

## THE MEDIEVAL TRADITION OF CICERO'S *VERRINES*

MICHAEL D. REEVE  
University of Cambridge  
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

---

### SUMMARY

Four conclusions are drawn from partial collation of 90 witnesses to the *Verrines* and full collation of a few: that the French family up to II 1.90 has other independent members besides D, that the family of p can be reduced to p, that the most valuable of the *deteriores* is a manuscript hitherto unreported, and that the agreement of p or this manuscript with the French family gives the oldest text recoverable from the medieval tradition.

### KEY WORDS

Cicero; *Verrines*; manuscripts; French; Italian; Bruni.

### RESUMEN

Se extraen cuatro conclusiones a partir de una colación parcial de 90 manuscritos de las *Verrinas* y una colación completa de unos pocos: la familia francesa hasta II 1.90 tiene otros representantes además de D, la familia p puede ser reducida a p, el más valioso de los *deteriores* es un manuscrito desconocido hasta ahora, y la coincidencia con p o la de este manuscrito con la familia francesa proporciona el texto más antiguo recuperable de la tradición medieval.

### PALABRAS CLAVE

Cicerón; *Verrinas*; manuscritos; familias de manuscritos francesa e italiana; Bruni.

---

Fecha de recepción: 21/04/2016

Fecha de aceptación y versión final: 14/06/2016

---

After a foray into the transmission of the *Verrines* over 30 years ago, when together with Richard Rouse I wrote a brief account of it<sup>1</sup>, I did not come back to it until 2012, when I belatedly set about reviewing a commentary on II 4<sup>2</sup>. Visits paid since to libraries and the arrival of important manuscripts on line have put me in a position to answer or at least sharpen many of the

<sup>1</sup> L. D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and transmission*, Oxford 1983, 68-72.

<sup>2</sup> G. Baldo, *M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem actionis secundae liber quartus (De signis)*, Florence 2004; see *Gnomon* 85, 2013, 25-30, at pp. 27-30.

questions that I asked in the review<sup>3</sup>. I have three reasons for not waiting till I have collated more passages: the need to warn prospective editors, or anyone interested in the evidence for what Cicero wrote, that the apparatus of Peterson's Oxford text is a snare<sup>4</sup>; the realization that an argument used in my review does not hold water; and the belief that further collation will not change my conclusions about which manuscripts editors should use.

Since R. Seider discussed the ancient fragments in 1979<sup>5</sup>, a parchment scrap of II 5 (s. v) has been discovered<sup>6</sup>. I shall be concerned, however, with the medieval tradition. Madvig showed in 1828 that it splits into a French family, no member of which is complete, and an Italian family, most of whose members are complete, among them the one that has since turned out to be the oldest; and he expressed distrust in the Italian family<sup>7</sup>. Where the two families agree, editors have seldom felt the need to intervene<sup>8</sup>; but they have not studied either family with enough care or thoroughness to identify their independent or most useful members, a task that I hope this article will advance.

Though a list of 75 manuscripts has been drawn up by G. Lopez & L. Piacente<sup>9</sup>, fewer than 30 have been investigated. When he left Florence for Rome in 1751, the Jesuit Girolamo Lagomarsini had spent 15 years or more collating manuscripts of Cicero in libraries at Florence, and nine of these contained the *Verrines*<sup>10</sup>. His collations were used in the 19th century, but

<sup>3</sup> Available on line in *Gallica* are five manuscripts in the *fonds latin* of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France: 4588A (k), 7775 (S), 7776 (p), 7822, 7823 (D). All manuscripts in the *plutei* at the Laurenziana are available at [teca.bmlonline.it](http://teca.bmlonline.it).

<sup>4</sup> G. (= W.) Peterson, *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes: Divinatio in Q. Caecilium, In C. Verrem*, Oxford 1907<sup>2</sup>1917; reprints number it as volume III of the speeches. Where I add line numbers to my citations by speech and section, they are those of Peterson's edition.

<sup>5</sup> "Beiträge zur Geschichte und Paläographie der antiken Cicerohandschriften", *Bibliothek und Wissenschaft* 13, 1979, 101-49.

<sup>6</sup> C. Gallazzi, "P. Mil. Vogl. Inv. 1190: frammento di Cicero, *In C. Verrem act. sec. lib. V*", *ZPE* 54, 1984, 21-6 with plate 1a; B. Bischoff, V. Brown, "Addenda to *Codices Latini antiquiores*", *Mediaeval Studies* 47, 1985, 317-66, at pp. 335-6 no. 1839 with plate Xa; Serena Ammirati, *Sul libro latino antico: ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche*, Pisa-Rome 2015, 79-80. I thank Maria Chiara Scappaticcio for showing me a discussion of it in draft.

<sup>7</sup> J. N. Madvig, *Ad virum celeberrimum Io. Casp. Orellium epistola critica*, Copenhagen 1828, 7-10.

<sup>8</sup> D. H. Berry, "Neglected and unnoticed additions in the text of three speeches of Cicero", in R. Hunter, S. P. Oakley, eds., *Latin literature and its transmission*, Cambridge 2016, 10-21, at pp. 11-13, argues convincingly for two deletions in II 5.

<sup>9</sup> "Inventario dei mss. delle orazioni ciceroniane contro Verre", *Arcadia: Accademia Letteraria Italiana, Atti e memorie* ser. 3 6.2, 1973, 83-95. Their opening paragraph is more guarded than the statement in Lopez's edition of II 2 for Mondadori, 1991, p. 11, that they drew up the list "recognitione apud omnes bibliothecas quae manuscriptos Latinos servant peracta".

<sup>10</sup> See J. Ruysschaert, *Codices Vaticani latini: codices 11414-11709*, Vatican 1959, ix-xxv; P. L. Schmidt, *Die Überlieferung von Ciceros Schrift "De legibus" in Mittelalter und Renaissance*, Munich 1974, 421-3; *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 63, 2004, 70-73 (F.

editors have inspected only three of his manuscripts themselves, together with fewer than 20 elsewhere. I add another 15 and also include the *editio princeps* (Rome 1471). In the full list given below as Appendix 1 I indicate the section or sections of this article where each witness is discussed. A quirk in my numbering of the sections, namely that between 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3 I place one called 2.2.1-2, results from deciding not to cover my tracks; strictly it belongs earlier in 2.2, but I had already done a fair amount of work on 2.2 before I saw the need for it, and I hope that the actual course of my investigation will have more than biographical interest. Unless accompanied by a reference to another section, 'above' or 'below' refers to the one where it occurs.

I shall start with the French family, concentrating on members written in the 14th or 15th century because they preserve the fullest text that it offers. One branch of the Italian family includes the two oldest Italian manuscripts, the other the great majority not only of the Italian manuscripts but of the manuscripts altogether. I shall discuss the two branches in that order. As the manuscripts on the second have acquired with little exploration or explanation the uncomplimentary name *deteriores*, I shall not only examine their relationships at length but also consider how editors should use the most authoritative of them. Contamination will rear its head in places, especially among the *deteriores*, but I have not found it an impediment to applying stemmatic methods, which I reinforce where possible with historical evidence.

### 1.1. THE FRENCH FAMILY (1): THE DESCENDANTS OF S

Fullest in this family is a branch that omits II 5.162-71 and everything between II 1.111 and II 4. It also omits *Caecil.* 65.16-66.23 *dubitare ... defendere* by *saut du même au même*, a fact that W. Peterson ignores in his apparatus but reports in his main study of the tradition<sup>11</sup>. The oldest manuscript

---

Arato). He gave each manuscript a number and wrote it on the manuscript; Ruysschaert, pp. xvii-xx, gives a concordance of his numbers with extant manuscripts of the speeches. His nine of the *Verrines* are all still in Florence: 1 = Laur. Fies. 187; 5 = Ricc. 499; 6 = Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IV 4; 14 27 29 = Laur. Plut. 48.14, 27, 29; 42 = Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79; 45 = Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1; 48 = Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8.

<sup>11</sup> "The MSS. of the *Verrines*", *Journal of Philology* 30, 1907, 161-207, at pp. 175, 186. I shall have seven more occasions for using the term *saut du même au même*. In a work inaccessible to me, Alfonso Traina asserted that it was coined by Louis Havet in the form *saut de même à même*, and the assertion is repeated by Y. Gomez Gane, *Dizionario della terminologia filologica*, Turin 2013, 297-8, and L. Gamberale, *ibid.* xii, who suggest that the form *saut du même au même* was introduced by Alphonse Dain. Can these notions please go no further? In Havet's *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins*, Paris 1911, I find *saut du même au même* not only three times in the *Plan de l'ouvrage*, pp. vi, vii, ix (in the titles of §§ 441, 698, 1427), but also in §§ 446, 557, 576, 780, 845, 846; *saut de même à même* I find nowhere, and Gauthier Liberman kindly tells me that it strikes him as questionable French.

on the branch, R (Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7774A, s. ix<sup>1</sup>), has kept only II 4-5, but its descendant S (Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7775, s. xii) has also kept II 1.90-111, and S in turn has descendants that supply its lost opening up to II 1.90.

That S descends from R is not agreed by everyone but should be, though whether it is a direct copy has not been established. Evidence was set out by the last Teubner editor, A. Klotz: S shares misguided corrections with R<sup>2</sup>, has many errors against the agreement of R and the Italian family, and makes enough misguided corrections itself to show that its occasional avoidance of an error in R can be put down to conjecture<sup>2</sup>. He did not mention II 5.174.17, which may appear to support Peterson's case for the independence of S. In his article Peterson reports that for the reading of the Italian family, *extra iudicium quae ad iudicium pertinent*, R has *extra iudicium pertineant* and S *extra quae ad iudicium pertineant*<sup>13</sup>. He was right about S and the Budé editor wrong to report that it agrees with R<sup>14</sup>. The reading of R, however, so manifestly lacks a subject for *pertineant*, and so manifestly arose by *saut du même au même*, that *quae ad* in S could easily be a conjectural supplement. If the common source imagined by Peterson had *extra iudicium quae ad iudicium pertineant*, why should S omit the first *iudicium*? and if it had the reading of S, why should R omit *quae ad*?

I am not much closer to solving three mysteries about the end of II 4: why R stops after 151.18 *calamitoso dies* before resuming with II 5; where the corrector of S found the missing lines; and how the corrector of S, whose supplement includes *Explicit liber .vi. in Verrem. Incipit liber .vii.*, knew or worked out that II 4 was the sixth speech of the set and II 5 the seventh when the title of II 4 in S itself is *Ciceronis invectiviarum in Verrem liber ultimus* and II 5 has no title. The preceding words, *a Syracusanis quae ille*, brought the scribe of R to the end of a regular quire (f. 48v<sup>b</sup>), and *calamitoso dies* stands at the beginning of a supernumerary line, after less space than usual but in the same hand; the next quire begins with five blank lines and space for a large *N* (the initial of the first word, *Nemini*), presumably because a title was planned for II 5 like the one for II 4 on the first surviving page. Perhaps the text from *calamitoso dies* was written on a slip or additional leaf now lost but still present somewhere in R when S was corrected. Only later were catchwords invented, but perhaps *calamitoso dies* had the similar function of indicating where the slip or additional leaf belonged. If instead the corrector of S took the supplement from the Italian family, where even

<sup>12</sup> *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia* V, Leipzig 1923, viii-xii.

<sup>13</sup> Peterson, "The MSS. of the Verrines" (n. 11), 171, 206.

<sup>14</sup> H. Bornecque, *Cicéron Discours* VI, Paris 1929, 92. The blame lies with Klotz (*M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta*), who attributes the omission of *quae ad iudicium* to  $\alpha$  and says in his list of symbols " $\alpha = RS$ "; whether or not he meant something less straightforward than " $=$ ", he should have been more careful.

without labels II 4 is clearly enough the sixth speech and II 5 the seventh, the behaviour of R still needs explanation.

Everyone has rightly agreed with Peterson that the later manuscripts on the branch descend from S. For his text up to II 1.90, where S begins, he chiefly used D, namely Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7823 (c. 1400), but sporadically reported five others, none of which has anyone ever considered older than D:

- G<sub>1</sub> = Wolfenbüttel Extrav. 265.2
- G<sub>2</sub> = Wolfenbüttel Weissenburg 41
- L = Leiden Periz. F 12
- K = B. L. Harl. 4105 (a. 1462)
- Z = B. L. Harl. 4852

In his main study of the tradition he associated with G<sub>1</sub> a manuscript that he rated higher, B. N. F. Lat. 7822, dated March 9th '1470'<sup>15</sup>, but in his edition he contented himself with mentioning it as a twin of G<sub>1</sub>. In II 1 both originally stopped in mid page at 105.2 *qui erat institutus*; 7822 continues with a change of ink to 106.18 *adversarium [Verrem] futurum* at the end of the page (f. 65v), where a note in the same hand too hopefully says *Quere reliqua in calce libri*, but G<sub>1</sub> continues in a less formal hand only to 105.7 *Malebat* 'etc.', where the same hand adds *Deficit de texto folium* + an abbreviation that I could not make out + a word sliced when the margin was trimmed (f. 70r). In the same article Peterson touched on B. N. F. Lat. 7786, assigned in the old catalogue to the 14th century and used by Zumpt in II 2-3 by way of a collation that Julius Sillig had made in 1824<sup>16</sup>. Peterson declared it 'of a composite character' and limited his reporting of it to eight readings in II 1.117-2.46. Composite it visibly is. It originally consisted of *seniones* but was supplemented with *quaterniones* written by a different hand (ff. 48-103); a stub follows f. 46, which ends with II 1.110 *sed P. Annii*, and new hands take over on f. 47r and f. 47v. Presumably the leaf now reduced to a stub originally contained the rest of II 1.110-11 up to *singu-*, after which the other descendants of S leave a gap or add only *-lari* or *-lis*; but why did the passage need to be written out afresh on a new leaf, and why did three hands take part in the supplementation? Whatever the answer, the supplement, which runs to the end of II 3, came from the Italian family (I shall be more specific below, § 2.2.1.3.2), and so did a large number of corrections to the original part, many of them made so neatly in erasure that they set one trap

<sup>15</sup> Peterson, "The MSS. of the Verrines" (n. 11), 183-6. Inconveniently, he cites the text by page and line of C. F. W. Müller's Teubner edition, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, Leipzig 1880, II, I.

<sup>16</sup> Peterson, "The MSS. of the Verrines" (n. 11), 186; *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae*, Paris 1744, IV, 395; C. T. (= K. G.) Zumpt, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Verrinarum libri septem*, Berlin 1831, I, xxx, II, 1024-62.

after another for collators. I very much doubt whether the manuscript is as old as the 14th century.

Altogether, then, Peterson considered eight descendants of S. Rouse and I mentioned another, Escorial R I 2, which I recently showed to have been written for Clement VI, pope 1342–52<sup>17</sup>. There are at least seven more:

Frauenfeld Kantonsbibliothek Y 227  
 Oxford Bodl. D'Orville 10  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7777 (dated 1466)  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16226  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16674  
 Stuttgart Donaueschingen 12 (*Caecil. – II 1.111 de istius singulis*)<sup>18</sup>  
 Vat. Lat. 1751 (dated 1452).

Roughly contemporary with D are B. N. F. Lat. 16226 and 16674, the latter commissioned for the Sorbonne by Andreolo Arisi, Milanese ambassador to Paris in the late 14th century and perhaps the early 15th<sup>19</sup>; 16226 may be even older<sup>20</sup>. The other five are all later than D. Frauenfeld Y 227 and Vat. Lat. 1751 were written in Italy. Vat. Lat. 1751 has a French text unaugmented except that it incorporates a few readings of the Italian family such as *Caecil. 65.16–66.23 dubitare ... defendere*, but Frauenfeld Y 227, which omits this passage, continues after II 5 with an Italian text of II 2 – II 4.7.9 *viderit tot pr.*, where the scribe must have noticed that he had already copied out II 4. Vienna 156, which has Milanese decoration no later than the mid 15th

<sup>17</sup> *Manuscripts and methods*, Rome 2011, 397–8. T. J. Hunt, *A textual history of Cicero's "Academici libri"*, Leiden 1998, 109 n. 11, assigns the manuscript to Clement VI without giving any evidence, and É. Anheim, “La bibliothèque personnelle de Pierre Roger/Clément VI”, in J. Hamesse, ed., *La vie culturelle, intellectuelle et scientifique à la cour des papes d'Avignon*, Turnhout 2006, 1–48, at p. 14, does the same without giving any beyond the ambiguous coat of arms.

<sup>18</sup> K. A. Barack, *Die Handschriften der Fürstlich-Fürstenbergischen Bibliothek zu Donaueschingen*, Tübingen 1865, 10–11, describes the relevant section as “Ciceronis Oratio in Verrem I, II, III (Divinatio, Proemium seu principium primae actionis, De praetura urbana)”, and Dr K. Losert of the Württembergische Landesbibliothek kindly told me before my visit that the third speech ends as I suspected at 111. She also checked two readings for me after my visit.

<sup>19</sup> L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris 1874, II, 143; E. Ornato, “Les humanistes et la redécouverte des classiques”, in C. Bozzolo, E. Ornato, *Préludes à la Renaissance: aspects de la vie intellectuelle en France au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1992, 1–45, at pp. 14–15 with n. 77. On Arisi see the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 4, 1962, 198 (G. Martini).

<sup>20</sup> See my edition of *Pro Quinctio*, Leipzig 1992, xv–xvi. Both 16226 and 16674 were mentioned by É. Thomas, *Discours de Cicéron contre Verrès, Seconde action - Livre V De suppliciiis*, Paris 1885, 28.

century<sup>21</sup>, conflates a French text with a recognizable version of the Italian text, but I could not find neat divisions between the two. It shares I 12.5 <*vastavit*> *vexavit* with Donaueschingen 12, Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, G<sub>1</sub>, B. N. F. Lat. 7822, and Vat. Lat. 1751. More about it below (§ 2.2.2.1) when I analyse the Italian family. Are all the other members of the French family actually French? The subscription of L includes the phrase *et sic est finis*, which I have come to regard as typical of German manuscripts; G<sub>2</sub>, assigned in the latest catalogue to the lower Rhine<sup>22</sup>, ends with *et sic est finis*; Donaueschingen 12 has a 17th-century provenance of Georgenthal (near Gotha); and I do not see why K or D'Orville 10 need be French.

Peterson went on reporting DG<sub>1</sub>G<sub>2</sub>LKZ in II 1.90-111, where S survives. In my review I pointed out a reading of D in his apparatus on this section that if correctly reported would serve a useful purpose: II 1.97.21 *produxit* for the reading of S, *protulit produxit* with an undatable line of deletion under *protulit*, clearly a *Perseverationsfehler* after *abstulit*. I have checked D, and its reading is indeed *produxit*. As Peterson's G<sub>1</sub> and G<sub>2</sub> have *protulit produxit*, they must descend from S independently of D, and the same applies to Peterson's K and L, Escorial R I 2 (from which I noted *protulit produxit* in 1983), the manuscripts in Frauenfeld and Stuttgart, Bodl. D'Orville 10, and Vat. Lat. 1751. It also applies to four other manuscripts in Paris: 7786, which like S has *protulit produxit* with a line of deletion under *protulit*, and 7822, 16226, and 16674, which have *protulit produxit* without the line. The only manuscripts that agree with D are Peterson's Z and B. N. F. Lat. 7777.

At *Caecil.* 15.27 Peterson reports the omission of *id* from G<sub>2</sub>LKZ. One might therefore wonder if they constitute a family to which D does not belong. Unfortunately, the report is inadequate: D too omits *id*. So does Esc. R I 2, as I noted in 1983, and so do all the other manuscripts in Paris except 7822. Here and elsewhere, for instance when they restore *Caecil.* 65.16-66.23 *dubitare ... defendere*, G<sub>1</sub> and 7822 draw on the Italian family. Neither Peterson nor Klotz reports that at *Caecil.* 1.5, in the very first sentence, D omits *consili(i)*, presumably recovered from the Italian family by the few members of the French family that have it, which include Z as well as G<sub>1</sub> and 7822; certainly the correctors of Esc. R I 2 and 7786, who restored it, drew on the Italian family.

I have collated in II 4.60.23-68.23 all the descendants of S except Donaueschingen 12, which does not include II 4-5. Though Esc. R I 2 is the oldest, I did not expect any of its later relatives to descend from it or authentic readings to be found in it against the agreement of the rest. I had

<sup>21</sup> H. J. Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich*, Leipzig 1930, VIII vi 1, 14-15 no. 7 with plate X 1.

