ABSTRACTS

**Mario Pozzi, Girolamo Ruscelli e la lingua italiana**

Girolamo Ruscelli, acting with determination (and perhaps a bit of audacity as well) set himself the task of formalising the Italian language. Going much further than Bembo, Ruscelli strove for a national cultured language devoid of words that were not understood by the majority of the population. Therefore, he rejected numerous terms taken from Dante and the Florentine vernacular, an action which provoked a heated reaction from Vincenzio Borghini, who instead supported what he considered to be the winning position expressed by Bembo, i.e. that the Italian language should mirror that of the three great masters of the Trecento. However, Borghini was wrong, for thanks to editors in the printing houses, a modern language had already been consolidated, one which if necessary would rather look to Latin to fill any void in terminology. It was an artificial language, but for this very reason was welcomed throughout Italy.

**ConCetto del Popolo, «San Martino» e una ‘suora poetessa’ di fine Duecento**

The second part focuses on the *Preghiera alla Vergine e alla SS. Trinità*, once again edited by Mussafia. Correcting feminine nouns and adjectives in the codex, the editor attributed the work to a Franciscan monk. Instead, the author was actually a *Povera donna*, a ‘poor woman’ who through this long poem transmitted an indirect witness of St. Francis’ *Oratio ante Crucifixum*. She was perhaps the only woman in the 13th century to write sacred poetry.

**Paolo Borsa, Il sonetto di Cino da Pistoia «Avegna che crudel lancia ’ntraversi» e il topos del “morir ridendo”**

This article shows how Cino da Pistoia and Francesco Petrarca made use of the theme of ‘morir ridendo’ – the former in the sonnet *Avegna che crudel lancia ’ntraversi* and the latter in the canzone *Qual più diversa et nova* – though referring to different sources and traditions. In *RVF* 135 («ne l’isole famose di Fortuna, / due fonti à: chi de l’una / bee, mor ridendo; et chi de l’altra, scam-pa»), Petrarca re-interprets Cino’s setting in light of Pomponio Mela’s *De chro- rographia*, and from there the topos makes its way through Boiardo’s *Amorum libri* and *Inamoramento de Orlando*, and then on into Tasso’s *Liberata*. Instead, the image conveyed in Cino’s sonnet («E se giammai alcun morendo rise...») is drawn from the lethal properties of *herbae Sardonicae* (Servio) and *apium risus* (Bartolomeo Anglico), exploited by religious literature as examples of *inepta laetitia*, whereby physical pleasure leads to spiritual death.
INIGO RUIZ ARZALLUZ, Una lettura dell’epitaffio di Petrarca

The epitaph which, according to tradition, Petrarch wrote for his own tomb exhibits features that are contrary to those present in other more classical epitaphs he composed throughout his life. Some formal elements unequivocally recall the true epigraphic tradition of Petrarch’s own time, as well as the language of liturgy and, in general, the Christian tradition. All this responds to Petrarch’s desire, firmly expressed in his testament, to build a modest tomb for himself, which constitutes, at the same time, another argument in favour of his authorship. Three epitaphs occasionally attributed to Petrarch are studied in a final appendix.