

**A Social Network of Knowledge: the Functions of
Knowledge in the Correspondence of Giovanni Garzoni
(1429-1505)**

Anna-Luna Post
3942163
RMA Thesis
July 7 2014

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
1. Giovanni Garzoni and the <i>Epistolae Familiares</i>	13
2. Knowledge as a Means to Structure Social Exchange	19
3. The Exchange of Knowledge as Primary Goal	35
4. Dedications: Knowledge as a Commodity	45
5. Dedications: Distributing Knowledge	56
6. The Didactic Function of Knowledge	62
Conclusion	77
Bibliography	80

Introduction

Scholarship on Renaissance humanism is extremely rich and diverse. Many classic works still influence our image of the Renaissance, while new works concerning humanism as an intellectual movement and humanists as a social group continue to be published everyday. Humanism as a movement is both sufficiently well-defined and just intangible enough to keep exercising fascination over a large group of scholars, belonging to both the Italian academies and the Anglo-American tradition, while the question to whom humanism appealed and for what reasons has similarly invoked debate. Recently this has led to enhanced attention to subjects such as humanist correspondences, social networks, patronage studies and the spread of knowledge. This thesis aims to contribute to existing scholarship on these subjects by analysing Giovanni Garzoni's network of correspondence and the various functions and meanings that different kinds of knowledge had for members of this network.

Giovanni Garzoni (1419 or 1429-1505) taught and practiced medicine in Bologna, where he also held a private school in oratory. His *Epistolae Familiares*, a collection of almost 500 letters, offers a wonderful insight into the network of a typical Renaissance polymath.¹ Garzoni corresponded with over a hundred different persons on extremely varied subjects. The majority of his correspondents lived in Bologna or its surroundings, but Garzoni also maintained correspondences with foreign rulers and former students who lived in other parts of Europe. Many of his Bolognese correspondents formed part of the city's elite: among them were high ecclesiastical authorities, several prominent scholars who taught at the university, and members of Bologna's ruling family, the Bentivoglio. Other correspondents held a more modest status: Garzoni's students in oratory occupy a prominent place in his correspondence as well.

Garzoni's interests are characterised by the same degree of diversity. That Garzoni worked as a professor of medicine and a physician as well as a private teacher of oratory already indicates that he combined many different interests. The list of his written works further illustrates this: he composed at least 19 historical treatises, dealing with Bolognese affairs or foreign wars, 45 saint lives, and many funeral orations and eulogies of prominent Bolognese men. Garzoni furthermore wrote many short treatises that deal with typically humanist subjects, ranging from the art of letter writing to the fickleness of fortune, but also

¹ L.R. Lind, *The Letters of Giovanni Garzoni, Bolognese Humanist and Physician (1419-1505)* (Atlanta 1992).

with less obvious topics, such as astrology and the natural sciences.² Some of the letters show considerable overlap with his written works; they closely resemble short treatises and can only be recognized as letters because of a salutation at the beginning or end. Other letters on the other hand are simply concerned with personal affairs. These serve to thank someone for a gift of fruit or pens, to share a funny anecdote, to congratulate a friend on a new career opportunity, or to console someone on the loss of a friend. Usually, however, these two elements coexist within one letter.

It is precisely this conjunction of knowledge and social relations, combined with Garzoni's many different interests and the variety in social status and professions of his correspondents, that makes it extremely interesting to ask what role knowledge played in Garzoni's correspondence. Studies concerning the exchange of knowledge within networks of correspondence in the sixteenth and seventeenth century suggest that the exchange of knowledge was one of the main goals of these networks. However, similar studies concerning the Renaissance are scarce. Through what can be called a micro-history of knowledge, I aim to provide such a study. The primary goal of this thesis is thus to analyse what role knowledge played in Garzoni's network of correspondence. What functions did different kinds (i.e. humanist, medical and theological) of knowledge perform? How was the exchange of knowledge related to social exchange? That is, was the exchange of knowledge usually the primary goal, or could it also be merely supportive to social purposes? And can patterns in Garzoni's different uses of knowledge with regard to different groups of correspondents be discerned?

As stated above, this thesis will touch upon several existing debates in Renaissance scholarship: humanist correspondences, social networks, Renaissance friendships and relations of patronage. The next part of this introduction will therefore be devoted to a brief discussion of recent scholarship on Renaissance correspondences and networks, with specific regard to the role of knowledge in them.

In the past decades many studies into the workings of social networks have been conducted. As the studies of social networks in the Renaissance have been heavily influenced by patronage studies, it is useful to start with a brief analysis of the different approaches and perspectives that lay at the basis of this specific field, before moving on to more recent literature on networks of correspondence and exchange. The first studies into relations of

² Giovanni Fantuzzi, *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi* 9 vols., (Bologna 1781-1794), vol. 3 (1783), 84-100, and Rolando Perrazoli, *L'umanista bolognese G. Garzoni e il teologo ripano G. Paci* (Ripatransone, 1999), 15-17.

patronage were heavily influenced by trends in sociology³ and focused primarily on patronage relations in the fields of art and politics.⁴ These studies mostly paid attention to clear-cut cases of patronage, which they described to be as unequal relations of mutual profit between rich or politically influential patrons and fortune-seeking clients, but already in 1981 Werner Gundersheimer argued that this approach underestimated the omnipresence of patronage relations. Because of their focus on the most important or visible patrons and clients, they overlooked the so-called ‘supporting structures’ of less influential patrons and clients. Gundersheimer thus stated that earlier studies portrayed patronage relations in an oversimplified way, failing to take the underlying network of social relations behind each relation of patronage into account.⁵

Since then, many scholars have followed Gundersheimer’s lead and stressed that relations of patronage were much more present and influential than initially thought: more recent studies have stressed how almost all Early Modern relations were characterized by an idea of mutual interest and utility. Especially in the last decade the complexity and flexibility of social networks has better been described, primarily by the reintroduction of a third party: that of agent or broker.⁶ These intermediaries bridged social or physical gaps between potential patrons and clients. They could simply be employed by a wealthy prince or merchant to search for works of art to their likings, or could have the somewhat more elusive task to introduce potential clients to potential patrons and vice versa. Most importantly, however, the recent emphasis on brokers and agents has led to a better understanding of how networks overlapped and intersected. In fact, the greatest merit of the volume *Double Agents*:

³ See S.N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger, “Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange” in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* vol. 22, No. 1 (Jan., 1980) 42-77, for an extensive bibliography, especially footnote 1 and 2 on pages 43-45.

⁴ Gary Ianziti noted how English knows only one word for patronage in art and politics, while Italian distinguishes *mecenatismo* (patronage in art) from *clientelismo* (in politics). In the context of the Renaissance, however, the ambiguity of the English term seems more appropriate: a strict division between different kinds of patronage is hard to maintain. Ianziti, “Patronage and the Production of History: The Case of Quattrocento Milan” in F.W. Kent and Patricia Simons (ed.), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* (Oxford 1987) 299-312, 301-302.

⁵ Werner L. Gundersheimer, “Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach” in G.F. Lytle and S. Orgel (ed.), *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton 1981) 3-23.

⁶ On cultural brokerage: Janie Cole, *Music, Spectacle and Cultural Brokerage in Early Modern Italy. Michelangelo Buonarroti il Giovane*, vol. 1 (Florence 2011). On agents: Hans Cools, Marika Keblusek and Badeloch Vera Noldus (ed.), *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe* (Hilversum 2006) and Marika Keblusek and Badeloch Vera Noldus (ed.), *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden 2011). Cole has argued that agents and brokers differ essentially: according to her, agents were employed formally while brokers played more informal roles (*Spectacle and Cultural Brokerage in Early Modern Italy*, 3-4). Marika Keblusek does not support the same degree of distinction between agents and brokers. She defines agents based on their function, not their profession: often the role of agent went hand in hand with a different employment – official or unofficial (Keblusek, ‘Introduction: Double Agents in Early Modern Europe’, in Keblusek and Noldus (ed.), *Double Agents*, 1-9.).

Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe (edited by Marika Keblusek and published in 2011) consists of the insights it gives in the variety of functions agents could employ, and in the overlapping of the networks in which they worked. In this volume, related to the research project ‘Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe’, Keblusek and others chose not to focus solely on networks of patronage or networks of art or information exchange, but adopted a more comprehensive approach. The articles in their volume therefore clearly show how agents worked on different levels. In fact, the research undertaken within Keblusek’s project demonstrates that the success of an agent depended mostly on his ability to combine these different roles and to shift between the different networks he worked in.

This conclusion is extremely important and has proven very valuable for this thesis, which supports the insights offered by Keblusek and her co-authors on the overlap of networks and the different functions a person could occupy at the same time. Yet, this thesis focuses on a subject that has received little attention in the volumes by Keblusek: the intellectual sphere. Just as earlier studies into social networks and relations of patronage tended to do, Keblusek’s project primarily focused on art and politics. Only one essay in the volume explicitly refers to the intellectual level as well: “Politics and Letters: Gisbert Cuper as a Servant of Two Republics”. In this article Bianca Chen emphasized how Cuper successfully combined his activities in the political arena of the Dutch Republic with his participation in the Republic of Letters. Cuper operated within different networks, and profited accordingly from his relations in both fields. He used his political power to exercise control over the appointment of a new professor, and received both political news and antiquarian knowledge from foreign friends.⁷ An earlier article by her hand is even more useful for this thesis. Here the influence of sociology is felt again: Chen uses Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of cultural, social and economic capital to analyse how Cuper used his network for the sake of his learning and vice versa. Chen’s approach may be taken as an example when examining early modern networks of intellectual exchange: she shows how Cuper’s political activities contributed to his success and reputation within the Republic of Letters and vice versa.⁸

Saskia Stegeman, Giuseppe Olmi and Paula Findlen have conducted similar studies of networks of correspondence and the function of knowledge in them. Stegeman has made an

⁷ Bianca Chen, “Politics and Letters: Gisbert Cuper as a Servant of Two Republics” in Keblusek and Noldus (ed), *Double Agents*, 71-93.

⁸ Bianca Chen, “Digging for Antiquities with Diplomats: Gisbert Cuper (1644-1716) and his Social Capital” in *Republic of Letters. A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts* 2008, vol. 1, issue 1, 1-18.

important contribution to this field with her doctoral thesis on Theodorus van Almelooven's (1657-1712) network of patronage. Her study of the patronage network of a minor participant in the Republic of Letters shows how social conventions dominated Van Almelooven's correspondence. A brief part of her work describes how dedications, gifts of books and recommendations were used by the Dutch physician and his correspondents to win services from others. Unfortunately, the question of how these social relations and their corresponding conventions contributed to the exchange or building of knowledge - the ultimate goal of the Republic of Letters - is not explicitly asked; Stegeman only treats the knowledge that is exchanged by Van Almelooven and his correspondents incidentally.⁹

Giuseppe Olmi on the other hand has specifically focused on the circulation of knowledge within Ulisse Aldrovandi's network. In several articles he has shown how the famous naturalist Aldrovandi (1522-1605) cleverly built himself a network of 'friends', who would send him drawings and plants or keep him up to date about new collections of natural artifacts in their home country. Hence, these friends actually functioned as agents, even though Olmi never used this particular word.¹⁰ Olmi's studies greatly contribute to our understanding of the spread of scientific knowledge in a network of correspondence, as does Paula Findlen's study of Pietro Andrea Mattioli's (1501-1578) commentaries on Dioscorides' *De materia medica*. Findlen too emphasizes the way in which a famous naturalist used his network of correspondence to collect knowledge.¹¹

It may be noted that all of these studies focus on persons that were born at least a century after Garzoni: most studies into the workings of intellectual networks focus on its most famous example, the Republic of Letters. With the exception of Stegeman, they also concentrate on very prominent figures in the world of learning. Of course this focus is not unexpected, given the uncontested position of the Republic of Letters as the one great example of an extensive network of scholars whose ultimate aim was to contribute to the building of knowledge. However, it makes one curious how the spread of knowledge within earlier societies worked, especially in ones that could not easily rely on printed works. The recent publications of two volumes on medieval and early modern literary and learned

⁹ Saskia Stegeman, *Patronage en dienstverlening. Het network van Theodorus Janssonius van Almelooven (1657-1712) in de Republiek der Letteren* (Nijmegen 1996).

¹⁰ Giuseppe Olmi, "'Molti Amici in Varii Luoghi': Studio della natura e rapporti epistolari nel Secolo XVI", in *Nuncius. Annali di Storia della Scienza* VI (1991) 3-31 and idem, "Bologna nel secolo XVI: una capitale europea della ricerca naturalistica" in: Sabine Frommel (ed.), *Crocevia e capitale della migrazione artistica: forestieri a Bologna e bolognesi nel mondo (secoli XV-XVI)*, (Bologna 2010), 61-80.

¹¹ Paula Findlen, "The Formation of a Scientific Community: Natural History in Sixteenth-Century Italy" in Anthony Grafton and Nancy Siraisi (ed.), *Natural particulars. Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge Mass. 1999), 369-400.

societies show that more people share this feeling. The contributors to these volumes establish that neither the Republic of Letters, nor the academies which started developing in sixteenth-century Italy¹², were the first networks of knowledge. Instead, they point to the existence of late medieval and early modern networks of knowledge, both in and outside of Italy.¹³ Unfortunately, the articles in these volumes focus primarily on vernacular literary networks, while the learned networks also mentioned in the title receive less attention throughout the rest of the volume. The focus on institutions instead of networks of correspondence also makes them less valuable for this thesis, but it is important to note that a shift towards a more systematic study of earlier networks of knowledge is already visible.

The volume *Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe, 1400-1700* does have epistolary exchanges as its main subject. This volume, part of a series on cultural exchange in Europe, looks at “different networks of exchange by means of correspondence in Europe and at various functions and meanings that handwritten correspondence had for members of different strata in European society during the early age of printing.”¹⁴ ‘Culture’ is in this series defined as “that which simultaneously holds a society together and distinguishes it from other societies”, while ‘exchange’ is described as a complex concept that is “never pure and symmetrical; moreover, it is usually fashioned by relations of power and expresses different presuppositions (and positions) of the persons or groups involved.”¹⁵ The methodological framework provided in the introduction has proven to be especially valuable for this thesis, which will follow the definitions offered in it and the main arguments presented in the volume, while it focuses on a very specific aspect of cultural exchange: the exchange and distribution of knowledge. This thesis, however, will focus less on the function of a correspondence *an sich*, and will pay more attention to the specific function of knowledge within this correspondence.

Some last statements on humanist correspondences and their value as source material for historians must be made. Humanist correspondences have received considerable attention in the last decades, as the letter was one of the favourite genres in both Italian and northern humanism. The familiar letter served as an important vehicle of personal communication, but often had a public or semi-public function as well: humanists were well aware that their

¹² As is proudly claimed in the title of the four-year research project ‘The Italian Academies 1525-1700: the first intellectual networks of early modern Europe’ (see italianacademies.org, last consulted on July 2 2014).

¹³ Arjan van Dixhoorn, ‘Introduction’, in idem and Susie Speakman Suchs (ed.), *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (2 vols, Leiden 2008), 1-16.

¹⁴ Francisco Bethencourt, Florike Egmond, ‘Introduction’, in idem (ed), *Correspondence and Cultural exchange in Europe, 1400-1700* (Cambridge UK 2007) 1-30, 4.

¹⁵ Robert Muchembled, ‘General editor’s preface’, xvii and Bethencourt and Egmond, ‘Introduction’, in idem (ed), *Correspondence and Cultural exchange in Europe, 1400-1700*.

letters circulated among others or could be published during their lifetime or thereafter.¹⁶ Renaissance letters were thus carefully constructed literary documents: humanist they paid close attention to both form and content and did not even hesitate to edit letters written by themselves or others after sending or receiving them. The reasons for editing are numerous: they could be literary, but also more practical, since humanists often wrote letters (directly to patrons but also to others) in search of patronage.¹⁷ It is not always easy to distinguish this kind of letters from more ‘innocent’ ones: one of the main similarities between the Renaissance letter and its ancient predecessors concerns the idea of friendship cultivated in them. The letters are characterized by the mixing of the ideas of *clientela* relations with those of *amicitia*: which resulted in idea of friendship that demanded mutual commitment to the interests of the other.¹⁸ This element of utility remains largely unspoken, however. An ideal of disinterested, all-conquering friendship is thus combined with an implicit but more practical mindset in which friends were expected to help each other, to be in each other’s services forever, and to give and ask favors when needed.¹⁹ This makes it very difficult to establish what kind of relation existed between two correspondents and what the purpose of their correspondence was – as we will see quite often in this thesis.

In certain respects the fact that most humanist letters were such carefully constructed documents make them all the more valuable. The volume *Self-presentation and Social Identification: the Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* shows how humanist letters can still be approached in a very useful way. The editors of this volume stress the importance of letters as a means of self-presentation and social identification: through letters scholars could present an image of themselves that they would like to conserve for posterity, but, more importantly, they could also “define themselves as belonging to a specific group of people who shared the same interests and ideals, and were engaged in similar endeavours”.²⁰ The same emphasis on the importance of correspondences for the formation of social identities can be found in the contributions to the aforementioned volume

¹⁶ Judith Rice Henderson, “Humanist Letter Writing: Private Conversation or Public Forum?” in: Toon van Houdt et al (ed.), *Self-Representation and Social Identification: The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* (Leuven 2002) 17-38, 17-18.

¹⁷ Cecil H. Clough, “The Cult of Antiquity: Letters and Letter Collections”, in idem (ed.), *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Manchester 1976), 33-67.

¹⁸ Ronald Weissman, “Taking Patronage Seriously: Mediterranean Values and Renaissance Society”, in Kent and Simons (ed), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy*, 25-46, 34-35.

¹⁹ Guy Fitch Lytle, “Friendship and Patronage in Renaissance Europe”, in Kent and Simons (ed), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* 47-62.

²⁰ T. Van Houdt, Jan Papy, ‘Introduction’ in idem (ed), *Self-Representation and Social Identification: The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* 3.

Correspondence and Cultural Exchange in Europe, while Brian Jeffrey Maxson has recently stressed the particular importance of humanist knowledge in this regard.²¹

These general statements on humanist correspondences certainly apply to Garzoni's letter collection. His collection was consciously set up in collaboration between Garzoni and one of his students, Leandro Alberti. The relations Garzoni had with his correspondents are often hard to define: seemingly sincere expressions of friendship are alternated with more or less implicit references to expected favors and services. In almost all of these letters, whether intentional or coincidental, a transfer of knowledge takes place. Sometimes this is the primary purpose of a letter: for instance when Garzoni is asked by one of his pupils to clear up some uncertainty about the understanding of a classical text, or when Garzoni asks one of his friends to explain a biblical passage. But even when gestures seem purely personal, as when Garzoni is praising one of his friends or thanking them for a gift of fruit, he often does so by citing some passage of Cicero or Valla, his most cherished authors. Here it might not be the main goal, but a transfer of knowledge certainly takes place. Precisely because Garzoni functioned within different networks and had very wide-ranging interests, it becomes particularly interesting to ask how and why he exchanged different types of knowledge in his different social relations.

The main question of this thesis, as I have already introduced above, will concern the different roles and functions knowledge fulfilled within Garzoni's network of correspondence. In this thesis I examine the different uses of three kinds of knowledge: humanist, medical and theological knowledge. The first two categories reflect Garzoni's professions as a doctor and professor of medicine, and as a private teacher of oratory. The third kind of knowledge, theological, is chosen because of the importance of religious functionaries in Garzoni's network? Secondly, I aim to determine the relation between the knowledge used in Garzoni's letters and his social exchanges: when was knowledge subordinate to social exchange and when were social relations subordinate to the exchange of knowledge? Closely related to this question is another one, which will be discussed more briefly: how did each specific function of knowledge contribute to the spread of knowledge? Lastly I will ask whether specific patterns can be discerned as to the use of different kinds of knowledge with regard to particular groups of correspondents, for instance Garzoni's students, political rulers, or ecclesiastical authorities.

²¹ Brian Jeffrey Maxson, *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* (New York 2014).

The notion of a social identity formed or confirmed by a correspondence will return in the second paragraph of this thesis, which deals with those cases where the use of knowledge is supportive or even subordinate to social exchange. This paragraph will be preceded by a short paragraph in which Garzoni's letter collection and his network are discussed in some more detail. Then, the third paragraph will analyse those letters in which the exchange of knowledge seems to be the primary goal. The letters in this paragraph also show how important knowledge was in the formation of a social identity, but in these cases knowledge is not subordinate to social exchange. Instead, the paragraph deals primarily with those relations in which the desire for knowledge lies at the basis of the correspondence. In these cases one can properly speak of the exchange of knowledge: whereas other paragraphs show a semi-unilateral distribution of knowledge from Garzoni's side, this paragraph deals with relations in which both correspondents equally contribute to the exchange of knowledge. Of course attention will be paid to the reasons for these differences throughout this thesis. Paragraphs 4 and 5 share a common factor: they deal with Garzoni's own works and the dedications to these works. In paragraph 4 the use of knowledge as a commodity to enter into relations of patronage will be discussed. Paragraph 5 on the other hand will be concerned with those cases in which social relations are subordinate to Garzoni's desire to distribute his own knowledge: it will discuss his habit of dedicating works to persons who do not have obvious 'patron potential' and his reasons for doing so. The last paragraph is devoted to a very specific function of knowledge in Garzoni's letters: the didactic purpose of knowledge that stood at the basis of his correspondences with his students in oratory.

1. Giovanni Garzoni and the *Epistolae Familiares*

The most extensive studies to Garzoni date back to the eighteenth century, when interest in the Dominican order first led to the rediscovery of his works and letters by Vincenzo Domenico Fassini. However, the results of Fassini's research remain largely unpublished, even though Florio Banfi, another Dominican scholar, undertook an attempt to let them resurface in 1936.²² During the twentieth century several other authors have also attempted to revive some of Garzoni's works. None of these studies were very conclusive, until in 1992 all known surviving letters of Garzoni were published in L.R. Lind's critical edition *The Letters of Giovanni Garzoni: Bolognese Humanist and Physician (1419-1505)*. This volume contains almost 500 letters, of which the major part was written by Garzoni to others. Although Lind has provided a short summary and some elementary biographical information of most of the letters and their correspondents, he has not undertaken a conclusive analysis of them. The major merit of his work lies in the publication of the letters, which were earlier only available in different manuscript collections. A more thorough analysis of Garzoni's personal correspondence thus seems justified in itself.

First, however, some biographical information seems in order. Giovanni Garzoni was born in Bologna and died in 1505. His date of birth is not certain; Lind dates Garzoni's birth in 1419, based on Leandro Alberti's *Historie di Bologna*, where Alberti writes that Garzoni had died at the age of 86.²³ Alessandra Mantovani, who has recently published a volume and article on Garzoni's *Historiae Bononiensis* contests this date and more convincingly proposes 1429 instead, following a marginal note by Leandro Alberti stating that his teacher died at the age of 76, plus information given by Garzoni himself concerning a trip to Florence.²⁴ Garzoni spent his first years in Bologna, where his father Bernardo taught medicine at the *Studium*.

²² Florio Banfi, "Un umanista bolognese e i Domenicani: A proposito dell'opera inedita su Giovanni Garzoni del P. Vincenzo Domenico Fassini O.P. contenutasi nel codice Vat. Lat. 10686" in *Memorie Domenicane* 1936, 3-39.

²³ Lind, *Letters*, 421-423.

