Acknowledgement: This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an Article published in *The Italianist*, 36.iii, Copyright Taylor & Francis.

RULES AND GRAMMARS OF ITALIAN IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND: THE CASE OF GIUSEPPE BARETTI

Vilma De Gasperin, University of Oxford, UK

In England, after the Renaissance, the Italian language enjoyed a renewed interest in the eighteenth-century, due to the appeal of Italian literature, as well as travel, opera, commerce, and fashionable education. This led to a fertile production of language manuals and in particular of grammar texts. Grammar was identified with rules, but in the eighteenth century the trend towards simplification meant that the need to list extensive rules was reassessed. One of the most innovative approaches to grammar in eighteenth-century Britain emerges from the work of the Piedmontese Giuseppe Baretti (1719–89). This essay examines his teaching methodology with regard to grammar rules in his A Grammar of the Italian Tongue *(1760), and his treatment of what he called 'a multiplicity of puzzling rules', which, he claimed, can hinder rather than assist the acquisition of Italian as a foreign language, if excessive attention is devoted to them.*

KEYWORDS: Giuseppe Baretti, Italian grammar, grammar rules, eighteenth-century, Italian language learning, Italian language teaching

Nel diciottesimo secolo, ci fu in Inghilterra una ripresa di interesse, dopo il Rinascimento, per la lingua italiana, grazie al fascino della letteratura, ma anche ai viaggi, all'opera, al commercio e all'educazione alla moda. Ciò comportò anche una ricca produzione di manuali di lingua e in particolare di testi grammaticali. La grammatica era identificata con le regole, ma nel diciottesimo secolo la tendenza verso la semplificazione portò a riconsiderare la necessità di ricorrere a regole dettagliate. Uno degli approcci più innovativi alla grammatica nell'Inghilterra del Settecento viene dal lavoro del piemontese Giuseppe Baretti (1719–89). Questo saggio esamina la sua metodologia di insegnamento con riferimento alle regole grammaticali della sua A Grammar of the Italian Tongue *(1760), e al suo trattamento*

di quella che lui stesso definiva 'una molteplicità di regole sorprendenti' che, secondo la sua opinione, rischiavano di ostacolare piuttosto che favorire l'apprendimento dell'italiano come lingua straniera, qualora vi si attribuisse un'attenzione eccessiva.

PAROLE CHIAVE: Giuseppe Baretti, grammatica italiana, regole grammaticali, Settecento, apprendimento della lingua italiana, insegnamento della lingua italiana

ITALIAN LANGUAGE LEARNING IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

Italian language learning in Britain began around the middle of the sixteenth century, at the time when religious exiles fled Italy due to the persecution following the Council of Trent and established themselves, mostly permanently, in England, often finding employment as tutors of Italian.[1] By the eighteenth century, learning Italian appealed to a wider social spectrum, and for a broader range of reasons than in the period of Michelangelo and John Florio, Iacopo Castelvetro and Giovanni Torriano. Members of either sex of the upper and middle classes now learnt Italian not only with literary aims, but more generally for cultural and practical reasons linked to commerce and a relatively increased mobility across Europe. Italian tutors used this new appeal of the Italian language to their advantage and in order to bestow prestige and status onto their language learning manuals. Ferdinando Altieri, for example, wrote in the Preface to his 1726 *A Dictionary of Italian and English*:

> The Italian language [...] is deservedly esteem'd on account of those excellent authors that have written in it; and it is also useful to be understood by nobility, gentry and merchants; there being few, if any, Courts in *Europe* where it is not used, and but few ports in Italy where the merchants of *Great Britain* do not carry on an advantagious traffick.[2]

Thirty years later, Evangelista Palermo, who is described as 'Editor of Altieri's Italian and English Dictionary and Teacher of the Italian Tongue in London' in the frontispiece of his 1755 Grammar, wrote in its Preface:

> It is needless to enlarge upon the sweetness and delicacy of the Italian Language, it being well known in all the Courts of Europe, and is at present the reigning state of the English Nation, the knowledge whereof, besides being useful to all Travellers, lovers of Music, Merchants, and to those who are desirous of reading the Classics in Italian, is reputed as a fine qualification for both Sexes, and no small part of polite Education.[3]

Palermo may be overstating the primacy of Italian as a foreign language, especially when compared to French, but he effectively sums up the reasons why Italian was gaining popularity in that age. Travelling, Italian opera, commerce and fashionable education along with the appeal of reading Italian literature in the original not only for the literary elite but also as part of a more general education all aided the rise of the Italian language.[4] As the translator of the Italian grammar of Port Royal states, 'the knowledge of this tongue is deservedly esteemed a part of polite education'.[5] Travelling to Italy contributed to the popularity of learning Italian, which spread from the realm of written books into that of spoken communication. The first half of the eighteenth century was the heyday of the Grand Tour to Italy for young aristocrats; in the second half of the century, although the aristocratic tour was declining, travelling to Italy appealed to and became possible for a wider social spectrum. As Rosemary Sweet writes in *Cities and the Grand Tour*: 'By 1760, young men from the landed elite were still being sent to Italy for the final polish to their education', as well as 'older men, professional writers, wealthier members of the middle classes, wives and family groups',[6] the sons of merchants, booksellers, artists and architects, up until the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1793, which made travel on the continent more difficult.

Grammar and rules

Such revived interest led to a fertile production of language manuals, with 19 grammars of Italian for English learners published between 1709 and 1775.[7] These texts display different approaches and views as to what the role of grammar should be in foreign language teaching and learning. The wider and more diverse body of learners, for whom knowledge of Latin could no longer be assumed, had to be taken into account when teaching foreign languages. Palermo writes that 'I have found that

almost every Gentleman is acquainted with Latin and French; and that the Ladies in general have a pretty good notion of the latter'.[8] This affects, he claims, the kind and amount of information that he includes in his grammar.[9]

