia e Filologia, dedicata al Prof. Antonino Salinas nel xl anniversario del suo insegnamento accademico, Palermo, 1907, 340.

In examining E. Modigliani's diplomatic reproduction of V. L. 3195,[1] Cesareo took the small crosses set against certain poems to mean that Petrarch meditated some change or correction still to be made with respect to them. Now the two sonnets in question are marked with such crosses, and [CCLXVI] even has two of them; and after Arbor vittoriosa, which closes Part I in the manuscript, is an erasure which is thus described by Modigliani[2]:

> Circa due centimetri sotto questo verso è una larga rasura di parole, ora non più leggibili, scritte su due righe. La prima riga sembra comprendesse due o tre parole e incominciassero con un' A; la seconda è un po' più lunga, principia con un S e termina con un' o o con un ro.

Cesareo feels certain that these erasures represent the two titles, Aspro core and Signor mio caro, which Petrarch would accordingly have intended to transfer to the end of Part I. In that case, as Cesareo says[3]:

> i due sonetti, tornando nella prima parte occuperebbero il luogo che loro spetta con l' altre rime dell' errore e della passione mondana, mentre la parte seconda apparirebbe composta tutta di rime ispirate a pensieri d'espiazione e di morte. E la trasposizione sarebbe stata accennata dallo stesso poeta.

The only discussion of this welcome suggestion which the present writer has seen is by Sicardi,[4] who rejects it

---

1. Op. cit., Rome, 1904.
2. Op. cit., 113, n. 5.
3. Op. cit., 342.
4. "Per un' abrasione del Vat. lat. 3195 e per la giusta collocazione di due sonetti del Petrarca," in Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, XLIII (1907-08). And separately, Turin, 1908.

entirely. In the first place, he notes, there are a great many of these crosses in V. L. 3195; there is one against each of the 14 following [CCLXVI], and then after 9 unmarked poems the remaining ones are marked alternately.[1] There are likewise such crosses to be found in Part I, and Modigliani[2] and Vattasso[3] both believe they were all added by a third hand.[4] Then, he asks, even supposing them to have been made by Petrarch's, why did he not use letters instead of crosses, as he did in the three sonnets rearranged by Cesareo?[5] Or why use only crosses to indicate various different purposes? Or why not recopy the poems outright upon the blank leaves? And what owner of V.L. 3195 was ever so ignorant or so rustic as to have made the erasures of Petrarch's notes? The manuscript belonged in

---

1. This statement is inaccurate. According to Modigliani's reproduction, which both Cesareo and Sicardi are quoting, the 13th of those poems has no cross, and after the 9 in succession which have none, the crosses reappear with the utmost irregularity, - against 13 in all out of the remaining 77. According to Vattasso (op. cit., xi, n. 3), the 2nd and 14th as well as the 13th of those 14 have no cross, and instead of 13 scattering ones he finds only 10. Both of them, however, show the distribution to be more irregular than Sicardi's statement would suggest.
2. Op. cit., xviii.
3. Op. cit., xi.
4. Sicardi quotes Vattasso on this point, where he supports him, but fails to say that the experienced palaeographer of the Vatican also states in the preceding paragraph that the mysterious postilla under discussion is forse in Petrarch's hand.
5. Vide supra, p.216.

turn to an uninterrupted series of intelligent persons who would never have taken such liberties with it, and there are we know several erasures of entire sonnets (CXXI, CXCIV, CCXLVI, CCCXXVII) presumably made by Petrarch himself. And why was this possible rearrangement never taken account of in the early editions, or in any of the many manuscripts?

Sicardi believes that the erased words were an Explicit written in by some one, and later obliterated by some erudite reader or possessor who recognized them as a "sacrilegious" interpolation. In any case, he says, if the notes were really Petrarch's and susceptible of Cesareo's interpretation of them, the poet would certainly have put them in before Arbor vittoriosa, which he thinks may as fairly be considered a reasoned close to Part I as Vergine bella is to Part II. This objection he thinks final:

> Anzi, si può esser certi che essa (obiezione) avrà sempre consistenza saldissima agli occhi de' critici, finchè non si saranno ben persuasi che il sonetto Arbor vittoriosa non chiude nulla; che la canzone I' vo pensando no inizia nulla; che ogni divisione del Canzoniere in due parti è del tutto arbitraria; e che le ragioni su cui essi si sono fondati finora per volerlo diviso a quel modo sono prettamente illusorie, anzi in piena contraddizione con la espressa volontà del poeta stesso. . . mi par che se ne debba concludere, per necessità, che nè codeste carte bianche che stanno di mezzo al Codice, nè l' iniziale grande di I' vo pensando possono realmente dare alcuno fondamento alla divisione del Canzoniere che è da poco tornato in onore.[1]

1. Op. cit., 37.

Some of these arguments are much easier to answer than others. There have been owners, or users, of the manuscript sufficiently "rustic" to make the various marks and notes enumerated by Vattasso[1] as by mani posteriori. The use of the same mark for different purposes many scholars and writers will certainly recognize as a working habit of their own; and this would explain also the large number of such crosses, if they were made by Petrarch, as indicating a wide variety of small changes still to be made in many poems by the fastidious never-resting file. The nature of each change would easily suggest itself to the artist as soon as the reminding cross invited his attention to a given poem. Sicardi's most important argument is the one easiest to dispose of. Petrarch did not recopy the poems himself merely because he failed to get around to it, with the casual and unsystematic method of correction and revision which he described in the year before his death in the letter to Pandolfo already cited[2]; while as for putting them ahead of Arbor vittoriosa, there are two good reasons for Petrarch's omission to do that: first, the pages were all filled, evidently, before he thought of making the change, and secondly, he left a number of pages

---

1. Op. cit., xi.
2. Vide supra, p.4.

blank after Arbor vittoriosa in V. L. 3195 probably for the purpose of writing in poems still to be composed or revised, as he did in Pandolfo's copy, according to his own express statement. And this suggests that Arbor vittoriosa was by no means for Petrarch necessarily the last poem of Part I, and that its apparent appropriateness to that position is adventitious.[1]

But while admitting Cesareo's hypothesis to be very attractive, it cannot be considered as proved, and we are still obliged to take the division where we find it, and accept the fact that Part II, though otherwise preoccupied almost exclusively with death, sorrow and aspiration, contains three poems which refer to Laura living, with two of them, for different reasons, quite off the key.

In summing up the question, two things we seem to be sure of: that Petrarch intended that there should be two parts to his collection, and that he intended I' vo pensando as an introduction to Part II. Why was it selected for that position? It is very beautiful, very striking, and must have been a favorite of its author, but this fact alone, although important, would hardly explain its opening a Second Part which differs so widely from the first, and

---

1. But see p.281.

(but for the two perplexing poems which follow it) is so much more homogeneous. The reason must be sought in the subject matter; if it should appear that, as Cesareo and Mestica insist, the poem is different from the poems in Part I, and yet appropriate to leading into Part II, we could feel sure the reason lay there. And on studying the poem we find both these things to be so. The subjects of Part I, aside from friendship and politics, - the intimate subjects, that is, personal to Petrarch, - are love and fame, religion sometimes, and, rarely, the thought of death. Now in I' vo pensando all four of these ideas are combined, a statement that would be true of no other poem. Whereas in a few poems in Part I, love is feared as an enemy and obstacle to fame, and in many more as a hindrance on the road to salvation, and the general idea of death is a recurrent refrain that reminds Petrarch that life is short at best, in I' vo pensando, on the other hand, love and fame appear not as enemies the one of the other, but as being both the enemies of his soul's welfare; the idea of death is no longer merely a poetic reminder of the brevity of all things earthly, but is for the first time a dread of Petrarch's own imminent death; while all three of these - love and fame seen as spiritual perils, and the fear of death - are driving Petrarch to seek religion and salvation

while there is yet time. This poem unites all the threads of personal emotion, that is, that we find in various poems of Part I, discusses them all and sorts them, deciding that two of them are unworthy henceforth of his highest interest. In this light the poem is seen to face both ways, - backward over a period when the two interests he now disavows were dominating him, and forward to a time when religion and the thought of death (which received infrequent consideration in Part I) shall rule his life.

This analysis, however, may suggest that Petrarch selected I' vo pensando to introduce just the group of poems we have described as constituting the rest of Part II, - a group of 40 poems, that is, of which 38 refer to Laura's death. But this is by no means certain; we cannot be at all sure that Petrarch had not made his general plan of a collection divided into two parts before that event. The only certainty we have as to the date of division into parts is the fact that CLXXIX, the fifth poem of Part II, was transcribed non in ordine on November 28, 1349, and that on the 3rd of the following April Petrarch noted of XXIII: post multos annos ... visum est et hanc in ordine transcribere.[1] So we know that by that date there was an "order"

---

1. Vide supra, p.206.

established, although this poem was not copied in that order until 1356,[1] and although by a few months later Part I had not yet progressed very far.

If, as we believe, CLXXV was written as early as 1340-42,[2] it would be probably contemporary with the Secretum,[3] which it so much resembles, - composed at a period, that is to say, of profound spiritual disturbance and conversion, when Petrarch felt that he was making a break with his past. Petrarch may have begun arranging his First Part before 1348, and have projected a Second Part which was to open with I' vo pensando, - a poem, which, as has been said, while judging all the main interests of his life hitherto, should pronounce against his two absorbing earthly preoccupations and announce the wish to devote the rest of his life to the pursuit of salvation. This is not to say that he had as yet succeeded in severing himself from his old loves, Fame and Laura; in fact, the last line of the canzone expressly precludes us from believing that he had, and the two following poems, the baffling Aspro core and Signor mio caro, - baffling at least in respect of their position, - are entirely secular. The only possible explanation of their position here is that they are a kind of

---

1. ivi.
2. Vide supra, p.205.
3. Its date, though not established, is still believed by the most recent Petrarch scholars to be about 1342-43.

corollary to that last line of I' vo pensando, proving that although he sees "the better" he still follows "the worse."[1] It may be that Petrarch conceived of a Part II from which should be excluded all poems of external life, all poems of politics and friendship (unless the latter also concerned Laura), but which should illustrate by various single poems the inward struggle so vividly depicted in one of them, - the one chosen to introduce them, I' vo pensando. He may have begun to put this plan into execution, when the death of Laura supervening led him to narrow the scope of Part II further than he had originally intended. Or he may have made the plan of a collection, and projected the two parts after Laura's death.[2] There is no proof either way.

---

1. We have perhaps, in the juxtaposition of LXI and LXII, a similar silent comment on this opposition of his intensest interests within his soul at a given time. And a still more striking one is the reversal of feeling shown in the contrast between the closing line of LIV and the opening one of LV.
2. In that case it is impossible to imagine a reason for admitting CLXXVI and CLXXVII.

CHAPTER VII

THE COMPOSITION AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE FINAL FORM OF THE CANZONIERE

As is well known, the manuscript V. L. 3195 was written in part by Petrarch's scribe and in part by Petrarch himself. The scribe transcribed the first and larger moiety of Part I - 190 poems - and the first and larger moiety of Part II - 55 poems - while Petrarch finished the transcribing of both parts.

The exact scribal history of the manuscript has been shown by Vattasso[1] on palaeological grounds to be as follows:

1. The scribe first wrote poems I-CLXV[1] in Part I.
2. The scribe next wrote poems CCLXIV-CCCIV in Part II.
3. The scribe next wrote poems CLXVI-CXC in Part I.
4. The scribe next and lastly wrote poems CCCV-CCCXVIII in Part II.
5. Petrarch then wrote the remaining poems, which may be subdivided into three main groups, according to the treatment of the initials of their first lines. They are given here not in the order of Vattasso's data, which he did not analyze or study, but in what the writer believes to be the chronological order of their transcription.

   a. With illuminated initials.

      i. CXXI (written in by Petrarch over an erasure), with initial in red.

---

1. Numbers in this chapter correspond to those in the editions which, like Carducci's, follow the order of V. L. 3195.

ii. CXCI-CXCIX and CCCXIX-CCCXXI, with initials in red and blue, alternately.

b. With initials in an ink different from that of the rest of the poems in which they occur.

(1) With ink darker than that of the poems in which they occur.

i. CC-CCLV in Part I.

ii. CCCXXII-CCCXXXIV in Part II.

iii. CCCLXVI.

(2) With ink paler than that of the poems in which they occur, the same ink as that used for transcribing the inserted *duernione*.

i. Four sonnets on f. 66v, CCCXXXV, CCCXXXVI, CCCL and CCCLV, - as afterward renumbered in Petrarch's hand.

ii. Four sonnets on f. 71r, -CCCLI, CCCLII, CCCLIV, and CCCLIII, - as afterward renumbered in Petrarch's hand.

c. With initials in the same ink as that of the rest of the poems in which they occur.

i. CCLVI-CCLXIII in Part I.

ii. The inserted *duernione* in Part II, - ff. 67r-70v - containing 23 poems;- CCCXXXVII-CCCXLIX and CCCLVI-CCCLXV, as afterward renumbered in Petrarch's hand.

The unavoidable deduction from these facts is that when Petrarch commissioned his scribe to make that transcription of his poems which we know as V. L. 3195, he gave

the latter as a copy to work from an earlier form of the collection containing exactly or approximately 165 poems in the First Part and 41 in the Second; that he then busied himself with planning addenda to the two parts; that when the scribe had finished copying CCCIV Petrarch had ready for him 25 more poems to be added to Part I; that when the scribe reached that point, Petrarch had ready for him 14 poems to be added to Part II; that Petrarch himself wrote the others in at three different general periods, corresponding to a, b and c, and in nine different blocks or units of work, corresponding to the subdivisions under a, b and c.

This is proved, not altogether by the order of the poems,[1] but by the human probabilities. Petrarch evidently started with the intention of having the initials of his part of the transcription illuminated like those in the part done by the scribe. He had a few of them illuminated,- those of a, which he copied first; the following long series, b, he expected to have done later, leaving space for it as he went along; then he gave up the idea, and wrote the initials in himself as he worked, - c. Then he

---

1. CCLVI-CCLXIII are indeed the last group in Part I, but in Part II the *duernione* was an afterthought, and inserted, with indicated renumbering, between what were CCCXXXVIII and CCCLXII of the original, uncorrected order of V. L. 3195.

went back and wrote in the others, doing first the group b (2), with the ink he had just been using for c, and then b (1). It was natural he should do b (2) first, since the two groups of four sonnets each which constitute b (2) are on ff. 66v and 71r respectively, - that is, the two pages between which the *duernione* was inserted. In other words, he finished up first that part of the manuscript which was just then under his hands and eyes.

It is evident also that the earlier form of the collection first given to the scribe was essentially identical with the Chigi form. It must have contained the original CXXI of Chigi L. V. 176, *Donna mi viene*, for which Petrarch later made a substitute in his own hand, over an erasure; but it either contained CLVII and CLVIII, which Chigi L. V. 176 does not, or else Petrarch handed them to the scribe separately, at the same time with the rest, with indications as to where they were to be inserted.

There may be question why, since CLXVI is the last of the old arrangement (and not the first of the new additions), the change of ink noted by Vattasso should not appear first in CLXVII. To this it may be replied that we have an exact analogy to Petrarch's procedure here in his rearrangement of the last 31 poems of Part II in V.L. 3195. He evidently wished by rearranging them to make what seemed

to him a more logical and harmonious grouping of the last poems leading up to Vergine bella, which closes Part II, and so renumbered them, as was discovered by Mestica,[1] from 1 to 31; yet the first of these, CCCXXXVI, since it retains its original position, would not appear to have needed to be included in the numbered group, any more than CLXVI. Both cases are evidently characteristic of Petrarch's always very careful methods.

Moreover, the last of the poems to be added before the end of Part I of the Chigi manuscript, Almo sol, CLXXXVIII (which was put in just before Passa la nave mia, CLXXXIX, with which Part I of that manuscript closes), has the letter Y (corresponding to its penultimate position) attached to the second redaction of it in V. L. 3196; and this, as Vattasso[2] says, is further proof that Petrarch rearranged the poems between CLXV and CLXXXIX, with additions, between Chigi L. V. 176 and V. L. 3195. Only such facts, he adds, can explain the order of the scribe's work, interrupting the transcription of Part II to go back and make additions to Part I. And they lead us to look also for evidences of arrangement in the groups and blocks of poems added at different times (as noted above) by Petrarch's

---

1. Op. cit., vii.
2. Op. cit., xxxvii.

own hand. The results of such examination are stated later in this chapter.

Each of the two parts of the Canzoniere in its final form, therefore, is not a unit, but a unit plus an addendum. The question now arises, whether, in making these addenda, Petrarch followed the same principle of arrangement so carefully followed in the earlier form of the collection.

With this question in mind, we shall proceed to examine the poems which when added to the collection in the Chigi form enlarged it to the form represented by V.L.3195. We shall consider these addenda first en bloc for each part, and then in smaller groups corresponding to the procedure, as far as we understand it, first of the scribe and then of Petrarch.

The poems added to Part I fall into two groups: first those between CLVI and CXC of V. L. 3195, - that is, between the last poem of those whose arrangement is identical[1] in both manuscripts and the one which in V. L. 3195 follows that one, CLXXXIX, which is the last of Part I in the Chigi manuscript. To the 18 of these which are in Chigi L.V.176, the last 18 in other words of Part I of that manuscript, there have been added 15 more,[2] all sonnets, and all but

1. Except CXXI.
2. These 15 added poems are: CLVII, CLVIII, CLXVI, CLXVII, CLXVIII, CLXXIV, CLXXV, CLXXIX, CLXXX, CLXXXI, CLXXXII, CLXXXIII, CLXXXVI, CLXXXVII, CLXXXVIII.

two of them -- CLXVI and CLXXIX — love-poems to or about Laura. Of the 74 others added to Part I of V. L. 3195 after the poem, CLXXXIX, which closes Part I of the Chigi manuscript, all are love-poems without exception, and there are only five of them - CCVI, CCVII, CCXIV, CCXXXVII and CCXXXIX - which are not sonnets. (The first two of these five are canzoni, the other three are sestinas.)

In part II, of the 62 poems in V. L. 3195 which do not appear in Chigi L. V. 176, all are sonnets but the following: CCCXXIII, a canzone, CCCXXIV, a ballata, CCCXXV and CCCXXXI, canzoni, CCCXXXII, a sestina, and CCCLIX, CCCLX and CCCLXVI, canzoni. All but three are of love and mourning for Laura on earth, or thoughts of Laura in heaven. Two of these three, CCCLXIV and CCCLXV, are poems of religion which refer to his love only with repentance, and in the rearrangement of the last 32 poems already alluded to, they were set immediately before the third one, the closing canzone to the Virgin.

A study of the above analysis reveals the "triple principle" as being very much less conspicuously at work than it seemed to be in the arrangement of Chigi L. V. 176. It will be convenient to show this under each of the three heads studied much more at length for that manuscript.

PART I.

I. Chronology

There are only three self-dated poems.

CCXII. Beato in sogno.

Così venti anni (grave e lungo affanno!)
Pur lagrime e sospiri e dolor merco (12-13).

This, as Cochin[1] says, evidently means 1347.

CCXVI. Tutto 'l dì piango.

ho già 'l più corso
Di questa morte che si chiama vita (10-11).

And this, as Cochin notes on the same page, must belong after 1339. See discussion under LIV.

CCXXI. Qual mio destin.

E son già, ardendo, nel vigesimo anno (8).

Here again, we must agree with Cochin[2] that this poem falls between April, 1346, and April, 1347.

The following can be dated by V. L. 3196:

CXCIX. O bella man.

In V. L. 3196 this sonnet has the note (f. 2v): 1368. maii 19. veneris nocte concubia insomnis diu, tandem surgo; et occurrit hic vetustissimus ante xxv annos.[3] This

---

1. Op. cit., 109.
2. Ibid., 110.
3. Appel, op. cit., 34.

shows that in 1368 Petrarch's recollection was that he had composed this in 1343.

CCVII. Ben mi credea.

This is annotated in V. L. 3196 (f. 15r):

> Transcriptum in alia papiro post xxii annos, 1368, dominico inter nonas et vesperas, 22 octobris, mutatis et additis usque ad complementum; et die lune, in vesperis, transcriptum in ordine membranis.[1]

So the date of composition is evidently 1346.

CCXI. Voglia mi sprona.

Above this on V. L. 3196 is written (f. 5r)[2]:

> Mirum, hoc cancellatum et damnatum post multos annos casu relegens absolvi et tr'. in ordine statim. non obstante. 1369. Junii 22, hora 23, veneris. pauca postea die 27 in vesperis mutavi. sive idem hoc ... erit(?)

We cannot come nearer to the date of this than to say it was composed "many years" before 1369.

For these there is some external evidence:

CCVIII. Rapido fiume.

Cochin[3] would put this sonnet back to 1333, the same journey as that celebrated in CLXXVI and CLXXVII, which transgress so notably the chronological order, and he quotes a phrase from the letter to Cardinal Colonna, Fam. I, 4.[4]

---

1. Appel, op. cit., 101.
2. Ibid., 51.
3. Op. cit., 108.
4. Frac., I, 48.

of that year,[1] Rhodanus mihi pro vehiculo erit, as similar to l. 3 of this sonnet, and also notes a likeness of sentiment between it and the second tercet of CLXXVII. Carducci assigns it without discussion "probably" to the year 1345.

CCXXXVIII. Real natura.

Most critics incline to follow De Sade[2] in believing that the episode commemorated in this sonnet took place at Avignon in 1346, at the time of the visit of Charles of Luxemburg, afterwards Emperor Charles IV, and a friend of Petrarch. Carducci accepts this date, agreeing with D'Ovidio[3] and Mestica.[4] Cochin[5] makes some objections, but admits that the theory has a great deal to recommend it. F. Marletta[6] discusses some of the objections, notably the one which observes that CCXXXVIII makes the Emperor, if it were he, find laura's, in 1346,

Fra tanti e si bei volti il più perfetto,

whereas in the Secretum (which Marletta takes to be not later than 1343[7]) Petrarch says that her beauty was by then

---

1. Frac. It., I, 282.
2. Op. cit., II, xviii.
3. "Madonna Laura," in Nuova Antologia, XCVII (1888), 243.
4. "Il bacio a Madonna Laura," in Nuova Antologia, CXXII (1892), 496.
5. Op. cit., 112-113.
6. Il bacio a Madonna Laura. Noterella petrarchesca, Catania, 1911.
7. Ibid., 10.

much reduced. Marletta considers the year 1346, for this and other reasons, "inadmissible,"[1] but does not propose a satisfactory substitute.

CCLIX. Cercato ho sempre.

As this sonnet refers apparently to Vaucluse, it must have been written after 1337.

Four of these nine, then, are presumably of 1346-47, and two others may be of the same date, or possibly a good deal earlier. One is of 1343, and one of 1345 or perhaps much earlier. Of the other we can predicate nothing definite. In Part I of the Chigi manuscript, with four exceptions, - CIV and CXXXVI-CXXXVIII, - which are perhaps a great deal later, or perhaps of 1346 and 1347 respectively, the latest dated poem is of 1344. So if we assume Petrarch to have been as careful even in his very general way[2] of the chronological order in these additional poems, as we found he appeared to be in the poems in Chigi L. V. 176, and allowed for a few exceptions to correspond to those in the Chigi group, then we should have to credit Petrarch with composing nearly 80 poems or so (out of 89) between 1344 and 1348 (to take no account here of CCLXVI, dated 1345).

---

1. Op. cit., 33.
2. Though putting nel vigesimo anno (CCXXI, 8) after venti anni completed (CCXII, 12-13) is not being quite so careful.

As it had taken him seventeen years to write the 174 in Part I of the Chigi manuscript, and as he was absent from Provence a good deal of the period of 1344-48, this would be an extravagant assumption.

II. Form

The last 25 poems in Part I of the Chigi manuscript are sonnets, and so are all those interpolated among them before the closing one, CLXXXIX, and so are CXC-CCV, added immediately after it, making an uninterrupted series in V.L. 3195 of 56 sonnets. Of the remaining 58 poems in Part I of V. L. 3195, only 5 are not sonnets: CCVI and CCVII, which are canzoni, and CCXIV, CCXXXVII and CCXXXIX, which are all sestinas. Two pairs of these, making four out of the five, will be observed to be set close together,- grouped, that is, as so often they were in Part I of Chigi L. V. 176; but they are not well distributed with respect to the whole, since these 5 poems with the sonnets among them (a fairly characteristic group of 34 altogether) are followed by 24 sonnets and preceded by 56, so that in an entire series of 114 poems there are only 5 which are not sonnets.

III. Content

There are no political poems at all among those added to Part I, and only three friendship-poems, - CLXVI,

CLXXIX, and CCXLIV. CLXXIX is followed by 64 love-poems in succession.

