

Torquato Tasso's *Rime d'amore*

Text, Variants, Bibliography

Diego Perotti

ABSTRACT

This essay examines the editorial tradition of Torquato Tasso's *Rime d'amore* (love lyrics). Beginning with a general overview of the manuscript and printed traditions, the various stages in which the textual history of the edition has been divided by the Edizione Nazionale delle opere di Torquato Tasso (National Edition of Torquato Tasso's Literary Works) will be analyzed, with special attention devoted to issues of authorial revision and structural rearrangement. After clarifying some crucial points concerning Tasso's final intention, especially by means of his own letters from the periods in question, an alternative solution to the critical edition of Tasso's *Rime* will be proposed.

ONE OF THE EDITORIAL ISSUES WITH WHICH TWENTIETH-CENTURY Italian textual criticism has faced has been the critical edition of Torquato Tasso *Rime* (Lyric Poetry). As Tasso's lyric production is the richest within Italian literature — one thousand seven hundred eight texts, part of them witnessed in autograph and annotated copies as well as supervised editions (MARTIGNONE 2004; CASTELLOZZI 2013) — it follows that the complex editorial history of the *Rime*, reconstructed through a philological debate that lasted almost a century, is still for some of its crucial parts far from resolved. The most recent critical edition of the *Rime* is included within the project *Edizione Nazionale delle opere di Torquato Tasso* (National Edition of Torquato Tasso's literary work, hereafter EN), for which eight volumes are to be published; as per scholarly norms, the witnesses have been organized according to a system established by Angelo Solerti in his nineteenth-century edition (SOLERTI 1898–1902), whereby letters are used to indicate manuscripts and annotated copies, while numbers represent printed editions:

- The complex evolution of the so-called *Rime d'amore* (love lyrics) will be represented by two volumes, the first reproduces the text of Tasso's autograph owned by the Vatican Library, MS Chigiano I viii

302, and dated 1583–1585 (hereafter C). The latter volume is based on the 1591 edition of Torquato Tasso's lyrics: *Rime d'amore con l'esposizione dello stesso autore*, Mantua: Osanna (85).¹

- A third volume reproduces the 1593 edition of Torquato Tasso, *Delle Rime del Sig. Torquato Tasso, parte seconda*. Brescia: Marchetti (87), the author's selection of *Rime encomiastiche* (encomiastic poems).
- A fourth volume reproduces the manuscript Vaticano Latino 10980 (V). Owned by the Vatican library, it is a seventeenth-century codex copied by Marcantonio Foppa (1603–1673) directly from a Tasso holograph that is now lost but datable approximately to 1589–1590; it contains additional encomiastic poems, plus a small group of *Rime sacre* (holy poems).²

These four volumes are to be followed by three appendices reproducing draft manuscripts or editorial initiatives partially attributable to the author:

- 1567. *Rime degli accademici eterei*. Venezia: Comin da Trino (4), the earliest collection of Tasso's poems, included within an anthology of poets associated with the *Accademia degli Eterei* (a literary academy in Padova).³
- ca. 1580. A composite songbook formed by two codices, owned respectively by the Biblioteca Comunale of Ferrara, ii.473 (F1); and Paris, unknown location/shelf mark (its description has been possible thanks to a reproduction found in a private collection, Pt).⁴

1. These two volumes have already been published. See GAVAZZENI-MARTIGNONE 2004; DE MALDÉ 2016. For seminal contributions on the *Rime d'amore*, see CARETTI 1950; MARTIGNONE 1990b; MARTIGNONE 1990a; MARTIGNONE 1995; COLUSSI 1998; and MARTIGNONE 2002.

2. The hypothesis advanced by Luigi Poma is that V's autograph was directly taken from a manuscript of encomiastic and sacred poems, autograph or with the value of an autograph. See SANTARELLI 1974; POMA 1979. To V is added the manuscript owned by the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milano, F.201 inf. (A4). This manuscript constitutes an initial phase of Tasso's religious songbook, which was subsequently rejected. See CASTELLOZZI 2008–2010.

3. For the main contributions on the *Rime degli Accademici eterei*, see CARETTI 1949; CARETTI 1990; ZACCARELLO 1991; GAVAZZENI 2003a; PESTARINO 2013.

4. See RANZANI 2003.

- Two additional manuscripts found in the Biblioteca estense in Modena, MS It. 385 =a.V.7.8, and It. 379a =a.V.7.2, respectively dated 1585 and 1587 (E1–E2).⁵

Finally, all remaining poems, unrelated to any authorial arrangement, are labeled by the editors *Rime sparse* or *stravaganti* (scattered lyrics) and left to a section further divided into several volumes, yet to be clearly planned.⁶

The Editorial History

The five phases in which EN is structured have been identified thanks to a philological debate that over the years has involved fundamental contributions from scholars such as Angelo Solerti, Lanfranco Caretti, Luigi Poma, and Dante Isella.⁷ Their work has been crucial for the subsequent stages of the philological and critical discourse on Tasso's *Rime*, which brought studies of Tasso's lyrics to their current state. From the infancy of Romance philology the approach has been traditional — especially in Italy — that consists of an author-centered editorial method. In Tasso's case this method has meant paying close attention to the poet's clearly defined insistence on revising and reorganizing his lyrics, a penchant that is expressed in his letter to the Venetian typographer Giovanni Giolito (1554–1591), dated 6 May 1591:

Desidero che tutte l'opere mie siano ristampate; e più volentieri in cote-
sta che in alcun'altra città: ma molte cause mi impediscono il venirvi; fra
le quali è principalissima la povertà: laonde io sarò costretto a rimanere
co' principalissimi poveri. Spero di pubblicare alcuna parte de' l'opere
mie o in Mantova o in Bergamo: ma non posso con tutto ciò soddisfarmi
nè degli altri nè di me stesso. Voi, signor mio, potete compiacermi, e
come io credo, senza vostro danno; facendo ristampare tutte le com-
posizioni particolarmente, che usciranno dalle mie mani in tre volumi

5. See BARCO 1983; MILITE 1990; MILITE 1987–1988.
6. Called “extravagant” and “scattered” precisely because of their heterogeneous and foreign nature to Tasso's authorial arrangement. See MARTIGNONE 1999.
7. The *Rime* have been widely debated in an extensive bibliography, spanning centuries; see SERASSI 1790; GUASTI 1853–1855 (hereafter, referring to the number of the letter within the edition, to be quoted by volume number); SOLERTI 1895; SPONGANO 1949; CARETTI 1973; DE MALDÉ 1984; GAVAZZENI-MARTIGNONE 1997; BAGLIANI 2003; DE MALDÉ 1999; GAVAZZENI 2002; GAVAZZENI 2004; GAVAZZENI 2003a; GAVAZZENI-MARTIGNONE 2006.

separati, com'io aveva disegnato; ed in altrettanti le prose. Sia eccettuata da questo numero la mia Gerusalemme, la quale non vuole compagnia. Nel primo volume de le poesie vorrei che si pubblicassero gli Amori; nel secondo, le Laudi e gli Encomi de' principi e de le donne illustri; nel terzo le cose sacre, o almeno in laude de' prelati.

(GUASTI 1853–1855, V: N. 1335)

Tasso expressed a clear intention to divide his lyric production into three parts, corresponding to three different themes: *Amori* (love), *Laudi* (praise/eulogy) and *Sacre* (religion).⁸ This letter has been considered the arrival point of a long review process started in 1581, while Tasso was imprisoned at Sant'Anna asylum (in Ferrara, now Emilia-Romagna). From his cell, he voiced for the very first time his desire to order his lyrics through a letter addressed to the cardinal Scipione Gonzaga (1542–1593):⁹

Per molte cagioni io non ho fretta de la stampa, e particolarmente perché io desidero fare una scelta delle mie rime, e di ridur l'altre cose a quella perfezione ch'io desiderava.

(GUASTI 1853–1855, II: n. 135)

More in detail, he wanted to revise and select his texts before giving them to the Venetian typographer Aldo Manuzio Jr. (1547–1597), who in the meantime was preparing his edition of the *Rime*.¹⁰ Tasso attempted to oppose Manuzio through the aforementioned letter, hinting for a reorganization and arrangement of his lyrics and *cose* (“prose writings”), which is a considerable event since he had before never felt such a need: significantly, his previous lyric production (1560s and 1570s) is witnessed only by manuscript miscellanies (except for the already mentioned collection *Rime*

8. The issue of Tasso's own publication program, repeatedly taken up and rearranged by the author from 1580 on, led to the formulation of two editorial projects outlined by Lanfranco Caretti and Raffaele Spongano, respectively, both abandoned in subsequent scholarship on Tasso (see SPONGANO 1949; CARETTI 1973). A unanimously accepted editorial method was then provided by POMA 1979, 8–16.

9. Tasso was detained from March 1579 to July 1586. For the history of his imprisonment, see VISSER TRAVAGLI 1999; BADESI 2004; JOSSA 2003; REDDAVIDE 2005.

10. Tasso complained to Curzio Ardizio as well about Manuzio's edition, see GUASTI 1853–1855, II: n. 205.

degli Accademici Etere).¹¹ Nevertheless, Manuzio began to publish a string of unauthorized editions, which proved deeply frustrating for Tasso, who developed strong intolerance toward typographers, worsening with time. Here is a shortlist of these printed editions, published against the author's own will or, at best, without his consent:¹²

- Venezia: Aldo Manuzio il Giovane. 1581–1582. *Rime* First and Second part; 1585. *Aggiunta* (Addendum);
- Ferrara: Vittorio Baldini. 1582. *Rime* First and Second part; 1587. *Rimanenti* (“remaining [poems]”);
- Ferrara: Mammarelli and Cagnacini brothers. 1582. *Rime* First and Second part; 1585. *Rime* Third part; 1586. *Aggiunte*;
- Mantova: Francesco Osanna. 1582. *Rime* First and Second part; 1585. *Aggiunte*;
- Ferrara: Giulio Vasalini. 1583. *Rime* first, second and third part; 1586. Fourth part; 1589. *Rime Nove* (New Poems);
- Genova: Antonio Orero. 1586. *Rime* Fourth and Fifth part;
- Milano: Pietro Tini. 1586. *Rime* Fourth part;
- Venezia: Giacomo Bericchia. 1589. (no parts indicated).¹³

In an attempt to reorganize his lyrics, Tasso started with his *Rime d'amore*: aiming for an authorial edition, he annotated two copies of the Vittorio Baldini (First part, 11) and Giulio Vasalini (Third part, 22) editions (see above). Luckily, both of Tasso's annotated copies are preserved, kept respectively in Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana library, S. P. 22. (Ts1) and Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, Aut. 1. 24 (Ts2). The former is bound with a partial manuscript kept in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana under the same shelf mark (Ar): this important witness contains authorial variants to the texts of Baldini's edition witnessed by a sixteenth-century transcription by Marcantonio Foppa, taken from a lost copy annotated by Orazio Ariosto. All three have been used in preparation of Tasso's autograph collection of

11. One exception is found in two printed anthologies that reproduce many texts; see ATANAGI 1565; SAMMARCO 1568.
12. For a detailed physical description refer to MARTIGNONE 2004; for the chronology and full titles of the end-of-the-sixteenth-century editions, see CASTELLOZZI 2013, 98.
13. The editions reported here refer to the printed works that contain only the *Rime*. Other lyrics have been published in various anthologies. See CASTELLOZZI 2013, 91–96.

his love lyrics (C). In their *Note al testo* for the critical edition of C, Franco Gavazzeni and Vercingetorige Martignone identified the project based on Ts1-Ts2 and C together with the one suggested by a letter sent to Angelo Grillo, dated 7 July 1584 (GAVAZZENI-MARTIGNONE 2004, xiv):