<sup>22</sup> H. Butzmann, *Kataloge der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel: Die Weissenburger Handschriften*, Frankfurt 1964, 161-5.

shown that it belonged to the papal library at Avignon and then Peñíscola till 1424, when it was sold to Alfonso of Aragon<sup>23</sup>. S, on the other hand, passed from Richard of Fournival to Gerard of Abbeville and from him to the Sorbonne, where it was recorded in 1338 as ‘Tulius ad Cecilium oratorem, ex legato magistri G. de Abbatisvilla. Incipit in 2° fol. *incommodis*, in pen. *sumus etiam*. Precium x sol.’<sup>24</sup>. Actually *sumus* was a misreading of *sed* (II 5.155.18), and the instances of *incommodis* early in *Caecil.* (8.23, 9.2) are preceded by only about half as many words as occupy any of the surviving leaves. As the title is unlikely to have taken up a whole page, the text may have begun on a verso, or else the layout differed. Be that as it may, S could easily have been used at the Sorbonne not just by the scribe of D, Nicholas of Clamanges<sup>25</sup>, but also by other humanists either contemporary or later. Presumably Esc. R I 2 was written in Paris, though for a papal commission S could perhaps have been taken from the Sorbonne to Avignon<sup>26</sup>. Wherever the copying took place, collation did indeed yield errors of Esc. R I 2 absent from the rest. Up to II 1.26.5 an annotator collated it against an Italian witness, one that at *Caecil.* 9.3 had *boni* for *idonei*; when I come to the Italian witnesses, I shall name some that fit (§ 2.2.1.3.2).

Not surprisingly, the letters of Jean de Montreuil, who shared with Nicholas of Clamanges an interest in Cicero, refer several times to the *Verrines*<sup>27</sup>; but the references do not add up to a neat story. In a letter probably of 1395, *Ep.* 108.11, he names the *Verrines* among works of Cicero’s that he would like to acquire from Italy, as though he had no *Verrines* at all. In others of 1400-1401, *Ep.* 110.1-2, 111.17-19, 141.26-27, he quotes from I and II 4, speeches available in either family. In one of 1417, *Ep.* 214.431, he represents Nicholas of Clamanges as familiar with the *Verrines*. An

<sup>23</sup> *Manuscripts and methods* (n. 17), 398.

<sup>24</sup> Delisle, *Le cabinet* (n. 19), III, 61 no. LI 6, from p. 195 of B. N. F. Nouv. Acq. Lat. 99, available in *Gallica*; R. H. Rouse, “Manuscripts belonging to Richard de Fournival”, *RHT* 3, 1973, 253-69, reprinted with *addenda* in R. H. & M. A. Rouse, *Bound fast with letters: medieval writers, readers, and texts*, Notre Dame 2013, 115-38, at pp. 255-6 = 117, 259 = 125 no. 30.

<sup>25</sup> G. Ouy, “Simon de Plumetot et sa bibliothèque”, in P. Cockshaw, M.-C. Garand, P. Jodogne, *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata*, Ghent 1979, II, 353-81, at p. 377 no. 56.

<sup>26</sup> Xavier Espluga kindly put me in touch with Francesca Manzari, who tells me that she regards Esc. R I 2 as Parisian. Many quires have a name below the catchword: *F. de Cales(io)* often preceded by .p. or .p. (ff. 60, 101, 121, 188, 198, 208, 227, 237, 247), *Gilibertus* (f. 70), *Egidius* (ff. 158, 168, 178, 227, 247, 257, 267), *Dionisius* (f. 168, cancelled and replaced by *Egidius*). I owe some of my information about its text of *Caecil.* to Ben Watson (Oklahoma), who is preparing a commentary on the speech.

<sup>27</sup> The latest edition is E. Ornato’s, *Jean de Montreuil: Opera* I, Turin 1963, with notes in IV, Paris 1986, on the dating and other matters. Nothing further in his article “Cicéron et les humanistes français de la première génération”, *Ciceroniana* n. s. 9, 1996, 25-35, at pp. 33-4.



undatable one addressed to an unidentified correspondent, *Ep.* 128, is worth citing in full (I reproduce the latest editor's text, punctuation and all)<sup>28</sup>:

Querenti mihi, ut fit, hoc in Elicone modico alium libellum quemdam meum, nunc, quasi dedita opera, sese ter quaterque Verrine mee, quas accomodati causa hesterno die quesiiistis, obtulerunt, ut quasi innittendo [?] dicere viderentur: 'Mitte nos, quas reicis isto modo, ad virum doctissimum illum, qui nos tantopere cupit et qui te magis, ut sentimus, nobis congratulabitur comiterque suscipiet, non dubitamus, et frequentius alloquetur'. Ego autem, reverende magister, verum perpendens istud esse, et quod forsitan numen quoddam moleste ferebat margaritam tantam apud me sistere incognitam aut sopitam sic diutius remanere, et precipue annuere desiderans vestris votis, ecce Verrinas ipsas benivolentiae vestre fert accessor. Precor igitur et enixe obsecro, ut eas corruptas in parte et laceras, alias ut vidistis, ingenii vestri clarissimi acu resuantur, ac disertie corrigantur pectine et comantur, quatinus ad me dum redierint incudis vestre limam fragrantis, et vobiscum gloriantur extitisse, et michi, cui re correcta opus est, utpote ignaro et inscio, eas tunc visendi occasio peramplius ingeratur et delectabile sit. Valet. Scripta.

The faulty syntax of *Ego ... accessor* and *eas ... comantur* does not affect the sense, but questions arise at two other points. Taking *ter quaterque* to mean 'seven', the editor argues that Jean need not actually have owned all seven *Verrines*, because even the French family called the last speech *liber septimus*. True, S after correction, followed by some of its descendants, has *incipit liber .vii.* at the beginning of II 5; but *ter quaterque*, an adverbial and not an adjectival expression, must go instead with *obtulerunt*. I also wonder if the editor's comma in *corruptas in parte et laceras, alias ut vidistis* should be placed instead after *alias*, whether adjective or adverb; certainly *laceras* would fit the end of II 1. To judge from *ut vidistis*, the addressee had already paid a visit and seen the copy.

From external evidence, however, I return to the text. As I have said, Donaueschingen 12 does not include II 4-5. Z and B. N. F. Lat. 7777 share the one error that I noted from D in my passage of II 4 and may therefore descend from it. Frauenfeld Y 227 may well descend from Esc. R I 2, whose original reading it discloses in many places where the corrector effaced it, for instance at the very beginning of *Caecil.*, where Esc. R I 2 had *eorum qui <horum tempore qui sunt> adsunt* before the corrector erased *-um*, changed *-r-* to

<sup>28</sup> B. N. F. Lat. 13062 ff. 89v-90r, available in *Gallica*. I have no quarrel with the transcription. Silvia Rizzo, whom I thank for her comments on the letter, suggests *innuendo* for *innittendo*.

-c, and put a line through *qui sunt*, or at *Caecil.* 8.25, where Esc. R I 2 has *vim* in erasure and Frauenfeld Y 227 *itaque*, also retained in Vat. Lat. 1751, G<sub>1</sub>, and B. N. F. Lat. 7822, when they restore *vim gravitatemque requirit iudiciorum*. There must have been an intermediary, however, because Esc. R I 2 gives in full *Caecil.* 4.16 *michi* and 7.13 *tempore*, which Frauenfeld Y 227 corrupts to *in* and *turpe*. L and D'Orville 10 are very close, but I doubt whether L, though less accurate than D'Orville 10, can descend from it. Otherwise all the members of the French family up to II 1.90 are independent of one another. Errors of each in my passage of II 4:

Esc.: 64.12 *regressit* (G<sub>1</sub>) for *reges ii* (*rege sit* S<sup>1</sup>, *regessit* S<sup>2</sup> ut vid., D etc.; S also has *r* in the margin, presumably meant as *require* but easily misunderstood), 65.28 *esset [et]* (G<sub>1</sub>), 67.2 *op[er]ibus*;

D: 64.21 *atque* for *ac*;

7777: 62.18 *in* for *et*, 64.13-14 [*quod ... potuerunt*], 65.27 *vendendi* for *videndi*;

7786: 62.10 [*et*] *audierat*, 67.9 [*unius*];

G<sub>1</sub>: 62.24 <*f pergrandicula*> *pergrandi trulla*, 63.1 [*res*], 65.28 [*et*] *regio*, 1 <*vel re*> *constituerunt*, 66.21 [*se*], 67.4 *esse*<*t*>, 68.21 *verra* for *vestrum*;

7822: 63.1 *res ipsa* ~, 68.21 *vero* for *vestrum*;

16226: 62.18 *sic* for *sit*, 63.29 [*iste*], 65.27 [*se*];

16674: 61.1 [*propter*], 62.15 *abunda[ba]t*, 63.6 [*rogatum velle se eam*], 65.5 [*operum*], 68.20 [*socium*];

G<sub>2</sub>: 61.30 [*nuper*], 1 *finem* for *sine*, 65.1 *clamore* for *-are*, 67.32 [*Romano*], 4 *vim* for *iam*;

K: 60.27 <*violatum*> *spoliatum*, 61.4 *postea[quam]*, 63.3 *apud ipsum pulcherrima* for *pulcherrima apud eum*, 6 *si* for *se*, 64.8 [*et*], 10 *in* for *ad*, 11 *e*<*st*>, 65.20-22 [*quomodo ... suspicare-*], 27 *se* after *videndi*, 28 [*et*] *puerili*, 6 *possit* for *posset*, 9 *i[llu]d*, 10 *eo* for *illos*, 66.16 [*im]pudentiam*, 21 *religionis* for *-ne*, 22 [*impediri*], 23 *hominis* for *operis*, 24 *precibus quam minis* for *minis quam precibus*, 25 *iubet* after *noctem*, 67.32 *erat* for *esset*, 1 *suae societatis* ~, *voluerit* for *esse voluisset*, 3 *qua[re]*, 13 *tempore* for *patre*;

Z: 60.26 *existimamus* for *-matio*, 61.5 a gap for *in Syriam*, 62.18 [*ita*], 22 *et maxime* twice, 25 [*satis credo* (D etc.) *idoneum*], 63.1 *ista* for *ipsa*, 5 *esset* for *nosset*, 64.8 *inde* for *iudices*, 65.28 *religiosi* for *-so* (D etc.), 8 *prospexisse* for *per-*, 66.20 *donare[re]*, 21 [*et*] *religione*, 67.7 *ipsum Iovem* ~, 12 *regis* for *regio*, 15 *provincia*<*e*>

L: 60.24 *huius* for *eius*, 62.25 *aur[re]o*, 65.10 *sacratum* for *satiatum*, 66.23 *isti* for *iste*, 67.31 *est* for *e*

D'Orville 10: 66.22 *impediret* for *-iri*, 67.10 *possint* for *-sunt*

Frauenfeld Y 227: 61.1 and 3 *regimen* for *regnum*, 3 [et], 5 *poterant* for *potuerunt*, 62.19 [se], 22 [regius] in lac., 26 <et> *dicere*, 63.26 *item* for *iste*, 64.14 *atque* for *ac*, 65.5 *cum* for *ea*, 66.20 *coep<er>it*, 67.31 *Capitolio* for *-lium*, 68.18 *perventurum* for *-ram*, 22 *inde* for *iudices*  
 Vat. Lat. 1751: 61.4 [ii], 62.10 *ut* for *et*, 19 *accep<ta>tum*, 21 *nam* for *non*, 64.8 *iudicium* for *iudices*, 65.23 *ac* for *aut*, 24 *participarent* for *perciperent*, 4 [gemmis]

