

ROMAN SOSNOWSKI
Jagiellonian University in Krakow
roman.sosnowski@uj.edu.pl

REMARKS ON THE LANGUAGE OF *CHIRURGIA PARVA* OF LANFRANCO OF MILAN IN THE MANUSCRIPT ITAL. QUART. 67

Keywords: Northern Italian vernaculars, medieval Venetian, Lanfranco of Milan, medieval manuscripts, medieval medicine

Abstract

This paper investigates the language of the vernacular version of Lanfranco's *Chirurgia parva* in the manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 kept at the Jagiellonian Library in Krakow. The brief description of the linguistic traits leads to the determination of the place of origin of the manuscript. From the initial idea that the manuscript was made in Northern Italy, through the examination of orthographic, phonetic, morphologic and lexical features, I arrive at the conclusion that the codex must have been written in Veneto, and more precisely in central Veneto, maybe in or near Padua. The language itself may be described as the expression of the "koiné di terraferma", a very characteristic Venetian variety of the 15th century that combined local and Tuscan characteristics.

1. Introduction

Lanfranco of Milan is one of the most outstanding figures of medieval surgery. The pupil of Wilhelm of Saliceto, he studied at the University of Padua before taking up medical practice in Milan. As a result of political turmoil, he found himself expelled and forced to move to France. First, he settled in Lyon where most probably *Chirurgia parva* was created, and then he moved to Paris where he wrote his major work, *Chirurgia magna*. Even though he did not directly teach at the University¹,

¹ He probably taught in Confrérie de St-Côme.

he managed to create his own school, whose most excellent students were Johan (Jehan) Yperman and Henri de Mondeville. In the 14th century it was the Parisian school initiated by Lanfranco that became the leading surgical centre of Europe.

The source of Lanfranco's fame resides in his activity as a teacher of surgeons and treaty writers, but above all, in his discovery of new surgical techniques (or propagation of Italian techniques, especially those coming from Wilhelm of Saliceto) as well as in his writing – he is the author of surgical works commonly read as late as the 16th century.

Lanfranco's treatments of the surgical arts were promptly translated into vernacular languages. Especially popular were translations of *Chirurgia parva*, whose size and style of argumentation fit very well into the popularising and practical dimension of medieval scientific literature. In addition, the translation into vernacular languages made them attractive handbooks for groups of surgeon-practioners, whose knowledge of Latin was often not so impressive but whose medical skills were good.

Obviously, these vernacular translations constitute a perfect testimony of the state of medical terminology in the late Middle Ages and allow us to see the stage of the language in its specialised versions. Studies of the text and the language of Lanfranco were conducted for French (De Tovar 1982), for English (Tyrkkö 2011), for German (Scholz 1977; Berg 1975) and for Spanish (Andrés Chico 1989). In this rich panorama of translations and Lanfranco's influences on surgery, Italian vernacular languages were actually completely missing. On one hand, it is understandable, as Lanfranco left Italy and became a propagator of the Italian surgeon arts abroad, but on the other hand, there are multiple witnesses of a wide reception of a Latin version of Lanfranco's works in Italy – including a very important edition of his work printed in Venice in 1498, 1499, 1519, 1546 (Keil 1985: col. 560–572) and was extremely popular in all of Europe.

Until this day, the importance of Lanfranco for French, English and maybe Spanish surgery has been exclusively stressed (Prioreshi 2004: 461), while his influence on Italian medicine has been considered in the light of Latin prints from the 15th and 16th centuries (Tiraboschi 1823: 261).

Considering the popularity of *Chirurgia parva* in Europe, the lack of manuscripts of Lanfranco's texts in Italy seemed to be an anomaly. This is the reason why after having identified manuscript Ital. Quart. 67, on which I worked within Project Fibula, as a translation of Lanfranco's Surgery, I proceeded to do further research. The difficulty of this research resided in the fact that vernacular manuscripts of *Chirurgia parva* usually do not have correct author attributions and the most certain way of identification is through their quite characteristic incipit.² Nevertheless, even this method may be unreliable, as vernacular Italian versions appear to be numerous and every one of them was created separately, which makes them vary considerably from one another.³ Through my research I managed to locate three other manuscripts: Classense

² Latin incipit is: *Intendens venerabilis amice Bernarde componere librum in quo tradam...*

³ In the Latin incipit there is a mention of the addressee, Bernard (probably Bernard de Gordon), but this name is omitted in all the Italo-Romance translations.

137 from Classense Library in Ravenna; ms 72 from Biblioteca Universitaria in Padua as well as Vat. Lat. 10239 from Biblioteca Vaticana. It is possible that the rich Italian collections hide other manuscripts of *Chirurgia parva* which may be catalogued under the general name of medical or surgical treatises.

The language of the manuscript discussed here, was initially, during the process of the first general language analysis, defined as north Italian (that is also its classification within the project of the National Science Centre conducted by myself⁴). However, a much more precise definition of the place of creation of the manuscript is possible and an even more specific determination of the environment for which the vernacular text was dedicated. The main tool for this purpose is an analysis of language characteristics. It can reveal not only the place where the translation was made but also where the copy was produced. This article is an attempt at an analysis that would lead us to conclusions as to the place of creation of the manuscript.

2. Physical characteristics of manuscript Ital. Quart. 67

Material: paper. Foliation: I + 75 ff. + I. Dimensions: 285 × 215 mm. Quires: 6 VI² + 1 (II-1)²⁵. Ruling: 170 × 120 mm; 21-24 lines. Watermarks: = Piccard, Anvil, IX, IV, 1115; Hall (Tirol) 1440.

Blank folios: 16r-17r, 60r, 70r.

Scribal features: one scribe, anonymous. The script is an informal *mercantesca* with a very cursive ductus. Letter *t* is always written doubled (*tt*), letters *d*, *l* with rounded loops. *i*, *j* and *y* with a dot above are indifferently used for the vocalic and semiconsonantic *i*. The division of words is non-syllabic which is an Italian feature as pointed out by Derolez (2003: plate 118). Corrections made by the copyist, notes by readers. Decoration: rubrication, paragraph marks, manichulae, pen flourished initials. Binding: original binding of the 15th century (285 × 220 mm), made of red coloured leather, tooled in blind, badly preserved; with clasps (trigram of Saint Bernardine); coloured edges.

Origin and owners:

Dating: watermarks on the paper, the binding and the handwriting allow dating to the mid-15th century. Lemm (Lemm 1918: 84) mistakenly dates the manuscript to the 16th century. The copyist is indicated in the colophon on f. 74v (*Ego priamus zio scripsi*), but no further information on him is available.

In the 19th century the manuscript was part of the Carlo Morbio (1811-1881) collection. Morbio was an Italian collector and historian, born in Novara. At an 1889 auction held in Leipzig, a large part of his collection (mainly the items dealing with the history of Lombardy) was purchased by Biblioteca Braidense, while another group of manuscripts reached Berlin.

⁴ Research grant number 2011/01/B/HS2/01320: Northern Italian version of “*Chirurgia*” of Lanfrancus Mediolanensis as an example of the divulgative scientific literature (critical edition of the manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 from the “Berlin collection” at the Jagiellonian Library, linguistic and historical analysis, commentary and glossary).

Contents of the manuscript

ff. 1r–15v Practice of medicine (vernacular). (1r) Title. ›*Pratticha di medexina*‹. (1r) Prologue. Incipit: *Perché molty de sottil intelletto pratticha in medezena...* Explicit: *pertantto me ò dilettao chonponere per vulgare azò che zaschaduno intenda questa ovra pizolina in la quale metterò 8 chapitoli*. 1v–2r Table of contents. 2r–15v Text. Incipit: *Prinzipiando dai segni de tutty umori che mesedadi de chonpagnia abonda in chorpo ...* Explicit: *axedo aqua ruoxa in opio e buol arminio le chonpositte si è quele che refreda le rene ditte de sora et med[ica]*. ›*È dato fin secondo la promysione sia laudado l'onipotentte del quale solo è sumo medigo*‹. It is a short medical treatise (8 chapters), maybe written directly in vernacular language as the prologue seems to suggest. As for the contents, it presents the humoural theory in a way very similar to *De humoribus* of Pseudo-Hippocrates. The illness is seen as the imbalance of the “complexion” due to the abundance or lack of one of the elements: hot, cold, wet or dry. There is also a description of medicines able to purge the excess of humours.