²⁴ Garzoni writes in one of his letters (no. 2 to Alberti) and in his short treatise *De proprio Ciceronis imitandi studio* that he visited Florence when he was not even thirteen years old. In the letter to Alberti he writes that pope Eugene IV resided in Florence at this time, and that he heard Leonardo Bruni speaking. The treatise also speaks of Carlo Marsuppini, St. Ambrose Traversari, Flavio Biondo and George of Trebizond. If Garzoni indeed visited Florence when he was only twelve years old and if we do set his birth in 1419, he must have been in Florence in 1431 – but Eugene IV only resided in Florence from 1434 onwards. Mantovani dates Garzoni's birth in 1429, based on a brief note in the margins of Garzoni's letter collection. The note is made by Alberti and states that his teacher died in 1505 at the age of 76. This would indeed support a date of birth in 1429, and thus a visit to Florence in 1441 – when Eugene IV, Bruni, Marsuppini, Biondo, and Trezibond would indeed have been in Florence. One problem remains, however: Traversari died in 1439. Alessandra Mantovani, "Giovanni Garzoni e le 'Historiae Bononienses'. Uno scolaro del Valla alla corte dei Bentivoglio", in Anselmi, G.M. and Guerra, M. (ed), *Lorenzo Valla e l'umanesimo Bolognese* (Bologna 2009) 59-83, 61-63.

From 1443 until 1450 Bernardo worked in Rome as the personal physician for pope Nicholas V, and Giovanni accompanied him during this period. During this period or shortly after Garzoni must have started his humanist studies, which he first conducted with Giovanni Lamola in Bologna. His letters also mention some lectures by Leonardo Bruni which he attended, but Garzoni does not seem to have studied in a more systematic manner with the great Florentine humanist. After this initial period of humanist studies he returned to Rome, where he studied with Lorenzo Valla for four years. The dating for this period is difficult, but Garzoni's letters attest that it must have at least partly coincided with the papacy of Callixtus III (1455-1458). Garzoni probably returned to Bologna after the deaths of Valla and Callixtus, thus in 1457 or 1458.²⁵

Garzoni then started his study of medicine at the Bolognese *Studium*. He received his degree in 1466 and started teaching medicine in the same year, an activity that he kept up until his death. Garzoni also worked as a physician – his letters make frequent mention of his duties as a doctor for both the Bentivoglio family, the ruling family of Bologna during Garzoni's life, and his work for the Augustinian order at the convent of San Giacomo. Garzoni started his work as a physician for the Augustinians in 1477, a couple of years after he had become friends with its head, Giovanni Paci of Ripatransone, whom he probably met around 1473.²⁶ He combined these duties with political activities: in 1461, 1468, 1473, 1478 and 1483 he served as a member of the *Anziani* (the governing board of Bologna), as a *tribuno della plebe* (a body that advised the *Anziani*) and twice as an ambassador to Rome: in 1493 to Alexander VI and in 1503 to Pius III.²⁷

His letters, however, barely mention these activities: from his *Epistolae Familiares* it becomes clear that Garzoni would have preferred to spend his whole life on his literary studies. In his free time he read classical texts, most of all Cicero, and wrote many works in Latin. Both the sheer abundance of these works and the enthusiasm with which Garzoni wrote about them makes Lind's judgement of him seem cruel and undeserved; Lind wrote that Garzoni was neither a "deep thinker nor a dedicated scholar". Although the first claim may indeed be true (Garzoni's letters do not display a particularly unique style of thought), the second certainly is not. Earlier historians have more adequately described him as "il poligrafo più operoso e forse più enciclopedico dell'umanesimo bolognese di fine secolo", thus as the

²⁵ Lind, *Letters* viii-ix and Rolando Perrazoli, *L'umanista bolognese G. Garzoni*, 11.

²⁶ Lind, *Letters* x-xi, 433-434.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, 439.

most industrious and perhaps most encyclopedic polymath of the Bolognese humanists at the end of the fifteenth century.²⁸

This claim is supported by the impressive list of Garzoni's writings. It contains more than a hundred works, among which at least 19 historical works, dealing with Bolognese affairs or foreign wars, 45 saint lives, and many funeral orations and eulogies of prominent Bolognese men, such as the members of the Bentivoglio family. Garzoni furthermore wrote many short treatises that deal with typically humanist subjects, ranging from the art of letter writing to the fickleness of fortune, but also with less obvious topics, such as astrology and the natural sciences.²⁹ In his letters Garzoni often refers to these works, stating that he has recently finished a long awaited saint life or that he is currently working on a historical treatise. Some of the letters also show some overlap with his written works; they closely resemble short treatises and can only be recognized as letters because of a salutation at the beginning or end. These letters contain brief accounts of contemporary or less contemporary wars, have the importance of virtue or the fickleness of fortune as their subject, praise the members of the Bentivoglio family, or discuss the virtues of a certain saint. Many letters on the other hand are simply concerned with personal affairs. These serve to thank someone for a gift of fruit or pens, to share a funny anecdote, to congratulate someone on a new career opportunity, or to console someone on the loss of a friend. This diversity in topics is by no means exceptional within a humanist correspondence: these were often characterized by a mixture between personal exchanges and learned expositions on wide-ranging subjects.³⁰

The letter collection itself consists of 489 letters, which are divided into ten books.³¹ In his letters Garzoni engaged in correspondences with more than a hundred different persons, Bolognese and foreign: among them were famous humanists (Pomponio Leto, Guarino da Verona, Antonio Codro, Angelo Poliziano), princes (several members of the Bentivoglio family; Frederic, duke of Saxony), cardinals (Ascanio Sforza, Tamás Bakócz), high inquisitorial functionaries (Giovanni Torfanino, Vincenzo Bandello di Castelnuovo),

²⁸ Ezio Raimondi, *Codro e L'Umanesimo a Bologna* (second edition; Bologna 1987) 70, read in Rolando Perrazoli, *L'umanista bolognese G. Garzoni*, 17.

²⁹ Giovanni Fantuzzi, *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi* 9 vols., (Bologna 1781-1794), vol. 3 (1783), 84-100, Perrazoli, *L'umanista bolognese G. Garzoni e il teologo ripano G. Paci* 15-17. See Alison Frazier, *Possible Lives Authors and Saints in Renaissance Italy* (New York 2004), especially chapter 4 and pages 395-414 for the most extensive analysis of Garzoni's hagiographical works.

³⁰ Bethencourt and Egmond, 'Introduction' 7.

³¹ The largest part of these letters is contained in manuscript 1896 (volume I) of the University Library of Bologna. These letters are copies of the original collection made by Leandro Alberti. This collection of letters is the one that passed into the hands of Garzoni's grandson Fabrizio, who donated Garzoni's works and letters to the library of the Dominican order in Bologna before his death in 1574. See Lind's *Introduction* for a more thorough description of each of the manuscripts that contain letters by Garzoni.

numerous members of the Augustinian and Dominican order and many students (among whom were Leandro Alberti and, briefly, Gerolamo Savonarola). To his favourite correspondents, Giovanni Paci, Leandro Alberti and Giovanni Torfanino, Garzoni wrote respectively 130, 77 and 66 letters.³² These last three correspondents each deserve a short introduction; their letters will figure prominently among the examples given in the rest of this thesis.

Giovanni Paci (born in 1440) was Prior of the Augustinian order in Bologna since 1476. Garzoni started working as a physician for this order in 1477, three years after his friendship with Paci started. The two exchanged letters until Garzoni's death in 1505, but their friendship was far from perfect. Several letters are predominated by feelings of resentment and suspicion on Garzoni's side, who at times accused his friend of being ungrateful and complained that the latter was not serving his interests as he was supposed to do. Still, many of the letters mention services and favours rendered from Garzoni to Paci or vice versa. Garzoni dedicated several of his works to Paci and tutored his nephew Alessandro, who came to Bologna to study civil law. Paci on the other hand introduced Garzoni to influential persons in and outside Bologna, such as the Venetian ambassador Antonio Vinciguerra.³³

With Giovanni Torfanino (dates of birth and death unknown), Vicar of the Holy Inquisition at Bologna, Garzoni had a similar relation, although this one was a little less marked by the ups and downs that characterized Garzoni's friendship with Paci. Torfanino was, just like Paci, a prominent member of a religious order – only not of the Augustinians, but the Dominicans. Garzoni's relations with Torfanino were very important for his network as well: the greatest part of Garzoni's students belonged to the Dominican order. From his correspondence with them and Torfanino it becomes clear that a clear link between Garzoni, Torfanino and the students them can be established. This aspect of Garzoni's network will receive particular attention in paragraph 6, which deals with Garzoni's relations with his students.³⁴

Leandro Alberti (1479-1552) was one of these Dominican students. Alberti became Garzoni's student in 1489, at the age of 10. He joined the Dominican order at Forlì four years later, in 1493, and the convent of San Domenico in Bologna in 1500.³⁵ Both Garzoni's letters to him and letters addressed to others concerning Alberti speak very highly of him; he must

³² Lind, *Letters*, 429.

³³ Perazzoli, *L'Umanista bolognese G. Garzoni*, 57, Lind, *Letters*, 434-435.

³⁴ Lind, *Letters*, 432.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, 423-424.

have shown particular talent and devotion. This would later result in an impressive list of works, among which his *Historie di Bologna* and especially his outstanding contribution to Italian geography, the *Descrittione di tutta Italia* figure most prominently. Alberti also wrote a book on the illustrious men of the Dominican order, in which he mentioned and lauded Garzoni as his former teacher and published three of his hagiographies.³⁶ Furthermore, Alberti is the one who collected and copied Garzoni's letters. That a pupil undertook such an endeavour is not too surprising; the letters of Poliziano for instance were (after his death) collected and published by a former pupil and an enthusiastic editor, although it is certain that Poliziano did at least part of the selection and editing himself.³⁷ Alberti on the other hand started working on Garzoni's letter collection in 1493, when Garzoni was in good health. Garzoni thus knew that Alberti collected and copied his letters and was involved in the process, although none of his letters to Alberti contain very specific instructions as to how his letters should be organised. It is Alberti who asks Garzoni to provide him with more information on his correspondents and who keeps Garzoni up to date about his progress, as he does in letter 140 where he tells him that he has already copied out more than two hundred letters.³⁸

As a source the collection has certain limitations. One problem is posed by the division of the collection into ten books: it seems as if some attempts have been made to organise the collection around the main recipients, but these attempts were only partly successful. Almost all the letters contained in books VII and VIII are addressed to Giovanni Paci. The superscription of letter 8, "Io[annis] Gar[zonis] Epistolarum Liber at F[ratrem] Vincentium Placentinum", suggests that Garzoni's letters to Vincenzo da Piacenza were intended to form a separate book as well. This time the plan must have been abandoned, however; only 7 out of the 13 letters to Vincenzo are presented in a sequence, while the other letters addressed to him are scattered throughout the rest of the collection.³⁹ The attempts to order the letters this way has further complicated an already existing problem: Lind has determined that only 17% of them are dated or contain references to events that make it possible to date them. According to his estimation the earliest of them was written in 1466 and the latest one in 1505, while a considerable peak can be discerned between 1498 and

³⁶ *De viris illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum libri sex in unum congesti* (Bologna 1517), read in Lind, *Letters*, 423.

³⁷ Alison Frazier, review of Shane Butler (ed.), *Angelo Poliziano: Letters*. Volume I, Books I-IV (Cambridge MA 2005), in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2008.08.39, read on <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2008/2008-08-39.html>, last consulted April 30 2014.

³⁸ Lind, *Letters*, lxx, 421-425 and letter 140 (Alberti to Garzoni), page 123-124 and 464-465.

³⁹ Lind, *Letters*, 5, 426.

1503.⁴⁰ Most of the dated letters appear in book VII and VIII: they are addressed to Paci and are mainly written in 1498, 1499 and 1503.⁴¹ If a chronological order within the rest of the letters once existed, the insertion of some letters at a certain point with the intention of starting separate books with letters from one particular correspondent has certainly ruined this.

The difficulties in dating the letters in turn contribute to already existing problems when determining what kind of relation Garzoni had with a certain correspondent. In the introduction I have briefly mentioned the rhetorical value of humanist letters, which are characterized by an ideal of disinterested, all-conquering friendship, but which at the same time implicitly refer to expected profits, services and favours. It is often impossible to establish which letter follows upon a letter in which such a favour is asked, which limits the possibility to establish if and how Garzoni profited from certain relations. Most importantly, however, almost all letters addressed *to* Garzoni are missing, which makes for a regrettably misbalanced picture. As said, to his favourite correspondents, Giovanni Paci, Leandro Alberti and Giovanni Torfanino, Garzoni wrote respectively 130, 77 and 66 letters.⁴² The surviving letters sent to Garzoni by these same correspondents count respectively 1, 2 and 0.

Still, even with these limitations the letters of Garzoni form a beautiful insight into the world of a late fifteenth-century humanist and physician. The letters offer a wonderful picture of Garzoni's rich and varied network, while they allow us at the same time to follow some of his longer lasting relations and the ways in which they developed. Garzoni's correspondence shows how his network had a firm basis in Bologna, but extended beyond the boundaries of Italy as well. The letters show Garzoni in a subordinate and a dominant role, for he both corresponded with persons who held a markedly higher status and with people whose social status was lower than his. They similarly portray Garzoni as both a benefactor and a receiver of favours and services. Finally, they show Garzoni in his professional function, namely as a teacher, and in a much more personal capacity.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, xxvii-xxx.

⁴¹ Lind, *Letters*, xxvii-xxx and Perazzoli, *L'Umanista bolognese G. Garzoni*, 20.

⁴² Lind, *Letters*, 429.

2. Knowledge as a Means to Structure Social Exchange

The most striking feature of Garzoni's letter collection is the omnipresence of knowledge in it: in roughly 80% of the letters some kind of knowledge is presented. However, both the types of knowledge present and the purposes for which they are used vary considerably. This paragraph will deal with the most common purpose of knowledge in Garzoni's letters. In these cases knowledge is used to praise a correspondent, to thank him, rebuke him for committing a *faux pas* in a friendship, or to justify a decision made by Garzoni. The distribution or exchange of knowledge is not the primary goal here. On the contrary, the use of knowledge is actually subordinate to a social purpose. This paragraph will analyse what types of knowledge were used for this purpose: did Garzoni employ his medical, theological and humanist knowledge in the same fashion? It will also ask whether Garzoni used different kinds of knowledge for different correspondents, or in different social situations. Did he, for instance, more often use theological knowledge when he wrote to his friends at the Dominican and Augustinian order, while saving his humanist knowledge for students and professional humanists?

When one studies Garzoni's correspondence as a whole, it becomes clear that Garzoni used some expressions over and over again, and that he did so in specific circumstances. These expressions are for the greatest part derived from classical literature: Garzoni often cites Cicero, but lines from Pliny, Livy, Seneca, Plautus, Terence, Vergil, Ovid, Homer and Aristotle also occur in this context. In very rare cases Garzoni also cites the letters of Paul the Apostle, but those instances are negligible when compared to the overwhelming use of humanist knowledge in this context. That Garzoni made use of these commonplace expressions is not surprising; many Renaissance teachers urged their students to write down useful phrases or examples from their favourite classical authors and works so that they could easily find them again to use them in their own works.⁴³ Analysing which sentences Garzoni used, in which situations he used them and to whom he used them will provide us with clear insights into the ways Garzoni used his knowledge of ancient texts and their authors for a social purpose. The first part of this paragraph will therefore be concerned with these returning expressions.

⁴³ Stegeman, *Patronage en Dienstverlening*, 40 and Fred Schurink, "Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 73, No. 3 (September 2010), 453-469, 453-454, especially note 3 on page 454, which refers to recent literature on the subject.

One of Garzoni's favourite expressions is a quote, “*laudari a viro laudato*”⁴⁴, derived from Naevius' *Hector Proficiscens*. Of Naevius' work only fragments are left, and Garzoni probably did not read the passage in a work of Naevius himself. It is much more likely that he read it in Cicero's *Epistulae Ad Familiares* of which Garzoni owned a copy.⁴⁵ In the *Epistulae* the sentence runs as follows: “*laetus sum laudari me,* inquit Hector, opinor, apud Naevium *'abs te, pater, a laudato viro.*”⁴⁶ This is followed by: “*ea est enim profecto iucunda laus, quae ab iis proficiscitur qui ipsi in laude vixerunt.*”⁴⁷ As we will see, Garzoni's references to Naevius often closely resemble Cicero's phrasing, especially in the two letters where the quote on Naevius' is followed by a paraphrase of the second sentence by Cicero. Garzoni mostly used the quote for one specific purpose, but subtle differences in the use of the quote and its presentation do exist. Now, in order to discuss the social purpose to which Garzoni employed this phrase, it is useful to start by citing the three instances in which the quote is used to Alberti:

“*Quippe laudari a laudato viro summum beneficium est, ut apud Naevium poetam inquit Hector*”⁴⁸

“*Utinam dignus essem opinion tua! Praecipuum est laudari a laudato viro; optima indole, optimo ingenio, optimis moribus, optimis litterarum studiis praeditus es.*”⁴⁹

“*Equidem laudari a laudato viro laudatissimum est. Apud poetam laetus est Hector quod laudatur a laudato viro. Turpissimi autem hominis laudatio (teste M. Tullio) ipsa paene turpis est. Mihi igitur iocundum est atque gloriosum quod cardinali Strigoniensi viro et mea et omnium sententia in omni dote praestanti labellum quo sanctissimi viri Aurelii Augustini vitam sum complexus dicandum curavi.*”⁵⁰

In both the first and the second letter Garzoni cites Naevius to thank Alberti for all the praise he bestowed on him, and to return the favour by praising Alberti instead. The first letter further urges Alberti to read Cicero: even though Garzoni is very grateful for Alberti's praise, Alberti should follow Cicero if he wants to become a great orator. In the second letter Garzoni

⁴⁴ Naevius, *Fragments* (ed. E. Warmington) 17, II, 118, read in Lind, letter 6, page 4.

⁴⁵ G. Manfré, “La biblioteca dell'umanista bolognese Giovanni Garzoni (1419-1505)”, *Accademie e Biblioteche d'Italia*, 27 (1959), 249-278, 4.

⁴⁶ Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares* 15.6.1, read on <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Cic.+Fam.+15.6.1&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0009> (last consulted June 22 2014).

⁴⁷ Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares* 15.6.1, read on <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Cic.+Fam.+15.6.1&fromdoc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0009> (last consulted June 22 2014).

⁴⁸ Lind, *Letters*, letter 6, page 4.

⁴⁹ Ibidem, letter 37, page 24-25.

⁵⁰ Ibidem, letter 249, page 208.

also uses the phrase to respond to praise expressed by Alberti. This time it is supplemented by explicit praise for Alberti, who is said to be gifted with the best talent, genius, manners and zeal for letters. The rest of the letter concerns Alberti's choice to become an orator and to devote himself to the religious life - a decision that Garzoni heartily supports.⁵¹ The two letters thus have a somewhat different content and purpose, but the phrase by Naevius is used in the same manner: it serves to thank Alberti for the praise he bestowed on Garzoni and to return it at the same time.

The third letter cited above shows a very different use of the quote. It is also addressed to Alberti, but actually concerns cardinal Bakócz and Garzoni's dedication of his *Life of Saint Augustine* to him. The letter opens with excessive praise for the cardinal, after which Garzoni refers to Naevius, who is not called by name but merely indicated as "the poet". This time the phrase is followed by another quote of Cicero, which states that the opposite is also true: to be praised by an infamous man is almost disgraceful. Therefore (and I paraphrase) Garzoni has thought it pleasant to dedicate his work on Saint Augustine to the cardinal. We can read this in two manners: Garzoni thinks of himself as a praised man, or the praised man is Augustine, through whose life Garzoni is praising the cardinal. Garzoni further adds that he wants and needs to follow the virtue of Cicero and Seneca, who dedicated their works to the most renowned men.⁵² Garzoni is thus explaining his decision to rededicate this work by using the quote from Naevius in combination with the references to Cicero and Seneca.

A similar use of the expression is found in letter 460 to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio, prelate of Bologna, to whom Garzoni dedicated his *De Felicitate Christianorum*. This time, however, Garzoni does not explicitly refer to Naevius. He also uses a slightly different formulation this time: "Ea res quantam tibi laudem esset allatura hinc sciri potest cum *laudari a praeclaro viro praeclarissimum censeatur*."⁵³ The same goes for letter 331, where Garzoni writes to Giovanni Paci that he is very happy to hear that Antonio Vinciguerra, the Venetian ambassador in Bologna, has praised his works. This time he writes "Ut enim improbi hominis laudatio labeculae est aspersio sic *a laudato viro laudari est amplissima*." Some examples follow of both praiseworthy men, by whom Garzoni would like to be praised, and wicked men, whose praise he would reject.⁵⁴ In these two letters Garzoni does not explicitly refer to Naevius, not even by indicating him as "the poet". In the first case he even changes the quote considerably. The significance of implicit citations will be addressed in more detail on page

⁵¹ Ibidem, letter 37, page 24.

⁵² Ibidem, letter 249, page 208.

⁵³ Ibidem, letter 460, page 391-392 (quotation on page 392).

⁵⁴ Ibidem, letter 331, page 264-266 (quotation on page 264).

26 and 27. For now it is important to note that the use of Naevius' expression in these two particular letters indicates that the use of knowledge was in these cases absolutely subordinate to a social purpose. In these cases the social goal was twofold: to respond to the praise expressed by Antonio Vinciguerra and to explain why Garzoni chose to dedicate a work to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio.

As has been illustrated by the letter to Paci concerning Vinciguerra, Garzoni would also use the quote to respond to praise uttered by someone else than the addressee of the letter. This is also true for letter 31, addressed to Giovanni Torfanino but concerned with a 'Bachalarium vestrum'. This was probably Vincenzo da Piacenza, a theologian from a noble Bolognese family, who joined the Dominican order at some point in his life – this letter to Torfanino must stem from around that time. Vincenzo may have taught logic and philosophy at the university. Alberti also called him his teacher: "già mio honorando precettore in logica e philosophia, reluceva oltre la Latinità, la perizia delle lettere greche con la philosophia et theologia".⁵⁵

In this letter Garzoni writes Torfanino that Vincenzo had praised Garzoni's works but that he should imitate Cicero instead. Still, Garzoni is very flattered by Vincenzo's praise: "Apud Naevium poetum laetus est Hector cum laudetur a laudato viro. Est enim ea iocunda laus quae ab his proficiscitur qui ipsi in laude vivunt."⁵⁶ This last sentence is (without reference) taken from Cicero's *Ad Familiares*, where it follows the sentence on Naevius and Hector. It occurs in letter 110 to another Dominican friar, Bartolomeo Manzolo, as well. Bartolomeo had praised Garzoni's work *De Eruditione Principum* and is thanked and praised in return.⁵⁷ The letter to Torfanino also ends with elaborate praise for Vincenzo: who is more religious, eloquent, learned and kind than he is? Garzoni says that he is very much indebted to him, and that he does not know how to repay him. He then tells Torfanino to recommend him to Vincenzo: "Vale et me illi commendato".⁵⁸

Some preliminary conclusions on how Garzoni used this quote by Naevius can now be made. As we have seen it could be employed for two purposes: it either served to respond to praise expressed by someone else, or to justify why Garzoni dedicated one of his works to someone. Vincenzo, Bartolomeo, Vinciguerra and Alberti had shown him a kindness by praising his works; Garzoni needs to respond appropriately to their compliments so that he

⁵⁵ Leandro Alberti, *De Viris Illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum libri sex in unum congesti* (Bologna 1517), IV, 150 b, read in Lind, *Letters*, page 426.

⁵⁶ Ibidem, letter 31, page 20-21 (quotation on page 21).

⁵⁷ Ibidem, letter 110, page 95.

⁵⁸ Ibidem, letter 31, page 20-21 (quotation on page 21).

does not seem ungrateful. Early Modern relations were characterized by a seemingly high degree of informality, while at the same time being part of a complex system of (implicit yet stringent) social rules. Garzoni and his correspondents often expressed their fear of seeming ungrateful by not responding properly to some favour or kindness rendered by their correspondents. The quote by Naevius offered the perfect possibility to respond appropriately to praise: by saying that it is wonderful to be praised by a praised man, Garzoni modestly accepts the praise bestowed upon him, while he returns it at the same time. The use of knowledge in the form of classical commonplace expressions thus helped to respond appropriately in different social situations: it structured social exchange.

That Naevius' quote was indeed used as a commonplace expression to structure social exchange is further supported by the use of the same phrase in a letter addressed to Garzoni. Unfortunately most of the letters directed to Garzoni are lost, which makes it impossible to determine whether Garzoni's frequent use of this particular quote may have inspired others to adopt it in similar situations as well. However, in one letter addressed to Garzoni we find the exact same use of the quote. In letter 227 Mino Tricirchio, a physician from Siena, expresses his gratitude for the compliments Garzoni had voiced for one of his works. Tricirchio is very happy to be praised by Garzoni, as everyone praises Garzoni as a physician and orator ("Laetor namque ut est apud Naevium laudari abs te qui est laudatissimus quem omnes et physicum eximium et oratorem clarissimum et habent et praedicant."⁵⁹ Tricirchio thus uses the quote by Naevius, to which he refers explicitly, in the same way as Garzoni did: to respond to compliments.

Let's examine another one of Garzoni's favourite expressions or examples. In seven different letters Garzoni refers to stories about Scipio Africanus and Livy, whose virtue exercised such attraction that others came from far to meet them in person. The story of Scipio Africanus is most probably derived from Valerius Maximus – but Garzoni does not explicitly refer to this author once. It recounts how Scipio, who had retired to his villa in Liternum, was visited there by two robbers who had come from far to speak with him because they had heard about his virtue.⁶⁰ The reference to Livy is based on Pliny's *Epistulae*: Pliny described how a man came all the way from Spain to speak with Livy, without even visiting the attractions of Rome before returning home.⁶¹ Garzoni used these two anecdotes for two closely related purposes: to explain why he appreciates a correspondence or to justify why he

⁵⁹ Ibidem, letter 227, page 188-190, 486-487 (quotation on page 189).

⁶⁰ Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium* 2.10.2, read in Lind, *Letters*, page 9.

⁶¹ Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae* 2.3.8, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 438, page 362-363.

is trying to open one. Additionally, they (as well as other quotes and references to classical authors) also served to establish a “learned connection” between himself and his correspondent. By referring to this quote Garzoni referred to a shared social identity. As Van Houdt and Papy formulated it: Garzoni thus defined himself and his correspondent as belonging to a specific group of people who shared the same interests and ideals.⁶²

In a letter to Vincenzo da Piacenza both stories are cited. The letter seems to have no other purpose than to praise Vincenzo and to confirm their friendship: Garzoni first states how highly he esteems Vincenzo, and then adds that this is caused because of the nature of virtue, which attracts both upright and wicked men. Garzoni then briefly refers to the stories of Scipio and Livy and adds that he does this so that Vincenzo will understand how important virtue is.⁶³ The quote is used in the same manner in a short letter to Alberti, where only the story of Scipio is cited.⁶⁴ In these cases the stories are thus used to confirm or fortify a friendship: by referencing to them Garzoni shows that he appreciates his correspondent and that he wants to keep up the correspondence. This is made explicit in a letter to yet another student, Johannes Blanchfeld, who is congratulated on receiving his doctorate and praised for his virtue. This time Garzoni adds: if Scipio’s virtue even attracted two robbers, who can blame me, an upright and chaste person, for wanting to speak with you?⁶⁵

In three other letters Garzoni uses these stories when he is approaching a new correspondent: he recounts the stories twice to the aforementioned cardinal Bakócz and once to Gerolamo Palmerio, of whom nothing much is known, except that he lived in Genoa.⁶⁶ In these letters Garzoni combines praise for his correspondents with statements derived from classical authorities on the importance of virtue: it is virtue that has compelled him to approach his new correspondent. Then the stories of Scipio and Livy come in: who can blame him for writing to Palmerio or Bakócz, if Scipio was even visited by robbers and Livy by someone all the way from Spain?⁶⁷

One side note should be made, concerning the use of these stories in a letter to Giovanni Paci where the stories of Livy and Scipio are paired with many different (classical) examples of virtue and its importance. Whereas in the previous letters the stories were used in combination with praise for his correspondent, this is not the case this time. In these letters

⁶² Van Houdt, Papy, ‘Introduction’ in idem (ed), *Self-Representation and Social Identification* 3. The term “learned connection”, coined by Brian Maxson, will be discussed further on page 29-30.

⁶³ Lind, *Letters*, letter 9, page 7.

⁶⁴ Ibidem, letter 286, page 233.

⁶⁵ Ibidem, letter 64, page 47-48.

⁶⁶ Ibidem, page 552.

⁶⁷ Ibidem, letters 139, 154 and 438, respectively on pages 122-123, 139-140, 362-363.

the stories had more or less the same function as the different references to Naevius had: they were subordinate to a social purpose and thus served to structure social exchange. Instead this letter seems to be more of an essay on virtue than a personal letter to Paci. It contains no personal comments whatsoever and the only thing that defines it as a letter is the salutation at the end, a short “Vale.” This is preceded by the sentence “Plura non scribam”, one that Garzoni uses more often when he gives his learned opinion on a subject. The stories of Livy and Scipio thus seem to have an entirely different function here, which will be dealt with in the next paragraph. For now it suffices to say that, even if the citations by classical authors were most often used in one and the same context, they could also be employed for other means – a sign of the many different uses Garzoni had for knowledge and the flexibility with which he handled it.

Still, in most cases the stories of Livy and Scipio have the same structuring function as the quote by Naevius did; they served to either fortify a correspondence, or to justify Garzoni’s desire to start one. They did so by connecting the themes of virtue and friendship – a strategy that Garzoni employs much more often. This can be illustrated by his use of a quote of Cicero’s *Laelius de Amicitia*, a work that Garzoni cites quite often. Cicero here describes virtue as a source of affection: “Nihil est enim virtute amabilius, nihil, quod magis adliciat ad diligendum, quippe cum propter virtutem et probitatem etiam eos, quos numquam vidimus, quodam modo diligamus”⁶⁸, and can be translated as “For there is nothing more lovable than virtue, nothing that more allures us to affection, since on account of their virtue and uprightness we feel a sort of affection even for those whom we have never seen.”⁶⁹ Garzoni uses this quote or abbreviated versions of it in seven letters to at least six different correspondents. It is used in two different ways: to flatter (in the case of letter 469 to Giovanni Battista Pio), and, more importantly, in introductory letters (to Francesco Tranchadini, the Milanese envoy in Bologna, cardinal Ascanio Sforza, Angelo Poliziano, Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio, Gerolamo Palmerio, and an unknown friend).⁷⁰

In these last letters the phrase is coupled to a request to start a friendship or correspondence. Typically such a letter starts with an opening remark on the virtue of the person Garzoni is approaching, which has compelled Garzoni to write him. To Angelo

⁶⁸ Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Laelius De Amicitia* 28, in C.F.W. Müller (ed.) (Leipzig 1884), read on <http://www.forumromanum.org/literature/cicero/amic.html#28> (last consulted June 27 2014).

⁶⁹ Cicero, *Laelius De Amicitia* 28, in W.A. Falconer (ed.) Loeb Classical Library XX (Cambridge MA 1923), 140-141.

⁷⁰ Lind, letters 48 to Tranchadini, 120 to Ascanio Sforza, 427 to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio, 437 to Angelo Poliziano, 438 to Gerolamo Palmerio, 469 to Giovanni Battista Pio, and 482 to an unknown friend. Respectively on pages 32, 107, 341, 361, 362, 403, 412.

Poliziano, for instance, he writes “Even if this was not my habit with you, Angelo Poliziano, I have been driven by rumours of your virtue to decide to write you.” This is followed by an explicit request for friendship: “What would be more pleasant for me than to be accepted by you, of whom they say that you have such great oratorical skill (in which I cannot deny to be mediocre), in your friendship?” Then the quote by Cicero comes in: “You are not ignorant that Cicero in his *Laelius* confirms that it is the power of virtue that those who have never seen each other are joined in friendship.”⁷¹ The quote is thus used as an argument: it serves to explain why Garzoni is approaching Poliziano, and to convince Poliziano that should accept his request for friendship.

The other letters show a similar use of the quote, but it is very interesting to note an addition to it that sheds great light on the existing social rules of the period. In two letters, the ones to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio and the one to Gerolamo Palmerio, the reference to Cicero is paired to a paraphrase of a different classical author: Aristotle. In the letter to Palmerio Garzoni writes that Aristotle distinguished three sorts of friendship: people could be compelled to start a friendship by pleasure, by usefulness, or by virtue. He then assures Palmerio that he is really drawn to him because of his virtue, not because of his utility. Garzoni writes the same in the aforementioned letter to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio, in which he tells him that he is dedicating one of his books to him. Garzoni certainly expected to receive a favour from the Bolognese prelate in return for his dedication to him. Yet he emphasized that this was not the reason he wrote him: it was not pleasure, nor utility but Antongaleazzo’s virtue that invited Garzoni to try and be linked to him in friendship.⁷² Here we have another clear sign of how Early Modern letters were bound to informal but set rules that prohibited stating their actual purpose too clearly. This letter is an excellent example of how Garzoni used his knowledge of classical authors to navigate these complex rules.⁷³

Garzoni did not only flatter and attempt to influence the prelate through the use of these commonplace expressions, but also in a more direct way – for which he still employs his humanist knowledge, however. He tells the prelate that their time knows many eloquent

⁷¹ Ibidem, letter 437, page 361: “Etsi nulla mihi tecum consuetudo fuerit, Policiano Angele, tamen virtutum tuarum rumore compulsus ad te scribere constitui. Quid enim mihi iocundius accidere potest quam ut abs te quem oratoriae facultatis, in qua me non infitior mediocriter esse versatum, peritissimum praedicant in amicitiam tuam recipiar? Non ignoras id quod Cicero Laelio teste affirmat eum esse vim virtutis ut qui se nunquam viderint inter se benevolentia coniungantur.”

⁷² Ibidem, letter 427, page 342: “Verum tamen abs te minime sum reiiciendus cum praesertim nulla me voluptas, nulla utilitas sed ipsa virtus tua ad coendum tecum amicitiam invitet.”

⁷³ See Guy Fitch Lytle, “Friendship and Patronage in Renaissance Europe”, in Kent and Simons (ed), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* 47-62 and Stegeman *Patronage en Dienstverlening* 115-116 on the (Aristotelean) ideal of all-conquering, disinterested friendship versus the more utilitarian one that was actually employed in the Renaissance.

men, but that Antongaleazzo is surely the very best of them. He then writes that he has read and reread the oration of the prelate for Pope Alexander VI and tells him that he greatly admires how Antongaleazzo combines his power of speech with gravity of thoughts. Indeed he imitated Cicero so well that “that he who reads your oration, reads Cicero.”⁷⁴

Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio was by no means the only one who was compared to Cicero: many of Garzoni’s students in oratory were praised in the same way. When they had made great progress they were compared to Cicero, Demosthenes or other famous orators.⁷⁵

Garzoni’s more theologically oriented knowledge could be used for the same purpose as well. To Torfanino Garzoni wrote how Filippo Musotto, another member of the Dominican order and a student of Garzoni, joined his power of speech to the other liberal arts so brilliantly that it seemed as if Paul the Apostle was speaking.⁷⁶ Examples derived from classical texts, however, figure much more prominently in this context. Of course, this context is one that makes references to ancient authors famous for their eloquence quite relevant. Still, it should be noted that Garzoni does not nearly use as much examples derived from Christian doctrine when he is praising his correspondents for their piety or devotion. Humanist knowledge could apparently more easily be employed for a social purpose – at least in Garzoni’s network.

But Garzoni did not only use his humanist knowledge to praise or thank: he also used his favourite expressions to tell his correspondents what they were doing wrong. This is maybe the clearest example of how he used knowledge to facilitate his social exchanges: by using a quote of another author, Garzoni avoided having to rebuke his correspondent himself. If, for instance, someone did not answer to his request for friendship, Garzoni could politely tell him that he was making a *faux pas* by citing another phrase of Cicero. In one of his letters to Brutus, Cicero had written that nothing seemed less human to him than not to respond lovingly to those who challenges one’s love.⁷⁷ Garzoni used this quote to Jacopo della Croce, a professor of philosophy, rhetoric and poetry at the Bolognese *studium*, in letter 470. The letter opens with the quote of Cicero, which is explicitly attributed to him and is even accompanied by the title of the work in which is found. This is a rarity in Garzoni’s letters:

⁷⁴ Lind, *Letters*, letter 427, page 342: “Venit ad manus meas abs te oratio ad Alexandrum Sextum pontificem maximum habita. Eam non semel sed sapius legi; tantam vim dicendi cum sententiarum gravitate coniunctam non admirari non potui. Ita Ciceronem in memoria habes exculptum ut qui orationem tuam legat Ciceronem legat”.

⁷⁵ See for instance letter 5, from Garzoni to Alberti, and letter 17, to Bonifacio da Casale, in Lind, *Letters*, pages 7 and 13.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, letter 27, page 18.

⁷⁷ Cicero, *Epistulae ad Brutum*, book 1, letter 1: “nihil enim mihi minus hominis videtur quam non respondere in amore iis a quibus provocere.”. Read on <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/adbrutum1.shtml> (last consulted June 24 2014).

although he does usually explicitly refer to quotes from Cicero's *Laelius*, most of the other works he quotes remain unspecified. After citing Cicero Garzoni tells Della Croce that he had been waiting for a response for a couple of days and asks him to confirm their friendship. He adds that Cicero always responded amicably to requests for friendship, even if the other person was not as eloquent as he was, and then urges Della Croce once more to answer him: "Noli abutere humanitate", do not waste kindness.⁷⁸

In this case Cicero is used as an authority, to remind someone politely that the latter was not observing the implicit rules of social contact – if a request to start a correspondence was formulated properly, one should reply accordingly. But as we have seen, Garzoni did not always explicitly refer to the author whose quote he is using. It is interesting to ask whether this influenced the capacity of the quote to structure social relations: if implicit and explicit quotes could serve the same purpose, this either means that the name of the author and the fact that the quote was derived from a classical work was not relevant to Garzoni and his correspondents, or that Garzoni assumed his correspondents would recognize it even without an explicit reference. This makes it interesting to ask whether Garzoni's implicit or explicit use of these expressions perhaps depended on his correspondent's intellectual background, or whether he only explicitly referred to an author when a letter had a didactic purpose as well.

A quick recapitulation of the implicit and explicit uses of the aforementioned expressions and stories shows that this did not seem to be the case. The stories of Livy and Scipio were mostly cited without explicit reference to their original authors; Garzoni only told Palmerio that the story of Livy came from Pliny. Cicero's quote on virtue and friendship on the other hand is only used implicitly once, to Palmerio. In all the other cases (thus to Giovanni Battista Pio, Angelo Poliziano, Francesco Tranchedini, cardinal Ascanio Sforza, and Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio) he does mention Cicero and/or his work. The citation of Naevius is both used explicitly and implicitly: explicitly to Alberti (twice), Torfanino and Bartolomeo Manzolo, implicitly to (again) Alberti, Paci, Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio. This quote was employed for two purposes: to respond to praise and to justify a dedication. The quote is both used implicitly (to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio) and explicitly (to Alberti) for this last purpose. It also does not seem to make a difference whether Garzoni cites Naevius explicitly when he uses the quote to praise a correspondent: he does so implicitly to Paci and Alberti, and explicitly to Torfanino (about Vincenzo), Bartolomeo and Alberti.

⁷⁸ Lind, *Letters*, letter 470, page 404, 538 (quotation on page 404).

These examples show that Garzoni did not only explicitly refer to the author of a quote when a letter also had a didactic purpose, or that he left it out when he assumed that someone would recognize it himself. No patterns can be discerned based on social status or profession. On the contrary, Garzoni uses some references implicitly and others explicitly to one and the same correspondent. The quote from Naevius is cited explicitly to Alberti twice, while it is also used implicitly once in a letter to him. In the letter to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio Garzoni does explicitly refer to Cicero, while he does not say where he read the stories of Scipio and Livy. Gerolamo Palmerio is the only one who Garzoni tells that he read Livy's story in Pliny's *Epistulae*, but he is also the only one to whom he leaves out a reference to Cicero when he cites his quote on virtue. A division based on the purpose of the letter cannot be established either: as is shown, Naevius' quotes served two purposes and was in both cases cited implicitly and explicitly.

We therefore have to assume that Garzoni's correspondents generally understood his references: in order to serve their purpose, they must strike a chord with their recipients. Only one letter shows that Garzoni sometimes overestimated the extent to which his correspondents would pick up on his references: letter 222 to Alberti shows how Garzoni explains a quote of Hesiod which he had used in a previous letter and which had not been understood by Alberti. In letter 222 he therefore explains it again, so that Alberti would understand what Garzoni had written earlier. This one case of confusion occurs in a letter that clearly has a didactic function: Garzoni explicitly tells his student that he does not lack a teacher.⁷⁹ In general we can safely assume that his correspondents would pick up on his references. As the focus of this paragraph reflects, these references were mostly derived from works of classical authors, with Cicero as the absolute frontrunner. Regardless of the social status and intellectual standing of his correspondents, of whom only a minority can really be described as professional humanists, Garzoni employed his humanist knowledge to structure his social exchanges. This leads to an exciting conclusion: that humanist knowledge had become a discourse that was understood by people of many different professions.

It is interesting to compare this conclusion to some secondary literature. Two publications are particularly important in this respect: Paul D. MacLean's *The Art of the Network. Strategic Interaction and Patronage in Renaissance Florence*, and the aforementioned work by Brian Maxson on humanism in Florence. Paul McLean has

⁷⁹ Lind, *Letters*, letter 222, page 184: "Superiori epistola visus es subdubitare quid sibi vellet Hesiodus poeta cuius verba interposui. Libuit Aristoteli ut sensa sua confirmant uti versibus Hesiodi quorum exemplum ad te mitto. Sic enim intelliges quae a me scripta sint nec alio egebis praeceptore videlicet." The letter continues on page 185.

examined an enormous corpus of Florentine patronage letters written in the fourteenth and fifteenth century. He has tried to examine the rhetorical techniques that individuals used when trying to enter into relations of patronage, in order to establish how culture is deployed in interpersonal interaction. This paragraph has done the same, albeit with a slightly broader focus in one respect and a slightly smaller one in another: MacLean has focused specifically on letters of patronage, whereas this paragraph deals with different kinds of letters as well, and MacLean chose the rather broad term ‘culture’, while I have chosen to focus on the at least somewhat more specific ‘knowledge’.

In order to answer his main question MacLean has chosen to analyse the occurrence of specific words, such as *amicizia*, *virtù*, *onore*, *favour*, *grazia* etc., in accordance with certain topics such as recommendations or requests for office, requests for information, thanks, etc.. With regard to these categories his conclusions are quite interesting, but unfortunately, they tell us nothing about the presence of knowledge in these letters. It was simply not one of the categories MacLean selected while making his analysis, even though he did signal the influence of classical literature on Renaissance letters and the rhetoric employed therein.⁸⁰ However, MacLean also provides us with several letters as examples, and a quick comparison between these letters and the letters from Garzoni’s collection shows one striking difference. Although they too make frequent use of commonplace expressions, *none of these are derived from or based on classical texts or examples*.⁸¹

For the rest MacLean’s corpus does resemble Garzoni’s letters; they know the same basic principles, such as frequent references to friendship and virtue. These principles, however, are not supported with any kind of knowledge. Now how can this one striking difference between these letters and the ones by Garzoni, where so many classical quotations and examples are used in a social function, be explained? One reason behind the differences lies in the broader public of the letters examined by MacLean; his corpus is not selected from a learned correspondence, but comes from a much broader selection. That these letter-writers were indeed of a different order than Garzoni’s correspondents is already indicated by the language they wrote in: the letters examined by MacLean were all written in Italian, while Garzoni only corresponded in Latin. Within this regard it is interesting to note that Brian Maxson recently argued that letters written in Latin, regardless of their content, testify to a so-called “learned connection”, a connection based on shared humanist interest, between two

⁸⁰ Paul MacLean, *The Art of the Network. Strategic Interaction and Patronage in Renaissance Florence* (Durham and London 2007), see specifically pages 1-6, 40-58, 96-97.

⁸¹ MacLean, *The Art of Network*, primarily chapter 5, “The Dynamics of Office Seeking” and chapter 6, “Friends of Friends.”

individuals.⁸² In the same work Maxson also showed that fifteenth century Florence knew many ‘social humanists’. These social humanists were persons who did have a certain knowledge of ancient texts, which they hoped to use for practical purposes and to enhance their social status. They would understand most references, but (as opposed to the so-called ‘literary humanists’) did not produce texts in Latin themselves.⁸³

Such learned connections figure prominently in Garzoni’s network, where individuals exchanged letters that were not only written in Latin, but also contained many references to ancient texts. But, although these learned connections and social humanists do account for the classical references in Garzoni’s letters, it would be foolish to assume that the lack of classical references in the letters described by MacLean is caused entirely by the absence of humanist interest at the side of his correspondents. Many of the letters he examined are directed to members of the main Florentine families, most notably Cosimo and Lorenzo de’Medici, who were lauded for their learning and interest in ancient culture and whom, even if they cannot be called literary or professional humanists, definitely belonged to the ranks of social humanists. Furthermore, both MacLean and Maxson (as well as other authors) attest to the high grade of literacy and learning and the broad spread of humanist knowledge in Renaissance Florence. Further research in this regard, based on both Latin and Italian letters, would thus be needed: when exactly could humanist knowledge be used to support social interaction, and when was it considered inappropriate or least ineffective?

For now we can only conclude that references to classical antiquity were clearly considered to be effective in Garzoni’s network. The omnipresence of humanist knowledge in letters addressed to persons who cannot be called professional humanists shows that many persons in Garzoni’s network had a basic knowledge of ancient texts and their authors, which allowed Garzoni to use his humanist knowledge to structure his social exchanges. This paragraph thus supports Maxson’s thesis by slightly expanding it to a Bolognese network, and further emphasizes the particular role humanist knowledge played within a social context.

The pre-eminence of humanist knowledge in this regard becomes especially clear when it is compared to other types of knowledge. The relative lack of theological knowledge in this context has already briefly been addressed on page 27, while we have also seen that humanist knowledge was often used for a social purpose in letters to persons who had a religious function: Giovanni Torfanino, Giovanni Paci, Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio, the cardinals Bakócz and Sforza. Theological knowledge, on the other hand, only serves this

⁸² Maxson, *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* 9, 20.

⁸³ *Ibidem* 8-12, 183.

same purpose in letters to professional humanists on a much lesser scale – it often does not even figure in letters to correspondents who did occupy a religious function. Similar points can be made pertaining to the lack of medical knowledge in a social function. Garzoni only applies his medical knowledge to praise his correspondent once: in letter 124 he writes that Paci's visit to him when he was ill had cheered him up so profoundly that he had been restored to health. Neither Hippocrates nor Galenus, in fact not even Avicenna, could have achieved this.⁸⁴

Of course, the pre-eminence of humanist knowledge can partly be explained by pointing to the fact that his correspondences were often based on a common interest in humanist learning, as many of his correspondents were either professional humanists or the students who had approached him precisely because of his knowledge of the pagan authors. But Garzoni even preferred to use his humanist knowledge in contexts where different types of knowledge could be employed. The example offered by his use of the quote from Cicero's *Post Reditu in Senatu* is particularly telling. In this oration Cicero recalls how one of the consuls had allowed him to return in the senate after his exile. This consul is said to have called him "from death to life, from despair to hope, from destruction to safety". He is praised excessively: Cicero says that he will not live long enough to sufficiently respond to the kindnesses or favours bestowed on him by the consul and his family.⁸⁵ Garzoni in turn uses the phrase "recalled from death to life, from despair to hope, from destruction to safety" four times, to three different correspondents. The use of the quote in a letter to Torfanino most closely resembles its original context: apparently Torfanino had made sure that Garzoni was named witness for the reading of a will, which Garzoni considered a great favour. In the letters to the others the quote is also used to thank them for a kindness rendered: Vincenzo da Malmignati, Giovanni Paci and Niccolò of Tolentino are said to quite literally have restored Garzoni from death to life, for they helped him when he was ill.