Grammar was largely identified with 'rules', as can be seen in the title of the first grammar of Italian for the English, William Thomas's *Principal Rules of Italian Grammer* (1550).[10] Indeed, many grammars do not even bear the word 'grammar' in their title, but use the word 'rules' instead, in some cases with reference to a 'method' or 'directions'.[11] Other authors such as Granthan (1575), Sanford (1605), Torriano (1640), Uvedale (1711), Plenus (1702), Barton (1719), Henley (1719), Palermo (1755), Altieri (1736), Baretti (1760) and Sastres (1775) clearly situate their manual within this specific genre by entitling it 'grammar'.[12] But what is 'grammar' taken to mean, other than a set of identifiable rules? The common definition of grammar by the early Humanist grammarians was of an *ars recte loquendi*, the art of correct speaking,[13] which then broadened to the art of writing and speaking correctly. Following this early Humanist tradition, the 1612 *Vocabolario della Crusca* defines grammar as 'Arte, che 'nsegna a correttamente parlare, e scrivere'.[14] In Florio's 1611 Dictionary *Grammatica* is 'the arte of Grammar or to teach to speake well, or to write correctedly [sic]'.[15] And it is this definition that Samuel Johnson uses in his 'A Grammar of the English Tongue', which opens his 1755 *Dictionary of the English Language*, as 'the art of using words properly',[16] which is also adopted by Giuseppe Baretti in his 1760 grammar. Grammar is thus defined as an art that is acquired when mastering the rules of a given language, rules that allow the learner to use words properly and speak and write correctly. How and to what extent these rules were to be acquired, however, was weighted in different ways.

Since the beginning of Italian scholarship in England, rules were at the heart of foreign language learning. William Thomas claimed he wrote his *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer* to meet the request of an English gentleman to have the rules neatly laid down for his perusal while in Italy: 'John Tamworth gentleman [...] being desirouse to learne the tongue, intreated the said William Thomas, to draw him out in English some of the principall rules, that might leade him to the true knowledge thereof'.[17] Similarly, in a dialogue in John Florio's *His Firste Fruites* (1578), the pupil asks his tutor to provide him with 'rules': 'I would, if it wer [sic] no annoiance to you, that you would teach me some rules, that I might learn to read, speak, pronounce and

write the Italian tongue'.[18] But while rules form indisputably part of learning a language, the role and importance granted to grammatical rules in language learning is varied. In the eighteenth century, grammars tend towards simplification rather than the aim of writing a comprehensive work, a trend, I believe, firmly rooted in the fact that these authors were involved in teaching students of different ages, different levels, and education: first-hand experience and the diversity of learners advised making grammar somewhat more digestible. Altieri, for example, at first criticized Torriano for having 'contented himself with laying down a few Rules [of the tenses of the Italian Verbs], very useful indeed, but not sufficient to learn *Italian* without the Assistance of a good Master'.[19] But then he veered towards the ideal of simplification, claiming: 'Let other Grammarians say what they will, their Way of forming the Terminations of Tenses, is perplexed and intricate'.[20] Palermo, whose grammar is largely based on Altieri's, also embraces the aim of making rules more accessible: 'As to the *Plan* or *Method*, as well as the *Explication* of the Rules, I have used my best endeavours to render them easy, clear, and concise', and part of the reason was for them to be 'useful and necessary for Beginners'.[21] One of the most innovative approaches to grammar in eighteenth-century Britain, expressing a belief in simplified grammar teaching for foreign learners, especially in the earlier stages, emerges from the work of Giuseppe Baretti. This essay thus now turns to examine his approach and teaching methodology with regard to grammar rules, his treatment of what he called 'a multiplicity of puzzling rules and observations',[22] which, he claimed, can hinder rather than assist the acquisition of Italian as a foreign language, if excessive attention is devoted to them.

BARETTI'S MODELS AND COMPETITORS

Giuseppe Baretti was born in Turin in 1719 and moved to England in his early thirties in search of better opportunities for his literary career. He lived there between 1751 and 1760 and then again from 1773 until his death in 1789, having left Italy after his career was hampered and his works faced censorship. Baretti's first volume of *Lettere familiari a' suoi tre fratelli Filippo, Giovanni e Amedeo* (1762),[23] which recounted his journey from London to Italy through Portugal, Spain and France, caused the Portuguese Minister in Milan to remonstrate with Count Firmian, the Austrian Plenipotentiary, who suspended the publication. Baretti published the second volume

in Venice in 1763, but was prevented from publishing the remaining two volumes by Venetian censors and the four volumes were eventually published in English in London.[24] Similarly, the publication of *La Frusta Letteraria di Aristarco Scannabue* (1763–65) was suppressed by the Riformatori allo Studio in Padua due to its polemical style. In England Baretti taught Italian and between 1753 and 1779 he published several works for learning Italian, including a collection of dialogues, a dictionary, an anthology of literary texts, an epistolary collection to serve as a model for writing, and a grammar.[25] His grammar originally preceded his revised edition of Ferdinando Altieri's bilingual dictionary in 1760,[26] and was then published separately with additional material in 1762.[27]

In the Preface Baretti places his grammar in the context of previous and contemporary grammars, to show, as was customary, how his own exceeds the merits and compensates for the deficiencies of the others: 'Only three grammars [...] were hitherto generally used. One by Messieurs of Port Royal, translated from the French, a second by Altieri, and a third by Veneroni. Which is the worst of the three is not easily to be determined'.[28] Baretti refers to the three most important grammars of Italian of the 18th century: *A New Method of Learning the Italian Tongue. Translated from the French of Messieurs de Port-Royal* (1750);[29] Ferdinando Altieri's *A New Italian Grammar* (1736); and the very popular *Maitre italien*, written by the French translator and lexicographer Jean Vigneron (Italianized as Giovanni Veneroni) in 1678, and translated into English as *The New Italian Grammar* by Uvedale in 1711 and reprinted several times.[30]

In his Preface, Baretti inveighs against each of these authors for different reasons, which serve to elevate Baretti's own work by comparison, a common practice of the day. As for the grammar of Port Royal, he claims that 'The Messieurs were unacquainted with the Tongue they pretended to teach to an astonishing degree',[31] on the basis that the authors of the original were French, even though *A New Method of Learning the Italian Tongue* was translated from the French of Port Royal 'By an Italian Master'. Ignorance and insensitivity to the literary language is the charge made against Altieri: 'Altieri was no less in the dark as to the beauties of his native language. He had not the least sparkle of poetical fire in his soul; and unpoetical people ought never to assume the right of teaching.'[32] Baretti's criticism of Altieri, besides attacking his lack of poetical talent, rests primarily on his belief that in

order to be effective a grammar should be concise and that its treatment of rules must not be exhaustive, which leads to a further charge against Altieri: 'Besides, he wrote for bread, and thought apparently of nothing but of multiplying rules, which for the greatest part are either faulty or unintelligible, that he might swell a book into a convenient sum of money'.[33] By this claim Baretti implicitly justifies the brevity of his own grammar, which is only 39 pages, against Altieri's 296 pages. Elsewhere, and in apparent contradiction, Baretti accuses Altieri of being 'a laborious but ignorant man' for stating that there are only four nouns — *re, specie, effigie, superficie* — with an invariable plural: 'I am only apprehensive that Altieri is mistaken when he says that we have only these four and no more, whose number does not change in the plural. *Requie* at least makes a *fifth* and there may be a few more that will not come just now into my head'.[34] This may seem to be in contradiction to Baretti's ideal of concision, however, he accuses Altieri of providing an absolute rule ('only four'), which he proves to be wrong, rather than of not including all possible exceptions, which Baretti himself does not do either. Baretti considers Veneroni's grammar to be 'a little better than the other two', only to add 'but his precepts are no less trifling and no less false for the greatest part, and he was still below Messieurs and Altieri in point of ignorance of the classical Italians'.[35] Later, in a footnote in his *Scelta delle lettere familiari* (1779), Baretti further criticizes Veneroni's notoriety and his knowledge of Italian: 'Ognuno sa come del Veneroni vanno a stampa varie Grammatiche tutte cattive, e un Dizionario Italiano e francese che è una molto perfida cosa. Chi egli si fosse, io nollo so. Italiano so che non era'.[36] Thus Baretti distances himself from these three major models on the basis of length, and of insufficient knowledge of the Italian language, of its poetic subtleties and of its literature. In order to further exalt the novelty of his own work, he criticizes a fourth grammar, by the contemporary Evangelista Palermo, which had been published five years earlier, in 1755: 'the two Grammars I here offer [Learners] are not raked together from those three works, as that of one Palermo lately published'.[37] Indeed, Palermo openly declares his debt to previous grammars in his Preface: 'like the industrious bee, I have collected from the flowers of the best Grammarians. [...] I have consulted all the Italian Grammars extant, even those published in other Languages, which were collected from the best authors'.[38] Palermo includes, among his acknowledged models, Benedetto Buonmattei, Girolamo Gigli, Veneroni, and Annibale Antonini.

Distancing himself from the dominant tradition of Italian grammars, Baretti declares that his models are, instead, those of 'two accurate philosophers': 'That of Mr Samuel Johnson prefixed to his English Dictionary, and that of Buonmattei were my guides'.[39] Benedetto Buonmattei's *Della lingua toscana* (1643)[40] was the most influential work of seventeenth-century Italian grammar, balancing 'autorità e uso moderno che si esprime, da un lato, con il rispetto verso il canone del *Vocabolario della Crusca*, dall'altro con l'integrazione di questo stesso canone con la lingua moderna e viva'.[41] Mention of Buonmattei in grammar texts in England begins to appear in the eighteenth century,[42] and although Buonmattei's grammar had never actually been translated into English (unlike Veneroni's), Elizabeth Thorne suggests that it was 'much used for over a hundred years wherever Italian was learnt'.[43] He is mentioned as an example that has been followed in the grammar of Port Royal[44] and Palermo,[45] as well as later grammarians, so this was by no means a model unique to Baretti. At the same time Baretti disregards later grammars that were published in Italy, by Girolamo Gigli (1721), Domenico Maria Manni (1737), and Salvadore Corticelli (1755)[46].

As for Baretti's other major 'guide', Johnson prefixed his *Grammar of the English Language* to his *Dictionary of the English Language* (1755). Baretti admired Johnson and was a regular visitor at Johnson's during the period when the latter was compiling his dictionary and grammar, which greatly influenced his own work. In his *The Life of Samuel Johnson,* James Boswell writes of 'Signor Baretti, an Italian of considerable literature, who having come to England for a few years before, had been employed in the capacity of a language-master and an author, and formed an intimacy with Dr. Johnson'.[47] Baretti followed Johnson's model and closely conformed to its structure, ideal of brevity, order in which topics are presented, and definition of grammatical terms. Baretti opens with the identical and widely used definition of Grammar given by Johnson: 'Grammar, which is the art of using words properly, comprises four parts, Orthography, Etymology, Syntax, and Prosody'.[48]

RULES AND USAGE

In the Preface to his dictionary, Baretti lays bare one of the fundamental principles underlying his grammar, namely conciseness coupled with effectiveness:

> To the Dictionary I have prefixed two Grammars, one for an Englishman who learns Italian, the other for an Italian who learns English. They are both very short, but I hope they both contain enough to conduct any learner of tolerable capacity through the dark labyrinth of a new tongue.[49]

Baretti thus introduces a core methodological principle regarding learning and teaching grammar of a foreign language: a grammar ought to be 'very short', and learning grammar made more accessible, not hindered by too many rules, which ought to be 'enough', but not exhaustive. As mentioned above, this notion is not exclusive to Baretti. Prefaces to grammars often reveal the author's intention to limit rules in order to ease learning, while some, on the contrary, boast having added more rules that cannot be found in competing grammars, leading to a tension between completeness and brevity. But overall, in the eighteenth century, when knowledge of Latin could not be taken for granted and language learning was spreading among the middle classes, the most frequent criticism was levelled against the excessive number or complexity of rules.[50] Baretti aligns himself with the approach that tends towards simplification and synthesis even at the cost of skimming over some linguistic detail. If a clear or helpful rule cannot be offered, or when there are too many exceptions, it is counterproductive to overload the learner with grammatical information. Explicit examples of this approach emerge at various points throughout the grammar treatise, often coupled with overt references to his competitors and in particular to Altieri, whose dictionary he was in the process of revising and from whom, for this very reason, he especially needed to dissociate himself.

a) Pronunciation rules

The section 'Orthography' deals with both spelling and pronunciation, which pose particular problems in language learning, especially given that there was no standard of spoken language and that the Tuscan-based Italian was spoken only by a literate elite. Grammars customarily begin with pronunciation and by giving a definition of letters. So Baretti conforms to the custom but at the same time marks his difference:

> Although I do not intend this Grammar for the use of those who are so illiterate as not to know which letter is a consonant and which a vowel; yet, for

> method's sake, I say that the Italian letters are partly vowels, partly consonants.[51]

Baretti is either justifying the lack of further information in his own work, or mocking those who were more thorough in their definitions by implying their grammar was addressing illiterate readers. This may be an implicit reference to Altieri, though the latter's definition rests on etymology and seems to address a cultivated reader rather than an illiterate one:

> The Vowels are thus called, because they form a Voice or perfect Sound of themselves, without the Help of another. The rest of the Letters are called Consonants, that is, sounding with another, because they cannot make a Sound, or be pronounced without the help of another, either before or after, as *be*, *ce*, *em*, *en*.[52]

In dealing with the length and strength of vowel sounds, Baretti gives the example of two different ways of pronouncing the letter *a*, 'when it is distinguished with an accent, which never happens but at the end of words; as in *calamità*' ('calamity') and the '*a* of *calamita*' ('magnet'). Baretti then goes on to criticize other authors who deal with this aspect at greater length: 'Some Grammarians, whom I know not whether to call philosophers or musicians, say that the Italian *a* has six or seven different sounds'.[53] Baretti is probably referring to Altieri, who distinguishes between three types of *a*:

> *A* sometimes is pronounced with more strength; as *Andare*, to go; and sometimes softer; as *Amore*, love; and sometimes we draw it long, as if there were two *aa*; as *ah, crudele! ah cruel!* perhaps 'tis the Effect of the Aspiration that follows it.[54]

Altieri then goes on to distinguish the short and long pronunciation in closed and open syllables as in *caro* and *carro*. Baretti, however, does not agree on focussing on such subtleties:

> as such a minute analysis of sounds would prove endless as well as puzzling, I shall therefore neither trouble myself nor the English reader with such aereal discussions, but follow the common method. It is not difficult to count the elms and oaks of St. James's park, but who will number the branches of each elm, and tell the leaves of each oak?[55]

At other times it is not an abundance of plausible rules that Baretti refuses to account for. It may be that a rule can simply not be discernible. Thus, when discussing open/closed vowels, Baretti writes that he has 'no infallible rule to give how to find out these differences'.[56] In these cases, answers should and can be found by consulting the sources which might provide this information: 'A Foreigner must find them out by practice, by asking the natives, or by consulting the Crusca and those other Italian books, in which such distinctions are marked'.[57]

Baretti is not always more concise than his rival Altieri. When discussing the pronunciation of the *s* sound, while Altieri explains the difference between 'sharp' (i.e. voiceless) *s* and 'soft' (i.e. voiced) *s* in a paragraph of 86 words, Baretti devotes 433 words to the explanation and exemplification of the *s* sound. This is not in order to be more detailed or prescriptive, on the contrary, it is in order to illustrate that subtleties in pronunciation cannot all be properly accounted for, especially considering the different regional accents of Italian, based on literary Tuscan, even within Tuscany itself:

> Yet I think it impossible to give a rule to determine precisely when the *s* is to be pronounced with more, and when with less force. I have even observed, that the Tuscans themselves, and the very inhabitants of Florence, in the rapidity of utterance, do not constantly agree on this particular.[58]

Baretti suggests that 'sweetness' of the sound is more important than what etymology and grammar dictate. In explaining that Tuscans say '*istante*, *costante*, *coscienza*, *istruire*, *istigare*', instead of '*instante, constante, conscienza, instruire, instigare*', he urges learners to adopt the form that is more pleasing to the ear:

> those that do not abandon etymology for facility of utterance, are certainly in the wrong, for sweetness is the chief characteristick of the Italian tongue, and the *s impure* preceded by a consonant sounds so harsh in our ears that we cannot avoid it too much. For the sake of sweetness we disregard sometimes not only etymology, but even grammar, that is *propriety* and *justness of speech*.[59]

Both forms, with and without *n*, are recorded in Baretti's—and Altieri's—dictionary, reflecting the diverse literary usage.[60] On the same grounds, he explains and recommends the use of the article *lo* in *lo scolaro* and the prosthetic *i* in *con ispavento*, *in istrada* etc. Baretti is alluding, consciously or unconsciously, to the tendency of phonetic evolution towards ease of utterance, in other words, it is easier to pronounce *losco* (in *lo sco*laro) than it would be to pronounce the consonant cluster *ilsco* (in *il sc*olaro). In this section, his focus is on pronunciation rather than on writing, but Baretti points to the fact that written, literary forms, whose correctness is established by the Crusca, guide but may be—and are—overrun by usage:

> In making my dictionary I have been obliged to peruse twice that of our Academicians, and I have found but two words *solstizio* and *superstizione* that have the *s impure*; but I must observe that the Tuscans in the rapidity of utterance pronounce the first sometimes *sostizio* and sometimes *solistizio*; and the second always *supestizione*.[61]

Not only does Baretti comment on variants that exist in writing (*istante* vs. *instante*), but he also introduces in his grammar a form that he has 'observed' in speech that is not attested either in the *Vocabolario della Crusca* or his own dictionary, even though he omits to specify that he is talking of '*s impura*', i.e. the *s* followed by another consonant. On the one hand Baretti relinquishes the principle of conciseness in favour of discussing minute differences, of which he had previously accused fellow grammarians. On the other, he shows that his idea of correct Italian is not based exclusively on written models and that not only usage may differ from these, but it may indeed be more pleasing to the ear than grammatical or etymological norms prescribe. The passage above, giving examples of epenthesis and syncope in the word

solstizio, brings in a descriptive dimension concerning how native speakers of Italy actually pronounce these words, though Baretti restricts his observations to Tuscany, on whose dialect literary Italian was based. He does not, however, dispense with the more traditional prescriptive authority of the Crusca, claiming that he twice consulted its *Vocabolario*, finding therein only two words that present this particular cluster, *solstizio* and *superstizione*.

As with the letter *a*, when Baretti discusses the pronunciation of the letter *z* he claims 'I have no rule to give (and it seems that the Academicians della Crusca had none themselves) for to distinguish when the *z* is soft and when hard'.[62] This is perfectly plausible even for a grammar. What he inveighs against, however, is the fashion of stating rules that are not really rules and that can only confuse a learner:

> Gigli, Altieri, Rolli, and other grammatical speculators,[63] although very ignorant of the genius and beauties of their language, and although born and bred in those regions of Italy where pronunciation is vicious, as Siena, Rome, Piacenza, Venice, and other places distant from Florence, have yet prescribed a multitude of rules. [...] Their confidence went even so far, that their rules leave no perplexity behind, and every word in the Italian language may be pronounced by any Englishman, French, Turk, Chinese, or Californian as well as by the Presidents of the Florentine Academies. Yet those English that will be pleased to follow my advice, (and who is the Preceptor who has not some good soul that follows his advice?) must fling those magisterial rules into the fire; for it is better not to go on a journey than miss one's way forever.[64]