17v–69v Lanfranco of Milan, *Chirurgia parva* (vernacular). (17v) Table of contents. 18r–69v Incipit: *M'amigo charisimo, secondo la ttoa dimanda, tte schriverò modo breve de medigare piage fresche e vechie e apostimazione ...* Explicit: *... secondo la promissione mia abiando chonpido chon brevittà de quello che promisy regratio l'onipotentte dio prade e fiol Iesu Cristo e spirito santto el quale regna in uno per infinittia sechula amen. Deo gratias Amen*. Venetian translation of the treatise *Chirurgia parva* by Lanfranco of Milan written in Lyon about 1290, after his exile from Milan. The treatise is divided in the following parts 1) fresh wounds; 2) old wounds; 3) abscesses; 4) fistula; 5) sprains; 6) broken bones; 7) medicines useful in the treatment of the above illnesses.

3. Selected linguistic features of *Chirurgia* in the manuscript It. Quart. 67

Conforming to traditional philological analysis, the language features were classified as graphic, phonetic, morphological, syntax and lexical. They are not considered separately, but are compared with features of many Northern varieties of the Italian language. Various comparative tools were applied: *OVI, Padania scrittologica* (Videsott 2009) and further, dialectological profiles were also used, as well as editions of medieval Texts from different North-Italian regions (*Testi padovani del Trecento* edited by Tomasin, *Il Milione veneto* edited by Andreose and Barbieri, *El libro agregà de Serapiom* edited by Ineichen).

3.1. Selected orthographic features

In many words we find the etymological *h*, e.g. *humori* 28r et al., *horzo* 20r, 42v, *hora* 21v et al. It should be emphasised that the spelling may be different within the same words; some of them with *h* and some without. It is clear that the use of etymological *h* lacks consistency; in the case of *humore*; *umore* we find almost the same number of forms without *h* (27 occurrences) as with *h* (25 occurrences). Often enough, *h* is

also present in words where there is no *h* in Latin, e.g. *holio (olio)* 21r et al., *hodorifero (odorifero)* 41v, *hesere (essere)* 40r, *hordine (ordine)* 25v. Although the presence of etymological *h* is very striking, the presence or absence of *h* is not very useful in the localisation of the manuscripts as it was common in the whole of Italy and its intensity depended mostly on the influence of Latin on a specific text or genre of traditions and on the habits of the individual scribes. The influence of the linguistic area was a minor issue.

Double consonants; in the manuscript text we find a systematic double *tt* (instead of *t*). It is a feature rarely present in manuscripts and it indicates difficulties with the interpretation of intense consonants. In the dialects of North Italy the simplification of geminate consonants is a constant feature, hence in writing we frequently find hypercorrect reactions such as the use of double consonants in words where they should be missing according to Tuscan norm. However, these hypercorrect forms concern single words, as examples from Padua practical texts show (see Tomasin 2004: 96). In the case of the analysed manuscript, it is a constant graphical feature. As it was many times underlined, the presence of double consonants in Venetian is caused also by Latin and Tuscan vernacular influences.

Apart from the presence of double *tt*, in our manuscript most double consonants are reduced, even if it does not happen at all times; good examples are *nesuno* (33r et al.), *secho* (34r et al.). Quite interesting are forms of prepositions combined with article *a + la* and *di + la*, in which we can find alternation of double and non-doubled forms: *alla, ala, della, dela, dila*. These data indicate a mixed form of the copied text which is conforming in this point with writing traditions called Venetian koiné with Tuscan influence. The spelling of etymological Latin consonant clusters *ct, ph* is missing, but in two cases, etymological spelling appears *pt*: *infrascripto* 17v, *apty* 32v (next to *atto* 35v, *atty* 64v, *infraschritte* 18r and 31r, *infraschritto* 31r).

The velar occlusive phoneme /k/ before vowels /a/, /e/, /i/ is written with digraph *ch* and, less frequently *c*. Examples for *ch*: *seche* 26v et al., *fresche* 17v et al., *adoncha* 18r, *charne* 18r, *soperchia* 59v.

Voiceless palato-alveolar affricate /tʃ/ in the Venetian of the 13th and 14th centuries was often represented by digrams *ch* or *cl* (see Milione 1999, 72). In the manuscript Ital. Quart. 67, only the spelling *ch* appears: *vechie* 17v and further, *chiara* 18r, *chiama* 18v as it was the solution more frequent in the central varieties in which the digraph *gl* was longer preserved (in coastal varieties also *cl* and *pl* – Ineichen 1962: 375). According to the spelling applied in the majority of Venetian texts of that period the voiced palato-alveolar affricate /dʒ/ is written as *gi* or *gl*: *glandule* 44v, *giandule* 65r.

Voiceless alveolar affricate phoneme /ts/ is represented by the letter *z* or *zi*. Voiced alveolar affricate /dz/ is written *z*: *orzo* 20r et al., *verze* 47v et al.

As for the alveolar fricative, the voiceless /s/ is written *s* while the voiced one is written mostly *x* (but also *s*): *bexogna* 17v, *bexogno* 22r, *bisogna* 18v.

Before a labial consonant the nasal is always written *n*: *sinplize* 18v and other, *insenbre* 21r and other.

Nasal palatal /ɲ/ is written *gn*: *bexogno* 22r, *ttegn* 20v, *bagnada* 19r, *ogni* 20r et al.

3.2. Selected phonetic features

3.2.1. Diphthongisation

Apart from the issue of the presence of diphthongisation in the oldest references of Padua variety (Tomasin 2004: 103; Ineichen 1962), scholars agree that in the 15th century, both in Paduan and in koiné based on the central Veneto, diphthongisation was present (as usual, both in open and closed syllables). Our text provides many examples of diphthongisation in open syllables, while there are only rare examples in closed syllables.

Diphthongisation of Ě (AE): *griego* 31v, *miedigalo* 34r, *viene* 36v, *piedi* 44r, in the closed syllable: *digestiva* 37v.

Diphthongisation of Ō: *bruodo* 25v et al., *luogo* 18v et al., *fuora* 21r et al., *muodo* 29r, *ttuo'* 27r et al., *chuor* 40r, *fuogo* 35v et al.

There are also forms without diphthongisation: *fen* 31v et al., *melio* 20v et al., *modo* 18r et al.

The diphthongisation of Ē is a frequent feature of 15th century Venetian, present both in the coastal and central varieties. Some examples are also present in manuscript Ital. Quart. 67: *christiero* 30v < *clystērem*, *postiema* < *apostēma*, *riegola* < *rēgūla(m)*. However, forms without diphthongisation are also present: *postema* 33r, 38v, *cristero* 34r.

3.2.2. Protonic Ē, Ě, Ī

In Tuscan, protonic *e* (deriving from Latin Ē, Ě, Ī) most of the times closes to /i/, e.g. *NEPŌTE(M)* > *nipote*, *DECĚMBRE(M)* > *dicembre*. The situation in Venetian is quite different (not only in Venetian, the same happens in other Northern dialects), the protonic *e* remains /e/. In the koiné varieties there are often Tuscan influences that lead to the presence of forms with a reduction of /e/ to /i/. In the text of manuscript Ital. Quart. 67, the forms without a closing of the vowel are predominant – *redure* 68r, *redurle* 68v, *defensivo* 24r et al., *defendando* 53r, *depende* 30r et al. – but there are also Tuscan-based koiné forms: *difendando* 48v, *dipende* 29r et al. In the case of *depende/dipende* the latter form is more frequent (12 occurrences).

3.2.3. Anaphonesis

Unlike Tuscan (from Florence and West Tuscany), the Venetian vernacular varieties, both central and coastal do not use anaphonesis, i.e. vowels raised to become high before the velar nasal or the palatal as in *vinco*, *stringo*, *stringe*, *famiglia*, *ungo*, *giungi*. As expected in the manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 we find forms: *strenghe* 19r, *honzy* 19v, *zonzi* 35r, *venze* 39r.

3.2.4. Metaphonesis

Ineichen (1962: 67–72) pointed to local provenance of metaphonesis in the Padua dialect, but there is no hard evidence to prove that, as Tomasin (2004: 102–103) notices. After all, in the 15th-century Continental Venetian-based koiné, we can expect metaphonesis only in the pronouns *vui*, *nui*. This is, at the same time, an important feature as it clearly indicates the dialect to be Venetian and not Lombardian or another, as a great deal of the features are assigned to the koiné. In our text we have an example of the

metaphonesis in the pronoun *nui* 65r and, perhaps in the pronominal form of *quilo* 22v (although this one is opposed to fifteen occurrences of *quelo*).

3.2.5. Development *AU* > *al*

AUDIRE > *aldire* belongs to Padua's type, and at any rate it is characteristic of central Venetian dialects (with Paduan as the most important one) and is also present in koiné variations based on those dialects. More Venetian type, characteristic of the coastal dialect, is *AU* > *ol*. However, the latter type does not occur in manuscript Ital. Quart. 67. Meanwhile, the Padua type is represented by *aldirai* 23r, *aldirà* 37r, *altturiare*.