So far Garzoni's use of Cicero's phrase is not surprising. It served to express his gratitude and thus to structure social exchange, as we have seen more often. That Garzoni uses the quote in a slightly different context than Cicero did is not very shocking; when knowledge was used in such a supportive, social function it was not necessary to use a quote

⁸⁴ Lind, *Letters*, letter 124, page 111 and 459.

⁸⁵ The original sentence by Cicero runs "qui mihi primus adflicto et iacenti consularem fidem dextramque porrexit, qui me a morte ad vitam, a desperatione ad spem, ab exitio ad salutem vocavit, qui tanto amore in me, studio in rem publicam fuit, ut excogitaret, quem ad modum calamitatem meam non modo levaret, sed etiam honestaret." (Cicero, *Post Reditum in Senatu* 24, read on <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/postreditum.shtml>, last consulted on June 24 2014), read in Lind, *Letters*, page 63.

that matched the situation one-to-one. It was the thought that counted and the phrase actually fit Garzoni's use quite well. What is most striking is that Garzoni primarily uses this phrase in a medical context, where we might expect him to use his medical knowledge. Garzoni was, after all, a physician who also taught medicine at the university. But Garzoni only uses his medical knowledge in one of the four letters; to praise Paci by telling him that he had achieved something Avicenna could not even have done. In the other letters he chooses to structure his social exchanges by referring to Cicero, and thus by employing his humanist knowledge.

Garzoni thus used humanist knowledge in letters to all of his correspondents: to his students and professional humanists, but also to cardinals, princes, and Bolognese ecclesiastical functionaries. In his correspondences with them he chose to employ humanist knowledge to structure their relations – not medical or theological knowledge, but knowledge of ancient texts and their authors. He even did so when the recipient's profession or the context of the letter would allow for the use of other types of knowledge. The omnipresence of classical quotes and examples derived from classical texts shows how common and self-evident the use of humanist knowledge in letters had become: quotes of classical texts had become the common discourse that formed the basis of social exchange, regardless of the subject of a letter or the profession of his correspondent. Humanist knowledge was the *lingua franca* of social exchange.

One last point should be made, regarding the spread of knowledge. This paragraph has illustrated how very subordinate the use of knowledge often was to a social purpose. This is one of the ways in which Garzoni's correspondence differs from later networks of correspondence, where the ideal of *communicatio*, the sharing of knowledge and information, was the highest goal.⁸⁶ As we will see in the next paragraph, such an ideal did exist within Garzoni's correspondence, but it was limited to certain relations. The use of knowledge in a supportive function, subordinate to a social purpose, was much more common – but what kind of effect did this use of knowledge have? Unfortunately, the sources examined for this thesis are not sufficient to draw firm conclusions as to whether Garzoni's use of certain expressions lead to their adoption by others as well. Still, the enormous amount of references to classical authors and their works must have had some effect. It's ironic, actually: the most common use of knowledge in Garzoni's letters did not have its spread as an important goal, but just

⁸⁶ Stegeman *Patronage en Dienstverlening* 113-114, Hans Bots, Françoise Wacquet, *La Repubblica delle Lettere* (Bologna 2005) 166-178.

because of its sheer abundance this use of knowledge may have contributed more to the spread of knowledge than any other type of exchange.

3. The Exchange of Knowledge as Primary Goal

To ask whether social relations facilitated the exchange of knowledge in Garzoni's letters, demanded it, or were made possible by it, seems similar to asking whether the chicken or the egg came into existence first. And indeed, it is often impossible to determine whether the desire to exchange knowledge was the primary goal to enter into a social relation, or whether it was subordinate to it. Partly this is because Garzoni's letters are flawed as a source: sometimes too little is known about his correspondents or the dating of a letter to firmly determine what role knowledge played in the correspondence. Also, we should note that the only source on the relevance of knowledge exchange in these letters, are these letters. There is no way to compare what they state about their purposes with other materials, which means that we have to rely on what Garzoni and his correspondents wrote, and on what they left out – and in this paragraph that would be any other purpose for the distribution of learning besides the love of learning itself.

The relations in which the exchange of knowledge seems to be the primary goal or at least the basis on which a correspondence is formed, are those between Garzoni and other experienced humanists. The largest part of Garzoni's correspondence is directed at his students and at two important correspondents: Giovanni Torfanino and Giovanni Paci. In these letters the exchange of knowledge knows many forms and purposes, but humanist knowledge rarely seems to be their main shared interest and is often made subordinate to different purposes. The letters between Garzoni and other well-known humanists show a very different pattern: they focus on the exchange of knowledge and if any other social exchanges take place (such as flattery or thanks), these seem subordinate to the exchange of knowledge.

The letter from Battista Guarino, a former teacher of Garzoni, is an extreme example. It concerns the career of the pseudo-Marius and is probably written in response to a request of information by Garzoni. The letter does not contain one reference to a personal relation between Guarino and Garzoni – in fact it does not even have a salutation at the beginning or ending.⁸⁷ In other cases a short 'Vale' at the end is the only thing that distinguishes the letter from an impersonal essay. The usual statements that structured social exchange were thus left out in these letters, which shows that a certain familiarity had been established, but also that the relation between the two correspondents was characterised by a higher degree of equality than most of Garzoni's relations. Nonetheless, letters in which some forms of social exchange

⁸⁷ Lind, *Letters*, letter 488, page 419-420, 568.

do occur, such as flattery or references to a bond of friendship, are still more typical. I would argue, however, that in these cases praise and flattery are expressed precisely because Garzoni and his correspondent are glad to share knowledge.

The letters between Garzoni and Antonio Urceo, called Codro, and Garzoni's letters to Angelo Poliziano are exemplary. These letters do contain references to social gestures besides the exchange of knowledge, but these are subordinate to the desire for knowledge. I will first discuss the letters written between Codro and Garzoni in a little more detail, and then move on to the letters to Poliziano: they illustrate beautifully how the desire for knowledge formed the basis on which a humanist friendship was constructed.

The first letter from Garzoni to Codro concerns their discussion of a quotation of Cicero in his *Pro Sestio*. Codro had asked Garzoni what Cicero meant in an attack on Clodius when they were in the church or monastery of the Dominicans. Codro had then given a possible explanation, which is (according to Garzoni) the same as the one Valla gave. Garzoni praises Codro for his kindness, wisdom and learning and states that he agrees with his explanation of the quotation. However, a friend called Traiano had recently suggested that Garzoni and Codro needed to take the opinion of Ermolao Barbaro into account, especially on the use of the word *embolium*. Garzoni answers Barbaro's interpretation by referring to the opinion of Valla again. It is not necessary to reproduce the entire argumentation of Valla and Garzoni on the subject, but it is interesting to note that Garzoni at some point introduces a medical argument to support Valla's opinion. Valla had said that Cicero portrays Clodius as unbridled in his lust for his sister, which is shown by the fact that he tries to sleep with her while she is menstruating. Garzoni confirms that this is a monstrous deed: if Garzoni would do this with a woman and she would get pregnant, a child would be born with the disease that physicians call leprosy. After this statement the letter ends quite abruptly, with Garzoni stating that this is what can be drawn from the sources of Lorenzo Valla, prince of the orators of his time.⁸⁸

This letter does not lack all references to a social relation between the two outside of their letters. However, the primary goal is undoubtedly to clear up some confusion about a quote of Cicero and thus to exchange knowledge. The social gestures are absolutely subordinate to this goal. The same goes for letter 448, also written from Garzoni to Codro, but this time Garzoni is the one asking for information. Here Garzoni more explicitly praises

⁸⁸ Lind has not found such an interpretation of Valla in his published works. Either Valla did not express it as such, or Garzoni had heard him explain it in person when he studied with him in Rome. Lind, *Letters*, letter 429, page 344-345, 547-548.

Codro: he learns from his friend and is not ashamed to ask his help. He would be forever grateful (“tum ipse tibi immortale ac divinum beneficium debebo”) if Codro could help him with something: he does not properly understand the meaning of the word ‘persona’ as it seems to mean ‘substance’ in some cases and ‘quality’ in others. To illustrate this he cites Valla and two examples from Cicero on the subject. As they seem to contradict each other, he longs for Codro’s opinion.⁸⁹

Again it is clear that the exchange between the two men is based on their mutual desire for knowledge. Still, these letters too make use of the typical Renaissance rhetoric of friendship. This is further illustrated by Codro’s long reply, which opens with Codro stating that he is bound to honour Garzoni’s request because of their friendship (“pro iure benevolentiae nostrae debui respondere”). Codro taught grammar, eloquence and Greek at the Bolognese *Studium* and it comes as no surprise that he uses his knowledge of many classical authors, especially Greek poets, to respond to Garzoni’s question and reflect on the meaning of ‘persona’ in literature. After a long and learned exposition (the letter almost takes up 5 entire pages) he confirms Valla’s opinion on the subject. The only other reference to any social exchange between the two men can be found at the end: here Codro expresses his wish to hear Garzoni’s judgement of his explanation.⁹⁰

In these three letters between two learned humanists the exchange of knowledge is clearly the primary goal. It is still linked to social contact, but not subordinate to it – rather, the social contact is dominated by the desire for knowledge. The letters written by Garzoni to Poliziano merit some attention in this respect as well. Because Garzoni explicitly asks to be admitted in Poliziano’s friendship they offer a brilliant insight in how the desire for knowledge formed the basis of a humanist friendship. Garzoni opens his first letter to Poliziano by stating that the latter’s virtue has driven him to approach him. Nothing could make him happier than to be admitted into the friendship of Poliziano, whose capacity as an orator is praised by everyone. As Poliziano knows, Garzoni wrote, Cicero said in the *Laelius* that virtue allows people who have never seen each other to be joined together in friendship. Just like ancient authors (Garzoni mentions Orpheus, Homer, Solon and Plato) travelled for their friendship and learning, Garzoni would come to Florence to meet Poliziano. Unfortunately, however, he is prevented to do this because of his medical duties. Still, he would like to present himself to Poliziano. He has therefore decided to send him a short work by his own hand on a subject that already interested Livy: the fictional battle between

⁸⁹ Ibidem, letter 448, page 375-376, 555 (quotation on page 375).

⁹⁰ Ibidem, letter 449, page 376-381, 555 (quotation on page 376).

Alexander the Great and the Romans. Of course he agrees with Livy on the subject, Garzoni rushes to assure Poliziano – never would he divert from such an authority.⁹¹

Unfortunately for Garzoni Poliziano did not reply, not even after a mutual friend, Domenico Fusco, urged him to. Fusco wrote Poliziano some days after Garzoni did, telling his friend that he had exhorted Garzoni to send Poliziano his work on Alexander. Because of his exceptional friendliness Poliziano will make sure to read them, Fusco writes, and when he has some time he will surely answer Garzoni. Praise and glory would be Fusco's if two such men would be joined in friendship because of his efforts.⁹² Despite of this very appropriately formulated letter, Poliziano still did not answer. Shortly afterwards, Garzoni repeated his request, but this letter probably did not receive a reply either.⁹³

The role of knowledge in these letters is slightly more diffuse than in the letters to Codro. In the letters to Poliziano Garzoni both uses classical examples to legitimize Garzoni's writing to him, a sign that Poliziano, often called the prince of humanism, enjoyed a much higher status than Garzoni did. Knowledge also functions as a gift in this letter, as Garzoni opens the correspondence by sending Poliziano his own work. In this case, however, Garzoni does not want or expect a financial favour, but Poliziano's opinion of it. The request for Poliziano's opinion on Garzoni's account of the fictional battle between Alexander the Great and the Romans is intrinsically linked with a request for friendship. This shows that knowledge truly stood at the basis of a friendship, in two ways. First of all, Garzoni is compelled to write Poliziano because of his virtue and knowledge; the wish to start a friendship is dictated by a desire to exchange knowledge. Secondly, the work Garzoni sends Poliziano serves as a substitute for a personal meaning: Garzoni cannot present himself in person to Poliziano, but sends him one of his works, which thus functions as deferred presence: Poliziano can decide whether he wants to take up a correspondence with Garzoni based on Garzoni's letter and on his work on Alexander and the Romans.

The size of this thesis does not permit to discuss every letter in which knowledge exchange is the primary goal in detail. Let it suffice to say that Garzoni maintained similar friendships based on a common interest in ancient culture with other renowned humanists, such as Francesco Filelfo and Giovanni Battista Pio.⁹⁴ It is more interesting to contrast the cases discussed above with some examples of letters that are not written to professional

⁹¹ Ibidem, letter 437, page 361-362, 552.

⁹² Ibidem, letter 425, page 340, 545.

⁹³ Ibidem, letter 424, page 339-340, 544.

⁹⁴ Ibidem, letter 450 (Filelfo to Garzoni), page 381 and letters 151, 259, 262, 275, 469 (Garzoni to Pio), respectively on pages 136-137, 216, 218, 227, 403-404, letter 235 (Pio to Garzoni), page 197-198.

humanists. Many of these letters are addressed to Garzoni's students. I will discuss some examples of letters written to Leandro Alberti, which will illustrate three things: first, the strange lack of references to his correspondent, second, the diversity of the subjects Garzoni wrote about and thus the different kinds of knowledge that were exchanged, and third, that a lack of references to any social exchange does not necessarily mean that knowledge exchange was the primary goal of a social bond, even if the cases mentioned above would suggest so.

In letter 136 Garzoni wrote Alberti on the subject of becoming rich, because this had once been asked to Attilius Galearis, someone who according to Garzoni was once quite famous in Bologna. This leads Garzoni to discuss how the ancient Romans thought of fortune – a constantly returning theme. In letter 156 Garzoni describes the virtues of Saint Symphorian, based on his own work on the life of the saint. To further illustrate the virtue of the saint Garzoni states that Caesar's virtues were nothing compared to those of Symphorian. In letter 160 Garzoni states that he disagrees with Cicero on punishment after death; instead he follows Paul the Apostle. Letter 169 concerns the battle at Faenza in 1501, in which Spanish and French troops were defeated, Garzoni writes to Alberti that the women of Faenza, who he compares with Mucius Scaevola and Horatius Cocles, were very brave. Historians of the town of Faenza should write their history, just as Livy and Vergil had written the histories of Roman heroes. Letter 185 contains knowledge that could have a more practical use: here Garzoni recounts Aristippus' answer to the question how men could be persuaded. There are three ways: by lavishing them with honours, presenting them with gifts, or by speaking well of them.⁹⁵

Letter 373 to Giovanni Paci poses an interesting example of a similar seemingly impersonal use of knowledge, this time to someone who was neither a student nor a professional humanist. In this letter, which I have also shortly discussed in the previous paragraph because it mentions the stories on Livy and Scipio that Garzoni was so fond of, Garzoni discusses the importance of virtue. The letter might have been written in response to a question posed by Paci, although, as we have seen in the one to Codro and as we will see again in paragraph 6, Garzoni usually refers to his correspondent's previous letter when he is asked to clarify a problem. Either way, its opening reminds of an essay: "Quanti virtus aestimanda sit facile hinc sciri potest cum eam non solum qui probitate ornantur sed etiam qui sceleribus dehonestantur colant et venerentur." Garzoni thus states that one can easily illustrate how much virtue should be estimated by the fact that she is not just appreciated by

⁹⁵ Ibidem, letter 136, page 120-121, 462, 471, letter 160, page 144-145, 472, letter 169, page 149-150, 472-473, letter 185, page 161, 476-477.

upright men, but also by those who have been dishonoured by crimes. Garzoni then recounts the stories of Scipio and Livy (rather elaborately, compared to many other letters in which the same stories are cited), which, according to Garzoni, confirm the opinion of the Stoics, who maintained that nothing is more beautiful than virtue. This is followed by praise for Livy, who is briefly compared with Sallust, Varro, Cicero and “*ceteris praestantibus viris quibus id temporis refertissima erat urbs Romana id evenisse legimus*”. Valla has therefore rightly called Livy the father of Roman history. After this quote the letter ends quite abruptly: “*Plura non scribam. Vale.*”⁹⁶

In all of these letters some kind of knowledge is exchanged: knowledge of ancient texts and their authors, theological knowledge, information on a recent war (supplemented with knowledge of ancient histories). Similarly, in all of these cases an explicit link to Garzoni’s correspondent misses and the only sign that we are indeed dealing with letters are the short salutations at the beginning and end of the letters. What purpose did knowledge serve in these cases? In the humanist friendships described above the forming of the friendship was intrinsically related to the desire to exchange knowledge. Was the relation in these cases based on a mutual desire for knowledge as well?

The correspondence between Alberti and Garzoni started out as one between a student and his teacher. In such a relation the exchange of knowledge was, of course, necessary. One could argue that knowledge serves as a commodity in these relations: Garzoni provided his student with knowledge and received a financial reward in return. The letters to Alberti thus already differ from the ones to other professional humanists in this respect. This would suggest that the knowledge in the letters cited above was just presupposed in a didactic context. However, the letter to Paci shows that Garzoni also wrote letters that solely contained knowledge (and thus left out any form of social exchange) to correspondents who were neither students nor professional humanists. It should also be noted that the relation between Alberti and Garzoni did not always remain a professional one between master and student. In total seventy-seven letters between the two are included in Garzoni’s letters. In some of these Garzoni clearly assumes his role as a teacher and aims to educate and stimulate Alberti, whom he often praises for his diligence in pursuing a career as orator. In other letters their relation more resembles one of friendship, while yet other letters show that Garzoni even asked Alberti for his opinion and advice, as when he asked his pupil to read a work he wanted to send to the recently elected cardinal Thomas Bakócz.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Ibidem, letter 373, page 301, 527 (quotation on page 301).

⁹⁷ Ibidem, letter 138, page 122, 463-464

The lack of dates for the letters makes it difficult to establish at what point in the relation they were written, and thus to determine with what purpose the knowledge in these letters was distributed by Garzoni. Still: although the letters to Alberti do not contain references to any form of social exchange to which the knowledge distributed by Garzoni is relevant, these forms of exchange certainly took place. For this reason it is difficult to establish the precise role knowledge played in in the letters addressed to them: the distribution of knowledge (with a didactic purpose or not) seems to be Garzoni's primary goal here, but given the somewhat more complicated relation between Garzoni and Alberti, it is impossible to draw firm conclusions. Similar statements can be made about Garzoni's somewhat turbulent relation with Paci, which has already been discussed briefly in the previous paragraph. Precisely because of their dynamic and somewhat ambiguous relation the letters between Garzoni and Alberti and Garzoni and Paci will be cited more often in this thesis: they beautifully illustrate the multi-faceted character of Garzoni's social relations and the different functions knowledge performed therein.

To conclude this paragraph, however, it is necessary to return to Garzoni's humanist friends: was the exchange of knowledge in those relations the only goal? The letters written by Garzoni and Codro seem to suggest that this was the case: their friendships are based on a mutual desire for humanist knowledge and in the letters exchanged between them no other subjects than classical authors are discussed. However, for quite some time historians writing about Renaissance friendships and humanist correspondences have warned us not to take the letters at their face value. Humanist letters may seem personal, private documents, but were often carefully crafted documents with a semi-public function.⁹⁸ With their beautifully written letters humanists could magnify their status and reputation with fellow humanists, but they could also use them to enter into relations of patronage: Elisabeth McCahill has shown how Lapo di Castiglionchio the Younger approached both powerful churchmen and humanists when he tried to win a post at the Roman curia. The humanists served as his brokers: only with their support (which could for instance be shown by letters of recommendations) he could hope to find himself employment.⁹⁹

⁹⁸ Rice Henderson, "Humanist Letter Writing: Private Conversation or Public Forum?" in: Toon van Houdt (ed.), *Self-Representation and Social Identification* 17-38.

⁹⁹ Elisabeth May MacCahill, "Finding a Job as a Humanist: The Epistolary Collection of Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger", *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 4 (Winter, 2004) 1308-1345, 1315-1316. On epistolary self-fashioning see Lisa Jardine's very influential *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton NY 1993) and the articles in the aforementioned volume *Self-Representation and Social Identification: The Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times*.

Whether this is also the case in Garzoni's letters is debatable. The fact that he consciously collected his letters (or rather had them collected by Alberti) shows that he might indeed have tried to establish a certain image of himself for posterity. Letters 105 and 140, the only ones written by Alberti included in the collection, refer to this attempt and show a certain initiative on his part in the collecting of Garzoni's letters. In letter 105 Leandro Alberti requests Garzoni to send him the letters he has written, so that he can add or return them to his collection.¹⁰⁰ Letter 140 speaks of more than two hundred letters "which, believe me, will make you immortal", copied by Alberti.¹⁰¹ The letters by Garzoni to Alberti on the other hand make no mention of Alberti's task or of the existence of a letter collection.

Two more letters indicate that Garzoni let his letters circulate among others as well. Letter 17 shows that Garzoni sent his letters to Bonifacio da Casale for correction.¹⁰² Letter 381 to Giovanni Paci speaks of a letter Garzoni had attempted to send to a certain Ludovico. Garzoni had probably asked Paci to give the letter to Ludovico earlier, which Paci had apparently failed to do – perhaps because he liked it so much, Garzoni suggests. Still, he urges his friend to make a copy for Ludovico, who is said to be courteous, friendly and learned. The letter closes with a reference to classical antiquity: Garzoni writes that Julius Ceasar would never have been killed if he would have bound the Roman citizens to himself in friendship – a nice example of how humanist knowledge could be used to politely pressure a correspondent into doing something.¹⁰³

These examples show that Garzoni did pay considerable attention to the form and content of his letters; he asked others to correct them for him. They also indicate that Garzoni would sometimes send his letters to different correspondents. This suggests that they were indeed not just personal documents, as do some rare examples of letters written between others. Letter 58 for instance is written by Filippo Beroaldo senior to Agostino Giustiniano. Giustiniano, originally from Genoa, entered the Dominican convent of Bologna as a new student in 1494. He became *magister studiorum* of the same convent in 1503 and later wrote (among other works) the annals of Genoa in Italian. Although Giustiniano may have been a

¹⁰⁰ Lind, *Letters*, letter 105, page 83, 105: "Quare si quae apud te sunt epistolas nuntio ad me dederis, eas in meum libellum referam." (quotation on page 83).

¹⁰¹ Ibidem, letter 140, page 124, 465: "Tuas ducentas et eo amplius epistolas exscripsi, quibus, mihi crede, immortalis fiet." (quotation on page 124).

¹⁰² Ibidem, letter 17, page 13, 428: "Altera est quod ancipiti cogitatione diu impeditus sum an ad te, virum omni dicendi munere ornatum, litteras meas redderem tam incomptas tampque verborum ruditate scriptas." (quotation on page 13).

¹⁰³ Ibidem, letter 381, page 307, 531.

student of Garzoni at the Dominican convent, no link to Garzoni is established in this letter: it only discusses Giustiniano's last work, which is praised elaborately.¹⁰⁴

However, the letters that refer to the practice of circulating letters are scarce, as are the references to the collecting of his letters. Garzoni's purposes for this collection thus remain quite vague. In this regard it is interesting to consider Garzoni's opinion on printed works. Two letters, addressed to Giovanni Paci and his nephew Alessandro, show Garzoni's outrage at the thought of printing his works. Letter 371, to Giovanni Paci, is especially interesting. Garzoni swears by Christ "optimum maximum" and Maria, queen of heavens that he will no longer be his friend if Paci does not quit this thought of his. How can he be so ungrateful? Garzoni has always honoured him; a work that praises him is extant in Italy. Does Paci not know that rare things are better, as Cicero attests? The letter continues in a similar manner for a while, after which Garzoni tells his friend to never bring up the subject again.¹⁰⁵

Of course we cannot be certain that Paci proposed the printing of his works to Garzoni in order to broaden the latter's public or reputation. Still, Garzoni's response it demonstrate that he would judge such considerations despicable. Literary fame should not be chased at all costs. The letters by Alberti to Garzoni also suggest that the collection of his letters was undertaken at the initiative of Alberti rather than Garzoni, although this cannot be established beyond doubt. All in all, we should not too easily assume that Garzoni's letters functioned as public or semi-public documents. Still, the question remains whether Garzoni expected to profit from his relations with his fellow professional (or literary, to speak with Maxson) humanists, or whether they were truly based on a mutual and genuine desire for knowledge.

I would argue that, in rare cases, the desire to exchange knowledge was indeed truly and intrinsically related to the forming of social relations. Of course the use of knowledge could be connected or even subordinated to social exchanges that were intended to enhance Garzoni's position. In fact, Garzoni may have more often employed knowledge for this purpose than out of selfless love for learning. But as the next paragraph will show, Garzoni sooner approached his friends at the Dominican and Augustinian orders and local and foreign rulers to enter into bonds of patronage than his fellow humanists. This does not mean that the exchange of knowledge between Garzoni and other professional humanists was entirely

¹⁰⁴ Ibidem, letter 58, page 42, 438-439. On Giustiniano see the entry in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, on [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/agostino-giustiniani_\(Dizionario_Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/agostino-giustiniani_(Dizionario_Biografico)/) (last consulted on July 4 2014).

¹⁰⁵ Lind, *Letters*, letter 371, page 296, 527: "Quae hesterno die de imprimendo opere meo abs te apud me verba facta sunt mihi stomachum vehementer moverunt. Christum optimum maximum, Maria caeli reginam testor, ni de sententia tua decesseris me nunquam tibi futurum amicum. Quenam ista inhumanitas qui mihi hoc dedecoris cures inurere? Semper te colui, observavi, veneratus sum. Extat de laudibus tuis quae per Italiam vagatur epistola mea. An ignoras, teste Cicerone, quae rara sint esse praeclara?" (quotation on page 296).

disinterested: Garzoni's income partly depended on his learning and his knowledge. Still, the letters cited above have shown how Garzoni's humanist friendships were intrinsically connected to a desire for knowledge. It formed the fundament upon which they built a friendship, which was motivated by a mutual and interested desire for learning.

4. Dedications: Knowledge as a Commodity

This paragraph will deal with those cases in which Garzoni sent and dedicated his own works to others. As stated in the introduction, Garzoni often dedicated his own works to Bolognese and foreign rulers, cardinals, and friends. In those cases it is very likely that he expected some kind of favour or reward in return, and sometimes other letters that refer to the dedication confirm this. In this paragraph I will thus focus on those instances in which Garzoni seems to use his knowledge to enter into relations of patronage. It should immediately be noted that Garzoni did not have official patrons, or at least that no evidence of such relations is extant. This was, actually, a very normal situation: whereas patronage in the arts was often of a more official character, written works were usually part of a much more unofficial exchange between a patron and a client.¹⁰⁶ These exchanges were characterized by informal bonds that relied on a mutual understanding of the concept of *amicitia*. Both correspondents were conscious of their obligation to help the other and to repay eventual favours or services rendered, but this was usually not made explicit.

As we will see in this paragraph, many of Garzoni's relations were indeed characterized by such an understanding. Some cases are clearer than others, however. It is usually not very difficult to establish what Garzoni's motivations were when he sent one of his works to a ruler, whether Bolognese or foreign, or to a cardinal. When it comes to some of his longer lasting relations, however, it becomes more difficult to establish what role the exchange of one of his works (and thus: of knowledge) was precisely. Garzoni operated on different 'levels': he both approached the high profile patrons that are most conspicuous, and persons with less obvious 'patron potential'. This supports the assertion of Werner Gundersheimer that patronage was much more widespread than the relations between high profile patrons and their clients suggest, and that certain hierarchies within the patronage system existed.¹⁰⁷

In this this paragraph I will specifically ask what the role of knowledge was in each instance: was it used as a commodity, or as supportive to a request? This means that even though this paragraph primarily deals with knowledge in Garzoni's own written works and their function, I will also analyse other uses of knowledge when I stumble upon them in the same letters. Furthermore, I will focus on different types of knowledge and the ways in which

¹⁰⁶ Alison Frazier, "A Layman's "Life of St. Augustine" in Late Medieval Italy: Patronage and Polemic", in *Traditio*, vol. 65 (2010) 231-265, 234.

¹⁰⁷ Gundersheimer, "Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach" 4, 13-23.

they were used: could Garzoni as easily employ his medical and theological knowledge as his knowledge of ancient authors and their texts?

The letters to cardinal Tamás Bakócz are a clear example of how knowledge could serve as a commodity: they show how Garzoni successfully sent one of his works to someone in order to profit from them. It is possible that Garzoni and Bakócz had met in person when Bakócz studied in Bologna during the years 1465-1466, although the letters make no mention of such an encounter. Garzoni sent three letters to the cardinal and dedicated two works to him. The first letter to Bakócz was probably written shortly after Alexander VI elected him as a cardinal, in 1500. It opens with almost the exact same phrasing as the letter to Poliziano discussed in the previous paragraph: Bakócz' virtue has driven Garzoni to the decision to write him and send him some works. The cardinal is elaborately praised by Garzoni, who asks if he can be blamed for wanting to make Bakócz a participant in his letters, if Scipio was visited by two robbers in Linternum because they were so attracted to his virtue, and if someone who came all the way from Spain visited Livy in Rome? This letter does not mention any type of dedication or written work, and it is important to note that Garzoni did not receive a reply until he had written a second letter, which went accompanied by his *Life of Saint Symphorian*.¹⁰⁸

This second letter opens with the same references to Scipio Africanus and Livy, in order to show how much virtue should be appreciated: not only virtuous men but also wicked ones are attracted to it. Two references to classical authors support this: an explicit reference to Cicero, stating that virtue never wavers, is followed by an implicit one to Plautus (a man with virtue has every blessing). Garzoni then tells the cardinal that the latter's honesty has made Garzoni dedicate a work on the young Saint Symphorian (who is praised in the last sentences of the letters) to him and that he is certain that the cardinal will receive this willingly.¹⁰⁹ This time Garzoni did have success. The cardinal's reply is unfortunately not extant, but Garzoni excessively thanks the cardinal for the 'honore ac munere' he has been given in letter 248. Nothing is more pleasant, more useful, and excellent than to be honoured by the cardinal with a task ("Nihil iucundius, nihil utilius, nihil praestantius mihi evenire poterat quam ut te a studio, officio, liberalitate ornarer.").¹¹⁰ It thus seems as if Garzoni did not only a reward for his last work, but also a commission to write another one. Florio Banfi

¹⁰⁸ Florio Banfi, "Giovanni Garzoni ed il cardinale Tommaso Bakócz Primate d'Ungheria," *L'Archiginnasio: Bollettino della Biblioteca comunale di Bologna* 31 (1936) 120-139, 121-122, and Lind, *Letters*, letter 139, 122-123, 464-465.

¹⁰⁹ The references are to Cicero, *Pro Sestio* 31.68 and Plautus, *Amphitryo* 650, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 154, page 139-140, 470.

¹¹⁰ *Ibidem*, letter 248, page 207.

has argued that this task must have been to write a eulogy of King Ladislaus II of Hungary, which indeed seems possible.¹¹¹ Garzoni's letter to the cardinal continues with the obligatory exclamations of gratitude: he does not know how to respond to the cardinal's kindness, for he does not want to seem ungrateful. Again, he cites an ancient author to structure his social exchanges: as Cicero said, gratitude is not only the greatest virtue; she is the mother of all virtues.¹¹²

In this case it is clear that Garzoni's work was used as a commodity; it is particularly telling that the cardinal did not respond to his first letter, and only answered the second one, in which he was offered the life of Saint Symphorian. That Garzoni put some effort into the work is illustrated by his correspondence with Leandro Alberti, whom he wrote that some people urged him to send the newly elected cardinal a sample of his work. He asked Alberti for his opinion on the work he was about to send to the cardinal: if Alberti did not approve, he would not send it. This letter also shows that the relation between Garzoni and Alberti exceeded their professional student-professor relation. It is understandable that Alberti, at this time around twenty years old, responded in a slightly embarrassed manner: he thinks it inappropriate that a student censures his teacher.¹¹³

Cardinal Bakócz was by no means the only one to whom Garzoni dedicated one of his works. In the same manner Garzoni dedicated a work called *De regenda civitate* to Giovanni Bentivoglio¹¹⁴, the work *De Felicitate Christianorum* to Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio, his book *De Principis Officio* to Guidobaldo of Urbino¹¹⁵, a work on Saxon history to Frederic, Duke of Saxony, a work on the recent war in Granada to Ferdinand, King of Spain, a life of cardinal Egidio Albornoz to his descendant, Alfonso Carillo Albornoz, and the aforementioned work on Alexander and the Romans to Domenico Fusco, perhaps to thank him for his recommendation to Poliziano.¹¹⁶ Furthermore he dedicated his dialogue *De Amicitia* to both Pandolfo Malatesta, ruler of Rimini and husband of Giovanni Bentivoglio's daughter Violante, probably in 1494, and to a cardinal whose name is not mentioned (possibly Galeotto della Rovere), in 1503 or 1504.¹¹⁷ Unfortunately it is not possible to establish how Garzoni profited from these dedications: only the reply of Frederic, Duke of Saxony, is still extant. In it the duke thanks Garzoni for his work and tells him that he is now a member of the extended

¹¹¹ Banfi, "Giovanni Garzoni ed il cardinale Tommaso Bakócz Primate d'Ungheria" 132-133.

¹¹² Lind, *Letters*, letter 248, page 207-208, 493.

¹¹³ Ibidem, letter 138 and letter 140, page 122-124, 463-465.

¹¹⁴ Lynn Thorndike, "Giovanni Garzoni on Ruling a City", *Political Science Quarterly*, 46 (1931), 277-280, 277.

¹¹⁵ See Lynn Thorndike, "Giovanni Garzoni on the Office of Prince", *Political Science Quarterly*, 46 (1931) 589-592 for a brief introduction to this work.

¹¹⁶ Lind, *Letters*, pages 560, 445, 564, 539, 545.

¹¹⁷ Ibidem, page 468, 477.

family, a commonplace often used in patronage letters.¹¹⁸ He praises the verisimilitude of Garzoni's work and promises that he will send the work to other German princes.¹¹⁹ Garzoni responds by praising the prince for his virtue. This time he does not thank his correspondent as excessively as he did with cardinal Bakócz; it is possible that the duke did not lavish the expected favours on him. Still, knowledge was used as a commodity here, as Garzoni claims a favour now: he greatly recommends a certain Antonio to the Duke and says that every benefit the duke bestows on him, he bestows on Garzoni.¹²⁰

As the responses of most of his correspondent's lack, in the majority of cases we do not know whether Garzoni's attempts to use his knowledge in order to win some kind of reward were successful. However, in the cases mentioned above we can safely assume that the intention was there. In some other cases this is harder to establish: Garzoni sometimes sent out works to contacts with whom he had a much longer and more dynamic, multi-faceted relation. The most obvious examples are Giovanni Torfanino and Giovanni Paci, to whom Garzoni dedicated works and who both granted him favours. The next few pages will discuss the works Garzoni dedicated to them, and the function they had in their relation.

To Torfanino Garzoni dedicated his *De Sanctissimae Crucis Inventione*. It is interesting that Garzoni wrote his friend three different letters on the subject of his dedication: in it he made his decision known, told him others had tried to change his mind, and wrote to say that he had recently finished the work and would soon send it to him.¹²¹ This shows that the dedication was a matter of importance to Garzoni. Apparently it was important to others as well: as said, the second letter mentions the fact that others had discouraged Garzoni to dedicate his work to Torfanino, for they thought it would be better if Garzoni dedicated it to someone who was better versed in the liberal arts. Of course, Garzoni writes, he immediately defended his friend's honour. He had told the others that Torfanino was pious and upright, and not at all ignorant in literary affairs. To this he added that the examples of Vergil, Cicero and Lactantius should be followed: they dedicated their works to the most renowned and powerful men.¹²² Once more classical examples serve as an authority to justify a dedication, as we have also seen in the second paragraph.

But was the dedication as important to Torfanino as it was to Garzoni, and did Torfanino reward his friend for his efforts? We do know that he rendered him some favours:

¹¹⁸ MacLean, *The Art of the Network* 51, 65-68.

¹¹⁹ Lind, *Letters*, letter 75, page 55, 445.

¹²⁰ *Ibidem*, letter 145, page 127, 467.

¹²¹ *Ibidem*, respectively letters 56, 217, 205, on pages 41, 181-182 and 174.

¹²² *Ibidem*, letter 217, page 181-182, 483.

from letter 45 it becomes clear that Torfanino had helped set up a marriage between Marcello, Garzoni's son, and Caterina di Lodovico Foscarari. In another letter Garzoni says he is grateful to be made a Knight of Christ through the efforts of his friend. The omnipresence of humanist knowledge in Garzoni's letters is shown here once more: Garzoni opens the first letter by paraphrasing Cicero, who said that one should speak badly of the man from Reate, who had injured P. Sextius. This man is contrasted with Torfanino, of whom Garzoni will only speak well: he thanks him abundantly for his efforts to realise the marriage for his son. He adds that the girl should be judged a good choice if he considers her in light of what Aristotle wrote, for she is of noble birth and good fortune.¹²³ In the aforementioned *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* Maxson briefly discussed how humanist learning made other types of social bonds, among which marriage, possible: he describes how Florentine patricians around 1420 and 1430 started to marry their daughters to the sons of humanists, whose knowledge elevated their social status.¹²⁴ A similar process may be at hand here, which indicates that humanist learning had achieved a certain status in Bologna as well.

The second letter too contains references to classical literature. Here they serve the opposite goal: Torfanino is rebuked because he has neglected to respond to Garzoni's letters. Garzoni first writes that he knows he is indebted to Torfanino, because it is through his efforts that he became Knight of Christ. However, this is no reason not to answer him. Garzoni then tells his correspondent that his book on friendship is extant in Italy. In it, he writes, he makes clear how useful friendship is ("in eo quantae utilitati nobis esset amicitia planum feci"). Torfanino would make a great mistake if it would not read it. It is just like the gravest poet said: those who violate a friendship hurt the common good – a reference to Horace's *Epistulae*.¹²⁵ Finally, a third letter refers to a favour rendered by Torfanino as well: he latter has made sure that Garzoni was named witness to a will, which Garzoni appreciated greatly.¹²⁶ These letters prove that Garzoni did receive certain favours from Torfanino, while a letter in which he rebukes Torfanino for not inviting him to a dinner at the Dominican order also shows that he expected to get these favours.¹²⁷ However, it is absolutely unclear whether these were related to the work Garzoni dedicated to him, both because Garzoni did not say anything on the subject and because dates for these letters are missing.

¹²³ Ibidem, letter 45, page 29 and 432.

¹²⁴ Maxson, *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* 35-36.

¹²⁵ The reference to Horace is from the *Epistulae* 2.1.3, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 96, page 76 (quotation on page 96).

¹²⁶ Ibidem, letter 216, page 181, 483.

¹²⁷ Ibidem, letter 423, page 339, 544.

In the first paragraph of this thesis I have already mentioned the importance of the Dominican and Augustinian orders for Garzoni's network. The previous pages have briefly touched on Garzoni's relation with Torfanino, a prominent Dominican and inquisitor at Bologna, while the following paragraph, which concerns dedication in a slightly different function, will further illustrate the bonds between Garzoni and his Dominican students. First, however, I would like to briefly discuss Garzoni's *Life of Saint Augustine*, which Alison Frazier has analysed in her convincing article "A Layman's "Life of St. Augustine" in Late Medieval Italy: Patronage and Polemic". According to the preface of Garzoni's work, he had been requested to write it by Paci. This is very well possible, even though there is no letter which refers to such a commission extant. Garzoni may have been asked to write the work when he was carrying out his medical duties at the convent of the Augustinians.¹²⁸

The work itself was written at a time in which a lively polemic on Saint Augustine flourished. It started with a quarrel over the appropriate depiction of the saint: as bishop with his traditional attributes or in black habit, as the founder of the Augustinian Hermits. As the debate moved to print both parties strived to publish the most compelling texts, and they did not hesitate to approach scholars from outside of their own ranks – such as, in this case, Garzoni. Frazier argues that Garzoni had been hired by the Augustinian Hermits of Bologna, but that he was not approached for his theological knowledge. Instead, Frazier states that they asked him to provide them with a rhetorically correct and compelling text on the life of their founder and that the Augustines even provided him with his base-source text, so that he would only need to improve the work rhetorically. Indeed the content of the work agrees with the Hermit's stance in the debate.¹²⁹

If Frazier's account is correct (and I have no reason to believe that it is not), this episode shows the links Garzoni had with the Augustinian order in general and with Paci in particular. More importantly, it is a perfect example of how social relations could influence Garzoni's works and thus the spread of knowledge. That his work was used as a commodity here is very likely, although not entirely certain. In his relation with Paci, however, one clear case of the use of knowledge as a commodity can be established. It occurs when Garzoni attempts of to get a raise at the Bolognese *Studium*. Again, dates for most letters lack, and it is impossible to establish a chronology of the different steps Garzoni took to reach his goal. What is clear, however, is that he both attempted to secure this raise through others (cardinal Ascanio Sforza and Giovanni Paci), as well as by directly addressing the prince. Furthermore,

¹²⁸ Frazier, "A Layman's "Life of St. Augustine" 240.

¹²⁹ Ibidem, 243-259.

Garzoni thus made use of both his social relations and his knowledge. In each of the letters connected to the episode Garzoni made use of his knowledge of ancient authors, albeit in different ways.

Letter 120 shows Garzoni's attempts to convince cardinal Sforza, legate of Bologna, on this matter. In this letter, probably written before 1492 because it mentions pope Innocent VIII, he praised the cardinal for his virtue. The previously discussed reference to Cicero's *Laelius* is used: as the cardinal knows, nothing is more lovable and there is nothing that more allures us to affection than virtue. Garzoni further agrees with Cicero, who also wrote that modesty and temperance are the greatest of virtues. He then goes on to praise the efforts of the cardinal and Innocent VIII for the university of Bologna, and asks him "even though you have not pursued Aristotelian philosophy nor Galen's medicine" to secure a raise for him. Garzoni adds that his colleague at the university makes more than he does, and that the rulers of the city (who are otherwise unspecified) are on Garzoni's side.¹³⁰ In this case knowledge of the ancient authors is not used as a commodity, but rather as supportive to a request to which Garzoni does not offer anything in return.

Unfortunately, once again we do not know whether the cardinal responded. We do know, however, that Garzoni undertook some new attempts to raise his salary around 1497. This time he played it through Giovanni Paci, who according to Garzoni had a lot of influence with the prince. Indeed he may have been the prince's confessor, although this is not certain.¹³¹ Garzoni wrote Paci three letters in which he asks him to approach Giovanni Bentivoglio II on his behalf. Of these, one specifically asks for help in getting the raise, one asks for help in getting Garzoni the free time he needs to write his works, and the third one asks Paci to be the one to present his recently finished work, *De Eruditione Principum*, to the prince. Garzoni also wrote one letter directly to the prince, in which he dedicated his work to him. The letter does not stand out because of its set-up: again Garzoni starts by saying that the prince's virtue has compelled him to dedicate this book to him. Praise for the prince follows, based on Garzoni's knowledge of ancient authors: he is compared to Alexander the Great, who honoured both the 'optimis disciplinis' and the 'honestissimis moribus' and thus enjoyed both the learning of Aristotle and the poems of Homer. At the end of the letter Garzoni explicitly asks the prince to accept him as a servant ("Tu autem ut me in servorum tuorum

¹³⁰ Lind, *Letters*, letter 120, page 107-108, 458-459.

¹³¹ Ibidem, page 443 and Perazzoli, *L'Umanista Bolognese G. Garzoni*, 9.

numerum adscribas et oro et obsecro”).¹³² Usually Garzoni’s is slightly less explicit about his intentions: this was one of the clearest formulations to be used in letters of patronage.

But Garzoni did not stop here: he wanted to make sure the prince would receive his book willingly, and asked someone else to help him with it. His first letter to Paci on this subject is written on February 4, 1499. It starts by praising Paci, after which Garzoni reminds him that they have been friends for more than twenty years. Paci therefore knows that Garzoni is of a good character, faith and integrity. Garzoni then goes on to say that Paci has a lot of influence over the prince, and that Giovanni Bentivoglio would listen to him if Paci spoke with him (“Apud principem summa es auctoritate. Tibi accedit, quare ore tuo excidunt verba auribus suis admovet.”). This is why Paci should try (*adnitere*, imperative) to get Garzoni a small raise. If Paci would do this, Garzoni adds, Garzoni would be more ready to write his history (“Id si feceris propensiore in scribendo historiam ero animo”).¹³³ The history he is referring to deals with Paci and his hometown; Paci started writing the work himself but it was rewritten by Garzoni. Paci is thus requested to act as a broker between Garzoni and Giovanni Bentivoglio. In return he would receive the history of his hometown, which would surely elevate his status. Indeed Paci is praised elaborately in this work. In the relation between Garzoni and Paci knowledge could thus also be used as a commodity.¹³⁴

Letter 328, written less than two weeks after number 431, shows a different use of knowledge: here it is not used as a commodity, but rather as supportive to a request by Garzoni for Paci’s influence over the prince. This time he writes that the head of the Augustinian order has the power to let Garzoni enjoy a sweet old day writing his histories. He should try to influence the prince and to show his friendship to Garzoni: “Non me fallit quanta sis apud principem nostrum auctoritate; quam loqueris orationem auribus suis admittit. Accedit sententia tuae; quare tui muneris est ea efficere quibus me tibi coniunctissimum esse intelligam.” Garzoni further tries to convince Paci by citing two quotes of Cicero and Ovid on friendship, another clear sign. Cicero already wrote that one does not know true friendship until times are difficult: “Verus enim amor, teste Cicerone, tum facile diiudicatur cum aliquod incidit tempus difficile.” This is followed by two lines from Ovid: “Nec tu ignoras benevolentia fidelis periculo aliquo perspicui quemadmodum aurum igni, id quot poeta his versibus expressit: *sed sat fulvum spectator in ignibus aurum; tempore sic duro est inspicienda fides.*” Garzoni then adds, and I paraphrase again: if you have ever done

¹³² Ibidem, letter 431, page 351, 550 (quotation on page 431).

¹³³ Ibidem, letter 324, page 258, 513-514 (quotation on page 258).

¹³⁴ Ibidem, page 513-514, 551-552, 560 and Perazzoli, *L’Umanista Bolognese G. Garzoni*, 45-56. This latter work contains both the original Latin text and an Italian translation (pages 248-328).

something for me, this is the moment, this the time that it is necessary that you do something for me. From this letter it becomes crystal clear that Garzoni expects Paci to serve his interests. Quotes from classical authors are used to remind him of this duty, as is a very strange reference to horses with white hooves, which should not be imitated by Paci.¹³⁵ Garzoni does not explicitly refer to his attempts to secure a raise in this letter, but its date, written less than two weeks after the one discussed above, suggests a link between the two requests.

