

Abbacus School

Høyrup, Jens

Published in:
Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy

DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02848-4>

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

Citation for published version (APA):
Høyrup, J. (2018). Abbacus School. In M. Sgarbi (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy* Springer.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02848-4>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact rucforsk@ruc.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ABBACUS

Jens Høyrup

Section for Philosophy and Science Studies

Roskilde University, Denmark

Article written for

Marco Sgarbi (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy*

Preprint

20 March 2017

Abstract

The abacus school was a school for artisans' and merchants' sons, functioning in northern Italy (13th–16th c.). It taught the use of Hindu-Arabic numerals, and fundamental commercial arithmetic: the rule of three; monetary and metrological conversions; simple and composite interest; partnership; simple and composite discounting; alloying; the technique of a “single false position”; and finally, simple area calculation. Topics like the double false position were not part of the curriculum, but they are often dealt with in the abacus treatises; they probably served to show virtuosity in the competition for employment and pupils.

The manuscripts connected to the abacus school tradition are of very different character. Some are messy problem collections, some orderly presentations, a few genuine encyclopaedia. Some are produced by mathematically incompetent compilers, some by the best European mathematicians of the age.

Traditionally but mistakenly, the abacus books are to be derived from Leonardo Fibonacci's *Liber abbaci* and *Practica geometriae*. As shown by closer inspection of the text, they derive from direct inspiration from a broader Mediterranean environment, which had also inspired Fibonacci around 1200. After c. 1330, however, the abacus tradition had become an autonomous current, no more significantly influenced by the Arabic or Ibero-Provençal world. Influences from Boethian and Euclidean arithmetic, though existing, remained peripheral.

Printing allowed the preparation and spread of the great works of Luca Pacioli, Girolamo Cardano and Nicolò Tartaglia, as well as more modest books corresponding to the school curriculum. The former group, integrated with the theory of irrationals of *Elements X*, provided the basis for the renovation of algebra brought about by Viète and Descartes; the latter made possible the spread of abacus-type teaching of basic applied arithmetic to the whole of Western Europe, where it stayed alive until c. 1960.

Essay

The abacus school was a school type existing in the region between Genova, Milan and Venice to the north and Umbria to the south from the mid-13th to the 16th century. It was mainly frequented by merchant and artisan youth for two years or less around the age of 12–14 (a few younger or older), who here learned basic arithmetic, having already learned reading and writing and before starting apprenticeship.

Etymologically, *abbaco* obviously comes from Latin *abacus* (< Greek $\alpha\beta\alpha\chi$), a reckoning board. However, *abbaco* (which we may distinguish by using the most common spelling of the time) has nothing to do with reckoning boards of any kind. The first known occurrences of the word are in Leonardo Fibonacci's *Liber abbaci* (1857) and *Practica geometriae* (1862) and in a few references in the latter to the former as his *Liber abbaci*. Most of these references are compatible with a generic understanding as “practical computation”, but a few give more restrictive information: the *Liber abbaci* (p. 5) as well as the *Practica* (p. 8) specify that *abacus* encompasses finger reckoning, while the *Liber abbaci* (p. 353) ascribes to the abacus a particular way to extract the square root of a non-square, multi-digit number. It seems that Fibonacci refers to a particular teaching tradition, which could be represented by the school (or whatever it was) where his father let him pursue “the study of the abacus” in Bejaïa for some time during his boyhood (1857, 1); but it may just as well correspond to a more widely disseminated Mediterranean type (the Italian area can probably be disregarded).

Whatever Fibonacci meant precisely by the word (if it was really his) may have been as obscure to his contemporaries as to us, but it caught on, first probably meaning “practical” or “commercial computation” and then soon referring to the new Italian school tradition that came to teach that topic. In 1241, Fibonacci received a yearly pension from the Commune of Pisa represented by its officials “*in abbacatione*” for his consulting services in *abbacandi* estimations (Bonaini 1858, 241) – thus probably not for teaching; but in 1265 a document refers to a master teaching the abacus in Bologna. In the 1280s sources start talking about abacus teachers paid by the city communes; in the longer run, only smaller cities would need to do that, Florence and Venice seem to have relied on privately run schools. Such schools remained in existence at least until the late sixteenth century – (Ulivi 2002) offers a convenient survey.

