

rhythmum Thuscum." In other words, Bembo's motivation here might have been that of eliminating the consecutive appearance of the same vowel. When this vowel is elided, the remaining possibilities are dubious. Without dialoepha after the second position, diaeresis would be required in the tenth position (otherwise the line would be hypometrical):

a cu'io dissi tu sola mi piäci[.]

This is impossible in Petrarch because a diaeresis in *piace* is etymologically unsound: the vowel *i* in *piacere* corresponds to the consonant *l* in *placeo* (Menichetti, *Metrica italiana* 192-94).¹⁹ We could also consider a diaeresis in *io*:

a cu'ïo dissi tu sola mi piaci[.]

But, again, this is unthinkable in Petrarch: diaeresis is employed only in pronouns at the end of the line or end of a hemistich (Bausi and Martelli 18). Thus, Bembo's revision actually created an un-Petrarchan figure (i.e., the improper use of diaeresis). This intervention results in either hypometrical scansion or an entirely inadmissible metrical figure. Although this is one of the few examples where the Bembo revision represents a deterioration of the text, it is evidence of the lost resiliency of pre-Humanist script.

Another strategy employed by Bembo in his eradication of dialoepha was the use of variant verbal forms. In 194.12, for example, he used such a tactic to eliminate the possibility of dialoepha. In the idiograph, this line was transcribed as follows: