

*Evidence for Early Tuscanisation in the commercial letters of the Milanese Merchant Giovannino Da Dugnano (?–1398) in the Datini Archive in Prato**

1. INTRODUCTION

Tuscanisation is taken here in a broad sense to refer to the presence of Tuscan elements in writing outside of Tuscany. The earliest time this has been suggested for Milan is during the late Quattrocento, when Tuscan became a model for the chancery, well before Bembo's codification of Tuscan (Vitale 1953, 36; Vitale 1988).¹ Acquaintance with Tuscan during the 14th and 15th centuries was advanced not only through the reading of the Three Crowns, an increased mobility of poets, notaries, *podestà*, judges and ambassadors, but also through the geographical mobility of merchants who brought different vernaculars into contact through their frequent correspondence. This paper will offer evidence that a similar process of Tuscanisation was occurring, a century earlier, in a corpus of merchant letters sent from Milan during the late Trecento. At first sight, the letters from the Milanese merchant Giovannino da Dugnano (?–1398) to employees of Francesco di Marco Datini of Prato seem to show a significant degree of Tuscanisation.

First, I give a brief background of the linguistic make-up of Lombardy in the Tre- and Quattrocento and the presence of Tuscan there, then move briefly to Giovannino da Dugnano. The final part of this paper looks at some Tuscan(ised or -ising) elements in the orthography and morphology of the language of his letters.

2. THE LANGUAGE SITUATION IN LOMBARDY FROM THE TRE TO THE QUATTROCENTO²

The linguistic make-up of Lombardy at the beginning of the Trecento was a picture of fragmentation with every *comune* having its own local, municipal *scripta*. In the following two centuries, the rapid expansion of certain centres of power with new political structures, such as courts and chanceries, led to the formation of a pan-Lombard, supra-regional language or what has been called a "koinè letteraria" or "semi-letteraria" (Vitale 1953, 36).³ The question of how to characterize the northern koinai dates back at least to Mussafia who described it as a "way of speaking (*un parlare*) that was not without refinement (*coltura*), with no few Latin reminiscences, with a large number of those elegancies that were not exclusively Tuscan nor Provençal nor

French, which in the Middle Ages arrived at a literary development" (Mussafia 229). Bongrani and Morgana prefer to speak of multiple koinai, calling them "instruments endowed with a wider validity and diffusion than those of the old municipal vernaculars" (1992, 96). Due to a lack of documents from the Trecento in Lombardy, and from Milan especially, these two authors highlight the difficulty in tracing the histories of particular centres, but nevertheless canvass the evidence available from Mantua, Milan and Cremona. On the other hand, Stella's approach ("Lombardia") is to survey the available documents from major Lombard cities such as Cremona, Mantua, Milan, Brescia, Bergamo, and Pavia.⁴ The most locally marked dialectal features of the vernaculars were progressively abandoned during the Tre- and Quattrocento in favour of linguistic forms common to Lombardy. Vitale explains that the koinè was itself a fragmented language, with much internal variation, and tending towards "a literary and Latinizing mixture" (1953, 36) and thus acquired a non-local, unprovincial nature.⁵ Texts which present some of the earliest features of pan-Lombard are the *gride gonzaghesche* from Mantua, dated 1374. In comparing the language of the *gride* to that of Vivaldo Belcalzer (a notary from Mantua writing sometime in the early 14th century), Bongrani and Morgana (1994, 117–118) identify elements such as the restoration of word-final vowels, the use of the masculine definite article 'li', the use of 'li' for the feminine definite article and the use of *-i* as a desinence for feminine plural nouns (alternating with *-e*), as typical traits of the evolving koinè language in the *gride*. In describing this 'official language', they note that, when compared to Belcalzer's prose, the most obvious dialect features are, in general, not present in the *gride* and have disappeared. What is more, Ghinassi ("Nuovi studi" 75, 79) describes the vernacular of Belcalzer's prose as "homogeneous, regular, and without any particular uncertainties or oscillations" and characterises a series of documents from Mantua from the Tre- and Quattrocento as beginning to "be inserted into the most complex inter-regional traditions which were being created in the Po Plain." The highest evolved form of the koinè, however, appears in the late Quattrocento, when the language becomes diatopically 'neutral' and difficult to ascribe to any one single geographical area simply based on linguistic factors (Bongrani and Morgana 1992, 92).⁶ While most studies stress that inherent variety and lack of cohesion are primary features of the koinè for the entire north, Maraschio's results from a heterogeneous corpus of diaries and letters from astrologers, doctors and engineers of the Duke of Mantua as well as armourers and embroiderers present a significant degree of homogeneity of forms.⁷ Referring specifically to the koinai of the Italian chancery, Ghinassi pointed out that the question of "how these koinai formed, what their points of departure were, the roads they took and their areas of diffusion are

questions that are still open and which do not have an easy solution" ("Il volgare mantovano" 14).⁸ In short, the main linguistic process which Lombardy underwent during the Trecento and Quattrocento was an evolution from "linguistic municipalism" to "supra-municipal formations" (Bongrani and Morgana 1992, 92) or to a koinè language.⁹

This process of mutual adjustment of neighbouring vernaculars would continue up until Ariosto's linguistic conversion to the norm defined by Bembo in the early Cinquecento (Vitale 1953, 37).¹⁰

3. TUSCANISATION

Vitale (1953, 16–17) noted that the first document in vernacular in the Milanese chancery appeared in 1426 and that use of Latin in chancery documents continued to decrease during the entire Quattrocento. In the second half of the Quattrocento, the vernacular acquired "absolute predominance." He notes that, for the Milanese chancery, the influence from literary Tuscan occurred late in the century and was imposed with growing confidence from decade to decade onto the already hybrid language of the chancery (1953, 41). Tuscan "fought" against the strong resistance of local, instinctive and habitual forms in the consciousness of writers. Stella ("Lombardia" 199) suggests that the "termine *a quo* di non ritorno verso Firenze" can be dated July 1489 when Ludovico il Moro asked Landino to translate Giovanni Simonetta's *Commentari* on Francesco Sforza's *gesta* into Florentine, thus spurning the Lombard humanists. In literary circles, knowledge of Tuscan in Lombardy during the late Trecento and Quattrocento appears to have been extensive. Bongrani and Morgana (1992, 98) note that, from the second half of the Trecento onwards, "alongside Latin and the local and regional vernacular, Tuscan entered in a stable way to form that composite and hybrid poetic language which would find fortune in the Lombard courts, and in all the north," citing the studies by Rajna and Migliorini on the *canzone* "Prima che 'l ferro" by Antonio da Ferrara who had been present in Milan during the Trecento.¹¹ Stussi ("La prima espansione del toscano" 14) has noted that, for literature, "the expansion of Tuscan in Ferrara, Milan, Padova, Treviso, and to a lesser degree Venice, is especially linked to the name of Dante" and that "despite the undoubted expansion of Tuscan, there was no scrupulous or general adaptation to Tuscan in any region (...) the competition of local linguistic traditions is very strong for the entire Trecento."¹² He describes Tuscanisation as "the consequence of the spread of poetic, mainly lyrical, models" and that, beneath the literary level, an extension of the use of vernacular occurred in both statutes and merchant correspondence (13).¹³ Ghinassi ("Incontri tra toscano" 86) pointed out that, even by looking at certain historical-cultural situations, the spread of Tuscan "occurred, not as an eruption *in vacuum* or as a radical substitution, without remnants, of a new system to the old

local systems [referring to *scriptae*], but rather that as a penetration which developed in a slow and gradual way." In discussing the system of infinitives used by a copyist of Bonvesin da la Riva's *Vita di Sant' Alessio* during the late Trecento, Wilhelm (20) points out that "different tendencies (*spinte*) are used here and are in contrast, in part coming from the dialect and from Latin, from the incipient regional koinè and, in part, already from literary Tuscan." Ghinassi ("Il volgare montovano" 17) describes Tuscan literature making its "first appearances" in Mantua in the early Quattrocento, describing these as "timid and mixed with indigenous elements, and then, as time went on, more open and natural," referring to the presence of Tuscan books present in the Gonzaga inventory of 1407. Bruttini reminds us of the important (but by no means absolute) distinction between the use of Tuscan in literary and non-literary texts during the Trecento when he writes that "the reasons why the Florentine vernacular was imposed are different and are not only of a literary nature such as the writings of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. It should be maintained that in the late Middle Ages and Renaissance, Tuscan must have been the commercial *lingua franca*" (4, quoted in Sosnowski 18). Inventories of printed books show the large demand for Tuscan works during this period, and there is evidence that Milanese aristocrats had copies of works by Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio.¹⁴

For non-literary texts, Vitale's studies are among the few I have found which consider Tuscanisation for Lombardy. Citing Vitale, Sgrilli notes that "only in the 1400s did Tuscan insinuate itself into writing of a practical nature" (450–1), referring specifically to Lombardy.¹⁵ Also, Bruni has highlighted how the religious *Disciplinati* movement helped to spread a "supra-regional language with a Tuscan base" in Piedmont, describing the language in the letters from Stefana Quinzani and Laura Mignani from Brescia as a "more or less obviously northern koinè" (17–19). For Mantua, Borgogno ("Saggio sulle consonanti" 36) has noted the presence of Ludovico degli Uberti, a Florentine in the service of Francesco Gonzaga, whose language is "singularly mixed with Tuscan elements and northern elements."¹⁶

Evidence for an earlier dating of Tuscanisation in non-literary Lombard vernacular may be found in the commercial letters sent from Milan between 1380 and 1407 to Tuscan merchants working for the Datini company.¹⁷ These letters would therefore pre-date the first recorded use of Tuscan in histories of the vernacular in Lombardy by a significant period of time.

Francesco di Marco Datini (c.1335–1410), the "merchant of Prato," moved to Avignon in the south of France at 15 years of age and soon after began trading in arms and armour, eventually founding trading warehouses (*fondachi*) in Prato, Avignon, Florence, Pisa, Genoa, Barcelona, Valencia and the Balearic Islands.¹⁸ On his return to Prato

from Avignon in December 1382, he stopped for a week in Milan to gather supplies for his onward journey and to establish trade agreements with fellow merchants. The main trading partner Datini gained was the Pescina family, but Datini and his associates would finally carry on direct correspondence with at least another four merchants from Milan itself or nearby, as well as from the main trading areas all over Lombardy.¹⁹

In total, there are over 810 letters from Milan in the Datini Archive. Of these, 526 were written by Datini's *soci* and *fattori*, all Tuscan, (who travelled to Milan on business errands and to meet with their Milanese correspondents) and are thus in Tuscan. Of the remaining 284 letters, 70 were written by other Tuscans or merchants from a Tuscan family or by merchants whose provenance I have been unable to establish, nine pieces of correspondence are not letters, four are in Latin and one letter was sent by an anonymous merchant. Out of the remaining 200 letters, there are six from one of Datini's main Milanese correspondents, Giovannino da Dugnano.²⁰

4. GIOVANNINO DA DUGNANO

The six letters from Giovannino da Dugnano were all written between January and March 1398. They were all sent from Milan to *Francesco Datini e compagnia* in Genoa and the handwriting of all six letters appears to be the same. Little is known about the details of Giovannino's life. With regards to his provenance, we can be sure that he was from or near Milan since another merchant from Milan, Giovanni da Pessano, who was in correspondence with both Giovannino da Dugnano as well as the Datini network, calls Giovannino a "*bon merchadante di questa terra*," in a letter from 1398 (letter 691 in Frangioni 495–96) and Melis indeed describes him as Milanese (172).

Giovannino's name is mentioned in a letter written by Francesco Sforza to the *podestà* of Milan, where he is again described as Milanese.²¹ The index in Santoro includes 11 merchants with the surname (*de*) *Dugnano*, none of whom have the first name *Giovanni* nor *Giovannino*. Mainoni (*Mercanti lombardi* 60–62) notes that Giovannino da Dugnano and Marco Serraineri went into business in Catalonia (*so-tietas Catelloigne*) circa 1395 and that they are "*due mercanti di Milano*" and in an earlier work she specifies that Marco was originally from Monza but later gained Milanese citizenship ("*Un mercante milanese*" 333).²² The partnership between Giovannino and Marco lasted only a brief time due to constant theft and shipwrecks, but they had employed a factor in Avignon, Gervaso Mantegazza, and Marco's brother, Aliprando, had gone to Valencia to trade on Giovannino and Marco's behalf.²³ Their company was liquidated in 1398, also the year of Giovannino's death.

It is with this business and the trafficking of some hides from Valencia to Genoa that Giovannino's letters are concerned. Giovannino writes to inform the Datini company in Genoa that both he and *Marcho Serraynio* have some animal hides (*PELLI*) from Valencia which they would like to divide equally in two parts. Giovannino asks the Datini company to inform him how many hides will be his and whether Datini's partners would sell them on his behalf. Giovannino writes that he has a dear friend who would like to go to Valencia and asks advice on whether now is a good time to leave or whether it is better to wait. He confirms that he has received a letter back from the Datini company and that there is a Castillian ship going to Barcelona or Valencia but Giovannino replies that that is too soon for his friend to get to Genoa. He confirms that the Datini company has informed him there are boats every day. In the end, the hides are sent to Quaglino "degli Ugelli" in Lodi and Giovannino tells his correspondents in Genoa he is happy about this arrangement.

Although metalinguistic comments in all of the letters from Milan are few and far between, Giovannino admits his lack of literacy when he writes "and since I am not used to reading your letters, I ask you to write in the most intelligible way that you can"²⁴ and repeats his request in the following letter: "once again I write to you, and since I am not used to reading your letters in the vernacular, please write them in the most intelligible way that you can for me."²⁵

6. THE LANGUAGE OF GIOVANNINO'S LETTERS

6.1 METHODOLOGY

My basis for ascertaining whether Giovannino's writing shows the presence of Tuscanisation has been to compare the language of his letters to forms of Tuscan and Milanese found in contemporary texts. Given the lack of available documentation from Lombardy during the Trecento, I have had to use texts that fall outside this period. For verb morphology, I have made particular use of the thorough descriptions available of Bonvesin da la Riva's literature from the late 1200s (Domokos "La morfologia verbale").

The varieties of language being considered here are in flux and so it would be erroneous to impose water-tight categories of either "Tuscan" or "Lombard." Nevertheless, the language histories of both Tuscany and Lombardy referred to in the first part of this paper ascribe unique, non-mutual features to both Tuscan and Lombard which I have used to verify whether Giovannino has used a Tuscan(ised) variant, or not.

The rest of this paper describes Tuscan elements in Giovannino's letters.

6.2 PHONOLOGY AND ORTHOGRAPHY²⁶

6.3.1 STRESSED VOWELS

Ā, Ā

Always > a, even before -L-. Examples: *almeno* (V: 24); *altra* (II: 28) (V: 40); *altre* (V: 26) (VI: 3); *altretanto* (V: 42); *altro* (I: 6, 14, 16) (II: 16, 32) (III: 24, 28, 34, 42) (IV: 21, 23) (V: 53); *altry* (II: 17) etc. but one case of *oltra* “oltre” (III: 15). Cf. Mil., A > o before L followed by a consonant (M, 3; S2, 254; S3, 154).

Ē

Always > e: *spexe* (VI: 34, 36) etc. Cf. Mil., sometime > i (DI, 37; R, §56; V, 50).

Ĕ

Always > e: *contento* (III: 16, 32) (IV: 8, 14); *freta* (V: 10); *nete* (V: 8); *pelle* (IV: 5, 17) (V: 5, 8); *presente* (III: 25) (IV: 26) (V: 2) etc. Cf. Mil., in closed syllable, “e” (DI, 37; R, §92 and §97; V, 50); “ie” (R, §92; V, 50). For Tusc., in closed syllable, “e” (R, §85).

In hiatus: > i, in *Di* “Dio” (IV: 23); *Dio* (I: 17) (III: 1) (IV: 1) (V: 1, 54) (VI: 1, 46); *mia* (II: 4) (III: 8, 43) (VI: 28) and sometimes represented graphically by “y” in y’ “io” (I: 1, 12) (II: 5, 21, 1^v); *my* “mio” (I: 8); *mya* (II: 8). Other times there is passing to “e” in *Deo* (II: 34); *meo* (I: 3, 13) (II: 21) (III: 5, 25, 29) (IV: 22) (VI: 40) and only four cases of “ey” in *eyo* (I: 15) (II: 4, 16, 31). Cf., For Mil., “e” (DI, 37; G, 319; MG, 50; V, 50) but sometimes > i (G, 319; MG, 50; V, 50). For Tusc., “e” (C, 72–78; C2, 377; R, §88; S, 49) which then passed to “i” (C, 72–28; C2, 377; R, §88; S, 49).²⁷

Ī

Always > i. Examples: *amico* (I: 13) (II: 21) (III: 5, 29) (IV: 22); *fatiga* (II: 12); *scrivo* (I: 17) etc. There is only one case where > “e,” in *venesse* (VI: 47).

Ĭ

The main form is > e: *letera* (I: 9) (II: 2, 4) (III: 2); *letere* (I: 16) (II: 11, 31) (III: 3); *letre* (II: 28); *meno* (IV: 7); *nere* (III: 12, 16) (V: 5, 32) etc. The only cases where the persistence of “i” can be seen are in *litera* (I: 5) and the Latinisms *inter* (VI: 23); *intra* (III: 9). Cf. Mil., “e” (DI, 38; R, §56; V, 51) and rare cases of “i” (MG, 47; R, §56). For Tusc., “e” (R, §46).

Ŏ

The dominant form is > o: *bon* (II: 25); *bona* (III: 6, 38) (VI: 9, 12); *bono* (V: 12); *oni* “ogni” (VI: 11); *pò* “può” (V: 53) (VI: 46); *proprie* (IV: 15); *sorte* (II, 7; III, 8); *vostre* (I: 15); *vostro* (III: 4) and all reflexes of *vostr-o/a/i/e*. There is one case of the Latinism *toto* (II: 1^v). The diphthong for 3rd person

singular present indicative of *potere* is represented graphically by *oy* [wo], in *poy* 'può' (I: 6, 7, 8, 15) (II: 7, 18, 19, 32). Cf. Mil., 'o' (C, 271; DI, 39; MON, 45; R, §113; V, 52); 'uo' (R, §113; V, 52). For Tusc., 'uo' (C, 271; TR, 58).

Ō

Always > o: *amore* (I: 12) (III: 4) (IV:21); *errore* (V: 24, 43) (VI: 15); *mentione* (VI: 3); *nome* (II: 8, 14) (IV: 1, 17) (V: 1) (VI: 1); *persona* (V: 23) (VI: 6) etc. Cf. Mil., 'ü' (R, §73; V, 53) and sometime 'o' (DI, 39; V, 53). For Tusc., 'o' (R, §66).