If the passage is a fair sample, D emerges as the most accurate of the 15, Peterson's K and Z as the least accurate. K also puts after I 17.6 *in manibus* two passages that must have occupied a bifolium of its exemplar transposed to the middle of a quire, *Caecil. 67.4 defendere ... I 2.19 populo Romano + I 31.16 a nobis dicta erunt ... 38.5 quidem suspicio*<sup>29</sup>. Shared errors reveal these sub-groups or possible sub-groups:

16226, 16674, G<sub>2</sub>, K, 7786, L, D'Orville 10: 63.5 <eam> *etiam* (~ K),  
 64.13 *numquam* for *nondum*;  
 G<sub>2</sub>, K, 7786, L, D'Orville 10: 61.3 <quod> *ad*, 7 *vocatus* for *-tur*,  
 62.24 *eximia* for *ex una*, 64.10 *exteras nationes* for *exteris nationibus*, 65.24 [ut] *ne*, 67.4 *ad se* for *etsi* (*et se* D etc.), 9 *huius unius* ~; 15 *princeps* for *praeceps*;  
 L, D'Orville 10: 63.6 *e<ti>am*, 13 *ostenderent* for *offenderant*,  
 64.21 *ad* for *ac*, 65.30 *postea quae* for *posteaquam*, 66.19 *servare* for *-ari*, 67.4 *antef[a]*, 68.20 *eis tum* for *ieictum*;  
 K, 7786: 60.23 [iam];  
 Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, 16226, 16674: 66.24 *-que* for *quam*,  
 though I suspect that D too originally had *que*;  
 G<sub>1</sub>, 7822: 61.1 [Syriae], 67.2 [ex] *auro* (certainly 7822: G<sub>1</sub> not clear), 3 *haec* for *hoc*;  
 16226, 16674: 62.23 *era[n]t*.

At 65.1, where S has *involutisque* with *cri* written above *tis*, the original *-tique* appears in G<sub>1</sub>, Esc. R I 2, 16674, Frauenfeld Y 227, L, and D'Orville 10 (and 7786 may have had it before correction), but 16226 has *-ticisque* and Vat. Lat. 1751 *-ticiisque*; and at 65.11 Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, G<sub>1</sub>, and 7822, have *revertuntur ad Antiochum*, the reading of S before marks of transposition were added. Similarly, 62.12 *haec*, at first omitted by S<sup>1</sup>, is also omitted by Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, G<sub>1</sub>, and 7822.

<sup>29</sup> This is my restatement of Peterson's laboured account, "The MSS. of the *Verrines*" (n. 11), 181-2; I ignore some untidiness at the extremities of the passages concerned. The exemplar was not any manuscript that I have seen.

As I had made notes on the text of Donaueschingen 12 in I 1.1-16.27, I collated in that passage all the other members of the family. More evidence accrued for the existence of the first two sub-groups: for the first, 2.1 [*praedonem*]; for the second, 13.19 <*a*> *iudicio*, 15.17 *mecum ratione* ~, 16.26 [*ab initio*] *ab eo res* for *ab initio res ab eo*. L and D'Orville 10 again share errors: 3.3 *religioseque* for *ac religiose*, 4 [*re*] *manere*, 4.14 *ego rebus* ~, 17 *exteris*<*que*>, 18 *qui*<*d*>, 5.29 *primo* for *-um*, 1 *tum* <*demum*>, 6.9 *privatorum*[*que*], 8.25 [*id*], 9.2 *fuertit* for *fieret*, 11.25 *fuisset* [*et*], *induxit* for *ad-*, 13.16 *coactae* <*sunt*>, 23 *maximae* for *optimae*, 15.17 *aliquam* for *-cuius*, 19 *his se* ~. As my passage of II 4 yielded only feeble evidence for the independence of L, here are some errors of each:

L: 2.15 *quidem* for *iudices*, 3.12 *tantoque* for *tantopere*, 4.22 *expugnare* for *-ari*, 5.27 *pecuniis fuit* ~, 28 *fuit* for *fecit*, 10.6 [*hoc*] *consilio*, 13.12 *satieta*<*s*>, 23 *opportunissimaeque* for *atque opportunissimae*, 16.26 [*ut*]

D'Orville 10: 1.4 *datumque* for *datum atque*, 3.5 *ego hoc* ~, 4.19 *esse*[*t*], 6.6 [*sum*], 13.20 *iudicati condemnati* for *indicta causa damnati*

G<sub>1</sub> and 7822 again share errors, but Donaueschingen 12 joins them in having for instance 10.10 *excepto* for *erepto*, 12.8 [*aliquando*], 15.10 *quoque eius* ~, and these errors also appear in an Italian member of the family, Vat. Lat. 1751. Unlike the other three, however, Donaueschingen 12 omits *Caecil.* 65.16-66.23 *dubitare ... defendere* with D and the rest. If it has no contamination elsewhere from the Italian family, it would follow that before contamination the other three all descended from a manuscript like it; and as I found nothing in my passage of II 4 to connect Vat. Lat. 1751 with G<sub>1</sub> and 7822, it might well not be a coincidence that Donaueschingen 12 never included II 4-5. Unless I nodded in collating the other Italian member of the family, Frauenfeld Y 227, it has none of the errors just listed in I 1.1-16.27; certainly it does not omit 12.8 *aliquando*. On the other hand, it shares two readings cited above, *Caecil.* 8.25 <*itaque*> *desiderio* and I 12.5 <*vastavit*> *vexavit*, with Esc. R I 2, Donaueschingen 12, G<sub>1</sub>, 7822, and Vat. Lat. 1751. I found no further evidence for the existence of my other three sub-groups, all of them poorly defined.

Up to II 1.90, then, S has so many independent descendants that editors will need to economize. The best policy would be to use Esc. R I 2 (though up to II 1.26.5, where correction has interfered, Frauenfeld Y 227 might be added or substituted), D, and one or other of 16226 and 16674. Where they all disagree or two agree against the other, a correction in S may have been responsible, but the surviving parts of S do not suggest that it had many, and usually the reading of the Italian family will clear up any doubt.

## 1.2. THE FRENCH FAMILY (II): ITS OTHER MEMBERS

I have nothing new to say about C (B. L. Add. 47679 + Geneva Lat. 169, s. ix<sup>1</sup>), O (Laur. Conv. Sopp. 79 ff. 5r-44r, s. xiv/xv), the relative or relatives of O collated in the 16th century<sup>30</sup>, or the manuscript reduced to the slivers that have come to light at Bamberg and elsewhere<sup>31</sup>, but I must return to the excerpts from II 3-4 present in H (B. L. Harl. 2682, s. xi) and E (Berlin Lat. 2° 252, s. xii). Peterson raised two objections to Clark's derivation of E from H, but in my review I pointed out that at II 3.5.9 he was wrong about H. I can now add that at II 3.3.7 he was wrong about E, which like H has *precipitur*.

Excerpts from the *Verrines* have been reported from the *Florilegium Angelicum*, compiled in 12th-century France and indeed probably about 1160 in Champagne if the dedicatory letter in Rome Angel. 1895 was composed by Nicolas de Montiéramey<sup>32</sup>. They number 18 and all come from II 4-5. I transcribe them from Vat. Pal. Lat. 957 (s. xii) ff. 171v-172r<sup>33</sup>:

*Cicero in Verrinis* (rubric).

*Abducuntur non numquam a iure homines et ab institutis suis magnitudine pecuniae* (4.12)

*In rebus venalibus qui modus (nodus ante corr.) est cupiditatis idem est estimationis* (4.14).

*Plerumque detrahitur honor debitus non homini sed ordini* (4.25).

*Est boni iudicis parvis etiam ex rebus coniecturam facere* (4.34).

*Improbi praesentis maior est vis imperio quam in bonorum absentium patrocínio* (4.89).

*Homines sepe fallit opinio* (4.86).

*Procrastinari non debet quod statim fieri potest* (4.100).

*Rei magnitudo breviter perstringere atrocitatem criminis non permittit* (4.105).

*Pessimus est qui id facinus ad quod nemo alius ulla pecunia adduci potest gratis efficere conatur* (5.11).

<sup>30</sup> M. D. Reeve, "A lost manuscript of Cicero's *Verrines*", *RHT* 12-13, 1982-3, 381-5. In the table at the beginning the "3 fr." of C should appear under II 2, not II 3.

<sup>31</sup> See my review in *Gnomon* 85, 2013, 30.

<sup>32</sup> R. H. Rouse, "The *Florilegium Angelicum*: its origin, content, and influence", in J. J. G. Alexander, M. T. Gibson, eds., *Medieval learning and literature: essays presented to Richard William Hunt*, Oxford 1976, 66-114, reprinted with an *addendum* in *Authentic witnesses: approaches to medieval texts and manuscripts*, Notre Dame 1991, 101-52. For the attribution of the dedicatory letter see P. Stirnemann, D. Poirel, "Nicolas de Montiéramey, Jean de Salisbury et deux florilèges d'auteurs antiques", *RHT* n. s. I, 2006, 173-88.

<sup>33</sup> I consulted it on line at [digi.bu.uni-heidelberg.de](http://digi.bu.uni-heidelberg.de).

*Res magna sine metu ac severitate administrari non potest* (5.22).

*Perversum est contra aliquem induci crimen sine accusatore, sententiam sine consilio, dampnationem sine defensione* (5.23).

*Abominabile est iura precio non equitate disponi* (5.27).

*Dicebat Annibal in castris non genere sed virtute oportere certari* (5.31).

*Multum inest inter hominum mentes et cogitationes* (5.35).

*Iudex esse bonus non potest qui suspicione non certa (certa non ante corr.) movetur* (5.65).

*Principia amicitiae minori negotio non retinentur quam comparantur* (5.175).

*Omnibus in rebus permagni momenti est ratio et inclinatio temporum* (5.177).

*Tacitae magis et occultae inimicitiae sunt timende quam inducte atque aperte* (5.182). *Explicit.*

Cicero's wording is often rearranged or paraphrased, and consultation of Peterson's apparatus yields only one reading of interest, *perstringere* with pS<sup>2</sup> at 4.105 (*praestringere* RS<sup>1</sup>); but it will not bear much weight, least of all when a late but respectable witness to the *Florilegium Angelicum*, B. L. Add. 25104 (s. xv, Italian), has *prae-*. The restriction to II 4-5 must create a presumption that the source was R in its present state or a descendant other than S, which long after the 12th century still included everything up to II 1.111.