This passage is revealing of Baretti's views on linguistic issues. While projecting the grammatical discourse onto an emotional, hyperbolic and humorous level, it not only shows that, unlike other grammarians of Italian in Britain, Baretti was aware of the linguistic production and debates of eighteenth-century Italy. It also reaffirms Baretti's belief in the supremacy of the Tuscan, or rather, Florentine, which, as a Turinese, he himself had learnt, rather than acquired since infancy. Baretti's mocking tone conceals his belief that a) excessive reliance on rules may misleadingly assure that pronunciation can be learnt by anybody, wherever they come from, and dispel

any trace of foreigness; b) the Italian language naturally engenders perplexity in that written rules may differ from what actually happens in speech.

b. Morphology rules

After dealing with pronunciation, Baretti moves on to the major part of his grammar: 'Etymology teaches the deduction of one word from another, and the various modifications by which the sense of the same words is diversified, as *il cavallo*, *i cavalli*; *amo*, *amai*, *buono*, *buonissimo*, and so forth'.[65] The section on 'etymology', that is, morphology, deals with articles, nouns, adjectives, pronouns and verbs and is followed by the last two shorter sections on 'Syntax' and 'Prosody'.

The following examples illustrate Baretti's approach to morphological aspects that lack homogeneity and are therefore particularly difficult to learn (and to teach) if one seeks to rely only on the comfort of rules: articles, plurals, and irregular verbs. For Baretti, knowledge of the correct use of articles is better gained by reading, where they can be learnt in the context of a sentence, rather than in a list of rules:

> Let me give this caution to all English beginners, to skim over the most difficult parts of Italian Grammar, especially the articles: to treasure up words and sentences; and to enable themselves to read Italian tolerably. When this is done, let them come back to grammar, and carefully read the whole affair of articles, which has been divided by Buonmattei into twenty two pretty long chapters; and I give them my word that they will be pleased at their progress.[66]

Baretti identifies the different roles played by theory and practice, not undermining the importance of theory, but merely assigning it to a later stage in the learning process: 'The Italian articles are stubborn things at a distance, and considered abstractedly they will fright foreigners. But by observing their different modes and situations in sentences, anybody may soon be enabled to master them'.[67] This marks a move away from fellow teachers, in his view, who linger on articles too long, affecting their pupils' progress:

> Some of my tongue-teaching Countrymen, have by this art kept a Pupil under their tuition much longer than they would certainly have done, if, instead of

> forcing them to anatomize the nature and use of articles, they had simply pointed them out, and gone onward explaining other parts of speech.[68]

Similarly, Italian plurals are notably slippery as they do not fit comfortably in clear-cut and easy rules, particularly words ending in *-co* and *-go*, which may take a plural with the palatal *ci* and *gi*, or the velar sound *chi* and *ghi*. While other grammarians, such as Palermo and Altieri, distinguish between two-syllable words and the rest, and alternate the rule with a long list of exceptions, Baretti does not offer one rule, instead, he leaves it rather vague, resorting to the adverb *sometimes:* 'The masculine nouns ending in *co* sometimes end their plurals in *ci* and sometimes in *chi*'. After giving four examples for each ending, he simply adds:

> but I do not know of any rule that can direct to form properly such plurals, and Buonmattei says that after long meditation he could find none; that they are therefore to be learnt only by practice and observation of the good writers that went before.[69]

Baretti here paraphrases a passage in Buonmattei's grammar, drawing on the key notions of practice, usage and the admission that there may not be a discernible rule, and that the pattern of palatalization in plural formation is, as Gerhard Rohlfs describes it, 'oscura e confusa':[70]

> Nomi che nel singulare escono in Co, o in Go; lasciano spesse volte dubbioso altrui come si debban profferire i lor plurali; perché alcuni si mutano in Ci, e in Gi; altri si voltano in Chi, e in Ghi. […] Questa cotal differenza non credo che si possa imparar se non per pratica: perché io per molto pensare non ho mai saputo ritrovar tanto ch'io la riduca a regola. e per quel ch'io mi creda, ciò è senza regola alcuna. però in questo bisogna rimettersi all'uso, e a quello ubbidire.[71]

Similarly, Baretti warns learners of the difficulties posed by verb conjugation, an aspect of the Italian grammar that is 'very difficult to an Englishman; because our

terminations are numerous, and our irregularities innumerable'.[72] For this reason, he cuts down on exemplification:

> That I may not frighten my young readers with a multiplicity of puzzling rules and observations, I will conjugate here the two auxiliary verbs *essere* and *avere*; then I shall speak of our different conjugations of other verbs, and exhibit examples of each of them.[73]

Baretti deals with the innumerable irregular verbs, here called 'anomalous verbs' in a similar way and spares the learner a list of irregularities that in his view would be discouraging, conjugating only *dare*, *parere* and *dire*:

> The Italian language abounds in anomalous verbs that deviate from the general rules of analogy or derivation. To point them all out with the irregular conjugations would take up too much room: perhaps a volume in folio would not suffice for such an undertaking. I will therefore conjugate here three of them [one of each conjugation] that occur most frequently in our discourses and writings, and without teazing [sic] my reader any longer with rules about verbs, more difficult to be learnt than the whole language itself, shall put an end to that part of grammar called Etymology.[74]

In this passage rules and language appear to be two separate notions: 'rules' are identified by patterns but marred by irregularities, whereas 'language' suggests a more comprehensive understanding, based on acquiring as much lexical knowledge alongside the basics of grammar. An insight into Baretti's teaching method is offered by the first dialogue of *The Easy Phraseology for the Use of Young Ladies* (1775), between the pupil Hetty/Esteruccia and her Master, which opens thus: 'Orsù, Esteruccia. Di grammatica già ne sappiamo quanto basta'.[75] As the Master goes over the grammar covered, he lists what 'Enough grammar' consists of: two auxiliary verbs, half a dozen regular and half a dozen irregular verbs, formation of adverbs and adjectives, number and declension of articles. Having established that the pupil has learnt these topics 'by heart', they then go through a wide range of vocabulary that has been acquired by means of the Master's lists ('grazie alle vostre lunghe liste, che

pajono cataloghi di banditore').[76] The dialogue conveys the belief that as soon as the essentials of grammar are taught, the learner's efforts should be channelled into learning vocabulary and reading. Hetty Thrale, the dedicatee of and inspiration for Baretti's dialogues, may be one of those pupils who he claims have proved to him the validity of his method, as he suggests in his grammar: 'I could name half a dozen young ladies that in a few months read Metastasio and Tasso by following this method'.[77]