3.3.6. The presence of *u* corresponding to Tuscan *o*

The feature reported by Ineichen (1962: 363) is present with some forms that constitute the minority of forms present in the manuscript, e.g. *churuzione* 49v and 50r; *choruzione* 49v, 50v (two occurrences), 51r, 61v.

All the vowel changes are compatible with central Venetian and 15th century Venetian "koiné di terraferma" influenced by the Tuscan variety. Moreover, the development *AU* > *al* (with forms like *aldire*) and the presence of metaphonetical forms in pronouns (*nui*, *vui*) has been often reported as characteristic of the Padua variety. The reduction of diphthongisation (*crístiro* for *crístiero*), described by Ineichen (1962: 357) as characteristic of the old Paduan variety is absent in our manuscript but it is also less present in *El libro agregà de Serapiom* (one occurrence of *crístiro* versus seven of *crístiero*).

3.2.7. Consonants

Latin /tj/ develops into /ts/ as in the following forms: *operazion*, *inflamazione*, *lapazio* 64r.

Only once /ts/ becomes a voiced sibilant /z/ (represented graphically by *x*): *raxonevele* 55r.

Latin /j/ develops into /dz/ as in the following forms: *zoveni* 25v et al. (> *iuvenes*), *mazore* (> *maiozem*), *zova* 28v (> *iuvat*), *zonzi* 31r (> *iungit*)

Initial or post consonantal /ke/ /ki/ develops into /ts/ as in the following forms: *zese* (*zesare*) 19v et al., *zenere* 27r, *zaschaduno* 25r et al., *chomenzarò* 22v. Sporadically, forms influenced by Tuscan are present as in *cessadi* 26r.

Initial or postconsonantal /ge/ /gi/ develops into /dz/ as in the following forms: *zette* 19v, *zenerarla* 58r, *zonzi* 22r.

Latin /ke/, /ki/ between vowels develops into /z/ as in the following forms: *diexe* 42v, *anexi* 38r, *chuoxile* 25r. In the frequently used *medexina/medezina* we find an alternation of graphical forms *x* vs. *z* with *medexina* being more present.

Latin /kl/ develops into /tʃ/. It was written in the Venetian texts as *chi* and *cl* (etymological) (Il Milione 1999, 85). In manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 we find only *chi*: *vechie* 17v et al., *chiara* 19r et al., *chiama* 27v et al.

Latin /gl/ develops into /dʒ/ as in the following forms: *ongie* 22v, *giandule* 65r.

Latin /pl/ develops into /pj/ as in the following forms: it is a very general change, common both for Venetian and Tuscan. Sometimes, etymological forms are preserved: *inplastro* 20v, *plui* 54v.

Latin /lj/ develops into /j/ or /ʎʎ/ as in the following forms: *oio* or *olio*, *folie* (more often spelled with *li*), *semelia* 62v.

Northern lenition of consonants (voicing and loss of consonants):

Latin /p/ develops often into /v/ and also /b/ into /v/. The same voicing process is used for the dental consonants: /t/ > /d/.

The northern Italian voicing of consonants is largely present in the text of the manuscript, e.g. *chavo* 22v et al., *averta* 27r, *lavri* 18v et al. Much less likely to have to deal with the consonant lenition between vowels: *chao* 22r, 64r, *figao* 30v, *deo* 21r and *infiaura* 32r, *fendaure* 24v, *schottaure* 67v, although these are more characteristic of the Venetian varieties. There are also forms without sonorisation, and so *chiamada* 27v coexists with *chiamatta* 30r (double *t* is only a graphic feature). In general, the review of the forms, where there is a northern Italian lenition of consonants, allows us to point to the general Veneto, but does not give a more precise indication as to the place where a copy of the text was made. Tomasin (2004: 109) notes, in the 14th century texts from Padua an occasional presence of the closure of *Ō* within the suffix *-on/-one*. Such a closure appears in manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 in the form of *flecmun* 39v (two occurrences). More common, however, is a form without *flecmon* closing 31r et al. (five occurrences).

All the consonant changes are compatible with central Venetian and with 15th century Venetian “koiné di terraferma” influenced by Tuscan variety. Some changes are very general, i.e. present in almost all the northern Italian varieties (e.g. voicing) but all the developments considered as a whole lead to a conclusion that the text of the manuscript must have been written in Veneto.