Ū

Always > u: *scrittura* (IV: 29).

Û

The dominant form is > o: *fosse* (II: 24) (III: 25, 30, 33) (V: 18); *molto* (III: 5, 11, 16, 32 etc.); *mondo* (VI: 8); *numero* (I: 10) (II: 9) (III: 11, 12) etc.; *noxi* 'noci' (III: 40); *secondo* (III: 18, 20); (IV: 4, 7, 8) *soma* (VI: 33) etc. There is one case of > e in *fesse* (IV: 11).

In hiatus, always > o: *doe* "due" (III: 3); *soa* (V: 41); *sova* (II: 14) but one case of *due* (III: 7).

GENERAL PROCESSES

Giovannino's northern provenance can be seen from the lack of anaphonesis in *aconseliassse* (II: 22); *conseliassse* (III: 34); *conselliassse* (II: 23); *longo* (V: 6); *migliore* (IV: 21); *meliore* (V: 33); *melliore* (II: 18) and *melliori* (III: 7). There are no cases of metaphony.

6.3.2 UNSTRESSED VOWELS

PRE-TONIC

E: There are two cases where > i: *lialmente* (V: 23); *mità* (VI: 41), and only two cases where > u in *zutare* (II: 7); *zutati* (I: 7).²⁸ I also include here cases where 'e' has been kept in a syntactic pretonic position.²⁹ For Mil., there are sporadic cases in (DI, 45; MOR, 334; R, §137; V, 58).

The prefix *ri-* always appears as *re-* in Giovannino's letters: *receuto* (III: 2) (VI: 2); *reffutate* (V: 17); *responderò* (III: 6); *responditi* (III: 3); *respondo* (V: 11); *regratio* (III: 6); *retegnando* (II: 17); *retenire* (II: 8); *retenitelle* (I: 8) etc. Cf. Mil., *re-* in (DI, 44; MOR, 334 and 329; SAL, 241; T, 216; V, 59) but *re-* also in MOR, 334.

The prefix *in-* never appears as *en-*: *ignoranzia* (VI: 17); *incore* (V: 43); *incorso* (V: 24); *inganati* (V: 12) (VI: 10, 13); *intelegibelle* (I: 16) (II: 32); *intuderà* (IV: 18). Cf. Mil., *en-* (R, §130) and for Tusc., *in-* (R, §130) as well as oscillation between *in-* and *en-* in MOR, 334.

The conjunction *se* always appears as *si*: (II: 13, 18, 28) (IV: 5, 7, 8, 12, 19) (V: 53) (VI: 15, 45, 46, 47).

I: There is only one case where *i* > *e*: *openione* (II: 23).

U: There are only two cases where *u* > *u* instead of > *o*: *recapitullare* (VI: 20); *voluntà* (III: 6).

POST-TONIC

A: There is only one case where > *e*: *fondego* “fondaco” (VI: 31). I also include here the forms from the Latin suffix *-ARIUS*. These are *-ari* in *zanari* ‘gennaio’ (I: 19) and *-ary* in *ginary* (II: 1) as well as *-aro* in *febrero* (III: 1) (IV: 1). Cf. Mil., *-aro* (R, §1072; V, 58). For Tusc., *-aio* (C, 22; C2; 102; R, §1072; S, 61).

WORD-FINAL POSITION

I: The only cases are *chi* “che” (I: 15) (VI: 19); *saveri* (III: 11). Final *-i* is also sometimes represented graphically by *-y* in *altry* (II: 17); *dinary* (II: 9); *fuory* (VI: 24) etc. I also note here that the final vowel for all 2nd person plural verbs is *-i* for the present indicative, future, *passato remoto*, present conditional and the present subjunctive, apart from very few cases, and thus mirrors Vitale’s results (1953, 55).

O: Word-final “*o*” is always kept. Cases of hyper-correction are *avito* (III: 11); *beno* (I: 12) (IV: 13) (V: 25, 40) (VI: 6, 15, 33); *chono* ‘con’ (VI: 36); *dondo* (V: 18); *termino* (IV: 12); *Zovano* (I: 12). Occurrences which show his northern provenance are *chomo* (V: 3, 5, 6, 13) (VI: 3, 22) and *como* (IV: 15).

6.3.3 CONSONANTS

C- (VELAR)

The only particular features of velar “*c*” to be noted are the five uses of *que* “che” (I: 8, 11) (III: 6, 17, 23)³⁰ and one occurrence of *ge* (LII: 1^v), also found in DI, 56.

-C- (VELAR)

There is much variation between the forms *-CH-* and *-C-*. For the former, we have *amicho* (III: 25, 32); *perichollo* (II: 19); *picholla* (III: 10); *picholle* (V: 3); *pichollo* (III: 9); *poche* (V: 18); *pocho* (IV: 3) (VI: 14) etc. and for the latter, *aconseliasse* (II: 22); *secondo* (I: 12) (II: 11, 21, 23) (III: 18, 20) (IV: 4); *amico* (I: 13) (II: 21) (III: 5, 29) (IV: 22); *dico* (II: 16) (III: 18, 24, 34, 42); *recordarò* (VI: 39); *ricore* ‘ricorrere’ (VI: 14); *secure* (IV: 10); *seuro* (II: 22, 25) etc. Lenition is only present in two cases: *fatiga* (II: 12); *fondego* ‘fondaco’ (VI: 31). Cf. Mil., *-g-* (BOR, 47–48; DI, 56; R, §197; V, 77); *-c-* (DI, 56). For Tusc., *-c-* (R, §194–95).

C- (PALATAL)

The dominant form is *c-*: *cento* (III: 15, 18) (V: 45, 46); *cera* (III: 37); *certi* (III: 35); *certo* (IV: 21) (V: 11) (VI: 15) etc. There are only a few cases of

passing to the northern affricate and these are restricted to a few words: *zaschuna* (V: 23); *zò* (I: 10) (V: 11) (VI: 14, 40); *zoè* (V: 39, 45, 48). Cf. Mil., *z-* (DI, 57; R, §152; V, 78). For Tusc., *c-* (R, §152).

-C- (PALATAL)

Here too the dominant form is *-c-*: *dice* (V: 41); *facevo* (V: 23); *piacere* (VI: 46); *receuta* (VI: 5); *receuto* (III: 2) (VI: 2); *recevere* (V: 4, 36) (VI: 18) etc. Cases of the affricate only occur in *piazza* 'piaccia' (I: 8) (IV: 9, 25) (VI: 47); *piaze* 'piaccia' (I: 16). There is one case with *-x-*: *dixe* 'dice' (IV: 9). Cf. Mil., voiced *-s-* (DI, 56; R, §214; V, 78); *-z-* (R, §214). For Tusc., *-sc-* (C, 31; R, §213) and in literary language *-g-* (R, §213).

C AFTER L

There is only one case where *c > g* following *L*, in *alguna* (III: 4). Other instances all keep the unvoiced consonant: *alchuna* (VI: 47); *alchune* (V: 18); *alchuno* (VI: 15); *alcono* (II: 24); *alcuna* (IV: 9, 19, 25); *alcuno* (III: 9). Cf. Mil., *-c-* (R, §246); *-ch-* (R, §246); *-g-* (R, §246). For Tusc., *-c-* (R, §246).

-CT-

The dominant form is *-t-*: *fata* (IV: 9, 19) (V: 2) (VI: 2, 10); *fati* (IV: 10) (V: 1); *fato* (III: 7, 11) (V: 11, 12, 27); *freta* (V: 10); *soprascrita* (IV: 18); *soprascrito* (VI: 3) etc.

The only case of *-tt-* is in *rispetto* (IV: 14). The combination is kept in Latinisms such as *respecto* (V: 13); *victura* (VI: 25, 30); *victurale* (VI: 30, 32); *victurali* (V: 34) *victuralle* (VI: 27). Cf. Mil., *-it-* (R, §258); *-gi-* (C, 270; S3, 197); *-tt-* or *-t-* (V, 77). For Tusc., *-tt-* (R, §240 and §258). Vitale records *-ct-* as a Latinism (p. 77) and Degli Innocenti notes *-g-* as a grapheme (p. 56).

C AFTER -N-, -R-

The only two cases show a northern form. These are *Barzalona* (III: 30); *perzò* (VI: 8). Cf. Mil., *-z-* (V, 78). For Tusc., *-c-* and *-z-* (R, §275).

-D-

Always *-d-* in *creditore* (I: 7); *Lode* (VI: 20); *modo* (IV: 10, 12); *vedere* (I: 7) apart from one northern case in *-z-* in *vezuto* (III: 23). Cf. Mil., *>* - (DI, 60; R, §216; V, 81); *> -z-* (R, §276 and §277). For Tusc., *-d-* (R, §216) and *-ggi-* (MG, 122; R, §276 and §277).

G- (PALATAL)

The only case is northern *zente* (VI: 8, 43) (but see *j-* below for other cases of palatal *g-*). Cf. Mil., *z-* (R, §156; V, 78); *g-* (R, §156). For Tusc., *g-* (R, §156).

-G- (PALATAL)

The only form is *-z-* in *lezere* (I: 15) (II: 31) *lezariti* 'leggerete' (II: 3). Cf. Mil., *-z-* (R, §218; V, 79). For Tusc., *-gg-* (R, §218).

H-

The only cases of Latinizing H- are forms of the verb HABERE *habia* (V: 51); *habiando* (V: 13); *habiati* (V: 52); *habuta* (II: 3); *habute* (V: 37, 39) (VI: 41); *habuto* (V: 2, 41, 42) (VI: 41); and also *hosteri* (V: 33, 35). Cf. R, §157 in Latinisms.

J-

Although there are some cases of J- passing to the dialectal form z-, the use of Tuscan g- is considerably more present. For example, z- only in *zanari* 'gennaio' (I: 19); *Zenova* (I: 1, 1^v); *Zovane* (II: 2, 28, 29); *Zovani* (I: 10); *Zovanino* (I: 18); *Zovano* (I: 12); *Zovanollo* (IV: 25). G- in *ginari* (II: 1); *Genoa* (IV: 26); *Genova* (II: 5) (III: 2) (V: 2, 42, 2^v) (VI: 23); *genovini* (V: 9); *Gienova* (II: 15, 24, 26) (III: 25, 35) (IV: 3, 17, 2^v); *Giovani* (III: 4) (IV: 21); *Giovanino* (II: 35) (III: 44) (IV: 24) (V: 55) etc. Cf. Mil., G- (R, §158; V, 68); z- (DI, 48; R, §158; V, 68; SALVI, 211). For Tusc., G- (R, §158). Latinisms have J- (DI, 48; V, 68).

-J-

The only two cases of -J- present the Tuscan form in *magio* (VI: 1, 19). Cf. Mil., -J- (DI, 48; V, 69); -G- (R, §220; V, 69); -S- (R, §220); -Z- (DI, 48; R, §220; V, 69). For Tusc., -GG- (R, §220).

-CJ-

Always presents a Latinizing form: *fatia* (V: 53); *fatiando* (VI: 3); *fatiانو* (V: 28); *fatiante* (II: 21); *fatio* (I: 1) (II: 13, 17) (V: 15) (VI: 5) etc. Cf. Mil., -Z- (DI, 49; R, §275); -C- or -CC- (V, 69) and graphemes -TI- (DI, 49; V, 69) and -X- (DI, 49). For Tusc., -CCI- (R, §275).

DJ-

The only case has a northern form: *zornate* (III: 30). Cf. Mil., z- (R, §182; V, 69); G- (V, 69). For Tusc., G- (R, §182).

-DJ-

The only case is -D- in *credo* (V: 12). Cf. Mil., -Z- (BG, 65; DI, 49; R, §277; V, 69); -DI- (V, 69). For Tusc., -GG- (R, §276); -ZZ- (R, §276).

-LJ-

The main form is -LI- in *aconseliasse* (II: 22); *conseliasse* (III: 34); *conseliasse* (II: 23); *meliore* (V: 33); *someliante* (IV: 11); *voliandelle* (III: 14); *voliate* (I: 2, 11) (II: 8, 10, 26, 27); *voliati* (II: 11, 32) etc. Other forms include Tuscanising -GLI- in *meglio* (III: 19) (IV: 4, 7); *megliore* (IV: 21); *vogliati* (IV: 6) and -LLI- in *melliore* (II: 18) *melliori* (III: 7). Cf. Mil., -J- (DI, 49; R, §280; V, 69); -GL- (MG, 90; V, 69) and with grapheme -LI- (DI, 49). For Tusc., -GL- (R, §280); -GGHI- (R, §280).

I have found no examples of forms for -CL- in Giovannino's letters.

-SJ-

This is consistently *-x-* in *bexognio* (I: 14); *caxone* (I: 13) (II: 13) (V: 52); *provixione* (VI: 37). Cf. Mil., *-st-* (R, §287; V, 70); *-gr-* (DI, 50; V, 70). Degli Innocenti also notes the grapheme *-x-* which represents a voiced dental fricative (DI, 50); *z-* (DI, 48; R, §158; SALVI, 211; V, 68). For Tusc., *-sci-* (MAN, 37; R, §286); *-gr-* (R, 286).

-TJ-

This combination presents the most graphically variable picture of all. The dominant form is the Latinizing *-tj-* in *datio* (VI: 31); *pretio* (V: 21, 27); *recomandatione* (II: 2); *regratiare* (VI: 45); *regratio* (III: 6, 35); *'secutione* (IV: 4). Others include northern *-zi-* in *prezi* (III: 35); *prezio* (III: 21) (IV: 6, 14); *prezo* (III: 36) (IV: 20); *servizio* (I: 3) (III: 5) as well as Tuscanising *-gi-* in *ragionate* (V: 8); *ragionando* (III: 14); *ragione* (V: 10). This latter is also represented graphically by *-x-* only in *raxone* (V: 52) (VI: 36). Cf. Mil., *-z-* (BG, 65, n.27; R, §290; V, 70); *-gr-* (R, §290) and sometimes with graphemes *-ç-* (S2, 96); *-ti-* (V, 70); *-ci-* (V, 70). For Tusc., *-zz-* (R, §289); *-gi-* (R, §289).

-CTJ-

Continuations of this combination only occur in reflexes of the verb *spacciare*. Both forms show a tendency towards a northern variant. The first is *-gi-* in *spaggiamento* (III: 14) and the second is *-z-* in *spazene* (III: 36). Cf. Mil., *-z-* (R, §291; V, 70); *-g-* (V, 70) and one finds *-cci-* in (V, 70). For Tusc., *-cci-* (R, §291).

-NTJ-

The only cases are *speranza* (III: 20) (IV: 5), *ignoranzia* (VI: 17) and one case of Latinizing *mentione* (VI: 3). Cf. Mil., *-nz-* (DI, 50; R, §291). For Tusc., *-nz-* (R, §291).

L BEFORE T

The *-l-* is almost always kept, viz.: *altra* (II: 28) (V: 40); *altretante* (VI: 41); *altretanto* (V: 42); *altro* (I: 6, 14, 16) (II: 16, 32) (III: 24, 28, 34, 42) (IV: 21, 23) (V: 53); *altri* (II: 17); *oltra* (III: 15) and one case *> -* in *atra* (I: 6). Cf. Mil., *-l-* (R, §243). For Tusc., *-l-* (C1, 33; C2, 301; R, §243); *-u-* (C, 47; MAN1, 122; R, §243) and sometimes *> -* (C1, 33; C2, 301; R, §243).

-L-

This consonant is always kept. There are no cases of rhotacism. Occurrences in *sensali* (III: 7); *voluntà* (III: 6) (VI: 28). Cf. Mil., *-l-* (DI, 50–51); *-r-* (BG, 63; DI, 50–51; S3, 197; V, 72) and sometimes *> -* (R, §221). For Tusc., *-l-* (R, §221); *-r-* (R, §221).

CL-

The only occurrences present a northern variant: *giara* “chiara” (V: 53); *giaramente* “chiaramente” (V: 44, 52). Cf. Mil., palatal *c-* (CON, 671; DI,

51; R, §179; V, 73); GI- (CON, 671; DI, 51; R, §179; V, 73) and sometimes velar c- in Vitale (V, 73). Rare occurrences of Latinism CL- (DI, 51–52). For Tusc., velar c- (R, §248).

-P-

The dominant form presents a Tuscan variant in *aperta* (VI: 5); *ripa* (II: 17); *seperate* (I: 11); *sapere* (V: 5, 15) (VI: 5); *saperete* (V: 36); *sapiando* (III: 20, 36) etc. The only cases of lenition are *savere* (I: 1); *saveri* (III: 11). Cf. Mil., -v- (DI, 60; R, §207; V, 81); -b- (DI, 60; V, 81) but -p- strong in Vitale. For Tusc., -p- (R, §205).

PL-

The dominant form is PI- in *piacere* (VI: 46); *piazza* “piaccia” (I: 8) (IV: 9, 25) (VI: 47); *piaze* “piaccia” (I: 16). There is only one case of PL- in *plenamente* (I: 14). Cf. Mil., PI- (DI, 52; R, §186; V, 74); PL- (DI, 52; R, §186). For Tusc., PI- (R, §186).

-PR-

Always the Tuscan form -PR-: *Aliprando* (II: 10) (III: 8) (V: 40); *apreso* (I: 8) (III: 29); *aprile* (VI: 2); *aprille* (V: 1, 2) (VI: 40); *sopra* (III: 19) (V: 13, 21, 27); *soprascrita* (IV: 18) etc. Cf. Mil., -vr- (DI, 61; R, §260). For Tusc., -PR- (R, §260); and rare cases of -BR- (C, 48).

-PT-

Always -T-, in *cativo* (III: 14); *scrita* (V: 4); *scrite* (III: 19, 35); *scrito* (III: 5) (IV: 22); *soprascrito* (VI: 3) etc. Only one case of -TT- in *scrittura* (IV: 19). Cf. Mil., -T- (R, §240); -C- (PALATAL) (DI, 61). For Tusc., -TT- (R, §240).

S-

Only one case of z-, in *zavora* (III: 37).

-S-

The dominant form is the voiced sibilant, represented graphically by -x-, in *avixare* (II: 9, 26); *avixariti* (III: 13); *avixato* (II: 13, 18); *avixati* (II: 20) (III: 4, 16) (IV: 16); *avixo* (IV: 19) etc.; *bixognio* (III: 6); *spexe* (VI: 34, 36); *uxa* (V: 6); *uxo* (I: 15) (II: 31) etc. There is only one case of -s- in *mese* (III: 28). Cf. Mil., voiced -s- (R, §210). For Tusc., -s- (R, §211).