The students, as mentioned, were mostly sons of artisans and merchants – including those belonging to the highest mercantile patriciate. But also Machiavelli, a lawyer's son, was sent to the abacus school of Pier Maria Calandri

(Black 2007, 379). In the city of Florence, in much of the period, between one fourth and one half of all children learned to read and write, and perhaps 10% of boys frequented the abacus school (Høystrup 2007, 27). In other towns the percentage may have been considerably lower – not to speak of the countryside, the abacus school was urban.

What did these boys learn? *Not* accounting – that was learned on-the-job by bank and merchant house apprentices. We happen to know two documents that outline a curriculum; one, from the earlier fifteenth century, is said to correspond to “the Pisa way” (Arrighi 1967); the other tells what was done in a Florentine school in 1519 (Goldthwaite 1972). The differences are modest, and mainly concern the order in which things were taught; scattered remarks in the writings of various abacus masters support the assumption that the two documents taken together are representative.

The initial part of the course taught operations with pure numbers. First came the writing of Hindu-Arabic numerals, next, the multiplication tables and their application. Neither source mentions addition and subtraction – these techniques may have been implicit in the learning of the number system. Division followed, beginning with divisors known from the multiplication tables and going on with multi-digit divisors. Calculation with fractions ended the first part.

The second part of the course trained commercial mathematics (in different order in the two curricula): the rule of three; monetary and metrological conversions; simple and composite interest, and reduction to interest per day; partnership; simple and composite discounting; alloying; the technique of a “single false position”; and finally, area measurement.

From the multiplication tables onward, everything was accompanied by problems to be solved as homework. More complex matters, like the use of a double false position and algebra, are amply treated in many “abacus manuscripts” (a notion to be dealt with imminently), but they appear not to have been part of the curriculum.

Though published almost four decades ago, (Van Egmond 1980) remains an almost complete catalogue of known “abacus manuscripts”. These have in common to have been produced by writers who appear to have been connected – as former students or as teachers – to the abacus school environment, and to deal with mathematics. Some are messy collections of problems (*zibaldoni*), some could look like “teacher’s books” (the students themselves did not have books), presenting a sequence of topics in an orderly way (but they may also be written for patrons or friends, some indeed claim to be adequate for self-study); three are genuine mathematical encyclopaediae – Benedetto da Firenze’s *Pratica*

d'arismetricha from 1363 was copied often, Vatican, Ottobon. lat. 3307 from c. 1365 and the slightly earlier Florence, Bibl. Naz. Centr., Palat. 573 are known only from their compilers' autographs (Høystrup 2010, 32, 39). Some of the manuscripts are author's autographs (but they may still draw heavily on earlier texts, as most mathematics textbook still do today), some are booksellers' or similar copies; some are anonymous, some carry the name of the author, some borrow the name of a famous author but alter or maltreat his text in one or the other way. Some authors have a deep understanding of the mathematics they present even when it is advanced, others make blunders as soon as the inverse rule of three or volumes are involved – and some cheat, either knowingly or naively plagiarizing the fraud of predecessors – the abacus manuscript of Piero della Francesca famously falls in the latter category (Giusti 1991, 64). This mainly regards the presentation of glaringly false rules for the solution of irreducible algebraic problems of the third or fourth degree, probably used to impress mathematically incompetent municipal authorities and to dumbfound rivals in competitions for employment.

It is a recurrent claim that the abacus books are derived from and represent reduced versions of Fibonacci's *Liber abaci* and *Practica geometriae* – representative quotations in (Høystrup 2005, 24–25). This is an almost complete mistake. The term *abbaco*, it is true, is likely to be inspired by Fibonacci, and one of the earliest known abacus treatises also cites and draws on the *Liber abaci*.

This treatise (Florence, Riccardiana 2404, ed. Arrighi 1989) presents itself as *Livro de l'abbecho secondo la oppenione de maestro Leonardo de la chasa degli figluogle Bonaçie da Pisa*, “Abacus book according to the opinion of master Leonardo Fibonacci”. It is a beautiful *de luxe* vellum copy of an original which because of misinterpreted internal evidence (copied older loan documents) has been dated to 1288–1290. It must be slightly to somewhat later, but hardly later than the first decade of the 14th century (the author does not recognize the most basic algebraic terminology). As closer analysis reveals, the text moves on two levels, clearly distinguishable in their number terminology (Høystrup 2005). On one level we find material adapted to the curriculum of the abacus school. This level has absolutely nothing to do with the *Liber abaci*. The other level is constituted by sophisticated problems outside the domain considered in the abacus school. Here, almost everything is translated from the *Liber abaci* – unfortunately, as it turns out, often without understanding. It seems that Fibonacci had already become a mythical culture hero for abacus mathematics around 1300 – but with little real impact.