There are, however, many "chapters" or small groups of poems on kindred topics. The first two added, for example - CLVII and CLVIII, which were inserted between CLVI and CLVII of the Chigi manuscript, - are of love and Laura's grief, as are the two of the earlier collection which precede them. CLXXXVI and CLXXXVII both mention classical personages, the names of Virgil, Homer and Achilles occurring in each. CXCIV, CXCVI, CXCVII and CXCVIII begin respectively: L'aura gentil, L' aura serena, L' aura celeste and L' aura soave. CXCIX, CC and CCI are all to Laura's hands. CCXXIX begins Cantai, or piango, while CCXXX begins I' piansi, or canto. CCXXXI and CCXXXIII both lament a malady of Laura's eyes, and it is perhaps an inadvertence that they are not next to each other and that there is a poem between CXCIV and CXCVI which does not begin with L' aura. CCXLIX-CCCLIV are poems of presentiment of Laura's death, and CCXLVIII is a very appropriate introduction to them, while CCXLVI and CCXLVII are clearly related to CCXLVIII.

But while within the added group we find this tendency to set poems next one another with a regard for subject-matter, it does not combine with the earlier or

Chigi group to make a unified whole, such as that appeared to be. For example, in the Chigi collection it seemed likely that the four "units" of political poems in Part I had been the object of deliberate distribution, so that the last of them was not much further from the end of the collection than the first of them was from the beginning; but it is now left so that instead of being the 35th before the last it is the 125th.

PART II.

I. Chronology

There are two self-dated poems.

CCCLXII. Volo con l' ali.

E per tardar ancor vent' anni o trenta
Parrà a te troppo (13-14).

As Cochin[1] remarks, this would be a strange length of life to expect if the poet were already well on in years. We must agree with him in thinking fifty the latest possible age at which he could think that "by reason of strength" he might yet see thirty years more. This would date the sonnet as of 1354 at latest.

CCCLXIV. Tennemi Amor.

Tennemi Amor anni vent' uno ardendo ...
Poi che madonna e 'l mio cor inseme
Saliro al ciel, dieci altri anni piangendo (1-4).

1. Op. cit., 145.

Twenty-one years added to 1327 make 1348, and ten more bring us to 1358, evidently the date of this poem. It is only two poems short of the end, and is the last of those which allude to Petrarch's love. And it bears the latest date of all that are self-dated. Its position is certainly by intention.

Two can be dated by notes in V. L. 3196.

CCCXXIII. Standomi un giorno.

This has the note, above the third stanza (f. 2v):

> 1368. octobris 13. veneris ante matutinum ne labatur con ... ad cedulam plusquam triennio hic inclusam; et eodem die, inter primam facem et concubium, transcripsi in alia papiro, quibusdam, etc.[1]

It evidently should be assigned to 1365.

CCCXXIV. Amor, quando fioria.

The notes to this <u>ballata</u> have already been quoted in part in the discussion under CCLXVIII, but may be given here in full (f. 14r):

> alibi scripsi hoc principium sed non vacat querere 1348. septembris 1. circa vesperas. - 1356. 7 februarii prima face: hoc est principium unius plebeje cantionis d(icte) s(upra) Amor quando fioria Mia spene e il guidaraon di tanta fede, etc. - Transcripsi in ordine post tot annos 1368. octobris 31. mane, quibusdam, etc. - Hanc scripsi, non advertens quod esset transcripta: sed ... et inveni et posui simul complures ... hodie ... Decembris.[2]

So this had been begun before Sept. 1, 1348.

---

1. Appel, <u>op. cit.</u>, 34.
2. <u>Ibid.</u>, 98.

From these four poems which it is possible to date, the conclusion seems to be that if Petrarch could follow a poem composed in 1365 with one dating from 1348, he had no concern for the actual chronology of composition, but was nevertheless still interested in the artistic effect of chronology, since he puts near the very end of the Canzoniere the poem which bears the latest date of those of whose date there is internal evidence. There is no case in the poems in the Chigi manuscript of such glaring disparity of date between two poems placed next to each other, nor of any disparity (excepting always CCLXV and CCLXVI) where some artistic principle cannot be discerned which would partly account for it.

II. Form

Of the 62 poems added to Part II of the Chigi manuscript to make Part II of V. L. 3195, eight are not sonnets. The first 18 are all sonnets, and becoming thus coextensive with the 34 sonnets which close Part II of the Chigi manuscript they make another long series of 52 consecutive sonnets. And CCCXXXIII-CCCLVIII make another group of 26. The poems which are not sonnets are again set near each other in small groups; CCCXXIII and CCCXXV are canzoni, separated by a ballata; CCCXXXI is a canzone and CCCXXXII a sestina; CCCLIX, CCCLX and CCCLXVI are all canzoni. But,

as already said, although well grouped, they are not well distributed.

III. Content

Here again are "chapters." CCCXV-CCCXVII, as Cochin[1] notes, all lament that Laura's death had occurred just before age might have calmed him so that their intercourse could have been more untroubled than ever before. CCCXXVIII-CCCXXX are reminiscent of the forebodings he had of Laura's death after he left her for the last time, in 1347. CCCXXXVIII ends:

> Non la conobbe il mondo mentre l' ebbe:
> Conobbil' io (12-13),

and CCCXXXIX begins Conobbi. In CCCXL Petrarch wishes he might dream of laura, and the three following describe the fulfillment of this wish. CCCXLV, 13, begins: Con li angeli la veggio, and CCCXLVI begins Li angeli eletti. In CCCXLVII-CCCXLIX Petrarch hopes that Laura will be his advocate in heaven, and summon him soon to her side. The last two poems are poems of religion and repentance, with no mention of Laura, and CCCLXIV, which precedes them and is the last that speaks directly of his love for her, is a prayer of repentance and aspiration.

---

1. Op. cit., 133.

Unlike the First Part, these poems make a unit with those in the corresponding part of Chigi 1. V. 176. But this is not so very significant, because there was very little variety of subject-matter, as has been pointed out, in the original Part II. It was more of a unit to begin with, and it was easier to preserve it as such. It is clear that Petrarch was either more eager, or found it easier, to make Part II an intelligible artistic unit, because when he added his last group of poems to that part of V. L. 3195, it was by slipping in an entire new duernione, four leaves, containing 23 compositions,[1] which still kept Vergine bella in its place at the very end; whereas for poems to be added to the latter part of Part I, as we know from the letter to Pandolfo Malatesta,[2] he seems to have been content to leave blank pages for addenda at the end of it. As he did also, as we have seen, in Chigi L. V. 176 and Laur. XLI, 17.[3]

On examining the smaller blocks of addenda, it will appear that each gives evidence of some principle of arrangement within itself.

Part I.

I. The first 15 new sonnets, worked in between CLXV

---

1. Modigliani, op. cit., xxiii; Vallasso, op. cit., viii.
2. Vide supra, p.4.
3. But cf. p.281.

and CLXXXIX of V. L. 3195, plus CXC, which is the last in the scribe's hand in Part I, are all of love but two, CLXVI and CLXXIX, which are of friendship; CLXVI is the first of a series of three interpolated sonnets, and CLXXIX is the first of a similar series of five.

II. CXCI-CXCIX (5, a, i), love-sonnets, include those beginning L' aura gentil, etc., and end with the first of the sonnets to Laura's hands.

III. CC-CCLV (5, b, (1), i), begin with two more sonnets to Laura's hands, which had probably been composed during the interval, and were a further development of a theme already broached, analagous to the adjuncture of CLVII-CLVIII to CLV-CLVI. This is the most important group of addenda. It includes the three self-dated poems; the two beginning respectively Cantai, or piango and I' piansi, or canto; those which lament a malady of Laura's eyes; and the series CCXLVI-CCLIV, connected with forebodings of Laura's death. Here, also, are the only poems not sonnets among the added poems in Part I, - CCVI-CCVII, CCXIV, CCXXXVII and CCXXXIX, - and while they break up their group agreeably, they still leave a series of 66 sonnets to precede the first of them in the collection as a whole.

IV. CCLVI-CCLXIII, (5, c, 1). These eight sonnets which close Part I of V. L. 3195 are a part of the group

marked c in the earlier analysis; that is, contemporary with the inserted duernione.

Part II.

V. CCCV-CCCXVIII (5), the last poems copied by the scribe in Part II, and the first to be added to Part II of the Chigi form, include almost at the end of them the series CCCXV-CCCXVII, which regret that the possibilities of a calmer relation between Laura and her poet had come too late.

VI. CCCXIX-CCCXXXIV (5, a, ii, and b, (1), ii), include one group of two canzoni and a ballata, set near the beginning, and one of a canzone and a sestina, set near the end of it: they include the series CCCXXVIII-CCCXXX, reminiscent of the sonnets of foreboding in Part I.

VII. The four sonnets immediately preceding and the four immediately following the inserted duernione (5, b, (2), i and ii), and Vergine bella (5, b, (1), iii), a group of 9 poems which at one time evidently constituted the closing group of Part II.

VIII. The inserted duernione itself, (5, c, ii). These two groups, 7 and 8, were rearranged into a closing sequence by the renumbering of the last 31 of Part II. That renumbering kept Vergine bella as the last poem in the Canzoniere, and left the following groups intact, while

shifting them: the two pairs beginning and ending respectively with the word conobbi, and the word angeli, and the series CCCXLVII-CCCXLIX, which expresses the hope that Laura is awaiting Petrarch in heaven. There are two canzoni; the rest are sonnets.

There can remain little doubt that Petrarch kept his principles of arrangement in mind to some extent at all times when he was ordering for transcription any number of them, however small, except perhaps once; and if the group CCLVI-CCLXIII does not seem to include any related poems, it was itself perhaps part of a larger conscious artistic plan.[1] But while the individual added blocks thus seem to show to some extent the triple consideration, the total effect of all the addenda, when taken together with the original collection, is such as to cancel the effect of such consideration upon the whole. Part I, at least, of the Canzoniere, is no such organized and ordered unit as Part I of the Chigi manuscript. Evidence of this is assembled in the following chapter.

---

1. Vide ultra, p.281.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONCLUSIONS

The general conclusion from this investigation is that V. L. 3195, or the Canzoniere as it stands in most recent editions, is composed of two separate portions, in a different sense from that in which this statement is usually understood. It is divided artistically, to be sure, and by Petrarch's intention, into Parts I and II, consisting respectively of 263 poems and 103; but it is also divided, and this not by Petrarch's intention but by the exigencies of time, age, health, travel, and we know not what other practical considerations, into two sections quite otherwise constituted. These two consist, first, of 174 poems of Part I plus the first 41 poems of Part II, a double group equivalent to Chigi L. V. 176 which we shall call I-II; and secondly, of the remaining 89 poems of Part I plus the remaining 62 poems of Part II, a double group which we shall call A-B.

Now while I-II was seen to be an organic whole, built upon a plan which rests upon a triple artistic principle of chronology, form and content, flexibly applied, A-B was seen to be much less plainly an expression of that principle. The principle of chronology, while not noticeably transgressed, hardly operates at all; whereas in I

there are 11 self-dated poems out of 174, there are but 3 out of 89 in A. The principle of content operates in A in about the same way as in I with respect to grouping, but not with respect to distribution: in A there are 61 love-poems in succession; there are 24 friendship-poems in I, and only 3 in A; there are 7 political poems in I and none at all in A. The principle of form is the most conspicuously disregarded of all: out of the 89 poems in A, only 5 are not sonnets, whereas of the 174 poems in I, there are 33 which are not sonnets; that is to say, while there are more than 5 times as many sonnets as other forms in I, there are nearly 18 times as many sonnets as other forms in A; and in I-A there is a series of 66 sonnets, in II-B a series of 52.

In consequence of these facts, the combination of I-A is lopsided in all three respects as compared with I alone. B, on the contrary, differs comparatively little from II, for reasons already detailed,[1] and in point of content the combination II-B is as organic and unified a whole as II alone. But in respect to form, it enlarges a series of 34 sonnets - the longest series in I-II - to the disproportionate number of 52, or just over half the total number of poems in II-B.

---

1. Vide supra, p.275.

There is some ground for thinking, however, that in the form in which he left it, Petrarch looked upon the Canzoniere as completed. The last poems to be added to it by himself, if the deductions drawn in the last chapter are correct, were the inserted duernione in Part II, - with the renumbering up to the end which it involved (a notable evidence of artistic intention), - and the last 8 poems in Part I. That is, he ordered an ending for both parts at about the same time, or at least after making any other changes in either part. Then he went back, apparently, and wrote in the omitted initials, as a finishing touch. This seems to give some basis to the idea, suggested tentatively by Cesareo[1] long ago, that Arbor vittoriosa may have been as ordered close to Part I as Vergine bella to Part II.

But despite these apparent attempts to impart an effect of order and finish to A, and perhaps a fitting close to I-A, the unassimilated masses in A prevent I-A -- II-B from manifesting the unified control evident in I-II.

If Cesareo's later idea is correct,[2] and Petrarch did wish to set Aspro core and Signor mio caro immediately after Arbor vittoriosa, this afterthought we could thus date as coming to him after the latest addition and change

---

1. Op. cit., 127.
2. Vide supra, p.249.

made in his arrangement. They would not make so fine a close for Part I as does Arbor vittoriosa (and this is Sicardi's final reason against the hypothesis),[1] but we can easily imagine that this defect may have seemed to Petrarch less serious than the one which arises from leaving the poems where we now find them, in Part II. Besides, it is only a conjecture that we offered above, to the effect that Petrarch may have intended Arbor vittoriosa as a closing piece for Part I; he may have fully expected to add more pòems on those pages still left blank in V. L. 3195.

I-II is really, then, the artistically arranged part of the Canzoniere. A-B is on the contrary something like a pigeon-hole, where the aging and often ailing poet put for safe-keeping the poems which he continued to write, or to recover from amongst his old papers and rewrite, almost to the last minute of his life. Within the limits of his pigeon-hole, he arranged them with logic and precision still, but he never found time or strength to work the later ones into the fabric of I-II. Or at least he never combined or unified A with I. He merely annexed it.

The error of the distinguished scholars who have studied the arrangement of the Canzoniere heretofore, and whose work has furnished the basis of the present essay, has lain in considering that Part I of V.L.3195 was a unified whole.

1. Vide supra, p.251.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS REFERRED TO IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS ESSAY

C. Antona-Traversi, Gli amori del Petrarca; studio critico, Naples, 1878

C. Appel, Die Berliner Handschriften der Rime Petrarcas, Berlin, 1886

C. Appel, "Petrarca in Avignon und Vaucluse," in Hamburg Correspondent, July 20, 1904

(Fr. Arnavon), Pétrarque à Vaucluse, Paris, 1803

L. Azzolina, "La contradizione amorosa in F. Petrarca," in Atti della R. Accademia di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Ser. III, VIII (1906). And separately, Palermo, 1906

O. Bacci, Le 'Considerazioni sopra le Rime del Petrarca di Alessandro Tassoni,' con una notizia bibliografica delle lettere tassoniane edite e inedite, Florence, 1887

C. Baeumker, Quibus antiquis auctoribus Petrarca in conscribendis Rerum memorabilium libris usus sit. Pars Prior. Scripsit Clemens Baeumker. Monasterii Guestfalorum, formis Coppenrathianis, 1882

A. Bartoli, "Appunti per uno studio sulla politica del Petrarca," in Letture di famiglia, XXX (1898), 8, 36

A. Bartoli, Francesco Petrarca, Florence, 1884

A. Bartoli, "Il Petrarca viaggiatore," in Nuova Antologia, LXXVI (1884), 585

G. Bayle, "Études sur Laure," in Bulletin historique et archéologique de Vaucluse, II (1880), 139, 445; III (1881), 283, 309; IV (1882), 23, 301, 511

G. Bayle, Le véritable emplacement de l'habitation de Pétrarque à Vaucluse; étude archéologique, Nimes, 1897

G. Biadego, "Un maestro di grammatico amico del Petrarca," in Atti dell' Istituto Veneto, 1878-99, 269.

L. I. Boccomino, La poesia esplicata nei principali poeti italiani, Terranova, 1895

G. Bologna, Note e studi sul Petrarca, Milan, 1911

G. Bologna, Nuovi studi sul Petrarca, Milan, 1914

A. Borgognoni, Excursus petrarchesco, Ravenna, 1876

G. Brizzolara, "Ancora Cola di Rienzo e F. Petrarca," in Studi storici, XII (1903), 353, XIV (1904), 69, 243

G. Brizzolara, "Il Petrarca e Cola di Rienzo," in Studi storici, VIII (1899), 239, 423

G. Brizzolara, "Le sine titulo del Petrarca," in Studi storici, IV (1895), 1, 447

B. Brugi, "Leggendo il Canzoniere," in Padova a Francesco Petrarca, MCMIV, Padua, 1906-09

M. Buonarroti, the younger, Opere varie in versi ed in prosa di Michelangelo Buonarroti il giovane alcune delle quali non mai stampate, raccolte da P. Fanfani, Florence, 1863

N. Busetto, "Francesco Petrarca satirico e polemista," in Padova in onore di Francesco Petrarca, MCMIV, 1909, II, 1

E. Carrara, "I commenti antichi e la cronologia delle egloghe petrarchesche," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXVIII (1896), 123

E. Carrara, "Padova in onore di Francesco Petrarca, MCMIV," in Giornale storico, LV (1910), 472

E. Carrara, "Il sesto centenario petrarchesco. Pubblicazioni dell' anno 1904," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLVII (1906), 88

G. A. Cesareo, "Gli amori del Petrarca," in Giornale dantesco, VIII (1900), 1

G. A. Cesareo, "Di un codice petrarchesco della Biblioteca Chigiana," in Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei, Rendiconti della Classe di scienze morale, Ser. V, IV (1895), 188, and in his Su le Poesie volgari del Petrarca, Nuove ricerche, Rocca San Casciano, 1898, App. I, 289

G. A. Cesareo, Francesco Petrarca. La vita, Messina, 1922

G. A. Cesareo, "Henry Cochin, La Chronologie du Canzoniere de Pétrarque," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXXII (1898), 403

G. A. Cesareo, "Per gli studi petrarcheschi," in Fanfulla della domenica, XV (1893), July 9, No. 28

G. A. Cesareo, Le Poesie volgari del Petrarca, nuove ricerche, Rocca S. Casciano, 1898

G. A. Cesareo, "Su l'ordinamento delle poesie volgari di Francesco Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XIX (1892), 229, XX (1892), 91

G. A. Cesareo, "L'ultimo amore del Petrarca," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXVII (1905), Oct. 8, No. 41

E. N. Chiaradia, La storia del Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca, Vol. I, Bologna, 1907

D. Ciampoli, "Il codice petrarchesco nella Biblioteca Victor Emanuele," in La Bibliofilia, VI (1905), 125

V. Cian, "La coscienza artistica nel poeta del Canzoniere," in Nuova antologia, CXCVI (1904), 247

V. Cian, Un decennio nella vita di messer Pietro Bembo, Turin, 1885

V. Cian, "Nugellae vulgares? Questione petrarchesca," in La Fanilla, Fasc. V, May, 1904. And separately, Perugia, 1904

V. Cian, "Spigolature di erudizione petrarchesca: I. Alla ricerca d'un Petrarca miniato. II. Un probabile spunto di poesia popolaresca in una canzone del Petrarca e un' imitazione petrarchesca. III. D'una lettera pseudo-petrarchesca. IV. Per la storia del petrarchismo nel sec. XVI," in Padova a Francesco Petrarca, 1904

C. Cipolla, "Sui motivi del ritorno di Francesco Petrarca nel 1347," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLVII (1906), 253

E. Cocchia, Magistri Johannis de Rysdinio Invectiva contra Fr. Petrarcham et Fr. Petrarchas contra cujusdam Galli calumnias Apologia. Revisione critica del Testo con introduzione storica e commento (Memoria letta alla R. Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e belle arti di Napoli dal Socio Enrico Cocchia), Naples, 1920

H. Cochin, Un ami de Pétrarque: lettres de Francesco Nelli à Pétrarque, publiées d'après le manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale par Henry Cochin, avec une introduction et des notes, Paris, 1892

H. Cochin, La chronologie du Canzoniere de Pétrarque, Paris, 1898

H. Cochin, "Comment il faut lire Pétrarque," in Revue des deux Mondes, LXXXIX, Pér. 6, 1 (Mar. 15, 1919), 376

H. Cochin, F. Pétrarque, Préface et traduction, Paris, 1920

H. Cochin, Le frère de Pétrarque et le livre Du repos des religieux, Paris, 1903

H. Cochin, "Giovanni Melodia. - Studi sulle rime del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LV (1910), 140

H. Cochin, "La grande controverse de Rome et d'Avignon au XIVe siècle," in Études italiennes, III (1921), Nos. 1, 2

C. Cochin, "Recherches sur Stefano Colonna, prévôt du chapitre de Saint-Omer, cardinal d'Urbain VI et correspondant de Pétrarque," in Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses, X (1905), 352, 554

F. Colagrosso, "La metrica nella cronologia del Canzoniere," in La Biblioteca delle scuole italiane, II (1890), 145

F. Colagrosso, Studi di letteratura italiana, Verona, 1892

M. E. Cosenza, Francesco Petrarca and the revolution of Cola di Rienzo, Chicago, 1913

L. Couture, "Pétrarque et Jacques Colonna, évêque de Lombez," in Revue de Gascogne, XXI (1880), 33, 91, 137

L. Couture, "Pétrarque à Lombez," in Revue d'Aquitaine, II (1857), 333, 372

E. Croce, "La vera Laura di Francesco Petrarca," in Cronache della civiltà elleno-latina, II, 1

L. Cuccurullo, "Lorenzo Mascetta-Caracci. - Dante e il Dedalo petrarchesco. Con uno studio sulle malattie di F. Petrarca," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XV (1910), 146

A. D'Ancona, "Il concetto dell' unità politica nei poeti italiani," in his Studi di critica e storia letteraria, Bologna, 1880, 1

A. D'Ancona, "Un sonetto inedito di F. Petrarca ed una canzone al medesimo attribuita," in Il Propugnatore, VII (1874), ii, 154

L. De Bondelon (l'abbé André), Découverte sur Laure. Vaucluse et ses souvenirs expliqués aux visiteurs, Vaucluse, 1879

I. Della Giovanna, "Per l'incoronazione del Petrarca," in Rivista d'Italia, VII (1904), ii, 113

A. Della Torre, "Per la storia interiore del Petrarca avanti l'innamoramento di Laura," in Giornale dantesco, XIV (1906), 106

J. Delmas, Pétrarque et les Colonna, Marseille, 1905

P. De Nolhac, "L'autografo del Canzoniere petrarchesco," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, VII (1886), 466

P. De Nolhac, La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini; contributions à l'histoire des collections d'Italie, et à l'étude de la Renaissance, Paris, 1887

P. De Nolhac, Le canzoniere autographe de Pétrarque; communication faite à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Paris, 1886

P. De Nolhac, "Une date nouvelle de la vie de Pétrarque," in Annales du Midi, II (1890), 65

P. De Nolhac, "Le De viris illustribus de Pétrarque," in Notices et extraits de mss. de la Bibliothèque Nationale, XXXIV (1890), I, 111

P. De Nolhac, Fac-similés de l'écriture de Pétrarque, et appendices au 'Canzoniere autographe,' avec des notes sur la bibliothèque de Pétrarque, Rome, 1887

P. De Nolhac, "Pétrarque à Bologne au temps d'Azzo Visconti," in Petrarca (F.) e Lombardia, 1904

P. de Nolhac, Pétrarque et l'humanisme, d'après un essai de restitution de sa bibliothèque, Paris, 1892

J. F. P. A. De Sade, Mémoires pour la vie de François Pétrarque, tirés de ses oeuvres et des auteurs contemporains, avec des notes ou dissertations, & les pièces justificatives, Amsterdam, 1764-1767

F. De Sanctis, Saggio critico sul Petrarca, Naples, 1869

F. D'Ovidio, "Ancora di Sennuccio del Bene e ancora dei lauri del Petrarca; postilla alle 'Questioni di geografia petrarchesca'; memoria letta all' Accademia," in Atti dell' Accademia ... di Napoli, XXIV (1889), 117, 149

F. D'Ovidio, "Madonna Laura," in Nuova Antologia, S. III, XVI (C, 1888), 209, 385

F. D'Ovidio, "Questioni di geografia petrarchesca, memoria letta all' Accademia," in Atti dell' Accademia di Scienze morali e politiche di Napoli, XXIII (1888), 35

O. D'Uva, Le anepigrafe di F. Petrarca edite con volgarizzamento e note, Sassari, 1895

M. Faucon, "Note sur la détention de Rienzi à Avignon," in Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, VII (1887), 53

F. Flamini, "Francesco Galeota, gentiluomo napolitano del Quattrocento, e il suo inedito Canzoniere," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XX (1892), 1

F. Flamini, "Il luogo di nascita di Madonna Laura e la topografia del Canzoniere petrarchesco," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXI (1893), 335

F. Flamini, "Tra Valchiusa ed Avignone, la scena degli amori del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, Suppl. 12, 1910, 1. And separately, Turin, 1910

R. Fondi, "Nuove ricerche su Cino da Pistoia. Quando nacque Cino da Pistoia?" in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXII (1910), 51

F. Forcellini, "Zanobi da Strada e la sua venuta nella conte di Napoli. Contributo alla cronologia dell' epistolario del Petrarca," in Archivio storico per le provincie napolitane, XXXVII, Fasc. aprile maggio giugno, 242

A. Foresti, "Frammento Queriniano di un codice del Canzoniere petrarchesco esemplato sull' originale del poeta," in Bibliofilia, XIX, no. 8-9

A. Foresti, "Giovanni da Parma e il Petrarca," in Archivio storico per le Provincie Parmensi, XXIII N. S. (1924), 1

A. Foresti, "La gita del Petrarca a Bergamo il 13 ottobre 1359," in Bollettino della Civica Biblioteca di Bergamo, XVII (1924), 2, 45

A. Foresti, "Postille di cronologia petrarchesca: I. Alla spelonca della Sainte-Baume nell' autunno del 1337. II. Quando fu aggiunto il supplemento romualdino nel trattato De Vita solitaria. III. Da Valchiusa in sull' aprirsi della primavera 1342. IV. Peregrinando tra le rovine di Roma con fra' Giovanni Colonna di S. Vito nell' Aprile del 1341," in La Rassegna, Ser. III, iv (XXVII, 1919), 108

A. Foresti, "Postille di cronologia petrarchesca, Serie seconda: I. Una parabola consolatrice. II. Al grammatico Gilberto da Parma. III. Una tappa presso Azza da Correggio nell' aprile del 1362," in La Rassegna, Ser. IV, XXXI (1923), No. 2, 323

L. Fùrnari, Canzoni di F. Petrarca, Reggio di Calabria, 1895

A. Gabrielli, Epistolario di Cola di Rienzo, Rome, 1890

E. Galli, "Le ville del Petrarca nel Milanese," in Archivio storico lombardo, Ser. IV, XXXII (1905), 359

A. Gaspary, Geschichte der italienische Literatur, Berlin, 1885

I. Giorgi and E. Sicardi, "Abozzi di rime edite e inedite di Francesco Petrarca, nota di I. Giorgi ed E. Sicardi," in Bullettino della Società Filologica Romana, 1905, N. vii, 27. And separately, Perugia, 1905

M. Girardi, "La nuova data, scoperta dal signor De Nolhac, sulla vita del Petrarca," in Atti e Memorie della R. Accademia di Padova, N. S., VIII (1891-92), 2-3, 321

G. Gröber, "Von Petrarca's Laura," in Miscellanea di studi critici edita in onore di Arturo Graf

H. Hauvette, "Laure de Noves?" in Bulletin Italien, II (1902), 15

H. Hauvette, "Pétrarque à la Chartreuse de Montrieu," in Nouvelle revue d'Italie, XVI (1919), No. 4

P. Högberg, "Les manuscrits italiens de Copenhague," in Études italiennes, II (1920), no. 3

A. Mortis, Scritti inediti di Francesco Petrarca, Trieste, 1874

G. Kirner, Sulle opere storiche di F. Petrarca, Pisa, 1899

G. Körting, Geschichte der Litteratur Italiens im Zeitalter der Renaissance, Leipzig, 1878

Labande, "Les souvenirs de Pétrarque et de Laure en Avignon et à Vaucluse," in Sixième Centenaire de la naissance de Pétrarque, Avignon, 1904

E. Lacchini, Francesco Petrarca e casa Colonna; conferenza tenuta la prima volta in Roma nel palazzo Colonna li XI dicembre 1904, Cagli, 1906

E. Levi, "Ant. e Nicolò da Ferrara poeti e uomini di corte del Trecento," in Atti e Memorie della Deputazione Ferrarese di storia patria, XIX, fasc. 2. And separately, Ferrara, 1909

E. Levi, Francesco di Vannozzo e la lirica nelle corti lombarde durante la seconda metà del secolo XIV, Florence, 1908-09

G. Lovascio, "Una nota critica sulla canzone Alla Virgine di Fr. Petrarca," in Rivista abruzzese, XXII, 7

G. Lumbroso, Lezioni universitarie su Cola di Rienzo, Rome, 1891

D. Magrini, Le epistole metriche di Francesco Petrarca, Rocca S. Casciano, 1907

P. Mammola, Studi di uomo italiano sul Petrarca, Florence, 1874

L. Mascetta, "Barbato di Sulmona," in Rassegna Abruzzese, II (1898), 15. And separately, (Casalbordino, 1898?)

L. Mascetta, Il Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca riordinato con illustrazioni storiche e un comento novissimo, Lanciano, 1895

L. Mascetta-Caracci, "Gli amori del Petrarca," in Rassegna pugliese, xiii. Also separately, Trani, 1896

L. Mascetta-Caracci, Dante e il Dedalo petrarchesco, con uno studio sulle malattie di Francesco Petrarca, Lanciano, 1910

L. Mascetta-Caracci, "Francesco Flamini - Tra Valchiusa ed Avignone. La scena degli amori del Petrarca," etc., in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XVI (1911), 225

L. Mascetta-Caracci, "Sulle pretese rime prepostere del Petrarca," in Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXI (1907), 36

L. Mascetta-Caracci, La torbida giovinezza di Francesco Petrarca, Naples, 1908

G. Mazzoni, "Come il Petrarca scriveva i versi," in Giornale d'Italia, April 19, 1904. And separately, Rome, 1909

G. Mazzoni, "Noterelle petrarchesche," in Il Propugnatore, N. S., I (1888), ii, July-August, 152

G. Melodia, "Adolfo Mussafia. - Dei codici Vaticani Latini 3195 e 3196 delle Rime del Petrarca," in Giornale Dantesco, VIII (N. S. V) (1900), 363

G. Melodia, Studi sulle Rime del Petrarca, Catania, 1909

P. A. Meneghelli, Sul presunto ritratto di Laura, Padua, 1822

G. Mestica, "Il Canzoniere del Petrarca nel codice originale a riscontro col ms. del Bembo e con l'edizione aldina del 1501," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXI (1893), 300

A. Mezières, Pétrarque, étude d'après de nouveaux documents, Paris, 1868

Ministero dell' istruzione pubblica, I codici petrarcheschi delle Biblioteche Governative del Regno indicati per cura del Ministero dell' Istruzione pubblica, Rome, 1874

E. Monaci and A. D'Ancona, Sul manoscritto del Canzoniere di F. Petrarca. Relazione dei soci Ernesto Monaci ed Alessandro d'Ancona sulla Memoria del dott. A. Pakscher presentata nella seduta del 16 maggio 1886, Rome, 1886

A. Moschetti, "Cesareo, G. A. - Su le Poesie volgari del Petrarca. Nuove ricerche," in Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, VII (1899), 74

A. Moschetti, Dell' ispirazione dantesca nelle rime di Francesco Petrarca, Urbino, 1894

A. Moschetti, "Henry Cochin. - La Chronologie du Canzoniere de Pétrarque," in Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, VI (1898), 121

A. Moschetti, "Mussafia Adolfo. - Dei codici vaticani latini 3195 e 3196 delle Rime del Petrarca," in Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, IX (1901), 116

A. Moschetti, "Può credersi che Laura sia stata della famiglia Colonna?" in Atti della Reale Accademia di scienze lettere e arti, XXII, and in Il Canzoniere e i Trionfi, Milan, 1908, xvii

E. Müntz, "La casa di Petrarca a Valchiusa," in Nuova Antologia, CLXXXIV (1902), 637

A. Mussafia, "Dei codici vaticani latini 3195 e 3196 delle Rime del Petrarca," in Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften; philosophische classe, XLI (1899-1900), VI, 1. And separately, Vienna, 1899

F. Novati, "Il Petrarca ed i Visconti," in Rivista d'Italia, VII (1904), ii, 135

Padova in onore di Francesco Petrarca, MCMIV, Padua, 1906-09

A. Pakscher, Aus einem Katalog des Fulvius Ursinus, Halle, 1886

A. Pakscher, "Cesareo, G. A., Su l'ordinamento delle poesie volgari di Francesco Petrarca," in Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie, XIV (1893), 170

A. Pakscher, Die Chronologie der Gedichte Petrarcas, Berlin, 1887

A. Pakscher, "Di un probabile autografo boccacesco," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, VIII (1886), 364

F. Pellegrini, "G. A. Cesareo, Su le Poesie volgari del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXXVIII (1901), 152

F. Pellegrini, "Intorno a nuovi abbozzi poetici di Francesco Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLVI (1905), 359

F. Pellegrini, "Lorenzo Mascetta. - Il canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca cronologicamente riordinato, etc.," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXVIII (1896), 401

E. Penco, "Il Petrarca e i Colonna," in Fanfulla della domenica, XVI (1894), No. 24. Also in his Storia della letteratura italiana, III, Florence and Siena, 1886-95

E. Penco, "Il Petrarca alla corte dei Visconti," in Fanfulla della domenica, XVI (1894), No. 21

G. Persico, "Il Petrarca a Napoli," in Napoli nobilissima, XIII (1904), 113

G. Perugi, "Il Petrarca a Capranica," in Fanfulla della domenica, xxvii (1903), No. 3

F. Petrarca, "Abbozzi autografi di Francesco Petrarca," E. Monaci, ed., in Archivio paleografico italiano, I (1880), 52

F. Petrarca, Autografi di Francesco Petrarca riprodotti in fototipia, ed. G. C. e G. S., Rome, 1898

F. Petrarca, Il Canzoniere e I Trionfi, con introduzione, notizie bibliografiche e commenti di Andrea Moschetti, Milan, 1908

F. Petrarca, Francisci Petrarcae Epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae tum quae adhuc tum quae nondum editae familiarum scilicet libri XXIIII, variarum liber unicus, nunc primum integri et ad fidem codicum optimorum vulgati, studio et cura Josephi Fracassetti, Florence, 1859-63

F. Petrarca, Francisci Petrarchae florentini, philosophi, oratoris et poetae clarissimi, reflorescentis literaturae latinaeque linguae, aliquot seculis horrenda barbarie inquinatae ac pene sepultae, assertoris et instauratoris, opera quae extant omnia, etc., Basle, 1554

F. Petrarca, Francisci Petrarche laureati poete rerum vulgarium fragmenta. Il canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca riprodotto letteralmente dal cod. vat. lat. 3195, con tre fotoincisioni, a cura di Ettore Modigliani, Rome, 1904

F. Petrarca, Lettere di Francesco Petrarca delle cose familiari libri ventiquattro, lettere varie libro unico, ora la prima volta raccolte, volgarizzate e dichiarate con note da Giuseppe Fracassetti, Florence, 1892

F. Petrarca, Lettere senili di Francesco Petrarca volgarizzate e dichiarate con note da Giuseppe Fracassetti, Florence, 1892

F. Petrarca, Librorum Francisci Petrarchae impressorum annotatio, Venice, 1503.

F. Petrarca, Il manoscritto vaticano latino 3196 autografo di Francesco Petrarca riprodotto in eliotipia a cura della Biblioteca Vaticana, Rome, 1895

F. Petrarca, "Il manoscritto Vat. Lat. riprodotto in eliotipia," ed. E. Monaci, in Archivio paleografico italiano, Rome, 1890

F. Petrarca, L'originale del Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca. Codice vaticano latino 3195 riprodotto in fototipia a cura della Biblioteca Vaticana, ed. M. Vattasso, Milan, 1905

F. Petrarca, Petrarcha con doi commenti sopra li sonetti et canzone. El primo del ingeniossimo misser Francesco Philelpho. Laltro del sapientissimo misser Antonio da Tempo: Novamente addito. Ac etiam con lo commento del eximo misser Nicolo Peranzone: Ouero Riccio Machesiano sopra li Triunphi; con infinite noue et excellente expositione, Venice, 1503

F. Petrarca, Le rime di m. Francesco Petrarca estratte da un suo originale, a cura di F. Ubaldini, Rome, 1642

F. Petrarca, Le rime di Francesco Petrarca di su gli originali, commentate da Giosuè Carducci e Severino Ferrari, Florence, 1899

F. Petrarca, Le rime di Francesco Petrarca, restituite nell' ordine e nella lezione del testo originario sugli autografi col sussidio di altri codici e di stampe e corredate di varianti e note, da Giovanni Mestica, Florence, 1896

F. Petrarca, Le rime di Francesco Petrarca secondo la revisione ultima del poeta, a cura di Giuseppe Salvo Cozzo, Florence, 1904

F. Petrarca, Rime di Francesco Petrarca sopra argomenti storici, morali, e diversi; saggio di un testo e commento nuovo col raffronto dei migliori testi e di tutti è commenti, a cura di Giosuè Carducci, Livorno, 1876