One last letter can be related to the episode as well. In this undated letter, Garzoni tells Paci that he sends him his recently finished work *De Eruditione Principum* so that the latter can to give it to Giovanni Bentivoglio. After some sentences in which the prince is praised, Garzoni states that the influence Paci has over the prince would make sure that the work would be received with the highest esteem (“non solum deferatur sed summis etiam laudibus collandetur”). Garzoni closes his letter with an (implicit) citation of one of his favourite phrases, the reference to Naevius: as it is terrible to be praised by a wicked man, it is best to be praised by an honest and skilful man.¹³⁶ The sentence can be interpreted in two ways: either as if Garzoni is the good man praising Giovanni, or as Paci praising Garzoni. Either way, here Garzoni’s knowledge is used to convince Paci to help Garzoni to do him a favour. The favour itself consists of presenting Garzoni’s work, clearly used as a commodity, to the prince.

From these letters it becomes clear how diverse the purposes for which Garzoni employed his knowledge were. In this last letter Garzoni asks Paci to help him use one of his works as a commodity, to be exchanged for some favours from Giovanni Bentivoglio. The request for Paci’s help is supported by a quotation of Naevius, just as Garzoni supports his request in letter 328 by quoting Cicero and Ovid. In these letters knowledge is not so much a commodity, but serves to structure social exchange: Garzoni uses the quotes by Cicero and

¹³⁵ The references are to Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 9.16.2 and Ovid, *Tristia* 1.5.25-26, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 328, page 261, 515. The letter is dated February 17 1499. Its entire text (on page 261) runs as follows: “Si tibi erga me summa fuisset fidelitas nullae mihi sedes novae in praesenti quaerendae essent. Senectutem iucundam et suavem agere, in scribendas historias omne studium meum conferri res et integra est et in tua potestae. Non me fallit quanta sis apud principem nostrum auctoritate; quam loqueris orationem auribus suis admittit. Accedit sententia tuae; quare tui muneris est ea efficere quibus me tibi coniunctissimum esse intelligam. Verus enim amor, teste Cicerone, tum facile diiudicatur cum aliquod incidit tempus difficile. Nec tu ignoras benevolentia fidelis periculo aliquo perspici quemadmodum aurum igni, id quot poeta his versibus expressit: sed sat fulvum spectator in ignibus aurum; tempore sic duro est inspicienda fides. Fac igitur ut re ipsa cognoscam me tibi esse carissimum. Si unquam abs te mihi mos gestus est, hoc tempore, hoc, inquam, tempore abs te mihi mos geratur necesse est. Noli, per deos immortales, equos albis unguibus imitari qui semper omnibus in rebus auxilio existunt modo nulla urgeat necessitas. Obsequere principi si eum precibus fatigaveris studiis tuis. Nam ut omittam suae dignitatis memoriam, omnes affatur, salutatur, benigne invitat, apparatis accipit epulis, multorum causas suscipit et semper paratus adest. Vale. 17 Feb. 1499.”

¹³⁶ Lind, *Letters*, letter 339, page 271, 518-519 (quotation on page 271).

Ovid to remind his correspondent of his duties as a friend. In letter 324 on the other hand knowledge is clearly used as a commodity again: Garzoni will write Paci's history, if Paci will help him get a raise from Giovanni Bentivoglio.

In the letter to Giovanni Bentivoglio knowledge is also used in these two ways: as a commodity (the dedicated work) and to structure social exchange (in the form of praise for the prince, who is compared to Alexander the Great). Knowledge is used in this last way in Garzoni's letter to cardinal Sforza as well, whom he explicitly asked for a raise but whom he first flattered by referring to Cicero on virtue. In other words: to reach one and the same goal (a raise), Garzoni approaches different persons (Ascanio Sforza, Giovanni Bentivoglio, and Giovanni Paci). To convince them he uses knowledge in two ways: as a commodity (to Bentivoglio and to Paci), as an argument to convince them to grant him this favour (to Paci and Sforza), and to flatter his correspondents (Sforza and Bentivoglio).

These examples illustrate the omnipresence of knowledge in Garzoni's letters and the ease with which he employed it to get his way. They also show that some differences in the use of different types of knowledge can be distinguished. An immediate distinction can be made between knowledge he produced himself, and knowledge of ancient authors (among which could be both pagan and Christian writers, although the first receive much more attention). The first type of knowledge can be used as a commodity: as we have seen Garzoni sent many works in order to receive something in return. Within this category further distinctions can be made, in order to establish how Garzoni used different kinds of knowledge: medical, theological and knowledge pertaining to the *studia humanitatis*, history, poetry, grammar, rhetoric and moral philosophy.

The first thing that should be noted is that Garzoni never employs his medical knowledge as a commodity – the works that he sends out are theological works (among which his many saint's lives figure most prominently), histories and treatises on moral philosophy. Although there is no strict system in what kind of works he sent to different types of potential patrons, some patterns can be discerned. Rulers received typical humanist knowledge: histories, as in the case of Frederic of Saxony and King Ferdinand of Spain, or treatises on moral philosophy, as in the case of Giovanni Bentivoglio, Guidobaldo of Urbino, and Pandolfo Malatesta. The essay that had been dedicated to Malatesta (*De Amicitia*) was also dedicated to a cardinal (probably Della Rovere), while the other ecclesiastical figures all received theological works: cardinal Bakócz, Antongaleazzo Bentivoglio (son of Giovanni and archdeacon of Bologna), Giovanni Torfanino and Giovanni Paci. To the only humanist who received a dedication, Domenico Fusco, Garzoni sent a work on Alexander the Great.

The second type of knowledge is not used as a commodity; it is used to convince or flatter and thus seems to have more of a supportive function. Within this category we can distinguish the same kinds of knowledge: medical, theological, and humanist. Theological knowledge is not used at all in these letters, and the examples cited above only show one reference to medical knowledge. It appears in the letter to Ascanio Sforza that concerns Garzoni's work as a professor of medicine, and is thus quite appropriate. Most references by far come from ancient authors, and from one in particular: Cicero. This use of Cicero will receive more attention in paragraph 5 – for now it suffices to say that in these cases, again, the supportive use of knowledge rested on Garzoni's knowledge of the ancient authors.

It may be superfluous to add that, regardless of the way knowledge was used, the exchange or distribution of knowledge was not the primary goal in the examples cited above. Instead, different types of knowledge served as a commodity or had a supportive function: to convince or flatter. In the next paragraph we will see that not all of Garzoni's works were used in this way, and that dedications could serve other purposes as well.

5. Dedications: Distributing Knowledge

In the cases discussed in the last paragraph Garzoni dedicated his works to people who enjoyed a higher social status than he did: they were princes and cardinals, or at least held high ecclesiastical offices in Bologna. His motivations for doing so are more or less clear: he expected some kind of financial reward or favour in return. But Garzoni also dedicated works to others, whose ‘patron potential’ was much less obvious. His letters show that he dedicated at least three works to (former) students – one on the life of Saint Thomas of Aquinas to Leandro Alberti, one on eloquence to a German student whom is only known by his Latin name, Itelsolfus Lapidus, and one to Bonifacio da Casale, another Dominican friar. In addition he also dedicated some works to lesser known brothers of the Dominican order: to Vincenzo Bandello di Castelnuovo he dedicated his life of Saint Dominic, and to brother Lodovico a work called *De Misera Mundi*. What were Garzoni’s motivations for dedicating his works to these students or lesser-known Dominicans? Were Garzoni’s written works here used as a commodity as well, or did he send them out with a different purpose?

Unfortunately, of Garzoni’s motivation for his dedication of the *Life of Saint Lucia* to Bonifacio da Casale nothing is known. I am thus forced to leave this dedication out of the equation. A letter in which Garzoni explicitly states his decision to dedicate his *Life of Saint Thomas* to Alberti lacks as well. Fortunately, however, another letter does shed light on Garzoni’s motivations. In letter 254 Garzoni asked his student to make sure that the work, which he had recently copied out again, was added to the Dominican library:

“Thomae Aquinatis viri et mea et omnium sententia doctissimi ac sanctissimi vitam quam prioribus annis scripseram exscribendam curavi. Eam in vestra biblioteca repositam iri mihi incessit cupido. Non me fugit sacerdotes vestros in ea legenda non parvam voluptatem percepturos; libuit mihi tam officiosam provinciam deprecere. Nihil in ea invenies quod censura dignum videri possit”.

The work was thus very suitable for the Dominican library: Saint Thomas excelled in theology and the literary studies, and should be taken as an example.¹³⁷ Even though Garzoni does not refer to an explicit connection between the two, it seems very likely that the request to have his work placed in the library of the Dominicans is linked to the dedication.

A similar request was made to brother Lodovico – but this time it was undoubtedly linked to a dedication. In letter 459 (the only letter in the collection addressed to him) Garzoni

¹³⁷ Lind, *Letters*, letter 254, page 210-211, 494 (quotation on page 210-211).

first praises Lodovico for his decision to join the Dominican order. There was really nothing more praiseworthy than to join the order and reject the worldly pleasures that brought ruin upon so many. Garzoni digresses a little on this subject and then tells Lodovico that he has recently finished a work that deals with this argument (“In praesenti quod otii nactus sum id ad explicandas huius mundi miserias contuli”). He dedicates this book, *De misera mundi*, to Lodovico, who should make sure Torfanino gets access to it after he has read it (“Libellum tibi dicavi quem cum legeris patri nostro fratri Joanni Trufanini legendi copiam facies”)¹³⁸. With this dedication Garzoni thus kills two birds with one stone: he praises and flatters his student, but also uses him to make sure that his work is shown to someone who enjoys a higher status and who can exercise more influence.

The letter to the German student who Garzoni calls Lapidus (his vernacular name may have been Stein) demonstrates a similar use of a dedication. Again Garzoni starts with praising his student for his eloquence, after which he tells him that Lapidus’ great progress in this regard has led him to dedicate an oration (*De laus eloquentia*) on this subject to him. Lapidus will read this with diligence and attention, and will make sure that it becomes available for others to read (“Eam omni diligentia accurateque legeris eique legendae aliis copiam facies”).¹³⁹ The salutation of the letter is quite interesting: Garzoni tells Lapidus to love him, while he reminds Lapidus of the role he played in his student’s education (“Vale et me qui tibi in discendis litteris socius atque adiutor fui ama singulari illo tuo amore”). It thus seems as if Garzoni knows that he is asking Lapidus to do him a favour, and as if this phrase serves to remind his student of a certain debt he has towards him. Of course we do not know whether his student followed Garzoni’s instructions, but the intention on Garzoni’s side is clear. By dedicating his work to Lapidus, Garzoni tried to expand his range of readers outside of Italy. Alison Frazier has argued that Garzoni’s desire to establish a reputation outside of Italy also played a role when Garzoni re-dedicated his *Life of Saint Augustine* to cardinal Bakócz.¹⁴⁰

But even though Garzoni undoubtedly undertook attempts to establish his fame in other European countries, his basis remained firmly in Bologna. This is illustrated by the dedication of his *Life of Saint Dominic* to Vincenzo Bandello di Castelnuovo. Vincenzo was inquisitor in Bologna from 1490 onwards, and was appointed Vicar General of the Dominicans in 1500. Unfortunately we do not know when Garzoni exactly wrote his *Life of*

¹³⁸ Ibidem, letter 459, page 391, 559-560 (quotation on page 391).

¹³⁹ Ibidem, letter 485, page 414, 566.

¹⁴⁰ Frazier, “A Layman’s “Life of St. Augustine” 260-262. See also Lind, *Letters*, letter 249, page 208, 493, where Garzoni seems to justify his decision to rededicate this work to the cardinal to Alberti.

Saint Dominicus, but it must have been before 1498 – Garzoni received a letter by Pomponio Leto, who died in that year, on this work. The dedicatory letter of this work is not extant, nor can we find another letter where Garzoni states his motivations for dedicating it to Vincenzo. However, letter 69 shows that this dedication gained Garzoni a larger public as well. In it he thanks Vincenzo for his invitation to dine at the monastery, where his work was read aloud. At this dinner many theologians, orators, philosophers, lawyers, knights, doctors and many prominent citizens were present, according to Garzoni. Everyone listened attentively, and Garzoni was delighted to see so many had gathered to honour him and his book.¹⁴¹ Garzoni also wrote about the dinner to Paci, most likely in order to prompt him to organise a similar reading of his work of Saint Augustine.¹⁴²

Even so, none other than Pomponio Leto criticized Garzoni’s decision to dedicate his work to Vincenzo. In the only letter Leto wrote to Garzoni he praised the work and said that some townsmen of the Saint even took a copy with them to Spain. However, he asked why Garzoni dedicated it to someone Leto had never heard of (“Verum inscription ipsa nulli mihi fuit voluptati quod librum dicasti religioso nescio cui”). Garzoni should recall his inscription and dedicate it to the Spanish king; Ferdinand was not negligent and would surely favour Garzoni. This advice is followed by a friendship request as we know it from paragraph 2: Garzoni’s virtue has compelled Leto to invite him into his friendship, and Leto assures Garzoni that it has been honesty, not pleasure or utility, that has lead him to approach Garzoni.

“Verum inscriptio ipsa nulli mihi fuit voluptati quod librum dicasti religioso nescio cui. Dicandus erat Ferdinando potentissimo et σεβαστοτάτῳ, Christianissimo Hispaniarum regi. Revoca inscriptionem et tanto munere regem afficiendum cura quo ut se donatum aspiciet et incredibili exiliet gaudio. Non erit immemor; eos diligit, eos amat quos virtuti deditos intelligit. Accede mihi; si quae scribo cogitatione complecteris, cognosces me veritati esse affinem. Ego virtute tua copulsus te in amicitiam meam invito, tu me in tuam recipito. Garzo meus est, Pomponius tuus sit, velis. Non voluptate, non utilitate, sed honestate adductus ut mecum amicitiam contrahere te excitavi, cuius initium felix sit deos obsecro atque obtestor.”¹⁴³

Garzoni did not heed Leto’s advice: no rededication of this work exists. However, it is possible that there is a link between Leto’s letter, Garzoni’s decision to write a history of the war in Granada and the dedication of this work to King Ferdinand. The letter from Leto dates

¹⁴¹ Lind, *Letters*, letter 69, page 51, 443.

¹⁴² Frazier, “A Layman’s “Life of St. Augustine” 242, 261-262.

¹⁴³ Lind, *Letters*, letter 68, page 50-51, 442-443 (quotation on page 50).

from before 1498, while the letters in which Garzoni announced his decision to dedicate a work to Ferdinand are dated around 1500.¹⁴⁴ In this case too, Garzoni asked someone to help him distribute his work outside of Italy. Jacob Arena, to whom he sent three letters in total, was asked to receive his book willingly and to make sure that it was placed between the other books in their library (“Libellum autem benigne accipies cumque enim legeris inter ceteros vestrae bibliothecae libros reponendum curabis”). The request closely resembles the one made to Alberti, only this time the work is not dedicated to Arena.¹⁴⁵ Instead, Garzoni dedicated the work to the Spanish king and asked Arena to help him make sure that the king received his work willingly. In a different letter Garzoni reminded him that he had promised to help him and sent him the work on the war in Granada, stating that he wanted Mena to help him in his desire to honour King Ferdinand.¹⁴⁶

Arena was not the only one who received a work without a corresponding dedication. Several letters by Garzoni testify that he let his works circulate among his correspondents. Torfanino for instance received at least three saint’s lives written by Garzoni: that of Paul, so that Torfanino would know that Garzoni had not lost faith,¹⁴⁷ that of Christopher, for which Garzoni does not give a reason¹⁴⁸, and the one on Dominic, which would surely be received willingly by Torfanino.¹⁴⁹ Alberti received this last work as well, without any specific reason.¹⁵⁰ Paci received Garzoni’s *De Officiis Principis* at his request¹⁵¹, his *Life of Maria* because Garzoni thought he might find some pleasure in it¹⁵², and some orations because a brother at the monastery had wrongly attributed different ones to Garzoni, who wanted this error corrected.¹⁵³ In letter 32 Garzoni writes Vincenzo da Piacenza that he sends him his histories (which are otherwise unspecified but may be the ones concerning Bologna) because

¹⁴⁴ Ibidem, page 563.

¹⁴⁵ Ibidem, letter 472, page 405, 563 (quotation on page 405).

¹⁴⁶ Ibidem, letter 475, page 407-408, 564: “Quare cum sis vir probus et nulla virtute egens ut quod mihi pollicitus es id exitu praestes te oratum volo. Nullum mihi maius beneficium conferre potes. Bellum Granatense litteris mando. Accede, quaeso, desiderio meo. Tui muneris est obsequi studiis meis quando Ferdinandum inclitum Hispaniae regem magno sim verborum honore prosecuturus.” (quotation on page 407).

¹⁴⁷ Ibidem, letter 174, page 152, 473: “Ne me a fide descivisse arbitraris mitto ad te quod de Pauli apostoli laudibus brevi sum complexus.” (quotation on page 152).

¹⁴⁸ Ibidem, letter 193, page 167, 478: “Christophori mei tibi legendi copiam feci.” (quotation on page 167).

¹⁴⁹ Ibidem, letter 214, page 180, 483: “Quam prioribus diebus de beati Dominici laudibus scripsi orationem ad te mitto. Non est apud me dubium quin magnam ex ea sis voluptatem percepturus.” (quotation on page 180).

¹⁵⁰ Ibidem, letter 220, page 183, 484: “Otioso mihi et quicquam litteris mandare cupienti nihil dignius visum est quam ut de gloriosissimi confessoris Dominici nostri laudibus orationem conficerem.” (quotation on page 183).

¹⁵¹ Ibidem, letter 362, page 287, 524: “Quod rogas ut tibi mea scripta mittam.” ((quotation on page 287).

¹⁵² Ibidem, letter 368, page 293, 526: “Illius vitam scripsi, quem libellum ad te mitto ut aliquando possis animo tuo voluptatem afferre.” (quotation on page 293).

¹⁵³ Ibidem, letter 390, page 313, 533: “Frater Joannes tuus plures et eas quidem perbreves exscripsit orationes quas nego esse meas quod in ipsis nullus est ordo, nullus est numerus, nulla iunctura. His tribus oratoris constat oratio. Quare iube eas discindi aut tollatur inscriptio. Quae ad te nunc perferuntur scito eas me scripsisse.” (quotation on page 313).

Torfanino urged him to do so.¹⁵⁴ Letter 66 shows that Vincenzo Malmignati da Ferrara had a copy of his *De eruditione principum*, which Garzoni wanted to have back because he needed to show it to the rector of the *Studium*, who would visit Garzoni for lunch and had requested to see some of his works.¹⁵⁵ Finally it should be noted that Garzoni could also be on the receiving end of such an exchange: from his former student Rodericus of Bohemia he received a work on Saint Simon¹⁵⁶ and a work on the art of letter writing. Garzoni praised both works in his letters to Rodericus, and told him that he had the work on letter writing circulating among others: “Venit ad manus meas libellus qui de scribendis epistolis abs te nuper editus est. Eius legendi multis copiam feci”¹⁵⁷

Garzoni’s own stated purposes for sending out his works thus varied considerably. Sometimes he was requested to do so, by a correspondent or a third party. In other cases the initiative was Garzoni’s. What role these works played in the relation Garzoni had with his correspondents is sometimes hard to determine: they may have functioned as a commodity as well, just like the works that were accompanied by a dedication. No clear evidence exists, however, that Garzoni directly received financial awards or favours in return. All the same, it does seem likely that Garzoni expected to profit from them in some way. Other letters testify that he did not like to loan books written by other authors to his correspondents; he was afraid that they would not return them.¹⁵⁸ That he sent out his own works willingly and eagerly thus indicates that this served a certain purpose. They may not have been sent out as real commodities like the works accompanied by a dedication, but certainly were gifts to fortify a friendship. In addition, however, they may also have been sent out as a sort of ‘teaser’ – in the previous paragraph we have seen that cardinal Bakócz commissioned Garzoni to write something after he had sent him one of his saint’s lives. A similar situation may be at hand here; Garzoni may have hoped to receive commissions from Paci and Torfanino after sending his works to them. Thirdly, by sending out his works Garzoni could also magnify his status and reputation, especially when he sent them to such key-figures within his network as

¹⁵⁴Ibidem, letter 32, page 21, 430: “Frater Ioannes Trufaninus, quo nemo apud me plus auctoritate valet ac voluntate, me non semel sed saepius verbis suis ut librum ipsum ad te mittendum curarem admonuit.” (quotation on page 21)

¹⁵⁵ Ibidem, letter 66, page 49, 441: “Apud me pransurus est magnificus dominus rector. Is me precibus obsecravit ut inventionum mearum a me particeps fieret. Multa scripsi quae per Italiam vagantur. Nihil autem elegantius nec homine philosopho dignius quantum coniectura consequi possum quam librum quem de principum eruditione conscripsi. In eo sum complexus onmen Peripateticam philosophiam, quare non gravaberis, maxime omnium orator, ipsum ad me remittere; id ut facias te etiam atque etiam obsecro. Vale meque in posterum ut soles amabis.” (quotation on page 49).

¹⁵⁶ Ibidem, letter 19, page 14, 428.

¹⁵⁷ Ibidem, letters 483, page 413, 566. Letter 484, page 414, 566, also concerns this work.

¹⁵⁸ See especially letter 210 to Torfanino, where Garzoni very strongly refuses to borrow him his copy of Valla’s *Elegantiae*. Lind, *Letters*, page 178, 482.

Torfanino and Paci. In this regard they also remind us of the work Garzoni sent to Poliziano; this simultaneously served as a gift and as a sort of test-case, on which Poliziano could base his judgement of Garzoni. And finally, we should not totally rule out the possibility that Garzoni also sent out his work, at least for a small part, out of genuine love for learning and the desire to spread knowledge.

The way in which Garzoni uses his network of (former) students reminds us of the way Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605), another Bolognese scholar, used his network of students some fifty years later. Giuseppe Olmi's studies on Aldrovandi's contact with his students show that they often stayed in touch after his students returned to their home country. These contacts favored the spread of knowledge as well: Aldrovandi's former students sent him valuable natural artifacts, information on collections or museums in their home country, or reports of their travels to far places where they found exotic new animal species.¹⁵⁹ Paula Findlen has demonstrated how the Sienese physician Pier Andrea Mattioli (1501-1578) employed his network in a similar manner: he used his correspondents to gather information and materials that allowed him to write his famous commentaries on Dioscorides' *De materia medica*. The contacts of Aldrovandi and Mattioli were extremely important in the formation of a learned community as well as a new discipline: that of natural history.¹⁶⁰ One important difference between Garzoni's situation and that of Aldrovandi and Mattioli can be established, however: whereas they mainly used their network to gather knowledge, Garzoni used his network of students precisely the other way around – he employed his social relations to promote his own works.

We could say that the students mentioned above all acted (or were asked to act) as Garzoni's brokers or agents, as they were requested to distribute his works further by placing them in their libraries, or to present them to someone else. In a way the dedications served as a commodity as well; by presenting a work to one of his (former) students, Garzoni could ask them to distribute his works for him. One clear difference with regard to the last paragraph can be established, however. In the previous paragraph Garzoni's works were used to fortify a social relation or to win a specific favour. They, and the knowledge presented in them, were thus made subordinate to social exchange. In those cases where Garzoni dedicated a work to his students, the primary goal was the distribution of knowledge (Garzoni's own works), to which the social exchange (the dedication) and the social relation were made subordinate.

¹⁵⁹ Giuseppe Olmi, "Molti Amici in Varii Luoghi": Studio della natura e rapporti epistolari nel Secolo XVI", 3-31 and idem, "Bologna nel secolo XVI: una capitale europea della ricerca naturalistica" 61-80.

¹⁶⁰ Findlen, "The Formation of a Scientific Community: Natural History in Sixteenth-Century Italy" 369-400.