E perciocchè le sue laudi si stendono ancora a le mie composizioni, ne la qual parte con minor vergogna io sostegno che mi siano date, le avrei mandati que' cinque libri de le mie Rime [. . .]. Fra tanto si contenti di non dare ad alcuno stampatore quei pochi sonetti i quali ha de' miei, perché potrebbe facilmente avvenire che si vedessero migliorati. (GUASTI 1853–1855, II: n. 293)

As the letter suggests, Tasso wanted to assemble the whole of his lyric collection into five books. Martignone and Gavazzeni locate further evidence of this multi-book project in another letter sent to Scipione Gonzaga, dated 15 October 1584:

Non solo io lodo, ma volentieri accetto il suo consiglio intorno a la pubblicazione de l'opere mie [. . .]. E s'io dovessi eleggere, eleggerei il Giolito o 'l Manuccio, che sono i migliori del al tempo nostro esercitino questa non meno utile che onorata professione [. . .]. Ora le mando il primo e l'ultimo volume: le manderò poi quel di mezzo, che non ho per ancora corretto né riveduto: e tutti credo c'avranno bisogno di molto maggior diligenza, di quella ch'io v'abbia potuta usare.

(GUASTI 1853–1855, II: n. 306)

In the letter, Tasso suggests three volumes in which he collected all his lyrics, two of which he sent to Scipione Gonzaga for his revisions. Dante Isella identified these volumes with Ts1 and Ts2. Nonetheless, Martignone and Gavazzeni proposed that these manuscripts actually document a dubious order in the texts, and it appears that not all corrections are in Tasso's hand: hence, the suggestion that those manuscripts were made for private use rather than for typographers, as the letter to Gonzaga seems to indicate (GAVAZZENI-MARTIGNONE 2004, xv–xvi). Accordingly, the two scholars' hypothesis is that the first volume mentioned by Tasso could be an exemplar of C, the second one would represent a reordering of the materials, the third would contain a collection of encomiastic lyrics, which were then transcribed into manuscripts E1 and E2.

A turning point in Tasso's whole editorial project came with his letter to the abbot Cristoforo Tasso about his own autograph manuscript C:

Non rifiuto però l'offerta che Vostra Signoria mi fa, di spender la sua autorità co 'l reverendo Licino; perch'egli non ha voluto né compiacermi né soddisfarmi in questo negozio de le mia scritte e de' libri: e forse il farà per rispetto di Vostra Signoria. La copia ch'egli fa de le mie rime, non è necessaria; e non mi servirebbe in quel modo che egli la fa. (GUASTI 1853–1855, III: n. 711)

The poet asks the abbot for help in order to pressure Giovan Battista Licino and force him to return C (which Licino was copying in the meantime, presumably for the typographers). C was eventually delivered to Tasso in the summer 1586, as we can read in the following letter addressed to Licino:

Ebbi il libro de le rime e ringrazio Vostra Signoria che al fine abbia cominciato a ricordarsi di me. Le mutazioni che io potrei fare in queste rime non saranno così poche, che Vostra Signoria dovesse ancora farle ricopiare; oltre che l'ordine non mi piace: però ha durato, o fatto durare, questa fatica indarno. Io finirò assai tosto di rivederle e di ricorreggerle: fra tanto avrei avuto bisogno di quelle prose che sono in sua man[o]. (GUASTI 1853–1855, III: n. 713)

Tasso wanted C back because he changed his mind, thus claiming that the copy taken from the codex was no longer necessary: he would have changed many parts of the original projects and, in addition, shuffled the poems' order. Isella assumed this statement could represent a rejection of C together with its editorial purpose: according to him, letters between the years 1587–1591 — although marked by Tasso's usual hesitations and oscillations — bear witness to a new publishing project (see GAVAZZENI — ISELLA 1973, 241–91, 294–343). Indeed, on 5 May 1587 Tasso wrote to his friend Antonio Costantini informing him that he had composed new poems collected in a “very large” book, although his reference to a new arrangement is indirect and allusive (GUASTI 1853–1855, III: n. 808). According to Isella, the new multi-volume, topic-oriented editorial project takes shape only at the beginning of 1588, with a letter dated 30 January and addressed to Ciro Spontone (1552–1613), in which Tasso claims he wants to produce a definitive and authoritative edition of his lyrics:

Io pensava di raccogliere tutte le mie cose, e di stamparlo insieme; perch'essendo divise in tante piccole e minute parti, agevolmente si pos-

sono smarrire: ma io ho tolerato lungo tempo questa noia. Laonde non posso negare a Vostra Signoria quel che non ho negato ad alcuno.

(GUASTI 1853–1855, IV: n. 955)

Later the same month, Tasso asked Licino to return to his possession the three volumes of lyrics (entrusted to him via Luca Scalabrino in 1585); the poet's request was fulfilled between July and August 1588 (GUASTI 1853–1855, III: n. 614, 658; IV: n. 973–974). At this point, Tasso was ready for the final reorganization of his *Rime*, having recovered and gathered all relevant material. In a letter sent to Giovan Battista Manso (1588), Tasso points out that the poems he collected and reordered are divided into many books and copied into three large volumes, of which he has only the first one, while others are in the hands of his patron Matteo di Capua and are ready to be transcribed.¹⁴

However, a few years later in 1589 such a detailed plan has already been set aside: writing to Costantini, Tasso notes that his poems are «copied for the most part» and that he would like to “publish them separately in a beautiful print, in-folio or at least quarto”, into “three volumes of love poems, eulogies, and spiritual compositions”, mirroring — albeit incompletely — the three books of prose works named *Lettere*, *Dialoghi* and *Discorsi* (GUASTI 1853–1855, IV: n. 1183). Eventually, on 6 May 1591 Tasso wrote to both Licino and Giolito, mentioning «four great volumes» to the former and «three separate volumes» to the latter: at the end of this contradicting history, we therefore must resort to the letter from which we started, although seemingly in contrast with the one to Licino sent exactly on the same day.