GRAMMAR IN METAPHORS

Four years after the publication of his grammar, Baretti conveyed his pedagogical ideas in a fictional debate on the role of grammar. In the issue of 15 February 1764 of *La frusta letteraria di Aristarco Scannabue*, Aristarco/Baretti published a letter purporting to be written by some Onesto Lovanglia to an English lady. The name of the fictional author of the letter is imbued with autobiographical connotation: Onesto, meaning honest, truthful, and Lovanglia, which suggests *Love Anglia*, lover of England and of the English language and literature, expressing Baretti's tribute to England. Onesto narrates a curious dream set in the area of the Elysium where grammarians reside. Here are gathered grammarians old and new of different nationalities: the Portuguese Emmanuele Alvaro, the French Pierre Restaut, Claude Buffier, and Giovanni Veneroni, the Italian Benedetto Buonmattei, and the English John Wallis and Samuel Johnson, respectively authors of Latin, French, Italian and English grammars. A heated debate is taking place between the Portuguese Jesuit Alvaro and Buonmattei, who voices Baretti's own views. The debate revolves around the question 'Se una persona che vuole apprendere una lingua, debba cominciare dalle regole grammaticali, o no'.[78] According to Alvaro, when learning a language, one must first get to know all the different verb categories, and be acquainted with the entire grammatical terminology:

> L'Alvaro, fiancheggiato principalmente dal Veneroni, gridava come spiritato che faceva assolutamente duopo dar principio alla fabbrica con un buon fondamento di regole, e saper bene quel che significa nome, verbo, mascolino, femminino, presente, preterito, gerundio, supino, attivo, passivo, dativo, ablativo, genere, numero, impersonale, anomalo, e altre simili gentilezze.[79]

To Alvaro's claim that one ought to study a foreign language 'col vero metodo grammaticale', Buonmattei replies that it would be a serious mistake for a foreigner to begin by cudgeling his brains with the grammar he himself had written. On the contrary, first the foreign learner ought to be introduced to the language through reading some of the less difficult Italian authors in order to build up a reasonable amount of common words and phrases:

> molto male farebbe esempligrazia quello straniero, il quale, volendo apparare la fiorentina favella, cominciasse limbiccarsi la fantasia con quella mia grammatica. Egli fa di mestieri, penso io, che quello straniero, nello accingersi all'ardua impresa, si faccia primamente spiegare dal maestro alcuno de' nostri autori più facili e piani; e che procacci in tal foggia un mediocre capitale di triti vocaboli e di frasi comunali, anzi che entrare nel vasto pelago delle difficoltà e delle minuzie grammaticali.[80]

Baretti borrows and reverses the sea metaphor for language learning that had been used by Giovanni Torriano a century earlier: 'As it is impossible to saile the ocean without a compasse, unless at randome; so likewise to attaine a language without rules'.[81] But whereas in Torriano grammar is the compass that guides through the ocean of language, for Baretti grammar is the perilous sea of minuteness that can 'frighten' learners and painfully slow down their progress: a useful instrument for Torriano, a counterproductive obstinacy for Baretti. Vocabulary, not grammar, is the foundation of language, as Buonmattei stresses:

> E che domine chiamate voi il buon fondamento di una lingua, padre Manuello Alvaro spettabilissimo? la grammatica? Padre no. I più triti vocaboli e le più comunali frasi a casa mia sono il fondamento d'ogni lingua, e non la grammatica. [...] Il voler apparare una lingua senz'avere innanzi tratto qualche provvisione di parole e di modi di dire, opra da mentecatto più che savio sarebbe.[82]

This is not to say that a learner should or could dispense with grammar learning altogether. On the contrary, but it needs to be learnt at the right stages and in the right doses: first the basics, without too many exceptions, then reading and acquiring vocabulary and phrases, and only *then*, can the learner advance his/her grammatical knowledge with profit:

> quando quello straniero avrà quella qualche provvisione, legga e rilegga e faccia studio sulla grammatica; avvegnaché la grammatica debba servire a lui come la calce a' muratori, onde legare insieme le pietre e i mattoni, che sono a mio intendere i primi grossi materiali d'una lingua.[83]

Grammar is the cement that glues words together, but the core of a language consists of words and phrases. In Baretti's view, to begin learning a language by focussing on grammar in too much detail, would be a gross pedagogical error leading to slow, difficult and disheartening progress. By way of reinforcing the notion of grammar as a punitive subject for the mind, the part of Elysian Fields in which the grammarians reside and in which the oneiric debate between Alvaro and Buonmattei is taking place, is 'un luogo non molto ameno' with 'durissimi sassi', 'senz'erba', overshadowed by 'rupi scoscese e ricoperte di freddissima neve', with leafless trees whose scarce fruits are 'di scorza molto dura, amari al gusto e di difficile digestione'.[84] For Baretti, the realm of pure grammar, even in a mythical afterlife, does not look very attractive. It is only when grammar is viewed and studied not as an end in itself, but as a means for the ever better communication and understanding of written literary texts that grammar serves its purpose: not as a tyrant, but as a tool.

---

[1] On Italian language learning in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, see Spartaco Gamberini, *Lo studio dell'italiano in Inghilterra nel '500 e nel '600* (Messina-Florence: Casa Editrice G. D'Anna, 1970); Jason Lawrence, *'Who the Devil Taught Thee so Much Italian?' Italian Language Learning and Literary Imitation in Early Modern England* (Manchester-New York: Manchester University Press, 2011); Brian Richardson, '"Varie maniere di parlare": Aspects of Learning Italian in Renaissance Italy and Britain', in *Ciò che potea la lingua nostra. Lectures and Essays in Memory of Clara Florio Cooper*, ed. by Vilma De Gasperin, *The Italianist*, Special Supplement, 30 (2010), 78–94; Michael Wyatt, 'Language

Lessons', in *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England: A Cultural Politics of Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 157–202.

[2] Ferdinando Altieri, 'To the Reader', in *Dizionario Italiano ed Inglese: A Dictionary Italian and English Containing All the Words of the Vocabulary della Crusca and Several Hundred More Taken from the Most Approved Authors; with Proverbs and Familiar Phrases. To Which Is Prefix'd a Table of the Authors Quoted in This Work*, 2 vols (London: William and John Innys, 1726), I, ff. a4 r–b2 v.