6. The Didactic Function of Knowledge

This paragraph will deal with one of the clearest and most well defined functions of knowledge: the didactic one. By now it is clear that many of Garzoni's correspondents were his former or current students. In his relations with them, the exchange of knowledge was expected and necessary. This paragraph will focus on the knowledge he exchanged with them: what exactly did Garzoni teach his students? Did he equally distribute medical, theological and humanist knowledge? Which authors did he recommend them to read? Did he use his letters to give them practical tips to improve their oratorical abilities, or did he also instruct them in other subjects? If so, how can we distinguish the didactic function of knowledge from other uses? Finally, was the didactic use of knowledge strictly reserved to Garzoni's relations with his students?

The first thing that should be noted when examining Garzoni's contacts with his students is the clear lack of any contact with the students to whom he taught medicine at the university. None of the letters are directed to them or even refer to their existence. Instead, the students whom Garzoni corresponded with are those he educated in the art of oratory. Many of them were members of either the Dominican order or, to a lesser extent, that of the Augustinians. They hoped to combine their study of oratory with theology to become better orators – the Dominican order was known as the 'Ordo Praedicatorum', the Order of Preachers. Garzoni adapted his teaching to this particular goal, and often referred to examples of Christian authors who had a particular talent for public speaking. Still, most of the knowledge exchanged in these letters comes from ancient authors and their texts. For the lack of contacts with medical students two reasons can be given: Garzoni's personal preferences may have played a part, for his letters show that he did not care much for his medical duties, and secondly the nature of both disciplines were important as well. The Latin letters Garzoni sent to his students could fulfil a didactic purpose regardless of their content, simply because his students were expected to write well. His medical students on the other hand did not have to practice the writing of beautiful Latin letters and Garzoni was thus not expected to send them letters within their professional relation. This indicates that humanist knowledge was more intrinsically related to social exchanges than other types of knowledge.¹⁶¹

The author Garzoni most often recommends to his students in oratory is Cicero. By studying Cicero, he tells them, they will become master orators themselves. Quintilian is cited

¹⁶¹ Stegeman signals a similar imbalance in the letters of Van Almeloveen and attributes it to Van Almeloveen's personal preference for oratory over medicine. Stegeman, *Patronage en Dienstverlening* 95-96.

less frequently and almost always in the same context: to recall the three most important characteristics of a good oration (junction, order and rhythm).¹⁶² One other, more recent author is often mentioned as an authority as well: Lorenzo Valla, with whom Garzoni studied when he was young. One difference in the use of Cicero and Quintilian as opposed to Valla can immediately be discerned: the references to Valla usually regard specific linguistic questions posed by Garzoni's correspondents. Cicero and Quintilian on the other hand are more often cited within a specific oratorical context.¹⁶³

The clearest examples of the didactic use of knowledge can be found in the letters in which Garzoni gives his students practical tips, based on his humanist knowledge, on how to improve their oratorical skills. Some of Garzoni's letters indicate that he attended the sermons his students delivered or the masses they celebrated, and that he provided them with feedback afterwards. Letter 29 offers a perfect example. Here Garzoni tells Filippo Musotti, a Dominican friar from a noble family of Bologna, that he should not celebrate mass in a hurry. What he needs instead is gravity and dignity, and to follow Cicero's precept: the "gravissimus orator" dictates that there should be a certain slowness in an oration, in order to capture the attention of the public. Garzoni also tells Musotti how Demosthenes, "who was rightly given the first place among the Greek orators", would respond when he was interrupted during an oration. Garzoni did not *always* use classical examples to support his opinion: in the same letter he uses a comparison between the pleasure the congregation feels when a priest properly celebrates mass and the pleasure spectators feel when they see a beautiful woman walk by.¹⁶⁴

Another letter to Musotti shows that Garzoni's student had succeeded in his ambition: he had been asked by the Dominicans to become an orator in their service. Garzoni of course congratulated him on his achievement, but he also told him that he was still making one grave mistake: he separated the strength of his opinions from the embellishment of his words. Again Garzoni cites Cicero to show how severe Musotti's error was:

"Vereor ne sententiarum gravitatem a verborum ornatu seiungas. Qui error quantus sit M. Tullius expressit. Affirmat enim gravissimus orator nihil esse furiosius inani

¹⁶² See for instance letter 82, where Vincenzo Malmignati da Ferrara is criticized for his un-Ciceronian oration and for violating this principle of Quintilian. Lind, *Letters*, letter 82, page 62.

¹⁶³ See Luisa Avellini, "Eloquenza e Committenza. Prosa encomiastica e agiografica di Giovanni Garzoni", in Bruno Basile (ed.), *Bentivolorum Magnificentia: Principe e cultura a Bologna nel rinascimento* (Rome, 1984), 135-153 and especially Alessandra Mantovani, "Giovanni Garzoni e le 'Historiae Bononienses'. Uno scolaro del Valla alla corte dei Bentivoglio", in Anselmi, G.M. and Guerra, M. (ed), *Lorenzo Valla e l'umanesimo Bolognese* (Bologna 2009) 59-83 for Valla's influence on Garzoni.

¹⁶⁴ Lind, letter 29, page 19-20, 429-430.

sonitu verborum nulla subiecta sententia, quae si cum verborum ornatu coniuncta sit nulla maior dignitatis accessio oratori fieri poterit.”¹⁶⁵

Most letters contained less practical tips, and in those cases the didactic use of knowledge already starts to resemble other uses of knowledge. To illustrate this I will discuss several letters (number 1, 2, 3 and 6) addressed to Leandro Alberti. We will see that all of these letters are written for didactic reasons, but subtle differences as to their message and the type of knowledge exchanged in them can be distinguished.

Letter 2 shows the clearest use of knowledge within a didactic function. It gives concrete and specific suggestions on how Alberti can improve his speaking skills. Just as he did with Musotti, Garzoni recommends Alberti to follow the precepts of Cicero if he wants to speak a clear and pure Latin. He clarifies: Alberti should avoid using neologisms and archaisms, and he should always make sure that his speeches are adapted to the intelligence of his public. Garzoni then explicitly states that Alberti should follow these practical tips if he wants to imitate Cicero: “Haec consequere si Ciceronem imitaberis”. The letter ends with one last reason why Cicero should be imitated: he was the man from whose tongue flowed speech sweeter than honey, “as Homer wrote of Nestor”.¹⁶⁶

In letter 3 Alberti is also urged to follow Cicero’s example. This time the first part of the letter praises Cicero and his outstanding achievements as an orator. In the second part Garzoni inveighs against those “most insane men” (“dementissimi homines”) who recommend the study of more recent authors. Garzoni judges this a worthless and idle opinion. He then tells his pupil that he once visited Florence, where he heard a Florentine youth ask Leonardo Bruni how to become a great orator. Leonardo answered the youth: by reading Cicero again and again. Garzoni tells his student that he will become most eloquent if he remembers this precept well. He hopes that Alberti will listen to his advice, since, as

¹⁶⁵ Lind, letter 103, page 82, 452 (quotation on page 82).

¹⁶⁶ Reference to Homer, *Iliad* 1.249. I have followed the translation on <http://nlp.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0134%3Abook%3D1%3Acard%3D245> (last consulted on June 18 2014), read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 2, page 2. Lind, *Letters*, letter 2, page 1-2, 424-425. The entire letter (on page 1-2) runs as follows: “Quod in eloquentem virum evadere institueris, mi Leander, et laudo et probo quoniam in rebus humanis nihil sit eloquentia dignius, nihil praestantius. Tenenda tibi erunt praecepta Ciceronis, quae si contempseris haud fieri posse existima ut voti compos sis futurus. Vitanda tibi erunt verba nova aut prisca aut duriter aliunde translata, in quem errorum cum multi memoria nostra incidissent damnata est eorum oratio. Erunt igitur inventionis tuae ad commune iudicium et ad popularem intelligentiam accomodandae. Sit oratio tua pura, non absit a Latinitate, sit aperta et lucida. Haec consequere si Ciceronem imitaberis. Is enim vir erat cuius ex ore dulcior melle (ut de Nestore scribit Homerus) fluebat oratio. Vale”.

Cicero wrote: “we must despair for him whose ears are so closed to truth that he cannot hear what is true from a friend”.¹⁶⁷

So far these letters are similar to the ones written to Musotti: in them Garzoni gives concrete and practical advice on how to become an orator. The first letter addressed to Alberti already shows a somewhat different use of knowledge, while still performing a didactic function. In this letter Garzoni praises Alberti for his desire to become an orator and tells him he is confident that Alberti would fulfil his ambition. To support this statement he cites Aristotle, who said that pleasure makes one complete a task. Garzoni then adds some wisdom of his own: diligence and inclination help as well (“Delectatio enim, teste Aristotele, opus perficit; addo etiam diligentiam ac voluntatem”). Two more classical authorities are paraphrased to further prove his point: Seneca, on virtue (which no one can resist), and Terence, “the poet”, who said that nothing is so difficult that it cannot be found by seeking.¹⁶⁸ This time Alberti is not given any practical advice on how to improve his oratorical skills, but is urged to keep up his studies and hard work. Still, it is clear that the advice is given within a professional relation between master and student, and that it pertains to Alberti’s studies.

Garzoni also employed his theological knowledge for this purpose. In letter 6, still to Alberti, Garzoni first thanks his pupil for the praise he had bestowed upon him in his last letter. He responds to this praise with the quote of Naevius that has been discussed in paragraph 2. But even though he is grateful for Alberti’s praise, he implores Alberti to follow the example of Cicero: many who did so became most eloquent. To prove his point Garzoni cites Pliny on the importance of imitating Cicero, and adds that Cyprian, Lactantius and Saint Jerome followed his example as well. Leandro is also urged to read these authors to make his speech richer.¹⁶⁹ In other letters the role of Christian authors is more pronounced: in letter 111 for instance, Garzoni specifically recommends Alberti to study the letters of Paul the Apostle. This letter opens with praise for Alberti, who showed great promise as an orator. His decision

¹⁶⁷ The reference is to Cicero, *De Amicitia* 90, translation from Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, vol. XX, 1923; Latin text with English translation by W. A. Falconer, found on http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Cicero/Laelius_de_Amicitia/text*.html (last consulted June 19 2014), Lind, *Letters*, letter 3, page 2-3, 425: “Quae ad te scribe in bonam partem accipito nec huiusmodi praecepta contemptui habeas nec acerbe feras. Cuius enim aures, teste M. Tullio, veritati clausae sunt ut ab amico veritatem audire nequeat, huius salus desperanda est.”

¹⁶⁸ The references are to (respectively) Aristoteles, *Etica Nicomachea* X 1174b20, Seneca, *Dialogus ad Polybium de consolatione* 11.17.2, and Terence, *Heauton* 675, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 1, page 1: “Virtus, ut ait Seneca, neminem dedignatur. Nihil est tam difficile quin in inquirendo investigare possit, ut ait poeta.” (citation on page 1).

¹⁶⁹ Lind, *Letters*, letter 6, page 4, 426: “Plinius iunior sibi cum Cicerone esse aemulationem scribit neque contentus est eloquentia saeculi sui, stultissimum enim putat ad imitandum non optimum quemque proponere. Numquam Cyprianus, numquam Lactantius, numquam Hieronymus si se a legend Cicerone alienos prasestissent tantam laudem consecuti fuissent. Eos ut legas hortor, siquidem orationem tuam pleniorum efficies.” (citation on page 4).

to become one is lauded once again: those who try to recall others who are departing from the right path are most praiseworthy. Alberti should take the letters of Paul as his example: they are full of pleasantness, gravity and the best precepts, so that by reading them, “we scorn those things written by others”. His letters had recalled many who were directed towards destruction – and if Alberti imitates him he will not just become a demagogue or preacher, he will become a great one. The letter is characterised by an interesting mix of humanist and theological knowledge: Garzoni then again refers to Pliny the younger, while Alberti is told in the last sentence that Garzoni knows no one who thinks it is wrong to study Cicero. Augustine did not judge it inappropriate to study what had been said by Cicero, as long as one did not also follow his opinions on religion.¹⁷⁰

This theme returns more often in Garzoni’s letters to his students (and to others, for that matter): should good Christians study the pagan authors? The relevance of this theme was clear for all humanists and students of the humanist disciplines. Still, in Garzoni’s network it might have played a somewhat more important role, as many of his students were members of either the Dominican or the Augustinian orders and wanted to become orators in this specific context. We have just seen how Garzoni implicitly referred to their ambition in letter 111, where he told Alberti that it was most praiseworthy to become an orator and to try to prevent those who threatened to deviate from the right path from doing so. In many letters the link between theology and oratory is established even more firmly: Garzoni often explicitly assured his correspondents that the study of pagan authors could be linked to theology, and even wrote how this combination would make for the best possible learning.

Garzoni’s letter to Jacob Mena, probably a Spanish student who came to Bologna, is exemplary:

“Quod non tam litteratura et prudentia quam fide et religione vitae praeditus existas et gaudeo et vehementer laetor. [...] Venisti in Italiam discendae theologiae gratia, non contentus liberalibus disciplinis in quibus tantam cognitionem habes quantam forte nemo alter. [...] Movebis tu cum te patriae reddes omnibus admirationem, in te omnium oculos convertes, qui dialecticam, philosophiam, theologiam cum oratoria coniungendas putasti.”

Mena has thus come to Italy to study theology, not being content with only studying the liberal disciplines. When he returns home, everyone will praise him because he is able to combine dialectic, philosophy and theology to oratory.¹⁷¹ A letter to Vincenzo da Piacenza

¹⁷⁰ Ibidem, letter 111, page 96, 456 (citations on page 96).

¹⁷¹ Ibidem, letter 109, page 91-93, 454-455 (citations on page 91 and 93).

shows the same elements: “Tu dialectiam, tu oratoriam, tu philosophiam cum theologia coniunxisti ut mirandum sit te unum existere in quem tot sint ornamenta congesta.”¹⁷²

This letter (no. 33) is interesting for another reason as well: in it Garzoni thanks Vincenzo for having solved a doubt on Seneca. This doubt is unfortunately not specified; Garzoni only writes that Vincenzo has freed him of every error and that he is now forever indebted to him (“Tu me omni errore liberasti; quae mihi de Seneca iniecta erat suspicionem sustulisti. Immortali tibi sum obstructus beneficio.”).¹⁷³ So far we have only seen examples of how Garzoni educated his students and clarified problems for them. In this case, however, someone who may have been a student of Garzoni explained something to him. It is difficult to establish what kind of relation Garzoni and Vincenzo precisely had. Lind’s information on Vincenzo is somewhat confusing: he first states that Vincenzo taught logic and grammar at the Bolognese *Studium* in 1495, but then writes that he only received his bachelor’s degree in 1501.¹⁷⁴ The letter discussed in paragraph 2 to Torfanino does suggest that Vincenzo was one of Garzoni’s students, as do other letters addressed to Vincenzo. Especially letter 14, where Garzoni answers a question on the coming of Christ and Mary by the Sybil of Cumae (which Garzoni explains based on a text from Saint Jerome and Vergil’s *Eclogues*), shows Garzoni in his didactic role again.¹⁷⁵ The letters exchanged between Garzoni and Vincenzo thus demonstrate how difficult it is to distinguish the didactic use of knowledge from other uses, most of all the use that was central to paragraph 3.

Some more examples may be useful to further explore this problem. The examples cited so far, with the exception of the just mentioned letters to Vincenzo, all concern oratorical knowledge and the oratorical abilities of Garzoni’s students. This type of knowledge has a very clear and well-defined social function: it is exchanged within a professional relation between a teacher and his students. Many letters, however, show that Garzoni also educated his students in other subjects, or at least that he provided them with knowledge belonging to other disciplines than oratory. In some cases Garzoni is explicitly asked to do so. Alberti, for instance, had asked Garzoni on the proper Latin term for the word ‘excommunication’. To answer his question Garzoni referred to Lorenzo Valla, who in turn had based his opinion on Jerome and Cicero.¹⁷⁶ Another example can be found in letter 222, where Garzoni tried to explain a quote of Hesiod (on the sacrifices a scholar has to make) to

¹⁷² Ibidem, letter 33, page 22.

¹⁷³ Ibidem, letter 33, page 22, 429.

¹⁷⁴ Ibidem, page 426-427.

¹⁷⁵ Ibidem, letter 14, page 10, 427.

¹⁷⁶ Ibidem, letter 215, page 180, 483.

Alberti, because he had used this quote earlier and Alberti did not understand it properly. Garzoni now cites the next lines of the passage so Alberti will understand the quote better. He also writes that this passage had been used by Aristotle, and that this master of philosophy was not ashamed to fortify his own argument by Hesiod.¹⁷⁷

The quote by Hesiod does not directly concern oratory, nor does the letter in which Garzoni explains the proper term for excommunication in Latin. Yet these letters clearly still have a didactic function; Garzoni is approached as an authority to explain something his student did not understand. The use of knowledge in letter 43 is slightly more complicated. In this short letter Garzoni advises Alberti to be moderate and to follow the example of Cato the Elder. No concrete oratorical knowledge is exchanged, nor does it serve to exhort Alberti to study hard to become a better orator, as the references to classical authors in letters 1 and 222 did. The subject of the advice given by Garzoni thus lies outside of the professional relation that explains the exchange of knowledge in the letters cited so far. How can we explain this letter to Alberti? Can we still call this use of knowledge didactic, or does it serve a different purpose?

First it is necessary to realize that a letter, regardless of its content, could already perform a didactic function *an sich*. The art of letter writing was often linked to the study of rhetoric and served as a preparation for the latter.¹⁷⁸ Garzoni thus often praised his students when he had received an extraordinarily well written letter from their hands, where they had obeyed all the principles of Cicero.¹⁷⁹ Nonetheless, we also want to know whether the content of the letter, the knowledge presented in it, also had a didactic function. Garzoni's goal in letter 43 can best be defined as giving moral advice – a practice that was quite frequent in humanist letters and one that had a classical precedent in the letters of Horace. Horace's moral epistles are often characterised by the framework of an older man giving friendly advice to a younger one. As Claudio Guillén put it, the older man is sharing his wisdom with the younger one and thus provides him with “counsel without didactic pride”.¹⁸⁰ Indeed many of Garzoni's letters show a similar division of roles: Garzoni counsels his students on other things besides their study progress.

It is interesting to ask whether a similar application of knowledge also figures in letters to other correspondents. In paragraph 2 and 3 I have already briefly mentioned letter

¹⁷⁷ Ibidem, letter 222, page 184-185, 484-485.

¹⁷⁸ Claudio Guillén, “Notes towards the Study of the Renaissance Letter” in Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (ed.), *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation* (Cambridge MA 1986) 70-101, 84-85.

¹⁷⁹ See for instance letter 5 to Alberti and letters 15 and 17 to Bonifacio da Casale, another Dominican friar, Lind, *Letters*, pages 3-4, 11, 13.

¹⁸⁰ Guillén, “Notes towards the Study of the Renaissance Letter” 78-79.

373, to Giovanni Paci. In this letter Garzoni digresses on the importance of virtue, a subject that can be characterized as belonging to moral philosophy. The letter almost seems to be an essay – it can only be recognized as a letter by the short ‘Vale’ at the end and does not refer to Paci or to any relevance the information contained in this letter has to him. The same is true of letter 61, albeit to a somewhat less extreme extent. This letter is addressed to Torfanino and concerns righteous behaviour. Garzoni writes that riches that have been gathered in a disgraceful way can easily disappear, and that Seneca said that only those things that were conceived with a just and honest intention last. “Quorsum haec?”, Garzoni then writes: “Why this?” He explains: Torfanino will understand that nothing can be considered better for a man than when he lives an upright, chaste and religious life. The memories of a life well spent and of many good deeds are the sweetest – an implicit reference to Cicero’s *Cato Maior*.¹⁸¹

These letters have a similar subject as the one to Alberti: they are concerned with moral philosophy. However, one clear difference can be established. In the letters to Torfanino and Paci an explicit link between the exchanged knowledge and the correspondent misses. The letter to Alberti on the other hand does contain such a reference: Alberti is told that he should follow the example of Cato, even though an explanation or motivation for the advice misses. He is “counselled without didactic pride”: as befits Garzoni when giving moral advice on a topic that lies slightly outside of the subject he taught Alberti. In the letters to Paci and Torfanino all indications that Garzoni is advising them is missing. There could be two reasons for this: either the letters were not intended as advice, or an explicit link was purposefully left out because it would be considered inappropriate if Garzoni would advice someone with an equal or higher social status. Given the complex rules that governed social relations in Early Modern Europe the last option seems probable. Sometimes, however, Garzoni did give them explicit advice. Letter 178 (addressed to Torfanino) for instance concerns the illness of Filippo Musotti. So far Musotti has received ineffective treatments, and Garzoni urges his friend to make sure other physicians see him. To this he adds that another brother, Bonifacio da Casale, would still be alive if Torfanino and the Dominicans had listened to his advice. Strangely enough Garzoni does not use his own medical knowledge to convince Torfanino; instead he adds a quote by Juvenal, who wrote that one could never be too cautious when human life is at stake.¹⁸²

¹⁸¹ The references are to Seneca, *De Brevitate Vitae* 1.4 and to Cicero, *Cato Maior* 3.9, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 61, page 45-46, 440.

¹⁸² The reference is to Juvenal, *Satires* 6.221, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 178, page 155-156, 474.

Garzoni thus urges his correspondent to take action – he advises him in a medical situation. However, in this case knowledge (the quote by Juvenal) was rather used in a supportive than a didactic function. Other letters demonstrate that Garzoni could and did employ his knowledge with a didactic purpose to Paci and Torfanino. Letter 172 for instance shows quite some similarities to the aforementioned letter 222 to Alberti. In letter 172 Garzoni corrected Torfanino on the use of the word ‘ballista’. He did so because the law of friendship required it: “Quare non omittam quod lex amicitiae postulat. Non enim debet amicus, ut alter in errore versatur, sinere ballistam dixisse esse tormentum.”¹⁸³ In letter 222 Garzoni used a very similar reason to explain the quote by Hesiod to Alberti: “Ego ut amicum tuum commonefacerem adduxi Hesiodum qui si apud illum fide carebit vereor ne sibi male consulat”.¹⁸⁴

The similarities between letter 127, to Paci, and letter 3 to Alberti are even more striking. Here Garzoni first praised his correspondent’s last letter but told him that he would become even better if he would imitate Cicero and Livy. This is followed by the familiar reference to Pliny, who said that it is most foolish not to imitate the best. Garzoni subsequently mentioned six more or less contemporary humanists (Leonardo Bruni, Poggio Bracciolini, Guarino of Verona, Francesco Filelfo, Giovanni Lamola and Lorenzo Valla) and wrote that those who only follow these humanists, without paying attention to Cicero and Livy, should not be praised. This statement is followed by praise for Cicero and Livy (who was also lauded by Pliny and Saint Jerome, as Garzoni adds), after which Garzoni stated that Paci should not take his own works as an example. If Paci appreciated Cicero, Garzoni would know that he had made progress – an implicit reference to Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*.¹⁸⁵

The letters to Alberti, Paci and Torfanino thus show considerable overlap. This overlap may partly be explained by pointing to the relation between Garzoni and Alberti. Although they started out as teacher and student, they may have developed something that more closely resembles a friendship later on in their ten-year long correspondence. Letters to other students show a similar pattern, and illustrate how the professional relation between teacher and student becomes mixed with elements of both friendship and utility. The same goes for Garzoni’s relations with Paci and Torfanino: these too are hard to define, precisely because feelings of friendship were coupled to expectations of mutual profit. Still, even if it may be hard to define the precise relation Garzoni had with them, they were definitely not his

¹⁸³ Ibidem, letter 172, page 151, 473 (quotation on page 151).

¹⁸⁴ Ibidem, letter 222, page 184.