Francesco Osanna's Mantova edition — 85 in the tradition, the first of the volumes authorized by Tasso — is dedicated to Vincenzo Gonzaga and dated 1 November 1591; the typographer sent five exemplars to Tasso — who was in Rome — immediately before 5 December 1591. Soon after Tasso started to complain about the outcome: by 18 July 1592 he prepared

14. We also know that to this date Tasso was at the same time working on the codex Vaticano Ottoboniano Latino 2229, labeled V1 (a mutilated apograph with authorial corrections, divided into books and dated 1587–1589) and on a songbook dedicated to Matteo di Capua, which soon became a workbook identified with the manuscript now found in Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale, Banco Rari 212 (P1). Luigi Poma recognized V1 as the direct ancestor of Pietro Maria Marchetti's edition (1593). See GUASTI 1853–1855, IV: n. 995.

two corrected copies of 85, commonly identified with the ones kept in Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica Angelo Mai, Tassiana L. 4. 2 (Ber) and Milano, Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, AB 11 34 (Mi; GUASTI 1853–1855, V: n. 1406).¹⁵ Following ongoing complaints addressed to Francesco Osanna, to whom Tasso had insisted on an amended reprint of the first part, the typographer Pietro Maria Marchetti in Brescia prepared the reprint (86). On 28 August 1592 Marchetti sent Tasso a few copies, which were immediately rejected by the author (GUASTI 1853–1855, V: n. 1418). Tasso then resumed his corrections for the volume, as we can read in his letter to Orazio Feltro (16 June 1593). Marchetti's *Seconda parte* (now indicated as 87) — which was, according to Solerti, annotated by Tasso in a copy that subsequently went missing, Ts4 (GUASTI 1853–1855, V: n. 1647) — was the last edition supervised directly by the author: shortly thereafter, the poet died in Rome 25 April 1595.

Editorial consequences of the abandoned project

In order to better define the project's research aims, I shall focus on the *Rime d'amore*, which have been recently edited by Vania De Maldé (2016) and briefly summarize what was set out above. Tasso published the first part of his lyrics in Mantua, 1591 (85); C documents the genealogy of 85, while Ber + Mi are Tasso's own revisions annotated on two exemplars of 85 in view of a subsequent (amended) edition; eventually, a revised publication of 85 was produced in Brescia by the typographer Pietro Maria Marchetti in 1592 (now indicated as 86), but was again immediately rejected by Tasso. Thus, this complex textual profile features almost all the different scenarios with which the Italian methodological tradition of *filologia d'autore* (the study and edition of authorial drafts [see ISELLA 1987 and 2007]): an autograph manuscript, an author's edition, two annotated copies for an additional edition, and the new edition itself. Thus, we must ask: which text for which edition?

First and foremost, let's consider the history of the *Rime* as reconstructed for the Edizione nazionale (EN). The first debatable assumption concerns the identification of two distinct moments of the poet's authorial intention: on the one side the production of C, on the other 85 and 86. C and 85 share ninety-one texts; De Maldé (2016) demonstrates how 85 mostly coincides

15. Generally, the typographies of the time reserved the incorrect copies to the authors, while the correct ones for distribution. See ASCARELLI-MENATO 1989; DE MALDÉ 1981–1983; DE MALDÉ 1978.

with C's latest versions, although there are readings seemingly derived from the Baldini edition (11): such circumstances lead De Maldé to suppose that, before sending C to Licino, Tasso annotated some of his latest variants in a copy of 11. Furthermore, the scholar argues that the most striking innovation of 85, in comparison with C, consists in the dislocation, at the end of the collection, of five poems found in the first book of C (III, XLIII, LXIV, LXV, LXIX, CLIV, CLXXV, CLIX, CLVIII, CXLVIII); symmetrically, six poems from the final part of C are shifted to the initial part of 85: CV, CVIII, CXXVII, CXXXVII, CXLVII, CLIII, XLIII, LXXXVI, LXXIX, LXXXIII, LIX, XV (DE MALDÉ 2016, xli–xlii). All in all, only eighteen of the ninety-one texts shared by C and 85 have slight discrepancies, while the remaining seventy-three prove the substantial coincidence — often highlighted by scholars — of 85 and the final redaction of C (DE MALDÉ 2016, xlii).¹⁶ Finally, De Maldé suggests that such discrepancies may be motivated by lost authorial papers, in which Tasso would have annotated readings that widened the gap between the final stage of C and 85.

The conjectures proposed by De Maldé are difficult to demonstrate and seemingly uneconomical; the most significant aspect is the direct dependence of 85 on C for the majority of its texts: either from loose leaves, or from C itself, the genetic relation between C and 85 is confirmed. Besides, it is not possible to exclude — on the grounds of extant contemporary letters — that Tasso could have direct access to C at that stage. Let's consider the treatment of madrigals within Tasso's lyric project. Since C collected love poems, it makes sense that the author initially decided to include madrigals within his songbook: not only was it the “innovative” prosodic genre of the sixteenth century — Tasso was himself one of the most prominent madrigalists of his day — but it was also suitable, no less than the sonnet, to express love poetry. 85 contains sixteen madrigals (one in common with C), while C has thirty-five (eighteen unpublished).¹⁷ With the exception of four ballate (two unedited) and six songs (one unedited), the remaining 111 compositions witnessed in C are sonnets, almost entirely derived from 11 and 22: ninety-three from the former (of which fifty-six are annotated in Ts1) and twenty from the latter (of which seventeen are annotated in Ts2). Such context makes it clear that a paramount change in the passage

16. The poems that have significant variants in 85 are: XXI, LVIII, LIX, XC, XCI, XCV, CXXIX, CXXX, CXXXVI, CXLI, CXLII, CXLV, CXLVI, CLIV, CLV, LXIII, CXLVII, LII.

17. C is divided into two books: respectively, the first book: I–LXXXI; the second book: LXXXII–CLVI.

from C to 85 was the total rejection of the madrigals contained in C, of which twenty texts were eliminated,¹⁸ while fifteen were retained (but later rejected in 85).¹⁹ Although interspersed with new poems, we find these excluded texts in a section of E1 entitled *De le rime irregolari /del Sig[no] r Torq[ua]to Tasso libro sesto* (“sixth book of ‘irregular’ lyrics by Torquato Tasso”), following the same sequence as C (the only exception being the rejected madrigal *Donna nel mio ritorno*).²⁰ This fact implies that Tasso removed some madrigals in order to publish them later, perhaps even copying them directly from C to E1 later in 1585–1587.

Therefore, the idea that the project represented by C was “abandoned” should be reformulated in these terms: Tasso changed his mind and decided to allocate these madrigals to one of the books in which he divided his rhymes (namely the sixth book [*libro sesto*]), but C remains the main source for over 90% of the texts it shares with 85. Indeed, looking at Tasso’s lyric production from fixed and separate points of view may lead to deceiving assumptions. Isella himself, referring to the *stratigrafie compositive* (“genetic” multiple stages) found in Tasso’s autographs, denounced the risks of a too rigid and mechanical demarcation of the various phases, which instead

18. The incipits of the texts, marked with an asterisk when unpublished, are: **Come vivrò ne le mie pene, Amore*; **Se 'l mio core è con voi come desia; Non è questa la mano; Amor l'alma m'allaccia; Poi che Madonna sdegna; Mentre nubi di sdegno; *Donna quanto più a dentro; *A chi creder deggio io; *Pastor che vai per questa [notte] oscura; *Ogni pianta gentile; Vorrei legnarmi a pieno; *Donna nel mio ritorno; Caro amoroso neo; *Amor per certo segno a le mie voglie; *Non fe' del vostro neo più vaghe note; Gelo ha madonna il seno e fiamma il volto; Tarquinia, mentre miri; Ne' vostri dolci baci; *Cagion forse è l'Aurora; La bella pargoletta.*
19. The incipits of the texts, marked with an asterisk when unpublished, are: **Io non posso gioire; *Già non son io contento; *Lunge da voi, ben mio; *Lunge da voi, mio core; Disdegno e gelosia; Con la saetta da la punta d'oro (n. CXXXVI in 85); *Messaggiera de l'Alba; *Tu furi i dolci odori; *Il cor voi mi chiedete; *Madonna gli occhi miei; S'a sdegno voi prendete; Se l'immagine vostra; Tre son le gratie ancelle; Al vostro dolce azzurro; Al tuo dolce pallore.*
20. The madrigals witnessed by both C and E1 are ordered as follows: *Se 'l mio core è con voi come desia; Non è questa la mano; Amor il cor m'allaccia (Amor l'alma [. .] in 4); Se pur costei disdegna (Poiché Madonna sdegna in 4); Mentre nubi di sdegno; Disdegno e gelosia; Donna, quanto più a dentro; A chi creder deggio io; Ogni pianta gentile; Donna nel mio ritorno; Tre son le gratie ancelle; Caro amoroso neo; Non fe' del vostro neo più vaghe note; Gelo ha Madonna il seno e fiamma il volto (repeated); Tarquinia, mentre miri; Al vostro dolce azzurro; Al tuo dolce pallore; La bella pargoletta.* C has sixteen texts in common with E1 and compiled in the same order, which may be counted as proof of the genetic relation between the two.

should be defined “not by external structuring (such as, for example, the dates of the editions assumed as the chronology of texts), but according to the ascertained consecution of the actual writing stages”.²¹ In other words, textual evidence itself is more important than external elements such as, for instance, the declarations expressed in contemporary letters (GAVAZZENI-ISELLA 1973). Therefore, though useful as a general premise to the critical edition, trying to reconstruct the author’s final intention through letters is a philologically risky path, especially considering that we still lack an authoritative edition of Tasso’s correspondence, texts that we must still read in Cesare Guasti’s nineteenth-century and occasionally unreliable edition.

A copy-text for the *Rime d'amore*

Tasso himself supervised the publication process of edition 85, which is dedicated to Vincenzo Gonzaga, duke of Mantua (1562–1612), who hosted the poet from March to November 1591. There are few surviving copies of 85 in Italian libraries: Bergamo (Biblioteca Civica A. Mai), Mantova (Biblioteca Comunale Teresiana), Ferrara (Biblioteca Comunale Ariosteana), Milano (Biblioteca Ambrosiana and Bibliotheca Nazionale Braidense), Torino (Accademia delle Scienze). De Maldé used the copy found at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milano (*sigla* S.N. V. IV. 29) as the base text for her edition. A description of the title-page follows:

DELLE | RIME DEL SIG. | TORQVATO TASSO | PARTE PRIMA.
 | DI NUOVO DAL MEDESIMO | in questa nuoua impressione ordi-
 nate, cor-|rette, accresciute, & date in luce. | *Con l'espositione dello stesso*
Autore. | Onde potranno i giudiciosi lettori ageuolmente conosce-|re gli
 infiniti miglioramenti, mutationi, & addit-|tioni loro; & quanto queste
 da quelle per | l'adietro stampate sien differenti. | *Con due Tauole, l'vna*

21. When Tasso's *Rime d'amore* were published by Martignone, Gavazzeni, and Leva (1993) some scholars observed that the first section of its apparatus did not distinguish the various correction stages (unlike the second and third section), making all of C's *lectiones* appear as pertinent to the same series of authorial revisions. To demonstrate the evolutionary complexity of C, Zaccarello proposed a comparison of the variants found in Ber and in some non-autograph manuscripts at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze, in order to demonstrate the non-linear and diverse nature of Tasso's work. See GAVAZZENI, LEVA, and MARTIGNONE 1993; ZACCARELLO 1994.

de' principij delle Rime: & l'altra deli Au-|tori citati nella loro Espositione.
 | CON PRIVILEGIO DI S. SANTITÀ, DEL SER. SIG. DUCA DI MAN-
 TOVA, | ET D'ALTRI PRENCIPI, ET REPUBLICHE D'ITALIA. | [Coat
 of arms: Gonzaga family, motto: FIDES] In MANTOVA, Per Francesco
 Osanna Stampator Ducale. 1591

The dedication to Vincenzo Gonzaga, dated 1 November 1591 (c. 2r-v) is followed by Francesco Osanna's introduction (cc. 3v-4r), and a list of quoted authors. Roman type (*tondo*) is used for the dedication letter, the argument of each text, and Osanna's introduction, while lyric texts appear in italics (*Italico Valentino*), placed one per page until p. 65, after which there are two texts per page, divided by a decorative line with less space between them. As discussed above, the text of edition 85 involved multiple source-texts, a reason why in her introduction De Maldé (2016, xxvi-xxxi) dedicates a full paragraph to the textual evolution witnessed by the variants of Ber and Mi — the copies of 85 annotated by Tasso in preparation for a newly emended edition — and another to manuscripts, annotated copies, and printed editions witnessing significant variants of 85, which, however, were not involved in Tasso's own emendations to 85 for a subsequent edition. Thus, we may assume that, depending on the poem involved, 85 holds various genetic connections to C, E1, E2, P1, Ts1, Ts2, Brn, 11, and 22, all listed in De Maldé's Table IV (2016, cxxiii-cxxxi).²²

Examining even more carefully the variants, we note that: Ber includes sixty-six emendations/variants both to the *Commento* and the poems themselves (thirty-nine in common with Mi, twenty-five exclusive to Ber).²³ Ber emends the incorrect numbering of cc. 46-47, but some textual errors still stand (CIV, 86-87; CXLIX, 7, 13; CLIII, 12; CLXV, 9; CLXVIII, 7; CLXIX, 6). Many alternative variants are noted in the margins without reference to the verse (CXI, 4; CXXXVIII, 14; CLXXXVIII, 8). We should note that De Maldé (2016) dismisses Ber because at XXI, 7 the correct lesson (*campagne*) is underlined instead of the error due to *saut du meme au meme* (v. 11).²⁴

22. P1, Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale, Banco Rari 212.

23. The texts involved in the scrutiny of the emendations and variants are, according to 85 numbered: 1, I, VI, X, XX, XXI, XXII, XXXII, XLIV, LII, LIII, LIX, LXXV, LXXVII, LXXVII, LXXXII, XCV, XCVI, XCVIII, CIII, CIV, CVII, CXI, CXII, CXIII, CXVII, CXVIII, CXXI, CXXIV, CXXV, CXXXVIII, CXLI, CXLII, CXLII, CXLV, CXLVI, CXLVII, CLIV, CLXI, CLXIII, CLXV, CLXVIII, CLXXXIII, CLXXXIV, CLXXXV, and CLXXXVIII. See DE MALDÉ 2016, xxvii.

24. The principle underlying the well-known phenomenon of *saut du même au même* (literally a "jump from the same to the same") can also be applied to

From this error De Maldé conjectures that Ber takes its emendations from an undefined list and thus lacks of any relevance in the process of establishing the text (2016, XXVI–XXVII).

The annotated copy Mi contains seventy-one corrections and/or variants, probably carried out in two distinct moments (as suggested by their different inks) that may correspond to two independent lists of emendations for its final part. Various cases of incorrect page numberings are corrected: 44 (46), 45 (47), 74 (92). A closer analysis of the variants between Ber and Mi reveals that the latter is a subsequent elaboration of the former (for instance, LXXV, 8 and CIV, 86–87). However, the two do not represent a homogeneous work, but rather two different stages of Tasso's own revision (though many points in common are unquestionable). The fact, for example, that Mi ignores some emendations in Ber (VI, 1; X, 10; XXII, 10; XXXII, 14; XLIV, 14), or emends errors in a different way (LXXVII, 8), or even arrives at the same *lectio* as Ber through an independent elaboration (LXXVII, 1) confirms the application of these two different stages of authorial revision (DE MALDÉ 2016, xxvii–xxx).

From a methodological standpoint, De Maldé's solution may be summarized as the choice to publish the *Rime d'amore* using 85 as her main reference text and dividing the apparatus into four separate sections as follows:

1. the first section contains unacceptable readings of 85;
2. the second collects the emendations to the first section, plus variants/corrections contained in Ber and Mi;
3. the third “genetically” collects all variants coming from prints, manuscripts, and annotated copies that are at play in the genesis of 85 (the aim is to inductively reconstruct the manuscript sent to the typographer);
4. the fourth section collects the *varia lectio* which, instead, does not come into play in the genetic process of 85.

The same orientation is adopted for Tasso's *Commento*, which contains two sections: the first one including errors and the other corrections attested in Ber and Mi.

the case of printed editions, for the visual error may occur during composition. Philologically speaking, errors such as these are defined as “polygenetic” because they can occur independently from one witness to another, making it more difficult to apply the principle to establish direct relations between witnesses.

Broadly speaking, this approach is based on the representation of a literary work's genesis, with the apparatus displaying the various passages through which the reading witnessed by 85 reaches its final form, with the latter normally coinciding with Tasso's final intention, apart from occasional discrepancies. In 85 only evident errors are emended conjecturally or on the basis of other witnesses, while it's again falls to the apparatus to convey other witnesses' *varia lectio* and evolutionary authorial readings conveyed by Ber and Mi. The rationale of such a complex, multi-layered apparatus lies primarily in the fact that the *Rime d'amore* are witnessed in varying degrees by multiple authorial documents that often prevent scholars from discerning direct relationships and common sources. This method confuses family branches of a potential *stemma* and limits the authority of individual surviving copies: any poem in the *Rime d'amore*, especially when witnessed by manuscripts, may strengthen these assumptions. The resulting scenario has led scholarly editors to publish the text with a large apparatus, often barely readable in its complexity.