3.2.8. Apocope

Venetian variety allows apocope after *l*, *n*, *r* while the central varieties only allow it after *n* (Zamboni 1988: 528). In the analysed text, we regularly observe the apocope after *n* (*flecmon* 30v) and several times after *l*: *anemal* 18v, *chonvenevel* 19v, *simel* 27v. Apocope occurs even after *r*, usually in infinitives: *medegar* 27v, *purgar* 28v, *abondar* 28r, but sometimes also in nouns *cholor* 30r, *umor* 29v. Even though in the central varieties (from Padua) such a vast appearance of apocope was less frequent (see Tomasin 2004: 124; Milione 1999: 80), it can be found in some texts, such as *El libro agregà de Serapiom* but less frequent than the form without apocope (similarly, in manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 the forms without apocope after *r* are dominant).

3.3. Selected morphological features

3.3.1. Articles

Forms of the masculine singular article are *el* (242 occurrences), *lo* (106 occurrences), *l* and *l'*; in plural - *i* (prevailing) and *li*. For feminine singular, the article is *la*, and for plural *le*. These forms are entirely consistent with the distribution of forms of the article in all varieties of Venetian, therefore they do not constitute evidence by themselves as to the specific provenance of the manuscript.

3.3.2. Nouns

The plural of nouns of the third declination frequently ends in *-e* as the singular forms (in Tuscan variety *-i*): *le polvere* 21v, *le radixe* 47v et al. This is a Northern feature, reported for Venetian varieties and Venetian based koiné but also for other Northern varieties.

3.3.3. Possessive

The possessives are: *so, suo* (*dil suo luogo*), *soa, sua* (rarely), for the plural *suo, soi, soe: ligamenti suo, per li suo segni, le suo purgatione, le soe radixe, i soi segni*. In the Venetian varieties, the Tuscan opposition *loro – suo* was absent. Sometimes, it could be reintroduced as Tuscan influence but it is not the case for our manuscript: *loro* is absent in the text of manuscript Ital. Quart. 67.

3.3.4. Future tense

There are two types of future tense for the first conjugation: *-erò* and *-arò*. The first one is a Tuscan (Florentine) form, common also in every koiné influenced by Tuscan, the second one is characteristic of Northern *scriptae*: *scriverrò* 18r et al., *tratterà* 27v, *chomenzarò* 22v, *chomenzarà* 31v, *ttrattarò* 28v. The forms in *-erà* are more frequently used. Other future tense forms: *serà* 18r and other occurrences, *sarà* 18r and other occurrences, *farà* 21r et al., *porà* 42r, *operrà* 65r.

The typical old Padua variety ending in *-axi, -asi* (*farasi, troverasi*) (Ineichen 1962: 400) is absent in manuscript Ital. Quart. 67. It is, instead, the normal ending of future forms (2nd person) in the *El libro agregà de Serapiom* from 1390 (*averaxi, daraxi, sentirasi, deverasi*, etc.).

3.3.5. Subjunctive present and imperfect

The subjunctive present forms are compatible with Northern varieties (included central Venetian): *abia, sia, faza*, etc. Subjunctive imperfect: *ponzesse* 23v, *avese, volese, perdese, fose* also (cf. Tomasin 2004: 188) who describes texts written in Padua variety of the 14th century.

3.3.6. Conditional forms

In the text of manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 there are only forms of Venetian tradition: *serave* 47v, *porave* 25v. There are no forms of other conditional sometimes used in Venetian varieties, i.e. *infinite +HABEBAM > -ia* (*saria, faria*, etc.)

3.3.7. Gerunds

All the gerundial forms are in *-ando* (Northern Italian type, very frequent in Venetian koiné): *sorazonando* 19r, *spolverizando* 19v, *lasando* 20v, *piando* 21r, *siando* 21v et al., *fando* 38v, *fazando* 23r, 29r, 32r and many other different forms (in total, 179 occurrences). There are only two examples in *-endo*, probably of Tuscan influence: *ttegnendo* 21v, *segendo* 69v.

3.3.8. Participles

There are no characteristic old forms in *-è* (e.g. *recevè*), instead most of the participles have the voiced consonant as in: *chresuda* 19v, *mettudo* 20v and other occurrences, *nasuda* 24r, *bagnada* 19r, *gettada* 19r, *ttaliado* 21r etc. Less frequent are forms with a voiceless consonant: *mandatto* 34r, *chavatto* 54r.

3.3.9. Adverbs

Adverbs type *-mente* (the majority of 26 occurrences) coexist in the text with the form type *-mentre* (seventeen forms): *mirabelmentte*, *spezialmentte*, *superfzialmentte*, *solamentte* vs. *spezialementtre*, *mirabelmenttre*, *profondamenttre*, *destramenttre*, *chopisosamenttre*, *gualmenttre*. The adverbial form *insenbre* 18v et al. (three occurrences) is a general Venetian form (present both in coastal and central variety).

3.3.10. Suffixes -ARIUS, -ABILIS, -IBILIS

The development of *-abilis*, *-ibilis* into *-evele* is a general Northern feature: *chresevele* 46r, *raxonevele* 55r. The same development can be found in *El libro agregà de Serapiom* but also in many Northern texts.

The development of the suffix *-ARIUS* is characteristic of Northern, continental forms of Venetian: /ariu/ > /airu/ > /ero/ > /er/, e.g. *mortter* 52v, 64v, 67r. Occasionally occurring forms *elettovario*, *lettovario* are Latinisms.

The described morphological features are compatible with the 15th century Venetian “koiné di terraferma” influenced by Tuscan variety. Some typically local features that could be described as Paduan (or clearly of the central variety) are absent: the future tense forms in *-asi*, *-axi* and the participles in *-è*. Instead, Venetian koiné forms or Tuscan-influenced forms are present in both cases. Nevertheless, it does not exclude attribution of the manuscript to the central Veneto as most features are compatible with the central variety and present also in texts such as *El libro agregà de Serapiom*.

3.4. Selected lexical features

In the lexical layer there are a few characteristic forms, such as *piera* (in Tuscan: *pietra*), present in Venetian, also in Paduan (different from the older form of *pria* present in *Serapiom*), and also *fiol* (69v), a typically central form, as opposed to the Venetian *fio*. The latter form indicates clearly that the language of the manuscript is closer to the central variety of Venetian (or koiné based on that variety). A similar conclusion can also be drawn by comparing the vocabulary (especially the specialised one) of the translation of Lanfranco’s surgery from the manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 with a formulary of the late 14th century (1390) published by Ineichen (1962), *El libro agregà de Serapiom*. The compatibility of these two is striking and, in fact, concerns not only vocabulary, but also a series of phonetic and graphic properties, for instance: alternations of forms such as *smachadura*/*smachaura*. Let’s note that the word *smachadura* is confirmed exclusively in *El libro agregà de Serapiom* (167r et al.) and in the Ital. Quart. 67 (23r et al.); it is absent from other medical texts present in the *Opera del*

Vocabolario Italiano. As already mentioned, the forms of the conditional are typical of Venetian forms *-ave*, both in Ital. Quart. 67 and in *El libro agregà de Serapiom* (e.g. *ingravierave* 256v).

Here are some examples of compliance as to the terminology:

- *squinantto* (62r in Ital. Quart. 67), *squinanto* (287r in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *chrestiero* (33r in Ital. Quart. 67), *crestiero* (285v in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *debele* (25v in Ital. Quart. 67), *debelle* (285v in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *latte di asena* (67v in Ital. Quart. 67), *late de asena* (281r in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *erispila* (30r in Ital. Quart. 67), *erispilla* (256v in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *epittimo* (35r in Ital. Quart. 67), *epitimo* (171r in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *anexi* (38r in Ital. Quart. 67), *anexo* (168v in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *verze* (47v in Ital. Quart. 67), *verçe* (24v in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *fen griego* (31v in Ital. Quart. 67), *fen griego* (114v in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)
- *reubarbaro* (41v in Ital. Quart. 67), *reubarbaro* (140r in *El libro agregà de Serapiom*)

Apart from some obvious differences in the writing habits of the copyists, the convergence of forms in both texts is remarkable despite being years apart. This demonstrates both the stability of medical terminology in vernacular languages of the Middle Ages and the homogeneity of the area, at least culturally (and even perhaps geographically), where the two texts were created.