¹⁸⁵ Ibidem, letter 127, page 113, 460.

students and they probably had a higher social standing than Garzoni did. Even so, the didactic use of knowledge seemed appropriate to Garzoni in these situations as well. This demonstrates, again, how versatile Garzoni's relations were, and how many different functions knowledge could fulfil within one friendship or correspondence.

One last issue should be addressed. We could say that knowledge functioned as a commodity in Garzoni's relations with his students, as he would receive a financial reward in return for his didactic undertakings. In this case the use and function of knowledge are quite straightforward. At times, however, it seems as if Garzoni was expecting to profit from his relations with his students in another way as well. Garzoni's letter collection shows that he often wrote to third parties about the progress his students were making. Sometimes these letters would praise a student, sometimes they would contain an explicit recommendation by Garzoni, and sometimes Garzoni would ask the third party to help him in his education of the student. This shows two things: how involved Garzoni was in the education of his students, and how important they were in his network and in his relations with others.

By far the largest part of these letters is addressed to Torfanino and Paci and concern Garzoni's students of the Dominican and Augustinian orders. Torfanino received several letters on the progress of Filippo Musotti, Vincenzo da Malmignati, someone called Polifilo, Bonifacio da Casale and Leandro Alberti. Paci was kept up to date on the progress of someone called Mariano, his own nephew Alessandro, and a student who was called Giovanni and who was later adopted by Garzoni. Some kind of link between Garzoni, Paci and Torfanino, and the students of the Augustinian and Dominican orders thus existed. Garzoni hints at this link in letter 27, where he writes Torfanino on the progress of Filippo Musotti. Musotti is referred to as "Philippus tuus, vel potius noster" and praised elaborately. He writes that he is very happy with the progress Musotti is making, as is his task: "Ipsi Philippo (ut mei muneris est) summopere gratulor". More praise follows, after which Garzoni writes that he recommends Musotti to Torfanino, and that he would consider every benefit bestowed upon him by Torfanino as a kindness to himself: "eum tibi commendo. Quicquid in ipsum beneficium contuleris, id te in me contulisse arbitror".¹⁸⁶

From this letter it becomes clear that Garzoni considered it his duty to praise his student and to keep his correspondent up to date on the progress he was making. The teaching of his students was for Garzoni thus by no means a disinterested activity – on the contrary, already in the first sentence he explicitly stressed a link between himself, his student and

¹⁸⁶ Ibidem, letter 27, page 19 and 429 (quotations on page 19).

Torfanino by calling Musotti “Philippus tuus, vel potius noster”, and in the last one he further stresses this link by telling Torfanino how he would consider every favour to Musotti also a favour to himself. This last sentence can be interpreted in two ways. At first sight it seems as if Garzoni is selflessly recommending Musotti to Torfanino, by asking a favour for Musotti and saying that he would consider this to be a favour to himself. The second possibility is that Garzoni is actually reminding Torfanino of his own efforts in the education of Musotti. If Torfanino were to reward Musotti’s progress, he should keep in mind that it was Garzoni who taught him so well. Whether Garzoni expected a concrete reward for his efforts or just wanted to remind Torfanino of his own achievements so that the latter would keep assigning students to him is not clear. Still, especially when we also consider the fact that Musotti came from a noble family of Bologna, and that Garzoni’s recommendation of him to Torfanino may also be considered to be a service towards Musotti and his family, it seems highly probable that Garzoni did expect to profit in some way from his student’s progress.

This is further illustrated by the letters between Garzoni and Paci concerning the latter’s nephew Alessandro. Alessandro came to Bologna to study law, an initiative that Garzoni supported whole-heartedly. In letter 477 (directly to Alessandro) he praises Alessandro by referring to Cicero, who wrote that lawyers had tamed primitive men, and that law secured order. In the same letter he also urges him to work hard by citing the same lines of Hesiod that he had also explained to Alberti. He then tells Alessandro that he would develop into an “optimam frugem”, an excellent fruit, if he followed the example of such an outstanding man as Cicero.¹⁸⁷ In another letter Garzoni gives Alessandro more practical advice: he tells him to read Cicero’s *De Officiis* because it will make him eloquent, and to reject wicked poems, for “as the apostle said and Gellius remembered” these had a bad influence on young people.¹⁸⁸ In the other letters to Alessandro Garzoni urges him to be virtuous by citing Plautus, who said (“ut ait poeta”) that he who is virtuous has every good, and by telling him of the Stoics and the value they attributed to virtue.¹⁸⁹ He also tells him to combine religion and eloquence, advice that we have encountered more often. A brief eulogy of Saint Thomas of Aquinas, who did the same and who was successful because of this strategy, serves to support the last advice. The same letter also mentions Isocrates, Pythagoras, Democritus and Plato as examples of excellent morals. One more example is

¹⁸⁷ Ibidem, letter 477, page 408-409, 564-565.

¹⁸⁸ Ibidem, letter 342, page 273, 519 (quotation on page 273).

¹⁸⁹ The reference is to Plautus, *Amphytrio* 651, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 341, page 272-273, 519.

given: that of Giles of Rome, who did not pick up a book until he had celebrated or attended mass.¹⁹⁰

More important, however, are the letters written to Paci about Alessandro. In these letters Alessandro's education is presented as a shared task between Garzoni and Paci. In letter 481 Garzoni tells Paci that Alessandro should take up the letters and orations of Cicero, and his work *Ad Herennium*. Most of all, however, Alessandro should practice. To this Garzoni adds that he will follow Alessandro's progress, and that Paci (although he does not need such an advice), should urge him to be honest and kind.¹⁹¹ Letters 400, 401 and 402 show how Garzoni urged Paci to give his nephew moral advice as well. Garzoni tells Paci that Alessandro is very talented and could certainly become a great lawyer, but he also warns him: he should be urged not to waste his time and to avoid the company of wicked man.¹⁹² In letter 402 he apologizes for the very strong tone he had chosen in his last letter (which could be either 400 or 401). However, he also writes that he did what a friend is supposed to do ("egi ut optimum amicum decebat"), for "as Cicero said", young people easily fall into vice. Garzoni has behaved himself as a friend and a brother towards Alessandro: "Secum egi amice et fraterne." Once again Garzoni stresses that Alessandro should keep away from the company of insincere men and keep to that of honest lawyers. If Alessandro keeps to the company of good men and studies hard, he will bring glory to his home city – he has come to Bologna to profit from the "commerce of good arts" ("bonarum artium mercaturam", an implicit reference to Cicero's *De Officiis*), and it would be shameful to return without having fulfilled his purpose. Two more classical authorities are used to further support Garzoni's argument: Seneca is cited on the value of time, and Xenophon on the importance of not being distracted while completing a task.¹⁹³

Again Garzoni established a link between himself, Paci and a student's progress: in his letters to Paci he presented the education of Alessandro as a communal undertaking. Garzoni does not explicitly tell Paci and Torfanino that he is helping Alessandro or other students as a favour to them, nor can we find any references to any gain Garzoni may expect from them in

¹⁹⁰ Ibidem, letter 375, page 303-304, 529-530

¹⁹¹ Ibidem, letter 481, page 412, 565: "Eis Ciceronis epistolae, orationes, liber ad Herennium in promptu existant necesse est. Exercitatio praeterea nequaquam praetermittenda est. Enimvero ipsum si ceperit oblivio nec quicquam haud dignum consequi potitur. Verumtamen ne me voluntati suae deesse arbitretur studiis suis obsequar. Tu qui nullo eges consilio vel potius abundas illius honestati et voluntati consulito. Quantum in me fuerit omnes curae meae, vigiliae, cogitationes, ad Alexandri salutem, honorem, utilitatem elaborabunt. Vale." (quotation on page 412).

¹⁹² Ibidem, letter 400 and 401, pages 318-319 and 353-356.

¹⁹³ The references are to (respectively) Cicero, *De Officiis* 3.2.6, Seneca, *Epistulae* 1.3, and Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 20.16, read in Lind, *Letters*, letter 402, page 319-320 and 356 (quotations on page 319 and 320).

the future. Still, even though no explicit statements on an expected profit can be found, the frequency of Garzoni's references to his students in his letters to Paci and Torfanino does suggest that he did not only teach these students for the financial reward he would receive of them, but that he expected to profit from them in other ways as well. This is especially true in the letters that concern Alessandro, who was not a member of the Augustinian order but a relative of Paci. While one could argue that Garzoni's updates on the progress of the Dominican and Augustinian students formed an integral part of his professional relation with Torfanino and Paci, his tutoring of Alessandro and the updates on his progress can only be considered as a personal favour to Paci.

In the introduction I have already discussed Bianca Chen's article on Gisbert Cuper, and the way in which he transformed his cultural capital into social capital. In Garzoni's letters we find similar processes: Garzoni could use his knowledge, his cultural capital, to improve his relations with his correspondents, thus to increase his social capital. Book dedications were of course one of the most common ways to do so, but this paragraph has shown that there were other ways as well. The didactic use of knowledge was sometimes employed for this purpose: Garzoni expected to improve his social relations with Paci and Torfanino through the education of his students.

However, the knowledge that was exchanged with a didactic purpose primarily served to do just that: educate a student. Therefore it seems only right to sum up the most important conclusions in this regard. First of all, it is important to stress once more that Garzoni's medical students did not figure at all in his letters. Instead Garzoni corresponded with his students in oratory. It is therefore unsurprising that most of the knowledge exchanged with a didactic purpose also belonged to the discipline of oratory, or to related fields that pertain to the *studia humanitatis*. The didactic use of knowledge found its clearest form in the practical tips on how to improve a student's oratorical skills. Garzoni taught his students (quite traditionally) that they should follow the rules described by Cicero and Quintilian. More contemporary authors such as Lorenzo Valla and Leonardo Bruni were praised and cited as well, but Garzoni recommended that they should only be studied in combination with Cicero and other ancient authors. They were used in a slightly different context than Cicero and Quintilian: especially Valla was referred to as an authority when students (or others) approached Garzoni with specific linguistic problems. For the basics Garzoni consequently referred his students to the ancient orators and (to a lesser extent) to the most famous examples of Christian preachers. Finally, Garzoni would also send his students moral advice that, strictly speaking, did not pertain to the subject of oratory. Still, this was appropriate

within the relation between teacher and student, and found precedence in the epistles of Horace, where an older man would counsel a younger one.

Although a clear predominance of humanist knowledge can be established, this was often combined with more theologically oriented knowledge. In the letters to these students he paid special attention to the desirability of combining theology and oratory, naming Thomas of Aquinas and above all Paul the Apostle as the most important examples to follow in this regard. They had been extraordinary preachers who combined gravity of thoughts with powerful speech, the ideal that should be followed at all times. The relative importance of theological knowledge in a didactic function attests to the influence of Garzoni's social relations and his network on his knowledge exchange. The interests of his students, often members of the Dominican and Augustinian orders, required this focus. A second conclusion can be drawn as well. Ronald Witt has already argued how the great appeal of humanism to Florentine patricians can be traced back to the oratorical demands of Florentine politics. Brian Jeffrey Maxson has recently nuanced Witt's thesis: he has argued that the oratorical demands posed by diplomatic ritual were mainly responsible for the spread of humanist learning among a large part of the Florentine population.¹⁹⁴ This paragraph has shown that similar claims can be made regarding the oratorical demands of religion: the greater part of Garzoni's students combined their studies of theology with oratory in order to become better preachers.

In many cases didactic use of knowledge shows great similarities to other uses, especially to the role of knowledge discussed in paragraph 3. In both cases knowledge is not subordinate to a social purpose, as it was in paragraph 2 and 4. Rather, the spread or distribution of knowledge is the main goal in both Garzoni's relations with his students and the ones with fellow humanists – but the reasons behind this goal differ considerably. In most of the letters discussed in this paragraph (letter 33 to Vincenzo shows an important exception), a certain imbalance between the correspondents exists: the knowledge comes almost exclusively from one side, namely from Garzoni. In these cases one might more properly speak of distribution or supply of knowledge. In return for this supply of knowledge Garzoni receives a financial award, or, as we have seen, he expects to profit by enlarging his social capital. The letters discussed in paragraph 3 on the other hand show a more equal relation, which is based on a mutual and shared wish on both sides of the correspondence to exchange knowledge.

¹⁹⁴ Maxson, *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* 14-17 and chapter four: "The Humanist Demands of Ritual" (quotation on page 16-17).

Finally, it should be noted that the didactic use of knowledge was not exclusive to the relations with his students: we find similar uses of knowledge in letters addressed to others, albeit on a lesser scale. This means that although the didactic function of knowledge found its clearest expression in Garzoni's relations with his students, it was not limited to them. This makes it difficult to determine what the precise relation between Garzoni and his correspondents was and what role knowledge played in this relation. However, it also shows how versatile and multi-faceted Garzoni's social relations were, and it demonstrates the importance of (mainly humanist) knowledge in each of these facets.

Conclusion

The previous paragraphs have displayed the great variety and diversity in Garzoni's epistolary exchanges, both with regard to his recipients as to the subjects treated in them. They have also demonstrated the overwhelming presence of knowledge in Garzoni's letters: in almost all of them some kind of knowledge is employed. The kinds of knowledge used and the ends to which Garzoni employed his knowledge vary considerably, however. It is now time to briefly sum up my conclusions and to answer the main question of this thesis: what roles did different kinds of knowledge play within Garzoni's network of correspondence?

Perhaps the most concrete and well-defined use of knowledge is when it served to educate Garzoni's students: in his relation with them, the exchange (or rather distribution) of knowledge was prerequisite. The kind of knowledge most often used in this regard is without a doubt humanist knowledge, which was employed with great frequency in the letters from Garzoni to his students in oratory. Because of his student's particular interests, Garzoni often combined his references to classical authors with references to particularly talented Christian authors or orators. This way he prepared his students for their future careers as orators for the Dominican or Augustinian orders. Theological knowledge could thus perform a didactic function as well, although humanist knowledge was certainly predominant in this regard.

Medical knowledge on the other hand was not invoked for this purpose at all – which is strange, given Garzoni's employment as a professor of medicine at the Bolognese *Studium*. Partly the astonishing absence of medical knowledge (in this function as well as in others) can be explained by Garzoni's personal preferences. Even so, I would argue that the natures of both disciplines should be taken into account as well. Garzoni's letters to his students in oratory already performed a didactic function *an sich*, notwithstanding their content: the art of writing preceded the art of speaking. The same was not true for medical knowledge, which could not be learned through correspondences but was taught at the *Studium*. This is a first indication that humanist knowledge was linked more intrinsically to social exchange than other kinds of knowledge.

A similar misbalance between the different kinds of knowledge can be discerned in a second use of knowledge in Garzoni's letters. Garzoni often employed his knowledge, in the form of his own written works, in order to enter into relations of patronage. In these cases knowledge thus functioned as a commodity: Garzoni respected financial rewards or favours in return. Humanist and theological knowledge both served this purpose: humanist knowledge most often when Garzoni presented princes or other rulers (Bolognese and foreign) with

histories or treatises on moral philosophy, theological knowledge when he sent out his saint's lives to cardinals or high ecclesiastical functionaries in Bologna. Medical knowledge is, again, markedly absent: a clear sign that humanist and theological knowledge could easier be employed to serve a social purpose than medical knowledge.

Most of all, however, knowledge was used to structure social exchanges. Both applications of knowledge discussed above were usually accompanied by citations of classical authors that served to facilitate the social exchange that took place. Garzoni uses his knowledge to flatter, rebuke, justify a dedication, enter into a relation of friendship, or to express thanks after receiving compliments or some kind of favour. In these cases knowledge serves to navigate the complex rules of social exchange that existed in Early Modern Europe. To serve this purpose, Garzoni employs one kind of knowledge in particular: his knowledge of classical texts and their authors. Theological knowledge could serve the same purpose, but was used to a much lesser extent. Medical knowledge is, yet again, almost absent: Garzoni only uses this with a structuring purpose once.

The pre-eminence of humanist knowledge in this function is further illustrated by the fact Garzoni usually preferred to employ his humanist knowledge even when the context would allow for the use of theological or medical knowledge, either because a letter dealt with a subject related to medicine or theology or because Garzoni's correspondents held ecclesiastical offices. The fact that humanist knowledge could be used as the *lingua franca* of social exchange demonstrates that humanist knowledge enjoyed a high following with all of Garzoni's correspondents, even the ones that can definitely not be defined as professional humanists. In this respect this thesis agrees with the results of Brian Maxson's study of the diffusion of humanist learning Renaissance Florence, while it simultaneously offers possibilities for new research: Paul MacLean's study of the rhetorical techniques employed to enter into relations of patronage does not show the same pre-eminence of humanist knowledge.

Finally, it will surprise no one that humanist knowledge is the kind of knowledge that figures most prominently in Garzoni's relations with other professional humanists as well. Knowledge of classical authors and their works and knowledge of more recent authors who had commented on these texts, both functioned as the basis on which the friendships between Garzoni and his fellow humanists were formed and as the glue that kept them going.

All in all, we have seen how the exchange or distribution of different types of knowledge played an important role in all of Garzoni's social relations. This is all the more true with regard to one specific kind of knowledge: humanist knowledge. This kind of

knowledge served more different functions than theological or medical knowledge did, and could much more easily be employed in a social context than other kinds of knowledge. This just might be one of the reasons that humanism still exercises the same kind of fascination on us as it apparently once did on Garzoni's fifteenth-century correspondents.

Bibliography

- Avellini, L., “Eloquenza e Committenza. Prosa encomiastica e agiografica di Giovanni Garzoni”, in Bruno Basile (ed.), *Bentivolorum Magnificentia: Principe e cultura a Bologna nel rinascimento* (Rome, 1984).
- Banfi, F., “Giovanni Garzoni ed il cardinale Tommaso Bakócz Primate d’Ungheria,” *L’Archiginnasio: Bollettino della Biblioteca comunale di Bologna* 31 (1936) 120-139.
- Banfi, F., “Un umanista bolognese e i Domenicani: A proposito dell’opera inedita su Giovanni Garzoni del P. Vincenzo Domenico Fassini O.P. contenutasi nel codice Vat. Lat. 10686” in *Memorie Domenicane* 1936, 3-39.
- Bethencourt, F., Florike Egmond (ed.), *Correspondence and Cultural exchange in Europe, 1400-1700* (Cambridge UK 2007).
- Bots, H., Françoise Wacquet, *La Repubblica delle Lettere* (Bologna 2005).
- Cevolotto, A., “Giustiniani, Augustino”, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* vol. 57 (2001), [http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/agostino-giustiniani_\(Dizionario_Biografico\)/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/agostino-giustiniani_(Dizionario_Biografico)/) (last consulted on July 7 2014).
- Chen, B., “Digging for Antiquities with Diplomats: Gisbert Cuper (1644-1716) and his Social Capital” in *Republic of Letters. A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts* 2008, vol. 1, issue 1, 1-18.
- Clough, C., “The Cult of Antiquity: Letters and Letter Collections”, in idem (ed.), *Cultural Aspects of the Italian Renaissance: Essays in Honour of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Manchester 1976), 33-67.
- Cole, J., "Cultural Clientelism and Brokerage Networks in Early Modern Florence and Rome: New Correspondence between the Barberini and Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger," *Renaissance Quarterly* vol. 60, no. 3 (Fall 2007) 729-788.
- Cole, J, *Music, Spectacle and Cultural Brokerage in Early Modern Italy. Michelangelo Buonarroti il Giovane*, vol. 1 (Florence 2011).
- Cools, H., Marika Keblusek, Badeloch Vera Noldus (ed.), *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe* (Hilversum 2006).
- Eisenstadt, S.N., L. Roniger, “Patron-Client Relations as a Model of Structuring Social Exchange” in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* vol. 22, No. 1 (Jan., 1980) 42-77.

- Fantuzzi, G., *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi*; 9 vols., (Bologna 1781-1794), vol. 3 (1783).
- Findlen, P., “The Formation of a Scientific Community: Natural History in Sixteenth-Century Italy” in Anthony Grafton and Nancy Siraisi (ed.), *Natural particulars. Nature and the Disciplines in Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge Mass. 1999), 369-400.
- Frazier, A., “A Layman’s “Life of St. Augustine” in Late Medieval Italy: Patronage and Polemic”, in *Traditio*, vol. 65 (2010) 231-265.
- Frazier, A., *Possible Lives: Authors and Saints in Renaissance Italy* (New York, 2005).
- Frazier, A., review of Shane Butler (ed.), *Angelo Poliziano: Letters*. Volume I, Books I-IV (Cambridge MA 2005), in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2008.08.39, <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2008/2008-08-39.html>, last consulted July 7 2014.
- Guillén, C., “Notes towards the Study of the Renaissance Letter” in Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (ed.), *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation* (Cambridge MA 1986) 70-101.
- Gundersheimer, W.L., “Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach” in G.F. Lytle and S. Orgel (ed.), *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton 1981) 3-23.
- Jardine, L., *Erasmus, Man of Letters: The Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton NY 1993).
- Keblusek, M., Badeloch Vera Noldus (ed), *Double Agents. Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden 2011).
- Kent, F.W., Patricia Simons (ed), *Patronage, Art and Society in Renaissance Italy* (Oxford 1987).
- Lind, L.R., *The Letters of Giovanni Garzoni: Bolognese Humanist and Physician (1419-1505)* (Atlanta, Georgia, 1992).
- MacCahill, E.M, “Finding a Job as a Humanist: The Epistolary Collection of Lapo da Castiglionchio the Younger”, *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 57, no. 4 (Winter, 2004), 1308-1345.
- MacLean, P., *The Art of the Network. Strategic Interaction and Patronage in Renaissance Florence* (Durham and London 2007).
- Manfré, G., “La biblioteca dell’umanista bolognese Giovanni Garzoni (1419-1505)”, *Accademie e Biblioteche d’Italia*, 27 (1959), 249-278; 28 (1960), 17-72.

- Mantovani, A., “Giovanni Garzoni e le ‘Historiae Bononienses’. Uno scolaro del Valla alla corte dei Bentivoglio”, in Anselmi, G.M. and Guerra, M. (ed), *Lorenzo Valla e l’umanesimo Bolognese* (Bologna 2009) 59-83.
- Maxson, B.J., *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence* (New York 2014)
- Olmi, G., “‘Molti Amici in Varii Luoghi’: Studio della natura e rapporti epistolari nel Secolo XVI”, in *Nuncius. Annali di Storia della Scienza VI* (1991) 3-31.
- Olmi, G., “Bologna nel secolo XVI: una capitale europea della ricerca naturalistica” in Sabine Frommel (ed.), *Crocevia e capitale della migrazione artistica: forestieri a Bologna e bolognesi nel mondo (secoli XV-XVI)*, (Bologna 2010) 61-80.
- Perrazoli, R., *L’umanista bolognese G. Garzoni e il teologo ripano G. Paci* (Ripatransone, 1999).
- Petrella, G., “Nella cella di fra Leandro: prime ricerche sui libri di fra Leandro Alberti umanista e inquisitore” in E. Barbiero and D. Zardin (ed), *Libri, Biblioteche e cultura nell’Italia del Cinque e Seicento* (Milano 2002) 85-135.
- Schurink, F., “Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England”, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 73, No. 3 (September 2010), 453-469.
- Stegeman, S., *Patronage en dienstverlening. Het network van Theodorus Janssonius van Almeloveen (1657-1712) in de Republiek der Letteren* (Nijmegen 1996).
- Thorndike, L., “Giovanni Garzoni on Ruling a City”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 46 (1931), 277-280.
- Thorndike, L., “Giovanni Garzoni on the Office of Prince”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 46 (1931) 589-592.
- Van Dixhoorn, A., Susie Speakman Suchs (ed.), *The Reach of the Republic of Letters: Literary and Learned Societies in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (2 vols, Leiden 2008).
- Van Houdt, T., Jan Papy, et al, (ed.), *Self-presentation and Social Identification: the Rhetoric and Pragmatics of Letter Writing in Early Modern Times* (Leuven 2002).