I have discussed elsewhere, with a sceptical conclusion, the possibility that the *Verrines* were read in France by 12th-century commentators on Horace's *Ars poetica* and Cicero's *De inventione*<sup>34</sup>.

## 2.1. THE ITALIAN FAMILY (I): P AND ITS RELATIVES

C in the French family included the *Catilinarians* and *Caesarians*, but in the Italian family the transmission of the *Verrines* had nothing to do with the transmission of Cicero's other speeches until combinations were devised in the 15th century, even then not often. Consequently, no arguments from analogy are available.

Besides 7786 (Zumpt's 'Paris. C'), the collations that Sillig made at Paris in 1824 for II 2-3 covered 7776 (Zumpt's 'Paris. B') and 4588A (Zumpt's 'Paris. A'). Assigned in the old catalogue to the 13th century<sup>35</sup>, 7776 took a long time to assert itself. True, it struck Zumpt as 'parens fortasse, certe simillimus Lagomarsiniani 29', namely Laur. 48.29 (s. xv); but Halm said nothing about it and instead singled out Laur. 48.29 as more honest than

<sup>34</sup> "Cicero's *Verrines* and the textual tradition of Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium*", *Studi sul Boccaccio* 43, 2015, 133-45, at pp. 137-9.

<sup>35</sup> *Catalogus* (n. 16), IV, 393.

the other members of the Italian family<sup>36</sup>. The first editor to treat it with respect was Émile Thomas, who gave it the symbol p<sup>37</sup>. In his first volume he kept it in the 13th century, but in his others he mentioned that Chatelain had just pushed it back to the 11th<sup>38</sup>. Chatelain's dating was reaffirmed by the last paleographers to have looked at it, who tentatively assign it to northern Italy<sup>39</sup>. In the 16th century it belonged to Celso Cittadini of Siena<sup>40</sup>. No editor has yet mentioned a note on f. 174v: *In reversione mea de curia ego istud proposui facere et ducere ad effectum et firmavi cum Ren. (?) in dominica .ii. de mense Setembri in signoria. Ingh. ... de Mangarenta (?) . 1226*<sup>41</sup>. One Inghiramo da Magreta is attested from March 3rd to October 15th 1227 as *potestà* of Siena<sup>42</sup>.

Alongside p Peterson used not only Laur. 48.29 (s. xv), which he called q, but also B. L. Harl. 2687 (s. xv<sup>2</sup>), which he called r. In my review I exposed as 'a complete sham' Klotz's case for their independence. Arguing that r descends from q and q from p, I asked whether by any chance II 4.30.16-17 *cum iste ... syngraphis* and 133.24-25 *cum ... arbitramini*, omitted by qr for no obvious reason, occupied a line in p. The former does. Furthermore, the scribe of q at first omitted but then restored two other passages that occupy a line in p, *Caecil.* 44.17-18 *quidem cogitas ... futurum* and II 4.2.16-17 *nihil istum ... me scitote*; q must therefore be a direct copy of p. I mentioned in my review that r omits a line of q in II 4 and twice does so in II 2, and I have since noticed that Peterson thanks A. C. Clark for pointing out the omission of II 5.168.28-169.1 *crucem ... tum fueris*<sup>43</sup>; these words, not *in crucem ... tum fueris* as Peterson says, are what q has on a line and r omits (the resultant *in infestus* should have alerted the scribe to the

<sup>36</sup> "Ueber die Handschriften der Verrinischen Reden des Cicero", *Gelehrte Anzeigen* 36, 1853, 233-67, at columns 238-40.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas, *Discours de Cicéron* (n. 20), 2, 28. There is more to be said for Klotz's capital P, but as I have worked from Peterson's text and he retained p, I too retain it.

<sup>38</sup> II, 4, 1886 (I have used the reprint of 1887) 2; *Caecil.*, 1892, 12; ed. 2 of all three speeches in one volume, 1894, 52.

<sup>39</sup> É. Chatelain, *Paléographie des classiques latins*, Paris 1884-92, I, xxxi; F. Avril, Y. Zaluska, *Manuscrits enluminés d'origine italienne*, Paris 1980, I, 76 no. 132. Klotz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta* (n. 12), said "s. xiii" in his preface, pp. xiii, xix, but "s. xi" in his list of symbols.

<sup>40</sup> M. C. Di Franco Lilli, *La biblioteca manoscritta di Celso Cittadini*, Studi e Testi 259, Vatican 1970, 82-3 no. 91, with plate XVII of f. 1r.

<sup>41</sup> Avril, Zaluska, *Manuscrits* (n. 39), give *Otiria* for *curia* and *Sagreria* for *signoria*.

<sup>42</sup> A. Lisini, *R. Archivio di Stato in Siena: Inventario delle pergamene conservate nel Diplomatico dall'anno 736 all'anno 1250*, Siena 1908, I, 195-9.

<sup>43</sup> Peterson, "The MSS. of the Verrines" (n. 11), 191. The omission was mentioned later by Clark himself, *The descent of manuscripts*, Oxford 1918, 8. What brought it to his attention, I wonder? Peterson also observes that r omits II 2.28.23-24 *primum ... ducamus*, which occupies a line in p; but as q has it, and not on a line, r must have omitted it by *saut du même au même* after *debemus*.

oversight). There are corrections by another hand in q up to the end of its fourth quire (f. 40v, II 2.8.11 *Romani*) and by yet another hand, no later than the first half of the 15th century, in II 5; I have noticed very few elsewhere. All these corrections passed to r. Below (§ 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.5.1) I shall assign them to the *deteriores* and those in the first four quires to an identifiable and eliminable family of *deteriores*. Henceforth, then, qr should be used only for conjectures or lucky slips.

Another descendant of p is Vat. Lat. 1754, written in the later 15th century on paper in an unpretentious but tidy and spacious cursive. Independent of qr, it omits II 1.149.23–25 *si in acceptum ... habiturum Rabonium*, which occupies a line in p.

Before I leave these three descendants of p and concentrate on p itself, a word about their origin. I have nothing to say about Vat. Lat. 1754 and nothing about r beyond what Rouse and I said over 30 years ago on the authority of Albinia de la Mare, that it was written in Florence or Rome and has Strozzi arms<sup>44</sup>. More interesting is q, written by the scribe of Laur. 36.23, which contains Ovid's *Fasti* and Catullus, and Laur. 50.4 part 1, which contains Cicero's *Orator* and *Brutus*<sup>45</sup>. The humanistic sections in three volumes of commentary on Dante, Laur. 42.14–16, signed and dated 1432, 1431, 1434, led Albinia de la Mare to identify him as Bartolomeo di Piero Nerucci of S. Gimignano<sup>46</sup>. Laur. 50.4 part 1 cannot have been written before 1421, when Cicero's *Brutus* and a full text of his *Orator* emerged at Lodi. Albinia de la Mare declared herself reluctantly convinced that the text of Catullus in Laur. 36.23 was written before the death of Salutati in 1406, but at the same time she appears to have convinced the proponent of this view that it was probably written about 1425<sup>47</sup>. A manuscript that Nerucci

<sup>44</sup> *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), 71. So too the *Catalogue of illuminated manuscripts* that the British Library has put on line.

<sup>45</sup> I owe the identification to Irene Ceccherini, who made it on the strength of the plate that I cite in the next note; she also referred me to two of the works that I cite in nn. 48 and 49. Laur. 50.4 is not mentioned in the latest Teubner edition of *Orator*, 1980, or *Brutus*, 1970.

<sup>46</sup> "Humanistic script: the first ten years", in F. Krafft, D. Wuttke, *Das Verhältnis der Humanisten zum Buch*, Boppard 1977, 89–110, at pp. 98–100, with fig. 5, which shows the first page of Laur. 36.23. I am not convinced, nor is anyone that I have consulted, by her attribution to Nerucci of B. L. Burney 160, which contains Cicero's *De oratore*; for a description and a few images see the first site that comes up on line for "Burney 160". I ignore here annotations that she attributes to Nerucci.

<sup>47</sup> D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus: a critical edition*, Chapel Hill 1978, 33–4, 46 no. 23, and *Catullus edited with a textual and interpretative commentary*, Toronto 1997, 75 no. 23. Gilberto Biondi and Dániel Kiss have kindly told me that his previous arguments for dating it no later than 1406 do not convince them. R. A. B. Mynors in the *O. C. T.*, 1958, p. vii, had even suggested that it might belong to the end of the 14th century. It is not mentioned by M. Zicari, *Scritti catulliani*, Urbino 1978, or D. S. McKie, *The manuscripts of Catullus: recension in a closed tradition*, diss. Cambridge 1978. Thomson associates it with his no. 95, Siena Com. H V 41, but I have a note of 1989 or 1990 from David McKie in which he says that



signed and dated 1454, Prato Bibl. Roncioniana Q II 2 (84), does not look close in date to the six just mentioned<sup>48</sup>, and I do not know what kind of script he used in S. Gimignano 62, which he signed and dated 1471-73<sup>49</sup>. Was he already copying out texts in 1419, as recent accounts of him say? Laur. 78.20 has on the verso of the flyleaf at the front a note that in its latest form reads as follows: *Iste Boetius scriptus fuit a me Bartolomeo Petri de Sancto Geminiano ... in scolis domini Mathie [Mattia Lupi] plebani plebis Aioli Pratensis comitatus die vigesima quinta mensis Aprelis sub annis domini millesimo quadringentesimo decimo nono*. Below *Petri de Sancto Geminiano*, however, is a cancelled name that may itself have been substituted for another<sup>50</sup>. If he did nevertheless write the manuscript, it is further in style than Prato Q II 2 from the other six and conspicuously less humanistic. Perhaps, therefore, Albinia de la Mare's instinct should be respected and 'c. 1425' treated as the likeliest date for q and the other two unsigned manuscripts<sup>51</sup>. Nerucci's place of origin may account for his access to p, which I take to have been in Siena at the time.

Whether p is the oldest member of the Italian family depends on the date of two partially effaced leaves that survive as pp. 219-22 of Montecassino 361, a well-known miscellany largely written by Peter the Deacon<sup>52</sup>. The leaves, which come from a different manuscript<sup>53</sup>, contain a passage of II 3, a speech that furnished him with places in Sicily to pass off as ancient possessions of the abbey<sup>54</sup>. When I saw the fragment in 2003, I jotted down 's. xi', but I

---

this manuscript 'is patently *not* a brother of the direct copy of R (Laur. 36.23), but a brother of the early  $\alpha$ -transposition ms. Laur. 33.13'.

<sup>48</sup> S. Bianchi & others, *I manoscritti medievali della provincia di Prato*, Florence 1999, plate XVIII; M. Boschi Rotiroli, *I manoscritti datati delle province di Grosseto, Livorno, Massa Carrara, Pistoia e Prato = Manoscritti datati d'Italia* 16, Florence 2007, plate 25.