[3] Evangelista Palermo, *A Grammar of the Italian Language. In Two Parts* (London: [Andrew] Millar in the Strand, 1755), p. x.

[4] As Lacy Collison-Morley writes: 'At that time Italian was widely known in England. Cultivated men like Gray, Walpole, and Johnson had learnt it thoroughly, and it was an important part of the education of the young girls of the day. The popularity of Italian opera encouraged its study' (Lacy Collison-Morley, *Giuseppe Baretti and His Friends* (London: John Murray, 1909), p. 78).

[5] 'The Translator's Preface' to [Claude Lancelot] *A New Method of Learning the Italian Tongue. Translated from the French of Messieurs de Port-Royal* [...] *By an Italian Master* (London: John Nourse, 1750), ff. A3 r–A6 r.

[6] Rosemary Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour: The British in Italy, c. 1690–1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 7–10.

[7] See Lucilla Pizzoli, *Le grammatiche di italiano per inglesi (1550–1776)* (Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 2004).

[8] Palermo, 'The Preface', in *A Grammar of the Italian Language* (London: Andrew Millar in the Strand, 1755), pp. v–x (p. viii).

[9] Palermo states that knowledge of French in learners 'has been the reason of my omitting the explication of the grammatical terms, as also the useless repetition of rules in Syntax, because the Italian (which may properly be said to be between the two languages named above, though derived from the former) has too great an affinity with them in respect to concordance and government' (Palermo, p. viii).

[10] William Thomas, *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer, with a Dictionarie for the Better Understandynge of Boccace, Petrarcha, and Dante* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1550).

[11] These include Claude Holyband, *The Pretie and Wittie Historie of Arnalt & Lucenda: with Certen Rules* (London: Thomas Purfoote, 1575); John Florio, *Necessarie Rules and Short Observations for the True Pronouncing and Speedie Learning of the Italian Tongue* (with separate title page), in *Queen Anna's New World of Words, or Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues* (London: Melchisedec Bradwood, for Edward Blount and William Barret, 1611), pp. 615–90; Giovanni Torriano, *New and Easie Directions for Attaining the Thuscan*

Italian Tongue. Comprehended in Necessary Rules (London: Richard Oulton for Ralph Mab, 1639); Angelo Maria Cori, *A New Method for the Italian Tongue* [...] *In the First Are All the Rules* (London: George James, 1723); François Cheneau, *The Italian Master; Or, Rules for the Italian Tongue* (London: Joseph Pote for James Hodges and John and James Rivington, 1754); David Francesco Lates, *A New Method of Easily Attaining the Italian Tongue,* [...] *Enlarged with Many Rules Necessary to Be Known* (London: printed for the author,1762); Giovanni Veneroni [Jean Vigneron], *The Complete Italian Master; Containing the Best and Easiest Rules* (London: John Nourse, 1763 and 1772).

[12] Henry Granthan, *An Italian Grammer Written in Latin by Scipione Lentulo a Neapolitane* (London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1575); John Sanford, *A Grammer or Introduction to the Italian Tongue* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1605); Giovanni Torriano, *The Italian Tutor or a New and Most Compleat Italian Grammer* (London: Thomas Paine, 1640); Thomas Uvedale, *The New Italian Grammar: or, the Easiest and Best Method for Attaining that Language* (London: Robert Bonwick (and others), 1711); Arrigo Pleunus, *A New, Plain, Methodical and Compleat Italian Grammar, Whereby You May Very Soon Attain to the Perfection of the Italian Tongue* (Leghorn: James Valfisi, 1702); John Barton, *A New Italian Grammar: or, a Guide to the Italian tongue* (London: Daniel Brown, 1719); John Henley, *A Grammar of the Italian Tongue, For the Month of September, 1719. Numb. 2 of The Complete Linguist, or an Universal Grammar of all Considerable Tongues in Being* (London: John Robert and John Pemberton, 1719); Evangelista Palermo, *A Grammar of the Italian Language* (London: Andrew Millar, 1755); Ferdinando Altieri, *A New Italian Grammar, Which Contains a True and Easy Method for Acquiring this Language. With Many Useful Remarks, Which Are Not To Be Found in Any Other Grammar of This Kind* (Venice: Giovan Battista Pasquali, 1736; Altieri's grammar was reprinted in Venice in 1753 and 1765, in London in 1728, and in Leghorn in 1756; see Pizzoli, p. 403); Giuseppe Baretti, *A Grammar of the Italian Tongue*, prefixed to *Dizionario delle lingue italiana ed inglese* [...]. *Più di dieci mila Vocaboli si sono aggiunti che l'Altieri aveva lasciati fuora. Questa edizione contiene una Grammatica della* [sic] *due Lingue*, 2 vols (London: Charles Hitch at al., 1760), II, i–xxxix; Francesco Sastres, *An Introduction to Italian Grammar* (Bristol: Bonner and Middleton, 1775).

[13] George Arthur Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500–1700: The Latin Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 16.

[14] *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca* (Venice: Giovanni Alberti, 1612), p. 398.

[15] Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words*, p. 217.

[16] Samuel Johnson, 'A Grammar of the English Tongue', in *A Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols (London: William Strahan for James Knapton (and others), 1755), I, ff. a1 r–d1 r (f. a1 r).

[17] Thomas, 'To the occasion', prefacing *Principal Rules*, f. π2 v.

[18] John Florio, *Florio His Firste Fruites, Which Yeelde Familiar Speech, Merie Proverbs, Wittie Sentences, and Golden Sayings. Also a Perfect Induction to the Italian, and English Tongues, as in the Tables Appeareth. The Like Heretofore, Never by Any Man Published* ([n.p.]: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Woodcocke, 1578), p. 105.

[19] Altieri, *A New Italian Grammar*, p. 3.

[20] Ibid., p. 120.

[21] Palermo, pp. vii and ix.

[22] Baretti, *A Grammar of the Italian Tongue*, p. xiii.

[23] Giuseppe Baretti, *Lettere familiari a' suoi tre fratelli Filippo, Giovanni e Amedeo*, ed. by Luigi Piccioni (Turin: Società Subalpina Editrice, 1941).

[24] Joseph Baretti, *A Journey from London to Genoa through England, Portugal, Spain, and France*, 4 vols (London: Thomas Davies and Lockyer Davies, 1770).

[25] For an overview of Baretti's language learning works, see Vilma De Gasperin, 'Giuseppe Baretti's Multifarious Approach for Learning Italian in 18th-Century Britain', in *The History of Language Learning and Teaching: Part 1: 16th–18th Century Europe*, ed. by Nicola McLelland and Richard Smith (Leeds: Maney Publishing, 2016, forthcoming).

[26] Baretti, *A Grammar of the Italian Tongue*, prefixed to *Dizionario delle lingue italiana ed inglese di Giuseppe Baretti. Più di dieci mila Vocaboli si sono aggiunti che l'Altieri aveva lasciati fuora. Questa edizione contiene una Grammatica della* [sic] *due Lingue*, 2 vols (London: Charles Hitch (and others), 1760), II, i–xxxix. All quotations from this edition.

[27] Giuseppe Baretti, *A Grammar of the Italian Language, with a Copious Praxis of Moral Sentences. To Which Is Added an English Grammar for the Use of the Italians* (London: Charles Hitch at al., 1762).

[28] Giuseppe Baretti, 'The Preface', in *A Dictionary of the English and Italian Languages*, I, 3–5.

[29] *A New Method of Learning the Italian Tongue. Translated from the French of Messieurs de Port-Royal* was a translation of the *Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre facilement et en peu de temps la langue Italienne* (Paris: Pierre Le Petit, 1660).

[30] The first translation was Uvedale, *The New Italian Grammar*. Subsequently, there were eleven more editions of the English translation. See Pizzoli, pp. 99–101 and 398–99.

[31] Baretti, 'The Preface', p. 4.

[32] Ibid., p. 5.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. vii.

[35] Baretti, 'The Preface', p. 5.

[36] Giuseppe Baretti, *Scelta di lettere familiari fatta per uso degli studiosi di lingua italiana*, 2 vols (London: John Nourse, 1779), I, p.180.

[37] Baretti, 'The Preface', p. 5.

[38] Palermo, p. vi.

[39] Baretti, 'The Preface', p. 5.

[40] Benedetto Buonmattei, *Introduzione alla lingua toscana* (Venice: Giovanni Salis, 1626); later *Della lingua toscana* (Florence: Zanobi Pignoni, 1643).

[41] Simone Fornara, *Breve storia della grammatica italiana* (Rome: Carocci, 2015), p. 66.

[42] Pizzoli, p. 122.

[43] Elisabeth H. Thorne, 'Italian Teachers and Teaching in Eighteenth-Century England', *English Miscellany: A Symposium of History, Literature and the Arts*, 9 (1958), 143–62 (p. 149).

[44] 'The best Italian writers have been consulted, as Corso, Dolce, Ruscelli, Pergamini, and particularly that excellent grammarian Buonmattei', in 'The Translator's preface', [Lancelot], *Port Royal*, f. A5 v.

[45] 'I have selected the famous *Buonmattei* and *Gigli*, both public Professors of the *Tuscan* Language' (Palermo, 'The Preface', p. v).

[46] Girolamo Gigli, *Regole per la Toscana Favella* (Rome: Antonio de' Rossi, 1721); Domenico Maria Manni, *Lezioni di Lingua Toscana* (Florence: Pietro Gaetano Viviani, 1737); Salvatore Corticelli, *Regole ed osservazioni della lingua toscana ridotte a metodo per uso del Seminario di Bologna* (Bologna: Lelio Dalla Volpe, 1745).

[47] James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnsons*, ed. by David Womersley, 2nd edn (London: Penguin, 2008), p. 164. The influence of Johnson on Baretti is explored in Catharina Johanna M. Lubbers-Van Der Brugge, *Johnson and Baretti: Some Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Literary Life in England and Italy* (Gröningen: Wolters, 1951).

[48] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. 1.

[49] Baretti, 'Preface', p. 4.

[50] 'La critica più frequente è quella alla sovrabbondanza di regole che rende noioso e inutilmente faticoso lo studio della lingua' (Pizzoli, p. 96).

[51] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. i.

[52] Altieri, *Grammar*, p. 3.

[53] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. ii.

[54] Altieri, *Grammar*, p. 4.

[55] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. ii.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid., p. iii.

[59] Ibid.

[60] See on this Gerhard Rohlfs, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Fonologia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1966), p. 256: 'Già nei testi italiani antichi le forme senza la *i* prostetica sono in numero prevalente: Dante fa uso della *i* molto raramente, di regola allo scopo di ottenere il numero di sillabe necessario [...]. Altri scrittori, anche di epoca più tarda, mostrano una predilezione per la *i*'.

[61] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. iv.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Girolamo Gigli (1660–1722) was the author of *Regole per la toscana favella* (Rome: Antonio de Rossi, 1721) and *Lezioni di lingua toscana* (Venice: Bartolomeo Giavarina, 1722). He had the Chair of 'toscana favella' for foreigners in Siena (see Claudio Marazzini, 'Grammatica e scuola dal XVI al XIX secolo', in *Norma e lingua in Italia: alcune riflessioni fra passato e presente*, ed. by Luigi Amerio (Milan: Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, 1997), pp. 7–27 (pp. 10–11)). Paolo Rolli (1687–1765) was a poet and melodramatist. He lived in London for 18 years, where he was tutor to the children of George II. He wrote a short language manual called *D'Avverbj, particelle, preposizioni e di frasi avverbiali libretto. Utilissimo a Gl'inglesi amatori della lingua Italiana* (London: John Chrichley, 1741), a 36-page list of useful adverbial expressions, presented in alphabetical order in a central column, with Italian synonyms on the left and the English translation on the right, but he does not discuss pronunciation.

[64] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. iv.

[65] Ibid., p. v.

[66] Ibid., p. vii.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid., p. viii.

[70] Gerhard Rohlfs, *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. Morfologia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1967), p. 45.

[71] Buonmattei, *Introduzione*, p. 142.

[72] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. xiii.

[73] Ibid., p. xiii.

[74] Ibid., p. xxvii.

[75] Giuseppe Baretti, *Easy Phraseology for the Use of Young Ladies, Who Intend to Learn the Colloquial Part of the Italian Language* (London: George Robinson and Thomas Cadell, 1775), p. 1.

[76] Ibid., p. 2.

[77] Baretti, *Grammar*, p. vii.

[78] Giuseppe Baretti, *La Frusta Letteraria,* ed. by Luigi Piccioni (Bari: Giuseppe Laterza & Figli, 1932), p. 269.

[79] Ibid..

[80] Ibid., pp. 269–70.

[81] Torriano, *New and Easie Directions*, p. 1.

[82] Baretti, *Frusta*, p. 270.

[83] Ibid.