F. Petrarca, Rime disperse di Francesco Petrarca o a lui attribute per la prima volta raccolte, a cura di Angelo Solerti, Florence, 1909

Petrarca e la Lombardia. Miscellanea di studi storici e ricerche critico-biografiche raccolte per cura della Società Storica Lombarda, etc., Milan, 1904

Petrarca a Venezia, Venice, 1874

E. Proto, "Del Petrarca e di alcuni suoi amici," in Giornale dantesco, XIV (1906), 243

E. Proto, "Francesco Petrarca. - Le rime di su gli originali, commentate da Giosuè Carducci e Severino Ferrari," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VII (1902), 139, 212

E. Proto, "Giovanni Melodia. - Studi sulle Rime del Petrarca," in Rassegna critica delle letteratura italiana, XV (1910), 225

E. Proto, "Laura e il bel tempo," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXIII (1911), No. 49

E. Proto, "Una nuova fonte petrarchesca," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VIII (1903), 112

N. Quarta, "A proposito delle relazioni del Petrarca con Cino da Pistoia," in Bullettino storico pistoiese, XI, N. 4

N. Quarta, "La casa e i giardini del Petrarca a Valchiusa," in Atti dell' Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti di Napoli, XXVI

N. Quarta, "La data di un viaggio del Petrarca," in Roma letteraria, I (1893), No. 21

N. Quarta, "I frammenti di rime nel codice vaticano 3196," in Il Rinascimento, IV (1899). And separately.

N. Quarta, Studi sul testo delle Rime del Petrarca, Naples, 1902

Z. Re, I biografi del Petrarca, Fermo, 1859

Z. Re, I ritratti di Laura, Fermo, 1857

R. Renier, "L'autografo del Canzoniere petrarchesca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, VII (1886), 463

Ricotti, Storia delle compagnie di ventura in Italia, Turin, 1845, II

C. Romussi, Petrarca a Milano (1353-1368); studi storici, Milan, 1874

D. Rossetti, Francisci Petrarchae poemata minora quae extant omnia nunc primum ad trutinam revocata et recensita, Milano, 1826-34, II, III

P. Rossi, "Simone Martini e il Petrarca," in Bullettino senese di storia patria, XI, 1, 2

V. Rossi, "Di un Colonna corrispondente del Petrarca," in Archivio della R. Società Romana di storia patria, XLIII (1920). Also separately, Rome, 1920

V. Rossi, "Il Petrarca a Pavia," in Bollettino della Società Pavese di storia patria, IV, fasc. III, Sept. 1904. And separately.

V. Rossi, "Il Petrarca minore e il falso Petrarca," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXI (1909), N. 7

R. Sabbadini, "Dal Virgilius Petrarcae dell'Ambrosiana," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLV (1905), 169

C. Salutati, Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati a cura di Francesco Novati, Rome, 1891-1911

E. Salvadori, "La vita politica di M. Francesco Petrarca," in L'Arcadia, II (1890-1891), Nos. 2-5, 11, 12

G. Salvo Cozzo, Il codice vaticano 3195 e l'edizione aldina del 1501; saggio di studj petrarcheschi, Rome, 1893

G. Salvo Cozzo, "N. Quarta. - Studi sul testo delle Rime del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLV (1905), 366

G. Salvo-Cozzo, "Le Rime sparse e il Trionfo dell' Eternità di Francesco Petrarca nei codici vaticani latini 3195 e 3196," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXX (1897), 369. And separately, Turin, 1897

C. Segré, Studi petrarcheschi, Florence, 1903

E. Sicardi, Gli amori estravaganti e molteplici di Francesco Petrarca e l'amore unico per Madonna Laura de Sade; con un' appendice, Milan, 1900

E. Sicardi, "Per il testo del Canzoniere del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, L (1907), 1; LI (1908), 94; LIII (1909), 41, 271; LV (1910), 33; LV (1910), 61; LVII (1911), 218

E. Sicardi, "Trans rivum. Per la corografia del Canzoniere," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XLVII (1907), 67

E. Stengel, "Rime di Francesco Petrarca ... Saggio ... a cura di Giosuè Carducci, Livorno, 1876," in Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, III (1879), 114

A. Tassoni, Considerazioni sopra le Rime del Petrarca, col confronto de' luoghi de' poeti antichi di varie lingue; aggiuntaui nel fine vna scelta dell' Annotazioni del Muzio ristrette, e parte eseminate, Modena, 1609

D. Ursmer Bellière, Un ami de Pétrarque, Louis Sanctus de Buringen, Rome, 1905

M. Vattasso, I codici petrarcheschi della Biblioteca Vaticana; seguono cinque appendici con testi inediti, poco conosciuti o mal pubblicati e due tavole doppie in fototipia, Rome, 1908

M. Vattasso, Del Petrarca e di alcuni suoi amici, Rome, 1904

B. Wiese, "G. A. Cesareo: Su l'ordinamento delle poesie volgari di Francesco Petrarca," in Zeitschrift für romanischer Philologie, XVII (1893), 324

Lord Woodhouselee, "An historical and critical essay on the life and character of Petrarch," Edinburgh, 1812

F. Wulff, "Deux discours sur Pétrarque," in Förhandlingar vid det VIe allmänna Nordiska Filologmötet i Upsala, 14-16, 1902. And separately, Upsala, 1902

F. A. Wulff, Le développement de la canzone, Amor, se vuoi, de Pétrarque, selon le MS. Vat. lat. 3196, fol. 12 recto, Lund, 1905

F. Wulff, "La Note sur le Virgile de l'Ambrosienna," in Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap utgifna af Nyfilologiska Sällskapet i Stockholm, II (1901)

F. Wulff, "Petrarch at Vaucluse," Lund, 1904

F. A. Wulff, "Préoccupations de Pétrarque, 1359-1369, attestées par Vat. lat. 3196, fol. 1 & 2," in Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N. F., Afd. 1, II, No. 4. And separately, Lund, 1907

F. A. Wulff, "Quelques ballatas de Pétrarque non admises dans les recueils de 1356 et de 1366," in Romanische Forschungen: Mélanges Chabaneau, XXIII (1907), 178

F. Wulff, "Trois sonnets de Pétrarque selon le ms. sur papier, Vat. 3196 (et une rectification)," in Från Filologiska, Föreningen i Lund. Språkliga uppsatser, II (1902)

L. Zanutto, Carlo IV di Lussemburgo e Francesco Petrarca a Udine nel 1368, per nozze Dalla Santa-Valsecchi

A. Zenatti, "Laura," in XX Luglio 1904. Numero Unico. Padova a Fr. Petrarca nel VI centenario della nascita, Padua, 1904, 11

N. Zingarelli, Un libro sul Canzoniere, 1889

B. Zumbini, "L'ascensione del Petrarca sul Ventoux," in Nuova Antologia, CXL (1895), 209, and in his Studi sul Petrarca, Florence, 1895

B. Zumbini, "Valchiusa," in Rassegna settimanale, 1° sem., 1879, 202

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF STUDIES UPON SINGLE POEMS IN PETRARCH'S CANZONIERE

Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggio di letterati esercizi de gli accademici Filergiti di Forlì, diviso in quattro parti; raccolti da Ottaviano Petrignani, segretario dell' Accademia, Forlì, 1699

Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggi de' letterati esercizj de' Filergiti di Forlì, libro secondo, raccolti da Ottavio Petrignani, segretario dell' Accademia, Forlì, 1714

B. Affini, "Sopra un sonetto del Petrarca," in Atti dell'Accademia degli Agiati di Rovereto, V (1888)

E. Aggarbati, Fr. Dionisio Roberti da Borgo S. Sepolcro e la canzone del Petrarca, O aspettata in ciel, Bologna, Parma, 1915

G. Albini, Nota petrarchesca, Imola, 1890

U. A. Amico, Note sul Petrarca, Palermo, 1898

A. F. Andreini, "lezione letta nell' Accademia Fiorentina l'anno 1617 sopra il sonetto del Petrarca che comincia: S'amor non è, che dunque è quel ch'io sento?" in (Dati, C. K.) Prose Fiorentine, 1751, II, iv, 83

C. Antona-Traversi, "Due interpretazioni petrarchesche," in Lettere e arti, II (1890), 18

E. Arnoni, Le opere di Francesco Petrarca, ad uso dei licei del regno; studio critico-storico-letterario, Rome-Milan, 1904

B. Averani, Dieci lezioni composte sopra il quarto sonetto della prima parte del Canzoniere del Petrarca, e recitate nell' Accademia della Crusca ...; all' illustrissimo signor Enrico Nevvtton inviato straordinario di S. M. della Gran Brettagne all' A. R. del Ser^mo G. D. di Toscana, e alla Ser^ma Repubblica di Genova, Ravenna, 1707

L. Balducci, "Obbiezioni al sonetto III del Petrarca," in Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggi de' letterati esercizj libro secondo, 1714, 555

G. Barone, "Su i versi 71-72 della canzone all' Italia del Petrarca," in Arte e morale, VI (1923), No. 6

A. Bertoldi, "L'ultima canzone di Francesco Petrarca," in Rivista d'Italia, XIII (1910), i, 521

S. Betti, Intorno alla canzone del Petrarca, La quale comincia Spirto gentil che quelle membra reggi, esposizione, Rome, 1854

S. Betti, "Intorno ad una famosa canzone del Petrarca, dialogo," in Giornale arcadico, N. S., XXXVI. And separately, Rome, 1864

S. Betti, "Tre dialoghi storico-critici," in Giornale arcadico, N. S., VIII (1858)

G. Bonifaccio, Lettione sopra vn sonetto del Petrarca del signor Giouanni Bonifaccio, l'Opportuno accademico Filarmonico, Rovigo, 1625

G. Bonifaccio, Lettione sopra vn sonetto del Petrarca, già fatta nell' Accademia de' Soleciti di Treuigi, Rovigo, 1623

L. Bonsi, Cinque lezzioni lette da lui publicamente nella Accademia Fiorentina. Aggiuntoui vn breue trattato della cometa. E nella fine vn sermone sopra l'Eucarestia da douersi recitare il giouedi santo del medesimo autore, Florence, 1560

A. Borgognoni, La canzone Spirto gentil ... (A chi meglio possa ella tenersi diretta, nuova interpretazione de' primi tre versi), Ravenna, 1881

A. Borgogni, (La canzone Spirto gentil), in Fanfulla del capitan Fracassa, No. 4, Jan. 26, 1885

G. Brizzolara, "I sonetti contro l'avara Babilonia e il Soldano del Petrarca," in Studi storici, VII (1898), 267, 317

M. Bufalini, "Sulla canzone del Petrarca Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Giornale dantesco, VII (1899), 385, 433

M. Buonarrati, the younger, "Lezione nell' Accademia della Crusca sopra 'l sonetto del Petrarca che comincia Amor, che nel pensier mio vive e regna," in (C. R. Dati), Prose fiorentine, 1751, II, iii, 48

G. Bustelli, Su la canzone del Petrarca all' Italia, considerazioni lette nel R. Liceo Spedalieri di Catania per la conferenza del giovedì 1 d'aprile 1869; aggiuntovi un corme latino di Vito Coco tradotto, Catania, 1869

A. Butti, "Nuova luce in una questioncella petrarchesca," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana," XV (1910), 97

A. Caffaro, "Alzando il dito nel Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXVI (1895), 457

S. Camerim, Esposizione delle due prime ballate e del sonetto do dicesimo del Petrarca, Pisa, 1837

P. Caponsacchi, Discorso intorno alla canzone del Petrarcha, Vergine bella, Florence, 1627

G. Carducci, "Archeologia poetica," in his Opere, 1908, XVIII

G. Carducci, "Lettera a Carlo Negroni," in G. B. Gelli, Lezioni petrarchesche, Bologna, 1884, 26

E. Carrara, "Italia mia," in La Cultura, III, 2, Dec. 15, 1923, 58

G. Casaregi, Bartolommeo, and others, Difera delle tre canzoni degli occhi e di alcuni sonetti, e vari passi delle Rime di Francesco Petrarca delle opposizioni del signor Lodovico Antonio Muratori, composta da Gio. Bartolommeo Casaregi, Gio. Tommasco Canevari, e Antonio Tommasi ... pastori arcadi, Lucca, 1709

(P. F. Cassini), "Canzone IX di Francesco Petrarca," in Fanfani, I (1881), 227, 248, 282, 296, 324

A. Cebà, Esserciti accademici, A Gian Battista Spinola di Giorgio, Genoa, 1621

A. Cerri, "Tre canzoni: un uomo e un poeta," in Dante, Alfieri, Petrarca; tre commemorazioni nell' Educatorio Whitaker in Palermo, Palermo, 1905

G. Cervoni, Sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, Amor, fortuna & la mia mente schiua, letto pubblicamente nell' Accademia Fiorentina, Florence, 1550

G. A. Cesareo, "Per la giusta collocazione di due sonetti," in Miscellanea di archeologia, storia e filologia, dedicata al Prof. Antonino Salinas nel xl anniversario del suo insegnamento accademico, Palermo, 1907, 340

G. A. Ceva, Lettione di Gio. Andrea Ceua, academico Suegliato, e Subito, da lui recitata nell' Accademia de' Suegliati in Pisa li 8. di maggio 1588, nel consolato dell' ecc.mo sig. Pietro Lupi, nella quale tolta occasione da vn sonetto del Petrarca, con dimostrazioni naturali si discorre dell' humana felicità, e de' mezi di conseguirla. al ... sig. Gio. Francesco Grimaldi da Ceua, Genoa, 1588

G. Chiabrera, Discorso sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, Se lamentare augelli o verdi fronde, Alessandria, 1626

A. Chioccola, Il cor ch'egli ebbe; F. Petrarca e la canzone Vergine bella, Naples, 1904

G. Chiosi, Saggio estetico pensieri e poesie varie, Cremona, 1828

V. Cian, Ancora dello Spirto gentil di messer Francesco Petrarca, nota, Turin, 1893

V. Cian, "Il Latin sangue gentile e Il furor di Lassù del Petrarca," in La Lettura, No. 7, July, 1905. And separately, Cividale, 1907

G. Cohn, "Zu Petrarcas Sonett Due rose," in Archiv für das Studium der neureren Sprachen, CXX (1908), 133, 176

P. Croci, "Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in La Lettura, XXI, no. 11, Nov. 1, 1921

T. M. Dall'Arme, "Riflessioni," in Accademia de'Filergiti di Forlì, Saggio di letterati esercizj, 1699, 81, 124

T. M. Dall' Arme, "Riflessioni," in Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggio di letterati esercizj, 1714, 614

A. D'Ancona, Dal mio carteggio, per festeggiar il dì natalizio xxvii marzo del Carlo nipotino che rinnova nel suo nome il vecchio nonno, Pisa, 1912

A. D'Ancona, "Del personaggio al quale è diretta la canzone del Petrarca Spirto gentil," in his Studi di critica e storia letteraria, Bologna, 1880

S. De la Barba, Nuoua spositione del sonetto che comincia In nobil sangue vita e' queta, ne la quale si dichiara qual sia stata la vera nobiltà di Madonna Laura, Florence, 1553

U. De Domo, Discorso nel quale si espone la vigesima seconda canzone del Petrarcha, secondo il suo vero sentimento, contro le varie opinioni de gli altri. All' illustriss. & reuerendiss. sig. Cinthio Aldobrini, cardinale San Giorgio, Perugia, 1603

I. Del Lungo, "Il papa soldano," in U. Hoepli, Dai tempi antichi ai tempi moderni: Da Dante al Leopardi, Milan, (1904), 227

F. De' Vieri, "Lezione sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, In qual parte del cielo," in Prose fiorentine, 1751, II, i, 84

A. Dispenza, "Sulla data della canzone Italia mia del Petrarca," in Rassegna Pugliese, XXII (1905), 221

G. Dobschall, "Zu Petrarcas Sonett Era 'l giorno ch'al sol si scoloraro," in Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen, CIII (1899), 335

L. Dolce, Dialogo nel quale si ragiona delle qualità, diversità e proprietà de i colori, Venice, 1565

F. D'Ovidio, (La canzone Spirto gentil), in Fanfulla del capitan Fracassa, No. 5, Feb. 2, 1885

F. D'Ovidio, (La canzone Spirto gentil), in Fanfulla della domenica, May 2, 1886

F. D'Ovidio, "Sulla canzone Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Nuova Antologia, XCVII (1888), 243

S. Erizzo, Espositione nelle tre canzoni di M. Francesco Petrarca, chiamate le tre sorelle. Nuouamente mandata in luce da M. Lodouico Dolce, Venice, 1661

Espositione dell' Inquieto accademico Pensoso, sopra 'l sonetto di M. Francesco Petrarca, Padre del ciel, dopo i perduti giorni, Milan, 1566

N. Fabri, "La canzone Spirto gentil di Francesco Petrarca," in Cesare Cantù, I, 33

P. Fedele, Aspetti di Roma nel Trecento, Rome, 1923

A. Foratti, "I sonetti del Petrarca per il pittore di Laura," in La Rassegna, XXVIII (1920), Nos. 1-2, 33

A. Foresti, "Due postille alla canzone del Petrarca, Una donna più bella assai che 'l sole," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LXXXIII (1924), 217

A. Foresti, "Due sonetti di F. P. al card. Giovanni Colonna," in Rivista d'Italia, XXIV (1921), ii, 403

A. Foresti, "Un saluto e un sospiro di Francesco Petrarca alla Certosa di Montrieu," in Emporium, XLVIII (1918), 21

L. Franceschi, "Lezione nell' Accademia della Crusca sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, che comincia Lasso, ch'i' ardo, et altri non me crede," in Prose fiorentine, 1751, II, iii, 63

M. Funai, "Nota petrarchesca," in Lettere ed arte, II (1890), 58

L. Fùrnari, La canzone Italia mia di F. Petrarca comentata da Luigi Fùrnari, Reggio di Calabria, 1893

L. Fùrnari, Le canzoni, I. Chiare, fresche ... II. Vergine bella ... III. Italia mia ... IV. Nella stagion che'l ciel ... di Francesco Petrarca, con commento e studi critici di Luigi Fùrnari, Reggio di Calabria, 1895

T. Gabrini, Commento sopra il poemetto Spirto gentil che il Petrarca indrizzò a Nicola di Lorenzo, tribuno e poi senatore di Roma, colla interpretazione della lapide che l'istesso Nicola fece apporre al torrione di Ponte Rotto ivi ancora esistente; opera del P. Tommaso Gabrini dei Chierici Regolari Minori, Rome, 1807

P. Garelli, Una canzone di Francesco Petrarca, con l'esposizione, dedicata ai Chiarissimi e nobili miei contemporanei, Florence, 1858

P. Garelli, Un sonetto di Francesco Petrarca, con l'esposizione, Florence, 1858

P. Garelli, Un sonetto di Francesco Petrarca, con l'esposizione, dedicata alla nobilissima città di Pistoia, Florence, 1858

P. Garelli, Tre sonetti di Francesco Petrarca con l'esposizione, al nostro illustre contemporaneo filosofo, Florence, 1859

G. B. Gelli, Il Gello accademico fiorentino sopra que' due sonetti del Petrarcha che lodano il ritratto della sua Laura, Florence, 1549

G. B. Gelli, Il Gello sopra Donna mi viene spesso nella mente di M. F. Petrarca, Florence, 1549

G. B. Gelli, Il Gello sopra vn sonetto di M. Franc. Petrarca, Florence, 1549

G. B. Gelli, Lettioni fatte nella Accademia Fiorentina sopra varij luoghi di Dante e del Petrarca, Florence, 1555

G. B. Gelli, Lezioni petrarchesche raccolte per cura di Carlo Negroni, con una lettera di S. Carlo Borromeo e una di Giosuè Carducci, Bologna, 1884

G. B. Gelli, "Lezione sopra due sonetti del Petrarca letta nell' Accademia Fiorentina il dì 29. di Maggio 1549, nel consolato di Francesco d'Ambra," in Prose fiorentine, 1751, V, iii, 15

G. B. Gelli, Tutte le lettioni di Giovan Battista Gelli, fatte da lui nella Accademia Fiorentina, Florence, 1551

A. Gentille, Chiare, fresche e dolci acque, una canzone del Petrarca commentata, Trieste, 1904

I. Giacomelli, D'un luogo non bene osservato nella canzone XIV di Francesco Petrarca, Piacenza, 1899

L. Giacomini, "Lezione sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, che comincia Quand' io son tutto volto in quella parte, etc.," in Prose fiorentine, 1751, II, iii, 113

L. Giacomini, "Lezione sopra il sonetto VII del Petrarca," in Opusculi inediti di autori toscani, Florence, 1837, I

L. Giacomini, Lezione sopra un sonetto del Petrarca, Florence, 1806

G. Gibelli, Considerazioni sopra un sonetto del Petrarca, Bologna, 1846

G. Gibelli, Considerazioni sopra un sonetto del Petrarca, Bologna, 1849

G. Gibelli, "Considerazioni sopra una sentenza del Petrarca," in L'Eccitamento, I (1858), 376

G. Gibelli, Considerazioni sopra un sonetto del Petrarca, Bologna

F. Giuntini, Discorso sopra il tempo dello innamoramento del Petrarca, con la spositione del sonetto Già fiammegiaua l'amorosa stella; alli ... academici fiorentini, Lyons, 1567

C. Gratzer, "Cola di Rienzo," in Miscelanea di studi in onore di Attilio Hortis, Trieste, maggio MCMIX, Trieste, 1910, II, 727

A. F. Grazzini, Lezione sopra un sonetto del Petrarca di Anton Francesco Grazzini, detto il Lasca, Castelvetrano, 1898

H. Hauvette, "La date de la canzone de Pétrarque I' vo pensando," in Études italiennes, III (1921), No. 2

H. Hauvette, "Sur un quatrain géographique de Pétrarque," in Bulletin italien, II (1902), 177

R. Jorio, La canzone Italia mia del Petrarca; della sua data e breve commento, Bologna, 1912

F. Labruzzi di Nexima, "I pretendenti alla canzone Spirto gentil," in L'Istruzione, IV (1890), No. 6; V (1892), No. 8

F. Iapini, Letione nella quale si ragiona in vniuersale del fine della poesia sopra il sonetto di M. Francesco Petrarca, Lasciato hai morte senza sole il mondo, letta priuatamente nella Academia Fiorentina nel consolato del magnifico M. Iacopo Pitti, Al reuerendiss. monsignore Antonio Altouito degniss. arciuescouo di Fiorenza, Florence, 1567

G. Levi, "Un sonetto del Petrarca," in his Studi estetici, Città di Castello, 1907, 107

A. Lisoni, A chi è indirizzata la canzone del Petrarca: O aspettata in ciel beata e bella; nuova proposta, Parma, 1895

G. Livini, Lezione sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, Conobbi quanto il ciel, ec., per la prima volta pubblicata, Venice, 1830

G. A. Lottini, Esposizione intorno alla canzone del Petrarca Verg. bella, doue per molti nuoui e con eleganza distesi concetti possono gli studiosi hauere di scelte intelligenze non poco lume e diletto; con la tauola delle cose piu notabili che nell' opera si contengono, Venice, 1595

G. Lumbroso, "Come lo Spirto gentil non possa essere Cola di Rienzo," in Rivista di Roma, XI, 3

F. Macry-Correale, La canzone del Petrarca Spirto gentil (Saggio di un nuovo commento), Siena, 1890

N. Maldeuti, "Obbiezioni al sonetto 109 del Petrarca," in Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggio de' letterati esercizj, libro secondo, 1714, 531

G. Malvezzi, Considerazioni sopra un sonetto del Petrarca, Bologna, 1852

F. Marletta, Il bacio a Madonna laura; noterella petrarchesca, Catania, 1911

L. Marsili, Canzone di Francesco Petrarca, col comento inedito di Luigi de' Marsili, Lucca, 1868

L. Marsili, Comento a una canzone di Francesco Petrarca per Luigi de' Marsili, Bologna, 1863

G. Mazzoni, "Due sonetti e una canzone del Petrarca," in Rivista d'Italia, VII (1904), ii, 68

G. Ménage, Historia mulierum philosopharum. Scriptore Ægidio Menagio. Accedit ejusdem commentarius Italicus in VII sonettum Francisci Petrarcha, à re non alienus, London, 1690

G. Ménage, "Lezione sopra 'l sonetto ... La gola e 'l sonno," in his Mescolanze d'Egidio Menagio, Rotterdam, 1692, 276

G. Ménage, "Sposizione di quel verso del Petrarca, Forse (o che spero) il mio tardar le duole," in his Mescolanze d' Egidio Ménage, Rotterdam, 1692, 3

G. Merlini, "Censura al sonetto 14 del Petrarca," in Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggio di letterati esercizj, 1699, 98

G. Mestica, "Il bacio a Madonna Laura," in Nuova Antologia, Ser. III, XXXVIII (CXXII, 1892), 496

G. Mestica, "Il più giovanile dei sonetti del Petrarca e il suo primo innamoramento," in Fanfulla della domenica, X (1888), No. 21. And separately, Rome, 1888

S. Moresino, Commento utilissimo sopra la canzone di M. Francesco Petrarcha, Mai non vo' piu cantar com' io soleva, Con gratia e privilegio, Milan, 1559

M. Morici, "Francesco Petrarca e Giovanni Colonna di S. Vito (a proposito del son. VII del Canzoniere: La gola e il sonno e l'oziose piume)," in Giornale dantesco, VII, 1899, 236

I. Mortillara, "Sul personaggio a cui è diretta la canzone del Petrarca Spirto gentil," in her Studii di critica letteraria, Palermo, 1910, 17

L. A. Muratori, Della perfetta poesia italiana, spiegata e dimostrata con varie osservazioni, Modena, 1706

L. Muzzi, Epistola contenente la nuova esposizione di un luogo del Petrarca e di alcuni di Dante, Bologna, 1825

L. Muzzi, Sopra un luogo del Petrarca e per incidenza sulla proposta del sig. cav. Vincenzio Monti, lettera, Bologna, 1823

L. Muzzi, Sopra un luogo del Petrarca nella canzone a nostra Donna, lettera di Luigi Muzzi, Bologna, 1823

U. Nottola, "Una parola ancora sulla canzone Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in L'Istruzione, VII (1893), 121

G. B. Orsi, "Censura al sonetto 78 del Petrarca," in Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggio di letterati esercizj, 1699, 111

P. Orsilago, La settima lettione sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, Passa la naue mia colma d'oblio, Florence, 1549

F. Pasqualigo, "Il sonetto del Petrarca, Amor ch'incende il cor d'ardente zelo," in L'opinione letteraria, I (1881), No. 9

F. Pasqualigo, "le visioni del Petrarca nella canzone Standomi un giorno confrontate coi Trionfi dello stesso," in La Cultura, Nov.-Dec., 1886. Also separately, Rome, 1887

F. Pasqualigo, "Quistioncella petrarchesca," in Il Boretti, XIII (1881), 19

F. Patritio, Di M. Francesco Patritio, La città felice; del medesimo, Dialogo dell' honore, Il Boriguano; del medesimo, Discorso delle diuersità de' furori poetici; Lettura sopra il sonetto del Petrarca, La gola e 'l sonno, e l'ociose piume, Venice, 1553

M. Pelaez, "Di una recente interpretazione petrarchesca," in Rassegna bibliografica della letteratura italiana, VI (1898), 311

A. Pellizari, "Un sonetto di F. Petrarca e uno di L. Camoens," in A Vittoria Cian i suoi scolari dell' Università di Pisa, 1900-1908, Pisa, 1909, 45

L. Piazza, "Riflessioni sopra il sonetto 110 del Petrarca," in Accademia de' Filergiti di Forlì, Saggi de' letterati esercizj, libro secondo, 1714, 542

L. Piccioni, "Per l'interpretation di un passo della canzone petrarchesca Ai signori d'Italia," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LXXXII (1923), fasc. 1-2, 223

L. Pieretti, "Cola di Rienzo e Bosone da Gubbio," in Rassegna italiana, Sept.-Oct., 1885

L. Pieretti, Nuova interpretazione di alcuni passi oscuri del Canzoniere di Francesco Petrarca, Ariano, 1889

L. Pieretti, "Sopra due luoghi della canzone 'Chiare, fresche e dolci acque,'" in La Biblioteca della scuole italiane, IV (1891), 24

O. Pio, Una canzone del Petrarca, Bologna, 1893

M. G. Ponta, "Interpretazione dell' addiettivo vivo e morto in alcuni versi del Petrarca e di Dante," in Giornale arcadico, CII (1845), 252

M. Porena, "Controreplica," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VII (1902), 39

M. Porena, "Per l'interpretazione del sonetto petrarchesco 'Anima bella,'" in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, V (1900), 202

M. Porena, "Replica," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VI (1901), 214

E. Proto, "Li angeli eletti ..." in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXII (1910), Nos. 45, 46

E. Proto, "Della canzone Qual più diversa e nova di F. Petrarca," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXII (1910), No. 14

E. Proto, "Note petrarchesche: La sestina Anzi tre dì creata era alma in parte," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXIV (1912), Nos. 20, 21

E. Proto, "Note petrarchesche: Solo e pensoso i più deserti campi," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXXIII (1911), No. 39

E. Proto, "Per la data della canzone Italia mia del Petrarca (a proposito di un recenti pubblicazione)," in Giornale dantesco, XIV (1906), 168

E. Proto, "Per un madrigale del Petrarca," in Rassegna crigica della letteratura italiana, XVI (1911), 97

E. Proto, "Il sonetto Una candida cerva di F. Petrarca," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XXVIII (1923), 129

N. Quarta, "Gentil ramo," in Rassegna pugliese, 1899

N. Quarta, Nuova interpretazione della canzone del Petrarca, Chiare, fresche, dolci acque, Naples, 1894

N. Quarta, Per la canzone delle bell' acque, Naples, 1898

N. Quarta, "Per una nuova interpretazione della canzone Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Giornale dantesco, XV (1907), 15

N. Quarta, "Per un sonetto del Petrarca," in Rinascimento, I, Nos. 6-7

Z. Re, "Comento sulla canzone Spirto gentil che quelle membra reggi," in his Vita di Cola di Rienzo, 1828, 357, and 1854, 301

F. S. Regnier-Desmarais, "Lezione intorno al terzo sonetto del Petrarca, Era il giorno ch'al sol si scoloravo," in his Poesie toscane del signor abate Regnier Desmarais; Poesias castelanas del mismo; Carmina Latina ejusdem, Paris, 1706, 58

A. Rinuccini, Quattro lezzioni lette publicamente da lui nell' Accademia Fiorentina, Florence, 1561

G. Rua, "Antica rivista imbastita sopra un sonetto del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXXV (1900), 354

V. Russo, "L'ispirazione della canzone Ad A. Mai," in his Note di letteratura ed arte, 1910, 3

L. Salviati, Cinque lezzioni, cioè due della speranza, una della felicità, e l'altre due sopra varie materie, e tutte lette nell' Accademia Fiorentina, con l'occasione del sonetto del Petrarca, Poi che voi & io più volte habbiam provato, Florence, 1575

A. M. Salvini, Prose toscane ... recitate nella detta Accademia; all' altezza reale del serenissimo Gio. Gastone gran principe di Toscana, Florence, 1715

M. Schevillo, "Un'ultima difesa di Cola di Rienzo (a proposito della canzone Spirto gentil)," in his Quattro saggi di critica letteraria, Naples, 1887

E. Sicardi, "Alla ricerca dell' 'amorosa reggia' del Petrarca," in Rivista d' Italia, V (1902), 54

E. Sicardo, "Ancora l'Alzando il dito (canzone ai grandi d'Italia) del Petrarca," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXIX (1897), 208

E. Sicardi, "Ancora della Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXXII (1898), 457

E. Sicardi, "Ancora per il son. del Petrarca Anima bella," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VI (1901), 204

E. Sicardi, "Attorno a Petrarca e a Laura," in Rivista d'Italia, III (1900), iii, 283

E. Sicardi, "Cortesia galanti e amorose imprese della prima giovinezza di F. Petrarca," in Rivista d'Italia, X (1907), i, 65. And separately, Rome, 1907

E. Sicardi, "Dell' 'angelico seno' e di altri luoghi controversi nella canzone del Petrarca Chiare, fresche e dolci acque," in Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, XXX (1897), 227

E. Sicardi, "Noterella petrarchesca," in Rassegna nazionale, Feb. 16, 1902, 652. And separately, Florence, 1902

E. Sicardi, "Per un' abrasione del Vat. lat. 3195, e per la giusta collocazione di due sonetti del Petrarca," in Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, XLIII (1907-08). And separately, Turin, 1908

E. Sicardi, "Per finirla (replica alla replica)," in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, VII (1902), 18

E. Sicardi, "Per la sincerità artistica del Petrarca," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXVII (1905), Nos. 8, 12

E. Sicardi, Le 'simil indi accese luci' di Madonna Laura, Palermo, 1907

E. Sicardi, "Il sonetto di Petrarca a Giacomo Colonna," in Fanfulla della domenica, XXIV, 13 (July 6, 1902)

B. Sorio, "Correzioni da fare al testo del Canzoniere di messer Francesco Petrarca pubblicato dal prof. Antonio Marsand, proposte dal P. Bartolomeo Sorio," in Foglio di Verona, 1844-45. And separately, Verona, n. d.

B. Sorio, Estratto dalla Rivista ginnasiale, fasc. I, 1855, Milan, 1855

B. Sorio, "Lezione accademica sopra la canzone del Petrarca Verdi panni sanguigni," in Foglio di Verona, 1844(?), 131

B. Sorio, Lezione critica sopra due passi della canzone del Petrarca Standomi un giorno solo alla finestra, Verona, 1846

D. Spada, L'amore del Petrarca (studio psicologico sul Canzoniere), e La canzone 'Chiare, fresche e dolci acque' (commento estetico e letterario), Faenza, 1906

C. Steiner, "La fede nell' Impero e il concetto della patria italiana nel Petrarca," in Giornale dantesco, XIV (1906), 8. Appendix on Italia mia, 32

C. Steiner, "Per la data della canzone Italia mia," in Padova in onore di Francesco Petrarca, MCMIV, Padua, 1909, II, 93

A. Tambellini, Il veltro, lo spirto gentil, il redentore, Rimini, 1893

N. Tommaseo, Studi critici, Venice, 1843

F. Torraca, "Cola di Rienzo e la canzone 'Spirto gentil' di Francesco Petrarca (osservazioni vecchie e nuove)," in Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia patria, VIII (1885), and in his Discussioni e ricerche letterarie, Leghorn, 1888. And separately, Rome, 1885

F. Torraca, "Su la canzone Italia mia di Francesco Petrarca," in Atti della Regia Accademia d'archeologia di Napoli, VII (1918), in Rassegna critica della letteratura italiana, XXIII, 18, and in his Studi di storia letteraria, Florence, 1923

B. Varchi, "Lezione sopra il sonetto del Petrarca La gola, il sonno, e l'oziose piume, detta nell' Accademia Fiorentina il dì 15 aprile 1541. - Lezione sopra i sonetti XXXIII, XXXIIII e XXXV di M. Francesco Petrarca, letta nell' Accademia Fiorentina il dì 20 aprile 1543," in Prose fiorentine, 1751, II, v, 1

B. Varchi, Opere, per ora la prima volta raccolte, con un discorso di A. Racheli intorno alla filologia del secolo XVI, e alla vita e agli scritti dell' autore. Aggiuntevi le lettere di Gio. Battista Busini sopra l'assedio di Firenze, Trieste, 1858-59, II, 439

E. Ventura, "Il giovenile errore di Petrarca," in Treviso nel sesto centenario da la nascita di Francesco Petrarca, Treviso, 1904

B. Veratti, "Di due neglette poesie del Petrarca," in Opuscoli religiosi, letterarj e morali, Ser. II, XII (1868), 286

E. Verga, "Impressioni petrarchesche: Il Trionfo della Divinità e la canzone Vergine bella," in Emporio pittoresco, XXV (1888), 269, 278

S. Volpicella, Sopra la canzone del Petrarca Gentil mia donna, ec., lezioni due, Naples, 1841

F. A. Wulff, "L'amorosa reggia del Petrarca," in Rivista d'Italia, III (1901), iii, 259

F. A. Wulff, "La canzone Che debb' io far? selon les manuscrits autographes de Pétrarque (Vat. lat. 3196 & 3195)," in Lund University, Årsskrift, XXXVIII (1901), Afd. I, 1

F. A. Wulff, "Les premières ébauches de Pétrarque après le 19 mai 1348," in Romania, XXXI (1902), 384

F. A. Wulff, "Petrarcas första redaktion af canz. Che debb'io far?" in Uppsater i romansk tillägnade P. A. Geijer, Upsala, 1901, 141

F. A. Wulff, "Pon freno al gran dolor che ti trasporta; une strophe travaillée de Pétrarque dans le MS. Vat. 3196, fol. 13 et 12," in Sartryck ur Nyfilologiska Sällskapets i Stockholm publikation, 1905, Studier i modern sprakvelenskap, III, 2. And separately, Upsala, 1905

F. A. Wulff, "Trois sonnets de Pétrarque selon le MS. sur papier, Vat. 3196 (et une rectification)," in Från Filologiska Föreningen i Lund. Språkliga uppsatser, II (1902), 1. And separately, Lund, 1902

E. Zincone, "Spirto gentil," in Dai tempi antichi ai tempi moderni, Milan, 1904, 235