<sup>49</sup> G. Garosi, *San Gimignano Biblioteca Comunale = Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia* 88, Florence 1972, 200-201. Nerucci receives no entry in the index, and I owe my knowledge of the manuscript to M. C. Davies, "The senator and the schoolmaster: friends of Leonardo Bruni Aretino in a new letter", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 33, 1984, 1-21, at p. 11 n. 58. On Nerucci see also S. Bellomo, *Dizionario dei commentatori danteschi*, Florence 2004, 345-8, but for "Laur. 40.15" on p. 345 read Laur. 42.15.

<sup>50</sup> Bandini's version of the previous name in his catalogue is much too short for the words between *Bartolomeo* and *in scolis*, and still too short, albeit longer, is the version arrived at with the help of ultra-violet by R. Black, G. Pomaro, "*La Consolazione della filosofia*" nel Medioevo e nel Rinascimento italiano, Florence 2000, 115-17 with n. 85, 202 with n. 147.

<sup>51</sup> Irene Ceccherini, who accepts the attribution of Laur. 78.20 to Nerucci and has explained to me why, concludes from the difference in style that the three unsigned manuscripts postdate 1419.

<sup>52</sup> On Peter the Deacon and the compilation of the manuscript see R. H. Rodgers's edition of Frontinus *De aquaeductu urbis Romae*, Cambridge 2004, 37-44.

<sup>53</sup> M. Inguauez, *Codicum Casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus, 1928-34*, II, 211, 212.

<sup>54</sup> E. Caspar, *Petrus diaconus und die Monte Cassineser Fälschungen*, Berlin 1909, 170-71; H. Bloch, "Der Autor der *Graphia aureae urbis Romae*", *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 40, 1984, 55-175, at p. 115.

have forgotten whether I was then aware of previous opinions, which had diverged enough to affect priority: on the one hand ‘s. xii’ narrowed down to ‘s. xii’<sup>55</sup>, on the other ‘s. x’<sup>256</sup>. Dated or datable Italian manuscripts are scarce before the 13th century and especially so in the 10th and 11th, and a relative dating might not even be possible if one were to see p and the fragment alongside each other. It is safe to say, however, that neither descends from the other, because the fragment, which covers II 3.120-29, has *profugerant* for *-erunt* at 120.9, and p omits 120.6 *tot* and 121.18 *decumano*, the former between lines<sup>57</sup>. For editors, though, the fragment hardly matters, whereas p is unquestionably the oldest member of the Italian family throughout the rest of the work.

The many corrections in p not made by the scribe, or at all events not made in the process of copying, include the restoration of short sequences omitted through *saut du même au même* or for no obvious reason. As overwriting is much commoner than erasure, the original reading is seldom in doubt, though it may not always have been a Latin word. Several hands appear to be involved, none, I think, later than the 13th century except that a 16th-century annotator, doubtless Celso Cittadini, jotted a few readings in the margin or in gaps; but the reproduction of p available on line is not good enough to support graphic distinctions<sup>58</sup>, and I have found no other way of stratifying the medieval corrections if they had more than one source. Did they come from the French family, from the single Italian manuscript known as k, from the Italian sub-family known as δ, or from a source not otherwise attested? I venture an answer below.

Within the Italian family Peterson gave the symbol δ to a sub-family of *deteriores* that included the early printed editions. Despite Halm’s remarks about q and Klotz’s conclusion that ‘neutram familiam prae altera contemnere licet’<sup>59</sup>, the notion has lingered from Madvig’s day that pqr too are *deteriores* beside the French family; but whether they are or not, I exclude them from my use of the term. More about the *deteriores* shortly; for the moment I will just say that they do form a closely knit sub-family.

<sup>55</sup> Inguanez (n. 53) 212; B. Munk Olsen, *L’étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris 1982, I, 227 no. C288, Paris 1989, III 2, 35.

<sup>56</sup> Rouse, *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), 71 with n. 99, on the authority of Bernhard Bischoff; Bloch, “Der Autor” (n. 54).

<sup>57</sup> Maria Chiara Scappaticcio obliged me by checking the text of the fragment on the microfilm held at the Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes. When we were preparing the entry for *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), Richard Rouse showed me a collation of the two reasonably legible pages against Klotz’s edition (n. 12).

<sup>58</sup> It was produced for *Gallica* from microfilm, whereas 4588A (k) was digitized from scratch.

<sup>59</sup> *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta* (n. 12), xxi. R. Sydow, “Beiträge zur Kritik von Ciceros Verrinen”, *Hermes* 67, 1932, 446-68, argued that Klotz should have accepted more words transmitted in the Italian but not in the French family.

Intermediate in date between p and the *deteriores* is a single Italian manuscript, Zumpt's 'Paris. A', 4588A. Peterson uses it sporadically and calls it k. It contains II 2-3 (ff. 76-91, two quires), II 4 from 29.23 *quidem cum essem* or thereabouts (ff. 66r-70r), and II 5 from 30.3 *fuertit siracusis* (ff. 71r-75v, continued by a slip, 75<sup>bis</sup>); after II 3.49.24 *redempturum esse dicebat* space was indeed left at the end of a quire, as I surmised in my review ('85v' was a slip for 83v), and a different hand used it for adding the end of II 1 from 156.25 *Iam vero*. Though neatly written by various hands in the late 12th or early 13th century, k is tiresome to collate, because its cramped and unarticulated columns of tiny script have suffered badly in places from damp or wear. It has few corrections.

Peterson says that k 'medium inter p et codd. deteriores locum videtur obtinere', an expression outmoded in stemmatic analysis but echoed by G. Lopez in his Mondadori edition of II 2: 'inter codicem P et deteriores collocandus'<sup>60</sup>. When I checked k here and there against Peterson's reports of p and δ, it appeared to share errors with each against the other, classic proof of either contamination or descent from a common ancestor that carried variants; doubtless that is why Peterson treated it as intermediate between p and δ. When, however, I checked p in places where kδ appeared to share an error against it, I found that the appearance was almost entirely an illusion, because he fails to report that p shares the error<sup>61</sup>. He also misreports some readings of p or k. Failure to report p begins as early as *Caecil.* 15.26, where like rδ (and q) it has *petissent <a me praesidium>*; in the *Actio prima* I have noticed serious mistakes at 16.29 and 19.10, '*condicione* p' (no) and silence on *spectare videbant*, for which p and δ have the better clausula *spectare arbitrabantur*; and in II 5 p has not *eveniunt* at 12.15 but *veniunt*, not *sicubi ita facta sunt* at 13.16 but *sicubi facta sunt ita facta sunt* (Peterson's text), and not *comparet* at 26.30 but *comparat* (so too δ). Here is a sample from the parts of II 2-5 also present in k (his π means pqr, and his b is a representative of δ unusual only in not going beyond II 2):

II 2.6.18 '*romanorum* add. ... O<sup>l</sup>brd' (pk), 8.10 '*et post p ... postea k*' (*post* pk), 17.26 '*ei* om. bδ' (pk), 18.7 '*a* om. k' (no), 29.5 '*uti* COp' (not p), 48.12 '*qui* qrk' (p), 52.16 '*quo* om. pq' (no), 92.14 '*cum* p' (no), 120.21 '*est* p in ras.' (no), 124.19 '*veterum* vulg.' (pk), 149.18 '*ita eos* pb al.' (*eos ita* p), 156.28 '*obsecrarunt* p' (-arent p<sup>1</sup> -arint p<sup>2</sup>), 172.6 '*etiam ille* pr' (not p), II 3.10.19 '*erimus* δ' (pk), 12.16 '*ratione* cOk' (not k), 28.2 '*esse* aiebat omnes ck' (not k),

<sup>60</sup> *M. Tulli Ciceronis actionis secundae in Verrem liber II*, [Verona] 1991, 10.

<sup>61</sup> At least one printing of his first edition, 1907, has *ERRATA ET CORRIGENDA* on p. xix. He there lists 32 passages of II 4-5 where "lectio codicis p erat in adnotationibus diserte enumeranda, ubi facit cum deterioribus (δ) contra RS". These reports were added to the apparatus of his second edition, 1917.

31.19 'condemnarent pk' (no), 41.21 'enim est laus p' (*est enim laus*), 55.6 'pareret p' (*parret*), 8 'ut Vqr' (p), 16 'magna Prisc. vulg.' (pk), 64.2 'in tanta impud. om. rell.' (pk omit only *in*), 68.19 'homini impr. p' (i. e. *homini improbissimo*, but pk have *homini in primis improbissimo*), 89.11 'litterae publicae p' (no), 112.16 'decumarum J. J. Hartman' (p<sup>2</sup>k), 199.17 'onus aliquod p' (*onus aliquo*), 222.22 'sortiturus es p' (no), II 4.30.17 'profugientes δ' (pk), 31.26 'minitando δ' (p and I think k), 35.23 'revertamur Sp' (not p), 73.18 'Siculis δ' (pk), 94.5 'ex (ante cohorte) om. δ' (pk), 113.5 *uti de* (pk), 118.5 'regis Hieronis δ' (pk), 119.23 *theatrum est* (pk), 128.24 [*num*] (pk), 147.10 'diligenter et caute δ' (pk), 150.23 'tanta δ' (pk), II 5 40.3 'tu om. δ' (pk), 46.9 'turpe numquam om. pδ: *turpe om. qk' (<postremo> tu tibi hoc numquam [turpe numquam]* pk), 58.16 'expoliatosque RSp' (*expilatosque p<sup>2</sup>*), 25 'denegarent δ' (pk), 67.12 'erat iam δ' (pk), 68.21 *excisum δ'* (pk), 76.7 'Acilium add. δ' (pk), 81.12 'libertus etiam k' (no), 84.1 'insula RS' (pk), 86.19 'in speciem kδ' (*in specie k with p*), 87.3 'luxuria SDδ' (pk), 96.13 'commosse RSp' (*commovisse pk*), 97.5 'viderent Vδ' (pk), 103.11 'et tolli et δ' (pk), 107.27 'ita om. Vδ' (pk), 108.18 'catenis aspiciunt Vk' (not k), 114.11 '-em R<sup>1</sup>δ' (pk), 129.5 'uxores sororesque δ' (pk, which omit *miserorum*), 133.23 'in invidiam V' (k), 3 'hoc Herb., hoc Amestr. Vδ' (pk), 141.19 'dicit δ' (pk), 151.23 'mehercules δ' (pk), 152.3 'seu fati SDp' (not p), 164.16 'iam p' (no), 27 '[tu] qrk' (p), 179.18 'ac δ' (pk), 187.26 'Catinae δ' (pk).