4. Conclusion

As the data from the analysis clearly indicate, the copy of the translation of Lanfranco's *Surgery* contained in manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 comes from the region of Veneto. In addition to some general North Italian features of the manuscript, some regional characteristics are overlapping and are superposed by some even more local features. While the macro-identification and assignment of the text to Veneto cannot be in doubt, a more detailed identification may be, in my opinion, controversial. This is due in large part to the linguistic situation in Northern Italy during the period of time in which the text was created – the 15th century in the North was a period of development of koiné with strong Tuscan influence. More local features often give way to forms more recognisable, identifiable with the regional or supra-regional variety of language. Nevertheless, the linguistic analysis carried out in this article gives certain indication also in this more particular matter: most of the features and characteristics of the text are compatible with the so called central variety of Veneto (veneto centrale: padovano-bassanese-vicentino-polesano) (Zamboni 1979: 18) or the variety that can be called “koiné di terraferma” according to Gianfranco Contini's definition (cf. Paccagnella 1993: 506). The latter denomination could describe the language of manuscript Ital. Quart. 67 without any risk of committing fraud. To be even more precise, given some phonetic and lexical features, one could attempt to assign the manuscript to Padua or the surrounding area. If, however, this assumption

may raise some doubts, the earlier one that places the creation of the manuscript in Veneto, and most probably in the central mainland of the region, does not seem dubious as it clearly results from an analysis of the language. This is a significant clarification as to the original general assignment of the manuscript to Northern Italy. Thus, it turns out that the analysis of the language of the manuscript fulfills an important role in solving philological and historical problems, and that the tools developed by historical linguistics are still very useful in this kind of research.

References

- Milione 1999 = Barbieri A., Andreose A. (eds.). 1999. *Il "Milione" veneto: ms. CM 211 della Biblioteca civica di Padova*. Padova.
- OVI = Opera del Vocabolario Italiano. *Corpus OVI dell'italiano antico*. [available at: <http://www.ovi.cnr.it>].
- Andrés Chico J.C. 1989. *Edición y estudio de un texto médico: "Cirugía mayor" de Lanfranco Mediolanense*. [PhD diss., University of Salamanca].
- Berg A. 1975. *Lanfranks "Chirurgia parva" in der Abschrift Konrad Schrecks von Aschaffenburg*. Pattensen.
- Derolez A. 2003. *The paleography of Gothic manuscript books. From the twelfth to the early sixteenth century*. Cambridge.
- Ineichen G. (ed.). 1962. *El libro agregà de Serapiom. Volgarizzamento di Jacobus Philippus de Padua. Edito per la prima volta a cura di Gustav Ineichen*. [vol. 1–2]. Roma.
- Keil G. 1985. Lanfrank von Mailand. – Ruth K. et al. (eds.). *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*. Berlin: col. 560–572.
- Lemm S. 1918. *Kurzes Verzeichnis der romanischen Handschriften*. Berlin.
- Paccagnella I. 1993. Uso letterario dei dialetti. – Serianni L., Trifone P. (eds.). *Storia della lingua italiana*. [vol. 3]. Torino: 495–539.
- Prioreschi P. 2004. *A history of medicine. Medieval medicine*. [vol. 5]. Omaha.
- Scholz D. 1977. *Lanfranks "Chirurgia parva" in einer Prager Überlieferung des Spätmittelalters*. Pattensen.
- Tiraboschi G. 1823. *Storia della letteratura italiana. Dall'anno MCLXXXIII fino all'anno MCCC*. [vol. 4]. Milano.
- Tomasin L. 2004. *Testi padovani del Trecento*. Padova.
- de Tovar C. 1982. Les versions françaises de la "Chirurgia parva" de Lanfranc de Milan: Étude de la tradition manuscrite. – *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 12–13: 195–262.
- Tyrkkö J. 2011. "Halles Lanfranke" and its most excellent and learned expositive table. – Timofeeva O., Säily T. (eds.). *Words in dictionaries and history: Essays in honour of R.W. McConchie*. Berlin, New York: 17–40.
- Videsott P. 2009. *Padania scrittologica. Analisi scrittologiche e scrittometriche di testi in italiano settentrionale antico dalle origini al 1525*. Tübingen.
- Zamboni A. 1979. Le caratteristiche essenziali dei dialetti veneti. – Cortelazzo M. (ed.). *Guida ai dialetti veneti*. [vol. 1]. Padova: 9–43.
- Zamboni A. 1988. Venezien/Veneto. – *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik IV: Italienisch, Korsisch, Sardisch*. [vol. 4]. Tübingen: 517–538.