Characteristic is the way the essential rule of three is dealt with. Fibonacci

does not really present a rule, he seems to describe (in terms taken from Euclidean theory) what he has observed to be done on an Arabic dust- or clayboard (Arabic since inscription starts from the right, and the left is “behind”) (Fibonacci 1857, 83f):

In all commercial exchanges [*negotiationes*], four proportional numbers are always found, of which three are known, but the remaining unknown. The first of these three known numbers is the number of sale of any merchandise, be it number, or weight, or measure [explanatory examples]. The second, however, is the price of this sale [...]. The third, then, will be the sale of some quantity of this merchandise, whose price, namely the fourth, unknown number, will not be known. Therefore, in order to find the unknown number from those that are known, we give a universal rule for all cases, namely, in the top of a board write the first number to the right, namely the merchandise. Behind in the same line you posit the price of the same merchandise, namely the second number. The third too, if it is the merchandise, write it under the merchandise, that is, under the first, and if it is the price, write it under the price, that is, under the second. In this way, as it is of the kind of that under which it is written, thus it will also be of the quality or the quantity, whether in number, in weight or in measure. [...]. When they are described thus, it will be obvious that two of those that are posited will always be contrary [*ex adverso*], which have to be multiplied together, and that if the outcome of their multiplication is divided by the third number, the fourth, unknown, will doubtlessly be found.

Riccardiana 2404 (Arrighi 1989, 9) gives the rule like this:

If some computation was said to us in which three things are proposed, then we shall multiply the thing that we want to know with the one which is not of the same [kind], and divide in the other.

If one misreads Fibonacci’s *ex adverso* as referring to difference in kind and not to the location in the rectangular frame which he has just described, the Riccardiana formulation may seem to abbreviate the last lines from the *Liber abbaci*. This overlooks, however, that the Riccardiana formulation had been standard in Indian and Arabic vernacular mathematics for almost a millennium (Høyrup 2012).

Another (now mutilated) early abacus text, Siena, L. VI. 47₂, was apparently written in Pisa around 1300 – (Franci 2015) suggests a late 13th century date, (Ulivi 2011), better argued, the early 14th century. The author might be a certain Bindo Nocchi de Ambaco, but only chronological overlap supports that assumption. A collection of numerical tables in the beginning might seem to be derived from the *Liber abbaci*. However, Fibonacci borrows a Maghreb term for prime numbers (*asamm*) as *hasam* and *asam*, while the Siena text uses *lasalma*, clearly derived (with misunderstanding) from something like *al-asammā*^c, with

the article, double consonant and a feminine ending which Fibonacci does not indicate, and which must come directly from spoken Arabic. Moreover, even though the initial introduction of the rule of three has been lost (if it was ever present), it is clear from the way its use in problems is stated that it coincided with the vernacular form found in the Riccardiana manuscript.

A third early text is the “Columbia algorism” (Vogel 1977), probably the earliest of all, from 1285–90 (Travaini 2003); it has been misdated to the mid-14th century because a coin list was misinterpreted. It contains an explicit introduction of the rule of three – a characteristic twisted version of the vernacular rule which only turns up again in the late 15th century but may have survived outside the core abacus area; however, problems calling for the use of three are mostly reduced to a counterfactual model, of the type “if 3 were 5, what would 7 be?”. This was the standard in all Ibero-Provençal abacus-type treatises until the end of the 15th century, and was also known to Fibonacci, who speaks of it (1857, 170) as the vernacular way – in agreement with Fibonacci’s reference in one early manuscript (Vatican, Palat. lat. 1343, fol. 47^r col. II) to reliance on a Castilian source. There are further Iberian affinities in the Columbia algorism, so all in all it turns out that Fibonacci as well as the budding abacus culture drew independently on both Arabic (Maghreb or al-Andalus) and Christian Ibero-Provençal sources.

This is even more clear if we look at *algebra* – a topic that did not belong to the abacus school *curriculum* but which is dealt with in many abacus manuscripts. As other advanced topics (in particular the double false position) it may have served in the training of assistant-apprentices – but this is a hypothesis with no support in the sources. What we do know is that proficiency in such difficult matters played a role in the competition for employment or for pupils. Algebra is dealt with in Chapter 15, section 3 in the *Liber abbaci* – but from the very beginning, abacus algebra is in a wholly different style, probably at first borrowed from the Ibero-Provençal area (Høyrup 2007, 147–169). One school tradition in Florence honoured Fibonacci and copied a translation of his algebra, but its truly outstanding members (among whom Antonio de’ Mazzinghi in the later 14th century, and Benedetto da Firenze around 1460) made their own algebraic work in continuation of the abacus tradition.

After the earlier 14th century we find very few plausible instances of recent Arabic or Iberian influence; by then, the abacus tradition had established itself as an autonomous current.

Beginning in the later 14th century, on the other hand, some ideas and concepts are adopted from Euclidean and Boethian mathematics into the non-

curricular higher level. Antonio de Mazzinghi may have been the first to speak of the sequence of algebraic powers as a continued proportion; Benedetto da Firenze includes a chapter on the Boethian names for ratios in his encyclopedic *Pratica d'arismetricha*, while another chapter draws on Euclid and Campanus in a presentation of the composition of ratios. However, as the roughly contemporary anonymous abacus encyclopedia Florence, Palat. 573 (fol. 17^v) observes concerning the Boethian names, “we in the schools do not use such terms but say instead [...] that 8 is $\frac{2}{3}$ of 12 and 12 is $\frac{3}{2}$ of 8”. The external influence thus remained external, and peripheral. This may astonish, given that several abacus masters also taught at universities – but what they taught there was astronomy and astrology, subordinate to medicine, not mathematical theory.

Only Luca Pacioli, Nicolò Tartaglia and Girolamo Cardano were to achieve some measure of integration between abacus and theoretical mathematics from the outgoing 15th century onward – the former two products of the abacus environment but determined to enter the world of university learning, the latter a university scholar looking at abacus mathematics “from a higher vantage point” (as once Fibonacci). It is no accident that all three had their works printed, but also genuine abacus books appeared in print – first the anonymous *Larte de labbacho*, printed in Treviso (1478), and Pietro Borghi's *Opera de arithmetica* (1484); Francesco Feliciano da Lazesio's *Libro de Abbacho novamente composto* (1526) was reprinted as late as 1692.

The latter reprint is symptomatic of one of the repercussions of the abacus tradition in later centuries. Until the new-math reforms of the 1960s, the teaching of practical arithmetic in European schools (and such schools of the colonial world where European teaching was imported) remained close to the pattern established by the abacus school. The most direct heirs were the German *Lese- und Rechenschulen*, which however also had to teach reading and writing. The spelling *Coss* of its translation of the algebraic *cosa* shows this German tradition to be derived from northern Italy (Milan etc.), which would write *cossa* – not from Tuscany or Umbria.

At the mathematically higher level, the indubitably most important legacy was *algebra* (Stedall 2010). In part mediated by Michael Stifel's *Arithmetica integra* (1544) and Simon Stevin's *L'arithmétique* (1585), the most influential works behind the renovated algebra created by Viète and Descartes were Pacioli's *Summa de arithmetica* (1494), Cardano's *Ars magna* (1545) and Rafael Bombelli's *L'algebra* (1572) – and these, on their part, owe most of their inspiration to the supra-curricular work of abacus writers, complemented by the theory of irrationals of *Elements X*.

References

Primary literature

- Arrighi, Gino (ed.), 1989. “Maestro Umbro (sec. XIII), *Liverno de l’abbecho*. (Cod. 2404 della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze)”. *Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l’Umbria* **86**, 5–140.
- Bombelli, Rafael, 1572. *L’Algebra*. Bologna: Giovanni Rossi.
- Borghi, Pietro, 1484. *Opera de arithmetica*. Venezia.
- Cardano, Girolamo, 1545. *Artis magna sive de regulis algebraicis, liber unus*. Nürnberg: Petreius.
- Feliciano da Lazesio, Francesco, 1526. *Libro di arithmetica et geometria speculativa et pratica*. Venezia.
- Fibonacci, Leonardo, 1857. *Liber abbaci*, ed. B. Boncompagni. Roma: Tipografia delle Scienze Matematiche e Fisiche.
- Fibonacci, Leonardo, 1862. *Practica geometriae ed Opusculi*, ed. B. Boncompagni. Roma: Tipografia delle Scienze Matematiche e Fisiche.
- Franci, Raffaella, 2015. “Un trattato d’abaco pisano della fine del XIII secolo (Ms. L.VI.47 della Biblioteca degl’Intronati di Siena)”. *Bollettino di storia delle scienze matematiche* **25**, 9-96.
- Larte de labbacho*, 1478. Treviso.
- Pacioli, Luca, 1494. *Summa de Arithmetica Geometria Proportioni et Proportionalita*. Venezia: Paganino de Paganini.
- Stevin, Simon, 1585. *L’arithmetique*. Leiden: Plantin.
- Stifel, Michael, 1544. *Arithmetica integra*. Nürnberg: Petreius.
- Vogel, Kurt, 1977. *Ein italienisches Rechenbuch aus dem 14. Jahrhundert (Columbia X 511 A13)*. (Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Museums für die Geschichte der Wissenschaften und der Technik. Reihe C, Quellentexte und Übersetzungen, Nr. 33). München.