- > Z AFTER N

The forms all present reflexes of *sensale*. These are -NS- in *sensali* (III: 7), but more frequent is -NZ- in *senzali* (V: 19, 22) (VI: 43); *senzalli* (VI: 16). Cf. Mil., -LZ- (R, §267, V, 76). For Tusc., -LS- (R, §276); -LZ- (R, §276).

-SC- + PALATAL VOWEL

The only cases are *cognositi* ‘conoscete’ (VI: 11); *cognositori* (III: 7). Cf. Mil., -s- (DI, 55; R, §265; V, 76); -ss- (DI, 55). For Tusc., -sc- (R, §265).

-T-

The form is always Tuscan -T-, in *catellani* (III: 23); *cognositori* (III: 7); *creditore* (I: 8) (IV: 20); *dati* (II: 17); *mercato* (V: 33); *mitate* (I: 5) (II: 7); *por-*

tatore (I: 5) (IV: 25); *quantità* (VI: 12); *quantitate* (I: 1) (II: 5); *salute* (III: 44) (IV: 24); *zornate* (III: 30) etc. No cases of lenition. Cf. Mil., -d- (DI, 59; G, 322; R, §200; V, 80); -DH- (DI, 59; R, §200); > - (BG, 66, n.6; DI, 59; R, §200). For Tusc., -t- (R, §200).

6.3.4 OTHER PHENOMENA

APOCOPE

Very few cases. Only of -o in *Di* "Dio" (IV: 23); *son* (IV: 8, 15, 21) and of -a in *fi* "fia" (V: 31) and of -N in *co* 'con' (VI: 38, 48).

EPENTHESIS

Only in *sova* (II: 14).

APHERESIS

Only in 'catasse "accattasse" (III: 13).

METAPLASM

Only of -ere > -ire and only in reflexes of *tenere*: *sostenire* (V: 26); *tenire* (II: 18) (IV: 9) but *tenerle* (IV: 12).

METATHESIS

Only of "L" in *vorgalle* "volgare" (II: 32) and of "R" in *indreto* (V: 24, 28, 30, 39); *vorgalle* "volgare" (II: 32).

SYNCOPE

Occurrences of -E- in *letra* (V: 2) (VI: 2, 4, 5, 10, 23, 47); *letre* (II: 28) (VI: 3, 40), of -N- in *regratiare* (VI: 45); *regratio* (III: 6), of -R- in *inttuderà* (IV: 18) and of -AR- in *apregiato* "apareggiato" (V: 54).

6.4 VERB MORPHOLOGY

6.4.1 PRESENT INDICATIVE

For 1st person singular verbs in the present indicative, the two endings which occur in Bonvesin are -o and a consonant.³¹ In Giovannino's letters, there are 24 cases with the -o ending and none with a consonant ending. With regard to 2nd person plural verbs for the first conjugation, Giovannino's letters only have two cases of -ati and two of -ate. For verbs in -ere, however, there are 10 cases of -iti, and one each of -ito and -ate. There are none for -ire verbs.³² Auxiliaries are *siti* (1 occurrence) and *aviti* (10 occurrences). Irregular verbs mainly show a northern desinence: *dagati* (1), *diti* (1) but *dite* (9), *deviti* (1), *fati* (1), *potiti* (5) etc. The only ending which contrasts clearly between Tuscan and Lombard, the 3rd person plural, is northern, -ene (1). Cf. Mil., -an(o) (R, §532; D, 263); -ano (D, 263; V, 93); -eno (V, 93). For Tusc., -ano (P1, 504; R, §532; M2, 144; T, 91); -ono (R, §532; MAN1, 57; M2, 144; T, 91).

6.4.2 FUTURE AND CONDITIONAL

Essere shows a very slight preference of the Milanese stem *ser-* in both future and conditional (vs. Tuscan *sar-*), with one case of the stem vowel *a* (1 case of *sarà*) against *serò* (2 cases), *serà* (1 case).³³

With regard to endings, the only form for the simple future tense for 1st pers. sing. for verbs in *-are* is the desinence *-arò* (3 times), but by the mid 14th century this is no longer a contrastive element between Milanese and Tuscan.³⁴ The only other future verbs are 3rd person singular *-erà* (1 case) and one of *-ariti* for 2nd person plural.

For the conditional, Giovannino again prefers a Tuscan variant for *-are* verbs, the only forms being *-arebe* for 3rd person singular (4) and one case of *-aristi* for 2nd person plural. These contrast against *-ev(e)*, *-av(e)* for 3rd person and *-issi* and *-issevo*, both 2nd person plural, in Bonvesin.

The case of *essere* is also exemplary of Giovannino's wider use of the conditional. All nine cases appear Tuscan: 1st pers. sing. has *serebe* (2), 3rd pers. sing. *serebe* (3) and *serebene* (1), and 3rd pers. pl. has *serebene* (3). Furthermore, out of the only forms which occur in Bonvesin for *essere* (*serev*, *seriss/serissi*, *serav/srave/srav*, . . . , *serissevo*),³⁵ there is none that appears similar to Giovannino's forms. The only conditional form of *avere*, *arebbe* (3rd pers. sing.) appears Tuscan.

6.4.3 PAST PARTICIPLES

Domokos has identified three Past Participle endings in Bonvesin for *-are* verbs: *-ado*, *-adho*, *-ao*.³⁶ Out of the 49 cases of Past Participles in *-are* verbs in Giovannino's letters, lenition is not present at all. The endings I have found are *-ato* (24), *-ata* (4), *-ati* (12) and *-ate* (9). For *-ere* verbs the endings are *-uto* (5), *-uta* (1) and *-ute* (9), and for *-ire* verbs there is a single case of *-ito*.

6.5 NOUN MORPHOLOGY

6.5.1 PERSONAL PRONOUNS

For Personal Pronouns, I first give all subject pronouns in Giovannino's letters and then consider direct, indirect, reflexive and disjunctive pronouns, listed according to person and number.

Subject pronouns show a mixed variety of forms. I have found five cases of "y" and four of "eyo."³⁷ The other subject pronouns too are Tuscan in form apart from 3rd person singular: three cases of "luy" but four of "el" (4) whilst 2nd person plural has only "voy" (9).³⁸ On the other hand, there are three cases of the Milanese reflexive pronoun "me" for 1st person singular. Third person singular has two cases of "si" and 13 of "se" whilst the plural has one of "se." For disjunctive pronouns, 1st person has "me" (14), "mi" (4) and "my" (2).³⁹ The others are Tuscan: "luy" (2) and "voy" (29).

There are no cases of a 2nd person singular subject, direct, indirect, reflexive or disjunctive object pronoun.

For 2nd person plural there are 15 cases of “*ve*” as the direct object pronoun and 28 of the same pronoun for the indirect. There are none for the reflexive pronoun and the disjunctive has 29 of “*voy*.”

For the 3rd person masculine singular, the direct object pronouns in Giovannino’s letters give forms which occur in both Tuscan and Lombard apart from one of them. The forms are the free pronoun “*lo*” (2) and enclitic “*llo*” (1). The only non-Lombard form is “*el*” (1). For the feminine, the forms are the free pronoun “*la*” (4) and enclitic “*lla*” (1). Again, indirect object pronouns have no forms which distinguish them as either Tuscan or Lombard apart from one of them. There is only one case of “*gli*” and one of “*ge*.” There are no feminine forms. For reflexives, the forms are clitic “*si*” (2) and “*se*” (13). For disjunctive pronouns, the only form is “*luy*” (2). There are no feminine forms.

For the 3rd person plural, masculine direct object pronouns are “*li*” (1), “*gli*” (1), “*i*” (1), and enclitic “*li*” (1). The feminine are “*le*” (11), “*li*” (2), “*gli*” (1) and enclitic “*lle*” (4). There are no masculine indirect object pronouns and only one for the feminine, “*le*.” The only reflexive pronouns is “*se*” (1). There is no 3rd person plural disjunctive pronoun.

6.5.2 POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVES AND INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

All singular possessive adjectives show a tendency towards Tuscanisation: *meo* (9), *mia* (2), *my* (fem. sing., 1 case), *mya* (2), *sova* (1), *soa* (1), *vostro* (3) and *vostra* (10). *Loro* (1) occurs in both vernaculars but was little used in the north in old texts.⁴⁰ Plural forms are *me* (fem. pl., 2 cases), *vostri* (2) and *vostre* (6).

The masculine singular indefinite pronouns I have found are Tuscan in form: *alchuno* (1), *alcuno* (1), *alcono* (1), *altro* (14) and *tuto* (17). There is still a Milanese influence in *zaschuno* (1) and a Latinizing vowel in *toto* (1).

6.5.3 ADVERBS

It is interesting to note Giovannino’s six uses of Tuscan *chostà*,⁴¹ a form which appears never to have developed in the north. The ternary deictic system seems to be a feature of Tuscany and central-southern vernaculars (Vanelli and Renzi 112). In this case, Giovannino uses a word from a Tuscan grammatical category which is foreign to Milanese.

7. CONCLUSION

Giovannino’s language presents us with an essentially northern variety but some elements are clearly closer to a Tuscan or Tuscanised variant. The variety of forms is remarkable, with some variants being mainly Tuscan, other variants mainly Milanese, and others with an

impressive diversity. It exemplifies well, therefore, the ongoing development of a northern koinè from the late Trecento which is becoming forever more open to Tuscan influences.

Clear northern traits can be seen in affricates in certain consonant combinations and 2nd person plural verb endings, but the presence of Tuscan is also clear in his use of palatals and in the lack of metaphony. The phonology seems to indicate a mainly Tuscan variety, such as the preservation of word-final "o," but it is peppered with northern occurrences of the conjunctions "*chomo*" and "*si*" for "*se*," the prefix *re-* and Latinizing elements such as *h-* and the combination *-ti-*. Conspicuous for its absence is the lack of long "o" > "ü." The conclusion which presents itself from the morphology is that of a significant degree of variety. The vast array of pronouns shows no clear preference toward either a Tuscan or a Milanese form. All possessives, on the other hand, are more Tuscan than Lombard, especially for plural persons. Indefinite pronouns, too, are almost all Tuscan, and Giovannino seems to reproduce almost perfectly these forms when writing to his Tuscan interlocutors but cannot help letting slip only a few cases from his native Milanese such as "*alguna*" and "*zaschuno*." Some cases, such as past participles, show no Milanese forms at all. In sum, any process of Tuscanisation which may be occurring in his letters seems to affect only certain aspects of his writing. Further research into syntactic aspects of Giovannino's language could provide further evidence of a tendency towards Tuscanisation but which I have had to neglect in this paper.

All references, in the research literature, to Tuscanisation in Lombardy are made in the elite contexts of the chancery or literary usage. Vitale's study of the chancery showed that Tuscan was already being used outside the sphere of literature in northern Italy during the Quattrocento. Before this, one gains the impression from the available histories of the vernacular in Lombardy that Tuscan was not a model for non-literary writing and that Tuscan influence in orthography and morphology is little evident. More recent studies have concluded that Tuscan was in fact much more widespread than originally thought during the late Tre- and early Quattrocento, but have preferred to focus their attention to the realm of literature or texts that were intended for a narrowly selected audience. Giovannino is removed from both a courtly and a literary environment—he is not a poet, and he is not employed in a court. The linguistic accommodation to his Tuscan interlocutors opens up the question of language choice in merchant writing and whether what Maraschio (1976, 37) has called the "vertical" expansion of Tuscan in the Quattro and Cinquecento might have begun earlier. In other words, Tuscan's presence is felt not only in the highest strata of Milanese society but it was also, at the other end of the spectrum, known and used for successful communication between the not

so educated merchant class and sometimes, at least in Giovannino's case, over significant geographical distances.

Given that the earliest time Tuscanisation has been recorded in language histories of Lombardy is sometime during the mid to late Quattrocento, Giovannino's use of Tuscan or Tuscanized forms is surprisingly earlier.

JOSHUA BROWN

University of Western Australia

NOTES

*An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 30th Annual Conference of The American Association for Italian Studies (AAIS) at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 22–25 April 2010.

¹ See section 3 below on Tuscanisation for the "presence of Tuscan" in northern Italy also for the Trecento.

² For a recent survey of studies on old northern vernaculars, see Tomasin, "Gli studi sugli antichi volgari settentrionali."

³ On the koinè more generally, see the collection of essays in Sanga *Koinè in Italia. Dalle origini al Cinquecento*. See also Persico.

⁴ For other northern areas see the various chapters in the same volume: Stella, "Piemonte," pp. 75–105; Stella, "Liguria," pp. 105–53; Tomasin, "Veneto," pp. 212–40; Pellegrini, "Friuli," pp. 240–60; Stella, "Emilia-Romagna," pp. 260–94 and particularly the section at pp. 272–74, "Il mancato riferimento al 'modello' fiorentino."

⁵ It should be noted here that there is ongoing debate surrounding the role which Milan played in the formation of the koinè. Lurati suggests Milan provided a centralizing force for the "Milanisation" of the other Lombard vernaculars, similar to what occurred for Piedmont and the Veneto (see Lurati). On the other hand, Massariello Merzagora suggests that the linguistic history of Lombardy does not revolve around Milan. Sanga has provided a synthesis of both viewpoints and suggests that Milan oriented the development of other Lombard dialects, both through its spread of the *koinè padana antica*, as well as through the spread of an Italian model mediated by Milanese over a long time (see Sanga, "Due Lombardiae" 181). Most recently, Stella notes that the language of the *volgarizzamenti* from French, the *Elucidario*, *Confessione* and *San Patrizio* from the early 1400s seems to prefigure "l'esplosione centrifuga che ha disseminato a raggera attorno alla capitale le tracce fonetiche e lessicali della sua grammatica e del suo vocabolario medievale" ("Lombardia" 194). See also this whole section: "Dai Visconti agli Sforza: per l'egemonia culturale e linguistica di Milano" (190–201).

⁶ On the complex question of when the koinè can be said to have started, see M. A. Grignani (35–53 and especially p. 38). Polimeni (63) also notes that "the coexistence of elements from different geographical areas aligned itself

under the vertical power of attraction from Tuscan grammar only in the late Ducento.”

⁷ Lurati, for example, describes the geographical domain over which the koinè was used as a “regno della variazione libera” (509). See also Maraschio. One example to represent the whole which she quotes is the 2nd person plural of the present and future indicative which, apart from a few cases, all present the koinè desinence in *-i*, e.g., *intendeti*, *sapeti*, *hareti*, *voltareti* (38).

⁸ For Mantua, see the series of essays in Ghinassi *Dal Belcalzer al Castiglione: studi sull'antico volgare di Mantova e sul "Cortegiano."*

⁹ Sanga (“Due Lombardie” 178) makes the important point that the terms *koinè alto-italiana*, *koinè padana*, *lingua cortegiana* and *lingua lombarda* have all been employed to refer variously to the pan-Lombard vernacular from the 12th to the 16th centuries.

¹⁰ For an analysis of Ariosto’s linguistic choices between the three editions of the *Furioso*, see Migliorini “Sulla lingua dell’Ariosto.”

¹¹ On Antonio da Ferrara, see Rajna and Migliorini (*Storia della lingua italiana* 215–17).

¹² In describing the knowledge and presence of Tuscan, however, Stussi refers specifically to the Paduan Antonio da Tempo’s comment from 1322 that “lingua tusca magis apta est ad literam sive literaturam quam aliae linguae, et ideo magis est communis et intelligibilis” (14) as well as Francesco di Vannozzo’s “complete familiarity” with Tuscan in the late Trecento (16). On Francesco di Vannozzo, see Levi. Referring to documents written between 1403 and 1416, Tomasin (“Veneto” 217) has noted that “Tuscanisation, in short, is active in levelling off (*smussare*) the most noticeable peaks (*punte*) of an original Venetian model.” For the Veneto more generally, see Medin and Brugnolo.

¹³ See also Stussi “Filologia mercantile.”

¹⁴ See Bongrani and Morgana 1992, especially pp. 97–98: “La prima diffusione della letteratura toscana in Lombardia.” See also Sgrilli and Marazzini.

¹⁵ Despite not being a study of language nor Tuscanisation, Stella describes the language of the series of statutes from Milan as being not much different from that already identified in the two studies by Vitale quoted in the Introduction. See Stella (*Gli statuti delle strade e delle acque del contado di Milano* 96).

¹⁶ Ghinassi refers to this example and remarks that instances such as these must have been no more than isolated cases since “the privileged channel for the entrance of Tuscanisms had to remain, especially for the second half of the Quattrocento, a literary one” (“Il volgare mantovano” 27).

¹⁷ The letters sent from Milan have been published in Frangioni. These letters are kept in the Archivio Datini at the Archivio di Stato di Prato. Since the letters have been catalogued according to place of arrival (and not where they were sent from), they are found in different files (*carteggi*). In alphabetical order, the letters from Milan to Avignon are in *carteggio* 184, to Barcelona in *carteggio* 893, to Bologna in *carteggio* 720, to Florence in *carteggio* 669, to Genova in *carteggio* 780, to Majorca in *carteggio* 1072, to Pisa in *carteggio* 531, to Prato in *carteggio* 341, to Rome in *carteggio* 1116 and to Valencia in *carteggio* 999.

¹⁸ For a general biography of Datini, see Origo.

¹⁹ Of the 38 writers from Milan, only the four correspondents from the Pescina family and these other four writers (Giovannino da Dugnano, Gasparollo del Maino, Gasparino da Monza and Francesco Tanzi) are indisputably from or near Milan and wrote in vernacular. The other 30 senders thus include: members of Tuscan families, senders who wrote in Latin, senders about whose provenance I cannot be sure, senders who wrote non-commercial letters as well as Datini factors who wrote letters from Milan.

²⁰ Variants of his surname I found include *Dugnani*, *de Dugnano* and *de Dugniano*. The online database of the Archivio di Stato di Prato records his name as *Giovannino da Dugnano*, which is the variant I have followed here. The database can be found at: <http://datini.archiviodistato.prato.it/www/queryLetters.html>. The only *Dugnani* in the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* is *Dugnani, Giacomo*. Covini (805–8) notes that Giacomo was born in the final years of the 14th century from a noteworthy Milanese merchant family and that Giacomo's father, Franceschino, was a part of the *ufficio di Provvisione del Comune di Milano* in 1386. Giacomo had three brothers, Giovanni, Ambrogio and Lucolo but since our Giovannino died in 1398, Giacomo's brother cannot be the same one as in the Datini Archive.

²¹ <http://www.lombardiabeniculturali.it/missive/documenti/8.788/>. [accessed 6 August 2010]

²² Further details on the economic workings of Dugnano and Serraineri's business can be found in Zerbi. Caselles (53), quoting Zerbi, briefly cites Giovannino and Marco Serrainerio's company when describing the increasing use of double entry bookkeeping in 14th century Italy. Letter 699 (Frangioni 501–2) from Giovanni da Pessano describes a certain "*Clemento da Dugnano*" as a friend of Giovannino's. Giovanni da Pessano writes to the Datini factors in Genoa asking them to provide a "*letera di recomandatione*" for Clemento who is travelling to Valencia for some business affairs with *Lafranço Serraynery*.

²³ Mainoni ("Un mercante milanese" 334) notes that Aliprando was Marco's brother.

²⁴ Letter 691 (Frangioni 495–6): *E perchè eyo no sonto da uxo lezere le vostre letere, ve piazze di scrivere pyù intelegibelle per my chi potiti.*

²⁵ Letter 692 (Frangioni 496–7): *E anchora ve scrisse, perché eyo no sono da uxo lezere le vostre letere in vorgalle, che me le voliati scrivoelle più intelegibelle che se poy per me.*

²⁶ In citing other studies, I have used the following abbreviations. Numbers immediately following the abbreviation refer to page numbers, apart from Rohlfs for which I cite the paragraph number. For Milanese: BG = Bongrani and Morgana 1994; BOR = Borgogno 1980; C = Casapullo 1999; CON = Contini 1960; DI = Degli Innocenti 1984; G = Giovanardi 1999; M = Merlo 1960–61; MF = Migliorini and Folena 1952; MG = Mengaldo 1963; MIG = Migliorini 1960; MON = Monaci and Arese 1955; MOR = Scotti Morgana 1983; R = Rohlfs 1966; SALVI = Salvioni 1902; S2 = Sanga 1997; S3 = Stella 1994, "Lombardia"; T = Tavoni 1992; V = Vitale 1953. For Tuscan: C = Castellani 1952; C1 = Castellani

1950; C2 = Castellani 2000; MAN = Manni 2003; MAN1 = Manni 1979; P1 = Palermo 1999; R = Rohlfs 1966; S = Serianni 1977; TR = Trolli 1972.

²⁷ In particular, see Castellani (*Nuovi testi fiorentini* 73–75). He notes that “i risultati toscani quali ci appaiono nel sec. XIII sono: (. . .) *noi, voi, Dio, io, mio, rio, suo, tuo, mia, ria, sia, via, sua, tua, mie, rie, due, grue, sue, tue*” and that “si ha dunque prevalenza della serie con vocale chiusa dinanzi a *u* (*o*), e chiusura di *e* in *i* e di *o* in *u* dinanzi a tutte le vocali tranne *i*” (75).

²⁸ Degli Innocenti quotes the forms *çitare, zitarano, zitado*, but also ‘con passaggio ad *u*, con valore fonetico di *ü*’, citing *zutay* and *zutadi* (45). For other examples where pre-tonic *e* > *ü*, see Salvioni “Dell’antico dialetto pavese,” §101.

²⁹ For pronouns which are in this position (*mi, vi, si*), see noun morphology in section 6.5.1 below.

³⁰ See R, §163: *qu-* iniziale. Stussi (1965, §4.7) also describes the “sporadic presence” of *q-* initial words in his corpus such as *qelo, qesti, qesta, quello*, and identifies traces of *qe* “che” and *que* “che.”

³¹ Cf. Mil., *-e* (MG, 118). Borgogno found prevalently *-o* and some occurrences of *-e* (BOR, 102). Rohlfs (§527) notes that the modern ending for Milanese is *-i* for 1st person singular (but does not say when it came into use.) He posits that the ending may come from *io* < EGO and may correspond to the *-i* ending in Provençal languages, possibly having an *-e* ending as its analogical origin and generalised on cases such as *dòrmi* < DORMIO, *sènti* < SENTIO. Still for modern Milanese, Sanga (“Lombardy” 254) includes this ending in his description of “common Lombard” which, he suggests, predates the split into eastern and western Lombard. Despite a lack of indication in the literature as to when this phenomenon evolved, Salvioni (“Fonetica e morfologia del dialetto milanese” 38) describes the *-i* ending in Carlo Porta’s poetry from the late 18th century.

³² Cf. Mil., *-ati* (M, 119; MIG, 200; V, 92); *-ade* (R, §531); *-ai* (R, §531); *-e* (R, §531). For Tusc., *-ate* (R, §531).

³³ Domokos (“La morfologia verbale” 268) notes the only future forms for *essere* in Bonvesin are: *serò, seré, serà, seram* and *seran*. It is worth noting here that Manni (*Il Trecento toscano* 35) records *serò, serei* as Tuscan forms in the Duecento but which changed to *sarò, sarei* at the beginning of the Trecento.

³⁴ For Milanese, see Rohlfs §587 and Domokos “La morfologia verbale” 267. With regard to Florentine, Manni (“Ricerche sui tratti fonetici” 154) has noted that the evolution of pretonic *ar* to *er* in the future and conditional of *-are* verbs can be said to be constant from the first half of the 14th century onwards.

³⁵ Domokos “La morfologia verbale” 269. Out of the three different ways Bonvesin forms the conditional (two are synthetic and one analytic), I have quoted the first of these which Domokos lists on p. 268, formed with the perfect of HABERE. The second synthetic type, formed with the imperfect of HABERE, presents only the 3rd person singular for the present conditional for *essere*, which is *seria*. On the question of Bonvesin’s formation of the conditional, the future, the passive and the assertive particle *sì*, see Domokos “Appunti su morfologia e sintassi del milanese di Bonvesin de la Riva.”

³⁶ Domokos, "La morfologia verbale" 274. Other Mil. forms for *-are* verbs are *-à* (MF, 28; V, 98) but *-ato* already present in (MF, 40; V, 98).

³⁷ Tavoni (216) notes that *io* is a Tuscan subject pronoun.

³⁸ See Rohlfs (§§434–440) for subject pronouns in old Tuscan and Milanese.

³⁹ The preservation of pre-tonic *e* for these pronouns and for the preposition has been noted as a northern trait by Mengaldo (111), Tavoni (216) and Palermo (327–28).

⁴⁰ For Tuscan, see Rohlfs, §427 and for Milanese §428 as well as Mengaldo, p. 112. With regard to the 3rd person plural in northern dialects, Rohlfs notes that "nei testi antichi 'loro' non è frequente; più usato è 'suo', cfr. l'antico lombardo *li madrane . . . veçando li soi filioli* (Barsegapé)" and that "nei dialetti attuali, 'loro' non è popolare in nessun luogo" (§428).

⁴¹ See Rohlfs §895.

WORKS CITED

- Bongrani, Paolo and Silvia Morgana. "La Lombardia." *L'italiano nelle regioni, I. Lingua nazionale e identità regionali*. Ed. Francesco Bruni. Turin: UTET, 1992. 84–142.
- . "La Lombardia." *L'italiano nelle regioni, II. Testi e documenti*. Ed. Francesco Bruni. Turin: UTET, 1994. 101–170.
- Borgogno, G. B. "Saggio sulle consonanti sibilanti in antichi testi dell'Italia settentrionale." *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia Virgiliana di Mantova* n.s. 36 (1968): 1–122.
- . "La lingua dei dispacci di Filippo della Molza diplomatico mantovano della 2a metà del sec. XIV." *Studi di grammatica italiana* 9 (1980): 19–171.
- Bruognolo, F. "I Toscani nel Veneto e le cerchie toscaneggianti." *Storia della cultura veneta*. Ed. G. Arnaldi and M. Pastore Stocchi. Vicenza: N. Pozza, 1976. 369–439.
- Bruni, Francesco. "Appunti sui movimenti religiosi e il volgare italiano nel Quattro-Cinquecento." *Studi linguistici italiani* n.s. 9 (1989): 3–30.
- Bruttini, A. *Pubblicità e contabilità secondo il metodo italiano della partita doppia in Inghilterra 1669–1731*. Siena: Dipartimento di Studi Aziendali e Sociali, 1987.
- Casapullo, Rosa. *Il Medioevo*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1999.
- Caselles, Enrique. *Los comerciantes valencianos del siglo XV y sus libros cuentas*. Castelló de la Plana: Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I, 2007.
- Castellani, Arrigo. "Un altro, l'altro." *Lingua nostra* 11 (1950): 31–34.
- . *Nuovi testi fiorentini: del dugento*. Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1952.
- . *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana. I. Introduzione*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2000.
- Contini, Gianfranco ed., *Poeti del Duecento*. Milan: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1960.
- Covini, N. "Dugnani, Giacomo." *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*. Ed. Alberto M. Ghiaslberti. Rome, 1968–2008. 805–808.
- Degli Innocenti, Mario, ed. *L'Elucidario. Volgarezzamento in antico milanese dell'«Elucidarium» di Onorio Augustodunense*. Padua: Antenore, 1984.