An alternative solution for a critical edition of the *Rime d'amore*, however, may involve the application of Greg's copy-text paradigm.²⁵ In Tasso's case, his writing habits in the decade 1580–1590 are well known thanks to surviving autograph manuscripts. Thus, the authorial supervision of 85, suggested by biographical evidence and by Tasso's own words in the dedication, is further proven by the edition's accidentals, consistent with the author's *usus scribendi* throughout the text, despite a slight, predictable tendency toward normalization due to the work of his proof readers (DE MALDÉ 2016, lxx–lxxii).²⁶ Unlike Tasso's poems, his *Commento* lacks regularity of etymological forms, word-division and gemination, often resulting in different spellings for the same word: this may possibly be due to the lack of a final revision before printing, with typographers reading Tasso's exemplar directly from an autograph (typically characterized by such oscillations) rather than a manuscript prepared for the typographer by a scribe (DE MALDÉ 2016, lxx–xcix). In terms of editorial strategy, this case leaves two options: to homogenize the text through the comparison with other authoritative witnesses, or to accept 85's text as it is. The first option requires implicit comparisons of 85 with the only two witnesses containing the *Commento*, C and 86. An autograph of Tasso's, C features the same

25. See GREG 1950–1951; BOWERS 1975; TANSALLE 1976.

26. Despite its slight normalization tendency (moreover, many forms can be restored through Ber and Mi), 85 features accidentals very close to Tasso's own, as may be confirmed by a comparison with C, E1, E2, Ts1, Ts2. See COLUSSI 2011.

spelling irregularity as 85, while 86, founded on 85, is irrelevant in terms of accidentals. Hence, adopting 85 as copy-text may prove a sensible editorial strategy.²⁷

However, a critical text would also have the task of correcting 85 in its substantives, adjusting it to Tasso's latest and approved solutions witnessed by Ber+Mi+86 (i.e., the most authoritative witnesses in terms of substantive readings) in the framework of careful consideration of the author's project. As far as the apparatus is concerned, the first section would include errors detected in 85 along with the various sources used for the respective emendations; a second section would discuss alternative readings rejected by the editor. Thus, the editor makes her/his choices according to his/her knowledge of the author's own autographs, assessing each proposed solution via a comparison of available witnesses. At the same time, the editor must bear in mind that the main challenge is to design and build a readable apparatus, in which every decision, carefully discussed in the introduction, may be open to scholars' verification and even potential rejection. Thus, this "hybrid" may engage readers in a methodological fusion between the Anglo-American copy-text tradition and a traditional comparative examination based on neo-Lachmannism, usually favored by Italian philology, with solutions supported on an ad-hoc basis by the tools of historical linguistics and *filologia d'autore*. Such a detailed, "hybrid" approach is well justified by a text with such a peculiar textual transmission and authorial elaboration as Tasso's *Rime d'amore*. After the long process of establishing the relationships among autographs, annotated exemplars, and subsequent editions, each variant must ultimately be assessed in its context and in comparison to other significant variants.

University of Verona

27. In her edition De Maldé does not analyze substantives in 86, reporting that the edition lacks of any relation with Ber and Mi, besides introducing new errors. Indeed, there is a letter (*Lettere* V, n1418) in which Tasso rejects 86 saying that it conveys the same errors of 85, plus new mistakes; it is also significant, within the same letter, that he complains about the *Commento*, saying he had no time to review it, probably alluding to the provisional version of it pointed out in 85 by De Maldé (2016, xix–xx). Nevertheless, according to copy-text criteria, we have to evaluate 86 for its substantives. If any evidence of authorial variants and emendation could be established, they would become the established text.

Works Cited

- ASCARELLI, Fernanda and Marco MENATO. 1989. *La tipografia del '500 in Italia*. Firenze: Olschki.
- ATANAGI, Dionigi. 1565. *De le rime di diuersi nobili poeti toscani* [. . .]. Venezia: Avanzo.
- BADESI, Licia. 2004. *Un mare turbatissimo: la vita di Torquato Tasso ripercorsa attraverso le lettere*. Como: Nuoveparole.
- BAGLIANI, Isabella. 2003. "Per l'edizione critica della seconda parte delle rime del Tasso". In GAVAZZENI 2003, 85–106.
- BARCO, Angelo. 1983. "E2, un autografo delle Rime tassiane". *Studi tassiani* 31: 85–106.
- BOWERS, Fredson. 1975. *Essays in Bibliography, Texts and Editing*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- CARETTI, Lanfranco. 1949. "Versi giovanili di Torquato Tasso". *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 126: 7–68.
- . 1950. "Correzioni autografe all'editio princeps delle 'Rime amorose' del Tasso". *Studi di filologia italiana* 8: 211–31.
- . 1973. *Studi sulle rime del Tasso*. Roma: Storia e Letteratura.
- , ed. 1990. *Torquato Tasso, Rime eterree*. Parma: Zara.
- CASTELLOZZI, Massimo. 2008–2010. "Il codice A4 delle rime di Torquato Tasso". *Studi tassiani* 56–57: 43–97.
- . 2013. "Aspetti della tradizione delle Rime disperse di Torquato Tasso". *Ellisse* 8: 65–98.
- COLUSSI, Davide. 1998. "La costruzione e l'elaborazione linguistica e stilistica del Canzoniere Chigiano del Tasso". *Studi tassiani* 46: 27–79.
- . 2011. *Figure della diligenza. Costanti e varianti del Tasso lirico nel Canzoniere Chigiano L VIII 302*. Roma-Padova: Antenore.
- DE MALDÉ, Vania. 1978. "Per la datazione dei postillati autografi BER e MI di Torquato Tasso". *Studi tassiani* 27: 119–26.
- . 1981–1983. "Il postillato Bernardi delle 'Rime' tassiane". *Studi tassiani* 29–31: 19–62.
- . 1984. "La tradizione delle 'Rime' tassiane tra storia e leggenda". *Filologia e critica* 9.2: 230–53.
- . 1999. "Le Rime tassiane tra filologia e critica: per un bilancio dell'ultimo decennio di studi". In VENTURI 1999, 317–32.
- , ed. 2016. *Torquato Tasso, Rime. Prima Parte. Tomo II. Rime d'amore con l'esposizione dello stesso autore*. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- GAVAZZENI, Franco. 2002. "L'edizione critica delle Rime di Torquato Tasso". *Studi tassiani* 50: 133–44.
- . 2003a. "Per l'edizione delle 'Rime de gli Accademici Eterei'". In GAVAZZENI 2003b, 213–28.
- , ed. 2003b. *Sul Tasso. Studi di filologia e letteratura italiana offerti a Luigi Poma*. Roma-Padova: Antenore.
- . 2004. "Per l'edizione delle Rime". *Studi tassiani* 52: 133–44.

- GAVAZZENI, Franco and Dante ISELLA. 1973. "Proposte per un'edizione delle 'Rime amorose' del Tasso". *Studi di filologia e di letteratura italiana offerti a Carlo Dionisotti*, 241–343. Milano–Napoli: Ricciardi.
- GAVAZZENI, Franco, Marco LEVA, and Vercingetorige MARTIGNONE, eds. 1993. *Torquato Tasso, Rime d'amore (secondo il codice Chigiano L VIII 302)*. Modena: Panini.
- GAVAZZENI, Franco and Vercingetorige MARTIGNONE. 1997. "Sull'edizione critica delle rime di Torquato Tasso". *Studi di filologia italiana* 55: 127–39.
- . eds. 2004. *Torquato Tasso, Rime. Prima Parte - Tomo I. Rime d'amore (secondo il codice Chigiano L VIII 302)*. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- . eds. 2006. *Torquato Tasso, Rime. Terza Parte*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- GREG, W[alter] W[ilson]. 1950–1951. "The Rationale of Copy-Text". *Studies in Bibliography* 3: 19–37.
- GUASTI, Cesare, ed. 1853–1855. *Torquato Tasso, Le Lettere*, 5 volumes. Firenze: Le Monnier.
- ISELLA, Dante. 1987. *Le carte mescolate. Esperienze di filologia d'autore*. Padova: Liviana.
- . 2007. *Le carte mescolate vecchie e nuove*. Torino: Einaudi.
- JOSSA, Stefano. 2003. "Il luogo della poesia: la prigione del Tasso a Sant'Anna". *Spazi, geografie, testi*, edited by Siriana SGAVICCHIA, 345–57. Roma: Bulzoni.
- MARTIGNONE, Vercingetorige. 1990a. "La struttura narrativa del codice Chigiano delle rime tassiane". *Studi tassiani* 38: 71–128.
- . 1990b. "Un segmento delle rime tassiane: gli inediti del codice Chigiano nelle stampe 27, 28 e 48". *Studi di filologia italiana* 48: 81–105.
- . 1995. "Varianti d'autore tassiane: un sondaggio sulle 'rime amorose'". *Italianistica* 24: 427–35.
- . 1999. "Preliminari all'edizione critica delle rime stravaganti di Torquato Tasso". In VENTURI 1999, I, 333–40.
- . 2002. "L'allestimento dell'apparato del codice Chigiano delle Rime tassiane". *Studi tassiani* 50: 145–58.
- MILITE, Luca. 1987–1988. *Il manoscritto a.V.7.8=It. 385 (E1) della Biblioteca Estense di Modena, raccolta di rime di Torquato Tasso. Edizione critica* (Phd thesis). Supervisor: Cesare Bozzetti, University of Pavia.
- . 1990. "I manoscritti E1 ed F2 delle Rime del Tasso". *Studi tassiani* 38: 41–70.
- PESTARINO, Romano, ed. 2013. *Torquato Tasso, Rime "eteree"*. Parma: Guanda-Fondazione Bembo.
- POMA, Luigi. 1979. "La 'Parte terza' delle 'Rime' tassiane". *Studi tassiani* 27: 5–47.
- RANZANI, Claudia. 2003. "Due testimoni delle rime del Tasso alle principesse di Ferrara". In GAVAZZENI 2003, 569–88.
- REDDAVIDE, Gianluca. 2005. *Torquato Tasso, Lettere dal manicomio*. Roma: Le nubi.
- SAMMARCO, Ottavio. 1568. *Il tempio della divina Signora Donna Geronima Colonna d'Aragona*. Padova: Pasquato.
- SANTARELLI, Giuseppe. 1974. *Studi sulle rime sacre del Tasso*. Bergamo: Centro Studi Tassiani.

- SERASSI, Pier Antonio. 1790. *La Vita di Torquato Tasso*. Bergamo: Locatelli.
- SOLERTI, Angelo. 1895. *Vita di Torquato Tasso*. Torino: Loescher.
- , ed. 1898–1902. Torquato Tasso, *Le rime*. *Edizione critica su i manoscritti e le antiche stampe*. Bologna: Romagnoli-Dall'acqua.
- SPONGANO, Raffaele. 1949. *La prosa di Galileo ed altri scritti*. Messina-Firenze: D'Anna.
- TANSELLE, G. Thomas. 1976. "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention". *Studies in Bibliography* 29: 167–211.
- VENTURI, Gianfranco, ed. 1999. *Torquato Tasso e la cultura estense*. Firenze: Olschki.
- VISSER TRAVAGLI, Anna Maria. 1999. "La cella di Torquato Tasso nel vecchio ospedale Sant'Anna di Ferrara". In VENTURI 1999, 843–53.
- ZACCARELLO, Michelangelo. 1991. "Appunti sulle Eteree del Tasso". *Rivista di letteratura italiana*. 9: 565–89.
- . 1994. "Postille ad una recente edizione delle Rime Chigiane del Tasso". *Rivista di letteratura italiana* 12.2–3: 441–56.