Secondary literature

- Arrighi, Gino, 1967. “Un «programma» di didattica di matematica nella prima metà del Quattrocento (dal Codice 2186 della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze)”. *Atti e memorie dell’Accademia Petrarca di Lettere, Arti e Scienze di Arezzo*, Nuova Serie **38** (1965–67), 117–128.
- Black, Robert, 2007. *Education and Society in Florentine Tuscany: Teachers, Pupils and Schools, c. 1250–1500*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Bonaini, F., 1857. “Memoria unica sincrona di Leonardo Fibonacci, novamente

- scoperta”. *Giornale Storico degli Archivi toscani* **1**, 239–246.
- Giusti, Enrico, 1991. “L’algebra nel trattato d’abaco di Piero della Francesca: osservazioni e congetture”. *Bollettino di Storia delle Scienze matematiche* **11**, 55–83.
- Goldthwaite, Richard A., 1972. “Schools and Teachers of Commercial Arithmetic in Renaissance Florence”. *Journal of European Economic History* **1**, 418–433.
- Høyrup, Jens, 2005. “Leonardo Fibonacci and *Abaco* Culture: a Proposal to Invert the Roles”. *Revue d’Histoire des Mathématiques* **11**, 23–56.
- Høyrup, Jens, 2007. *Jacopo da Firenze’s Tractatus Algorismi and Early Italian Abacus Culture*. Basel etc.: Birkhäuser.
- Høyrup, Jens, 2009. “What Did the Abacus Teachers Aim At When They (Sometimes) Ended Up Doing Mathematics? An Investigation of the Incentives and Norms of a Distinct Mathematical Practice”, pp. 47–75 in Bart van Kerkhove (ed.), *New Perspectives on Mathematical Practices: Essays in Philosophy and History of Mathematics*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Høyrup, Jens, 2010. “Hesitating progress – the slow development toward algebraic symbolization in abacus- and related manuscripts, c. 1300 to c. 1550”, pp. 3–56 in Albrecht Heeffer & Maarten Van Dyck (eds), *Philosophical Aspects of Symbolic Reasoning in Early Modern Mathematics*. London: College Publications.
- Høyrup, Jens, 2012. “Sanskrit-Prakrit Interaction in Elementary Mathematics As Reflected in Arabic and Italian Formulations of the Rule of Three – and Something More on the Rule Elsewhere”. *Ganita Bhārati* **34**, 144–172.
- Stedall, Jacqueline, 2010. *From Cardano’s Great Art to Lagrange’s Reflections: Filling a Gap in the History of Algebra*. Zürich: European Mathematical Society.
- Travaini, Lucia, 2003. *Monete, mercanti e matematica. Le monete medievali nei trattati di aritmetica e nei libri di mercatura*. Roma: Jouvence.
- Ulivi, Elisabetta, 2002. “Scuole e maestri d’abaco in Italia tra Medioevo e Rinascimento”, pp. 121–159 in Enrico Giusti (ed.), *Un ponte sul mediterraneo: Leonardo Pisano, la scienza araba e la rinascita della matematica in Occidente*. Firenze: Edizioni Polistampa.
- Ulivi, Elisabetta, 2011. “Su Leonardo Fibonacci e sui maestri d’abaco pisani dei secoli XIII–XV”. *Bollettino di Storia delle Scienze Matematiche* **31**, 247–286.
- Van Egmond, Warren, 1980. *Practical Mathematics in the Italian Renaissance: A Catalog of Italian Abacus Manuscripts and Printed Books to 1600*. Firenze: Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza.

Translations into English are due to the present author.