- Domokos, György. "Appunti su morfologia e sintassi del milanese di Bonvesin de la Riva." *Aevum: Rassegna di scienze storiche linguistiche e filologiche* 72.3 (1998): 619–631.
- . "La morfologia verbale del milanese antico di Bonvesin dra Riva." *Verbum* 9.2 (2007): 261–277.
- Frangioni, Luciana, ed. *Milano fine Trecento. Il carteggio milanese dell'Archivio Datini di Prato*. 2 vols. Florence: Opus Libri, 1994.
- Ghinassi, Ghino. "Nuovi studi sul volgare mantovano di Vivaldo Belcalzer." *Studi di filologia italiana* 23 (1965): 19–172.
- . "Il volgare mantovano tra Medioevo e Rinascimento." *Ludovico Ariosto: lingua, stile e tradizione*. Ed. Cesare Segre. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1976. 7–28.
- . "Incontri tra toscano e volgari settentrionali in epoca rinascimentale." *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 61 (1976): 86–100.
- ed. *Dal Belcalzer al Castiglione: studi sull'antico volgare di Mantova e sul "Cortegiano"*. Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2006.
- Giovanardi, Claudio. "Le lingue regionali nell'Italia settentrionale." *Storia generale della letteratura italiana*. Ed. Nino Borsellino and Walter Pedullà. Milan: F. Motta, 1999. 312–326.
- Grignani, M. A. "Koinè nell'Italia settentrionale. Note sui volgari scritti settentrionali." *Koinè in Italia. Dalle origini al Cinquecento*. Ed. Glauco Sanga. Bergamo: P. Lubrina, 1991. 35–53.
- Levi, E. *Francesco di Vannozzo e la lirica nelle corti lombarde durante la seconda metà del secolo XIV*. Firenze: Pubblicazioni della Sezione di Filosofia e Filologia, 32, 1908.
- Lurati, Ottavio. "Aree linguistiche, III. Lombardia e Ticino." *Lexikon der romanistischen Linguistik*. Ed. Gunter Holtus, Michele Metzeltin and Christian Schmitt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1988. 485–516.
- Mainoni, Patrizia. "Un mercante milanese del primo Quattrocento: Marco Serraineri." *Nuova Rivista Storica* 59 (1975): 331–377.
- . *Mercanti lombardi tra Barcellona e Valenza nel basso Medioevo*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1982.
- Manni, Paola. "Ricerche sui tratti fonetici e morfologici del fiorentino quattrocentesco." *Studi di grammatica italiana* 8 (1979): 115–171.
- . *Il Trecento toscano*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2003.
- Maraschio, Nicoletta. "Lingua, società e corte di una signoria padana fra Quattro e Cinquecento." *Ludovico Ariosto: lingua, stile e tradizione*. Ed. Cesare Segre. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1976. 29–38.
- Marazzini, Claudio. "Fortuna del toscano letterario." *La lingua italiana: profilo storico*. Ed. Claudio Marazzini. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1994. 252–255.
- Massariello Merzagora, Giovanna. *Lombardia*. Pisa: Pacini, 1988.
- Medin, A. "La coltura toscana nel Veneto durante il Medioevo." *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere e Arti* 82 (1922–23): 83–154.
- Melis, Federigo. *Aspetti della vita economica medievale (Studi nell'Archivio Datini di Prato)*. Siena: Monte dei Paschi, 1962.
- Mengaldo, Pier Vincenzo. *La lingua del Boiardo lirico*. Florence: Olschki, 1963.

- Merlo, Clemente. "I dialetti lombardi." *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 24 (1960–61): 1–12.
- Migliorini, Bruno. "Sulla lingua dell'*Ariosto*." *Italica* 23.3 (1946): 152–160.
- Migliorini, Bruno. *Storia della lingua italiana*. Florence: Sansoni, 1960.
- Migliorini, Bruno and Gianfranco Folena, ed. *Testi non toscani del Trecento*. Modena: Società Tipografica Modena, 1952.
- Monaci, Ernesti and F. Arese ed. *Crestomazia italiana dei primi secoli*. 2 vols. Rome: Società Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1955.
- Mussafia, Adolf. "Monumenti di antichi dialetti italiani." *Scritti di filologia e linguistica*. Ed. Antonio Daniele and L. Renzi. Padua: Antenore, 1983. 221–246 [Originally published in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, (1864). Vol. 46. 113–235].
- Origo, Iris. *The merchant of Prato: Francesco di Marco Datini*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Palermo, Massimo. "La lingua dei mercanti." *Storia generale della letteratura italiana*. Ed. Nino Borsellino and Walter Pedullà. Milan: F. Motta, 1999. 482–511.
- Pellegrini, Giovan Battista. "Friuli." *Storia della lingua italiana*. III. *Le altre lingue*. Ed. Luca Serianni and Paolo Trifone. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1994. 240–60.
- Persico, G. "Il volgare illustre predantesco nell'Italia Settentrionale." *Saggi di Umanesimo Cristiano* 4 (dicembre). 4 (1949): 55–71.
- Polimeni, Giuseppe. "I volgari municipali e l'affioramento di una scripta nel medioevo lombardo." *Quaderns d'Italià* 8–9 (2004): 51–66.
- Rajna, Pio. "Una canzone di Maestro Antonio da Ferrara e l'ibridismo del linguaggio nella nostra antica letteratura." *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 13 (1889): 1–36.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*. 3 vols. Turin: Einaudi, 1966.
- Salvioni, Carlo. *Fonetica del dialetto moderno della città di Milano*. Turin: Loescher, 1979.
- . "Dell'antico dialetto pavese." *Bollettino della Società pavese di Storia patria* 2 (1902): 193–251. Rpt. in *Scritti linguistici*. Ed. Michele Loporcaro et al. Vol. 3. Belinzona: Edizioni dello Stato del Cantone Ticino, 2008. 410–468.
- . "Fonetica e morfologia del dialetto milanese." *L'Italia Dialettale* 38 (1975): 1–46.
- Sanga, Glauco. "Due Lombardie." *Rivista Italiana di Dialettologia* 12 (1989): 173–95.
- ed. *Koinè in Italia. Dalle origini al Cinquecento*. Bergamo: P. Lubrina, 1991.
- . "Lombardy." *The dialects of Italy*. Ed. Martin Maiden and Mair Parry. London: Routledge, 1997. 253–259.
- Santoro, C ed., *La matricola dei mercanti di lana sottile di Milano. Con 78 tavole e un'appendice di documenti*. Milan: Giuffrè, 1940.
- Scotti Morgana, Silvia. "Materiali per la storia della lingua non letteraria: gride e documenti dell'ultima età sforzesca." *Studi di lingua e letteratura lombarda offerti a Maurizio Vitale*. 2 Vols. 1983. 317–361.
- Serianni, L ed., *Testi pratesi della fine del Duecento e dei primi del Trecento*. Florence: L'Accademia della Crusca, 1977.

- Sgrilli, Paola. "L'espansione del toscano nel Trecento." *La Toscana nel secolo XIV: Caratteri di una civiltà regionale*. Ed. Stefano Gensini. Pisa: Centro di studi sulla civiltà del tardo medioevo - San Miniato. Collana di studi e ricerche, 2, 1988. 425–464.
- Sosnowski, Roman. *Origini della lingua dell'economia in Italia: dal XIII al XVI secolo*. Milan: F. Angeli, 2006.
- Stella, Angelo, ed. *Gli statuti delle strade e delle acque del contado di Milano*. Milan: LED, 1992.
- . "Emilia-Romagna." *Storia della lingua italiana. III. Le altre lingue*. Ed. Luca Serianni and Paolo Trifone. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1994. 260–294.
- . "Liguria." *Storia della lingua italiana. III. Le altre lingue*. Ed. Luca Serianni and Paolo Trifone. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1994. 105–153.
- . "Lombardia." *Storia della lingua italiana. III. Le altre lingue*. Ed. Luca Serianni and Paolo Trifone. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1994. 153–212.
- . "Piemonte." *Storia della lingua italiana. III. Le altre lingue*. Ed. Luca Serianni and Paolo Trifone. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1994. 75–105.
- Stussi, Alfredo, ed. *Testi veneziani del Duecento e dei primi del Trecento*. Pisa: Nistri-Lischi Editori, 1965.
- . "La prima espansione del toscano fra Tre e Quattrocento." *Lingua, dialetto e letteratura*. Ed. Alfredo Stussi. Turin: Einaudi, 1993. 13–19.
- . "Filologia mercantile." *Studi di filologia e letteratura italiana in onore di Gianvito Resta*. Ed. Masiello Vitilio. Roma: Salerno, 2000. 269–284.
- Tavoni, Mirko. *Il Quattrocento*. Milan: Il Mulino, 1992.
- Tomasin, Lorenzo. "Gli studi sugli antichi volgari settentrionali." *Bollettino di Italianistica* n.s. 4.2 (2007): 71–85.
- Tomasin, Piera. "Veneto." *Storia della lingua italiana. III. Le altre lingue*. Ed. Luca Serianni and Paolo Trifone. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1994. 212–240.
- Trolli, D. "La lingua di Giovanni Morelli." *Studi di grammatica italiana* 2 (1972): 51–153.
- Vanelli, Laura and Lorenzo Renzi. "Personal pronouns and demonstratives." *The dialects of Italy*. Ed. Martin Maiden and Mair Parry. London: Routledge, 1997. 106–115.
- Vitale, Maurizio. *La lingua volgare della cancelleria visconteo-sforzesca nel Quattrocento*. Varese-Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1953.
- . "La lingua volgare della cancelleria sforzesca nell'età di Ludovico il Moro." *La veneranda favella. Studi di storia della lingua italiana*. Ed. Maurizio Vitale. Naples: Morano, 1988. 169–239.
- Wilhelm, Raymund. *Bonvesin da la Riva. La Vita di Sant' Alessio. Edizione secondo il codice Trivulziano 93*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2006.
- Zerbi, T. "L'efficacia del metodo nella completezza del sistema." *Il mastro a partita doppia di una azienda mercantile del Trecento*. Ed. T. Zerbi. Milan: Cavallieri, 1936. 237–74.