The only shared errors of kδ that have survived my checking are II 2.117.18 *cognoscerem* for *cognossem*, II 5.82.2 *tunc* for *tum*, and II 5.108.24 *et* for *ac*, hardly solid evidence of a connexion.

How then are pkδ related? For a provisional orientation I collated all the Italian witnesses against Peterson's text in two passages and most of them in a third. The three passages were these:

II 3 up to 10.20, where the French family is represented by H (B. L. Harl. 2682, s. xi) and O (Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79, s. xiv/xv);  
 the passage of II 4 used above (§ 1.1), 60.23-68.23, where it is represented by R and H;  
 the beginning and end of II 5.156.23-177.18, where it is represented by R (R omits 162.19-171.2).

From the evidence that I am about to present it emerged very clearly that k is a close relative of p unconnected with δ. Of the readings that pkδ share against the French family I cite only additions, omissions, and transpositions, with the warning that four additions of pkδ accepted by Peterson against the French family do not appear in my list: II 3.1.6 *innocentiae <continentiae>*,

II 4.60.24 *sed* <ad>, 66.26 <ex> *eius*, II 5.172.16 <vestram severitatem desiderant>.

pkδ against the French family: II 3.1.4 *sed* <etiam>, 2.16 <ratione> *recte*, 4.18 *ego hoc* ~, 19 <ab> *his* <se>, 5.7 *istius unius* ~, 12 [fero], 9.14 *hic* <solus>, 10.18 [et] *dicentur*, II 4.62.12 *olei vini* ~, 24 <cum> *manubrio*, 63.29 *nihil iste* ~, *aliud* <quam id>, 64.13 *nondum* <etiam>, 65.29 [id] *in*, 1 *clamare iste* ~, 7 <quod> *cum*, 66.13 *mittit* <rex ad istum>, 67.15 <e> *provincia*, II 5.156.28 *paulo* <ante>, 157.17 [usque], 160.13 [in], 14 [civium Romanorum], 16 [tam], 19 *coepit* before *et queri*, 20 [civem Romanum], 30 [in], 161.2 *benivolentiam* after *erga se*, 15 <proripi> *vehementissime*<que>, 162.17 *istius* for *illius*, 172.16 [omnium], *quoniam* <id>, 17 *veritas* <omnium>, 176.7 *cognatio* <est>, 16 *iam non* ~

pk against δ and the French family: II 3.2.13 *removit* for *-et*, 5.12 *patiar* for *-or*, 13 [sua], 6.29 *po[ste]st*, 3 *expilationi* for *-ne*, 5 *habere* for *-ri*, 7.13 *qua[m]*, 8.2 <l> *arissimos*, II 4.61.3 *regem* for *regnum*, 62.18 *decessit* for *dis-*, 63.28 *illum* for *illud*, 65.5 *eorum* for *operum*, 66.13 *referre* for *-i*, 16 <h> *os*, 67.10 *posse* for *possunt*, 68.20 <et> *eiectum*, II 5.160.15 [e], 20 *recte* for *recta*, 26 *atque* for *itaque*, 161.5 *qui* for *quo*, 13 [aliquod], 171.3 [non], 4 *ut longius* <ut>, 9 [et], 11 *indignissime* for *-mi*, 172.18 [et] *qui ubi*<cum>*que*, 21 [versari], 173.22 *hab*<er>*ent*, 8 <hoc> *in hoc*, 175.25 *ornamenta ista* ~, 28 [in], 30 *non[dum]*, 176.3 *quit quantulum* for *qui tantulum*, 4 *conflexerit* / *-is* for *de-*

δ against pk and the French family: II 3.1.3 [solum], 2.10 [ab], 3.2 *rerum voluntates* ~, 17 *ita[que]*, 5.7 [dico], 6.18 [tu], 7.9 *ei me* ~, 8.24 *horum* for *eorum*, II 4.60.24-25 [omnia ... in quo], 61.4 *post[ea]quam*, *populi Romani* for *rei publicae*, 62.10 [is quem], 17 [ut] *sit*, 21 [multum], 64.11 *clarissimis* <et>, 65.26 *uti* for *ut id*, 5 *et* for *ea*, 66.13 *si* <sibi>, 67.29 [in foro], 4 [iam], II 5.156.26 [ex] *cogitata*, 157.14 *provincia* <Sicilia>, 158.26 <e> *laborandum*, 1 *testimoniis* before *omniumque*, 159.6 *sunt* for *sint*, 160.17 *illo*<rum>, 23 *ipsum* for *istum*, 25 <et> *omnium*, 161.9 *meruisse* <se>, 11 *comperisse* <ait>, 162.18 *hoc* for *haec*, 171.8 [et], 172.12 *indign*<issim>*a*, 18 *absunt* for *ad-*, 173.23 *nam* <et>, 30 *et* for *atque*, 4 [id], 173.8 *flagiti*<um>, 174.12 *est* after *locus*, 14 *ex* for *et*, 15 *tibi quicquam* ~, 175.24 <de> *liberatam*, 176.7 *accusationibus* for *ex-*, 177.12 *rationem iam* ~

I have no difficulty in believing that the peculiar readings of pk or δ listed here are all errors, as one would expect if δ is an independent relative of pk. If, however, it conflates the texts of pk and the French family, internal

reasons are needed for treating as errors the readings that pk share against the French family. I will come back to  $\delta$ , but I do not doubt that most of those readings are indeed errors as editors have thought. I therefore proceed in the conviction that k is a close relative of p.

Furthermore, as k differs from p in my three passages only by having errors of its own, there is a strong temptation to derive it from p. Complications arise, however, from the corrections in each, numerous in p, much less so in k. Some of those in p appear in the text of k, but others do not. Here are samples of the two categories<sup>62</sup>:

p<sup>2</sup>k: II 2.17.5 *accedendo* for *agendo* (*acendo* p<sup>1</sup>), 23.6 *qui ... interfuit*, 31.12 <*credito*rem> *petito*rem, 50.19 *sub* for *ubi*, 70.12 *multo*, 93.27 *si tantulum morae fuisset*, 108.24 *ut ... videatur*, 110.16 *cuius absentis nomen recepisti*, 130.5 *habitis* for *factis*, 137.24 *clam*, 174.3 *legem*, II 3.48.2 *illo*, 63.18 *et*, II 4.58.25 *cartula* for *cretula*, 2 -*gula conclavia ... non modo*, 81.28 *civitatis sum quam*, 87.20 *multitudo atrocitate rei*, 88.5 *nostri nomine non*, 97.13 *nomen*, 101.2 *aut deorum aut*, 106.28 *ex Ennae vertice rumpunt*, 112.22 *quam tu a iure et a*, 118.4 *quae duobus portibus cinctus in*, 119.18 *in ea parte fori unum fanum*, 124.28 *hoc*, 129.5 *ferebantur*, 132.11 *intellegere possumus*, 139.20 *sed in eos* (*si deos* p<sup>1</sup>, *sed eos* R), 150.30 *negare non pot(u)erunt* (*ne tum* p<sup>1</sup>), II 5.63.18 *metum*, 70.8 *a navigando ... remotissimos*, 72.17 *putem*, 73.25 *hominis*, 75.19 *tibi*, 83.15 *Romano ... denique*, 100.29 *urbis*, 102.27 *se*, 2 *quaerit ... singillatim*, 104.25 *apertas* <*poterone*>, 112.10 *solum ut*, 13 *in carcere*, 125.9 *vetustatis auctoritatis*, 127.17 *negligunt pecunias*, 136.3-4 *quicum ... amicus est*, 156.25 *ut securi ferirentur*, 29 *timidiorem*

p<sup>1</sup>k: II 2.50.22 <*in*> *alteram*, 115.25 [*hoc*], 127.23 [*erat*], 165.16 *restitu* for *est ita*, 171.1 *debemus* for *possemus*, 188.8 [*omnes*] *ex con[ven]tu*, 192.4 [*neque committebant*], II 3.9.4 *ferundus* for *-dum putas*, 11-12.12 [*ac sustinemur haec causa tri-]pertita*, 22.25 *videbantur* for *vocabantur*, 54.28 [*ex Nymphonis arationibus*], 56.6 [*non*], 62.23-24 [*quid ... taceret*], 63.18 [*domestico*], 109.17 *expecta[re noli]te*, 157.1 *unius* for *totius*, 223.15 [*quid possumus*] *in lac.*, II 4.39.11 *machior* for *acrior*, 45.26 *confirmavit tam* for *conferam vitam*, 52.7 [*scuta ... privatis*], 53.16 [*quam ... solebant*], 20 [*puto*], 28 [*fuerat*], 59.15 [*hoc denique quod*] *in lac.*, 65.5 [*certare videretur*] *in lac.*, II 5.33.8 *eruditurus* for *aere dirutus*, 34.14 [*dicere*], 36.20 [*ius*], 37.25 [*alicui ... oportuerit*], 38.5 [*illud*], 57.5 [*primum*], 174.13 *quid eas* (*quiescas* k<sup>2</sup>) for *videas*

<sup>62</sup> Clark, *Descent* (n. 43), 252-5, lists passages restored by p<sup>2</sup> but ignores k.

One pairing seems to predominate in some stretches: p<sup>2</sup>k in the first half of II 2, in II 4 from about 60, and in II 5 from about 60; p<sup>1</sup>k elsewhere, most noticeably throughout II 3. At II 2.2.17, where p has *debetis* with *ea* above the second *e*, k has in the text *debetis vel debeatis* with *vel debeatis* expunged, and in a few passages the same reading appears as a correction in both p and k, for instance these:

II 2.15.3 <ad>, 16.17 <g>ratum, 26.22 <veniat ... nemo> (both have *hd* in the text, and p has *hp* in the lower margin before the supplement), 34.27 *gesserit* for *fuerit*, 35.8 <venisse> *relictam*, 50.8 <im>probitate, 61.13 <ducta est>, 69.4 <suis>

In default of other evidence, one might infer either that k was copied from p between two campaigns of correction or that k or a relative was used for one of the campaigns. At II 3.63.18, after p<sup>1</sup> had omitted *et domestico*, the two words were visibly added at different times, which makes it understandable that *et* appears in the list for p<sup>2</sup>k, [*domestico*] in the list for p<sup>1</sup>k; but as I could not find any systematic way of stratifying the corrections in p that did not involve k and so beg the question, I resigned myself to carrying out a full collation of both so far as the present state of k allowed. I began with II 2, jumped to II 5, and then collated II 3-4. I will report first on the disconcerting outcome in II 2 and II 5.

II 2, then. The oddest corrections in p, or rather the oddest readings corrected, odder than anything I remember encountering in any other text, occur on ff. 54v-55r in II 2.101.28-107.16. I reproduce the first eight lines of f. 54v and the beginning of the ninth, using bold type for letters either heavily retraced or supplied in gaps:

*esse videtur. postremo illo desperatissimo perfugio uti posset.  
se inpru  
dentem fecisse. existimasse id licere. quamquam haec  
perditissima defensio est.  
ut aliquid dici videretur. Tollit ex tabulis id quod erat. et  
facit coram  
omnibus esse. hic videte in quot laqueos se induerit. quorum  
ex nullo se  
videri expediret. Primum ipse in sicilia saepe et palam de loco  
superiore  
vetierat. et in sermone multis demonstrarat. licere nomen  
recipere ab  
ipso. se exemplo fecisse id quod fecisset. haec eum dicitasse  
pro ore actione  
erexit. pompeius chlorus dixit. de cuius virtute antea  
commemoravi. et  
.cn. pompeius theodorus*

Not only do the readings in bold all occur at the beginning of a line, but seven of the nine bear no visual resemblance, and six of the seven no syntactical resemblance, to the reading of the French family and  $\delta$ , which a corrector has added above them or in one place failed to add: *uti* for *esse*, *tñ* for *ut*, *delatum* (not added; transmitted here in  $\delta$  but after *esse* in the Vatican palimpsest and the French family<sup>63</sup>) for *omnibus*, *umquam* for *videri*, *dixerat* for *vetierat*, *-sentis* for *ipso*, *sex.* for *erexit*. Much the same thing happens at the end of two lines on f. 55r, the seventh and fourth from below. I reproduce the passage in question:

*Nihil horum quero. fortassis  
enim sthenius. non splendorem hominis. sed familiaritatem  
secutus est.  
quid si omnium mortalium sthenio. nemo inimicior. quam hic  
.c. claudius  
cum semper. tum in is ipsis rebus et temporibus fuit. si de  
litteris corruptis **ad esse p**  
venit. si contra omnia ratione pugnavit*

The French family and  $\delta$  have *fortasse*, but at least both forms exist, and the reading of *p* would hardly be worth lingering over if it did not fit the pattern under discussion. Three lines below, a corrector has crossed out *ad esse per* and written above it the reading of the French family and  $\delta$ , *contra venit*, of which *venit* was then cancelled because it had already been written in the next line. Most of the original readings baffle me, and comparison with *k* only deepens the mystery: in its original text it agrees with *p*<sup>1</sup> even in reading *omnibus* for *delatum*, but a corrector who looks different from the scribe has introduced all the readings of *p*<sup>2</sup> except *tamen* for *ut*. If the readings of *p*<sup>1</sup> were misguided attempts at restoring faded sequences of letters or filling gaps, the layout in *p* shows that the attempts must have been made in *p* itself, from which *k* would then have to descend; but I hesitate to accuse anyone of guessing so wildly or taking *vetierat* to be a Latin word. There are other corrections in *p*, however, that look as though they might have led to errors in *k*: at II 2.92.14, where *p* has *ita* above the *at* of *atque* but leaves *at* unexpunged, *k* has *ita atque*; at II 2.94.9, where *p*<sup>2</sup> corrects *legere* to *licere*, one can see why *k* writes *licgere*; and at II 2.102.16, where *p*<sup>2</sup> cancels what looks like *-tr in* after *prima-* and writes *-rii* above it in a way easily mistaken for *-ris*, *k* has *primaris*. Add that in the whole of II 2 I found not a single error of *p* against *k*. That tallied not only with my results in the three passages of II 3-5 but also with my earlier reading of Peterson's apparatus: in the one place where I found him reporting from *p* an error that I had seen to

<sup>63</sup> G. Lopez in his edition (n. 60) wrongly says that *pk* have *coram omnibus esse delatum*.



be absent from k, II 4.97.13, he is wrong about p, which does not omit *nomen* but has it as the last word of f. 130v, added as a correction. I also mentioned above that p omits II 3.120.6 *tot* between lines, which suggests that it is the manuscript where the omission arose; and k shares the omission. Probably then, I thought, k is nothing more complex than an honest descendant of p unconnected with its other relatives; but where it does not agree with p<sup>2</sup>, it can be used for determining any reading of p<sup>1</sup> hard to make out.

Next, II 5 – and a shock. Here for the first time I met evidence sufficient to show that k cannot descend entirely from p:

84.23 *aequitatis* Rδk<sup>64</sup>: om. p

123.5 *cum Herbitensem* Rδk: *Herbitensem* p

In the second passage k could perhaps have restored *cum* by analogy with what follows, *cum Heracliensem*, but in the first there was nothing to suggest any omission after *dignitatis*. In five other passages k agrees with the French family against pδ:

45.4 *te habere nihil licet* R: *te habere mercari nihil licet* k: *tibi habere mercari nihil licet* pδ

66.4 *ad supplicium duci* Rk: *ad supplicium adduci* p, cett. fere

94.12 *excitatur* Rk: *excitatur exit* pδ

102.3 *tabulas* Rk: *tabellas* pδ

140.28 *iudices dico* Rk: *dico iudices* pδ

Unless these are lucky slips in k or readings imported by contamination, the relationship of pkδ is more complex than I have yet found any other reason for supposing. Even in II 5, however, there are signs of descent from p. At 51.26, for instance, k has [*ecquem*] *nautam* [*ecquem*] *militem*, omissions that would be unaccountable but for the lines under both words in p, surely meant not to delete them but to indicate that they are single words, like the brace under *ecquit* at II 1.132.28, *ecquando* at II 2.43.20, *ecquod* at II 3.131.10, *ecquando* at II 5.66.24, and *hecquem* at II 5.67.7; the same thing must have happened at 150.22, where p has the *circum* of *circumretitum* at the end of a line and at the beginning of the next underlines *retitum*, omitted by k; and <et> *habetis* in k at 60.15, where *Habetis* opens a new paragraph in p at the top of a verso (f. 152v), may well have resulted from the sign in the margin of p, one of many such (their significance is lost on me) but closer than most to the Tironian 7 for *et*.

<sup>64</sup> When I cite R in II 4-5, I am trusting editorial reports, but I have checked S on line. I do not know whether the passage in question is legible in the palimpsest V (Vat. Reg. Lat. 2077).

To put aside  $\delta$  for the moment, the simplest conclusion to draw from the evidence so far would be that *k* descends in II 2 entirely from a state of *p* earlier than its present state but in II 5 not entirely from *p*. With this difference in mind I set about collating II 3-4.

The first thing to say about II 3 is that 49.24 *redempturum esse dicebat*, after which *k* has a blank space at the end of a quire, does not end a quire of *p* but falls in mid page (f. 77v), though a new paragraph follows. Even if *k* descends from *p*, therefore, it should not be a direct copy. Nevertheless, it behaves exactly as it does in II 2, except that the scribe who takes over in the new quire is more accurate and acquiescent than the previous scribes and does not bat an eyelid when faced with such prodigies as these:

- 65.3 *stuatores* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *stipatores*  
 65.8 *tu apis* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *turpis* (*p*<sup>1</sup>), 80.15 *diseatus* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *disertus*,  
 198.27 *fauctum* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *fructum*; presumably *a* for *r* is a graphic  
 error caused by rustic capitals  
 72.16 *apronis* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *patronis ab*  
 77.24 *legentiam* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *licentiam*  
 88.8 *rediptio* (*p*) for *direptio*  
 97.8 *vaxor* (*p*) for *uxor*  
 107.9 *culea* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *culpa*  
 122.1 *neg[leg]litis* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 122.14 *cer<ci>tiores* (*p*)  
 135.30 *re[cu]peratores* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 135.6 *agi<e>s* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 136.10 *loquido* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *liquido*  
 136.18 *puperet* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *cuperet*  
 142.9 *for[tu]nasque* (*p*<sup>1</sup>), 198.26 *for[tu]nis* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 144.27 *L. Metelli<cogno> cognoverit* (*p*)  
 159.16 *vehemen[ter]* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 161.13 *imbro* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *improbo*  
 169.13 *ho[c]* (*p*)  
 171.17 *atque <atque>* (*p*)  
 184.17 *consula<to>ri* (*p*)  
 186.5 *[t]ardiores* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 200.7 *pet<end>endum* (*p*)  
 201.17 *minam* (*p*<sup>1</sup>) for *minima*  
 207.4 *lu<n>gent* (*p*<sup>1</sup>)  
 210.16 *promanus* (*p*) for *populus Romanus*  
 223.10 *aliinis* (*p*) for *alienis*

Some errors in *k* could again be due to peculiarities of *p*, especially peculiarities that result from correction. At 76.16, for instance, *p* has *frumentariam* corrected to *frumentarium*, and the result looks like *frumentari ai*, the

reading of k; similarly, at 137.3 *tuam* corrected to *tuum* looks like *tuai*, the reading of k; at 81.4 the superscript stroke in p that turns *depsisset* into *dempsisset* is placed somewhat to the right of the *e*, and k has *depressisset*; at 114.16 I cannot make out the original reading of p before *medimnis*, but the correction that turned it into *ternis* can easily be taken for *terri is*, the reading of k; at 115.1 the strange reading of k, *decudare* for *decumas dare*, is explained by the layout of p, where the scribe wrote *decu* at the end of a line but continued on the next with *dare*, forgetting *mas*; at 152.14, where k has *congallius* for *C. Gallus*, the scribe of p at first omitted the initial before *gallius* but then added it above the line and as usual gave it a superscript stroke; at 153.9 p has *metellus* at the end of a line and so uses an abbreviation for *us*, and k has *metelli*; at 157.22 p uses another abbreviation for *us*, this time written above the *m* of *dicamus*, and k has *dicamen*; and at 223.5, where p has *ida* corrected to *ita* by the addition of a crossbar to the top of the *d*, k has *idea* (*iċa*). Apart from trivial slips like *putero* for *potero*, *auctorit[at]e*, *f[r]umentum*, or *sole |lebat*, I found only three errors of p not repeated by k: 154.24 <in> *inimicis*, 220.8 *improbitati[s]* with  $\delta$  ('fort. recte' Peterson), 222.1 *posset* for *possit*. I therefore have no hesitation in drawing the same conclusion as in II 2: k descends from an earlier state of p than its present state.

As II 4 has suffered most from the damage to k, I did not look forward to reaching it, but early on it yielded a good piece of evidence for descent from p. At 57.15 k has the strange error *anulus audiret* for *anulus fieret* – strange until one sees that *anulus* is the last word of a line in p (f. 123r) and *audiret* the first word of the same line. I had been hoping in vain to find k omitting a line of p as q and Vat. Lat. 1754 do, but *audiret* arose from the similar mistake of going back to the beginning of the same line. Another good piece of evidence for descent from p offers itself near the end of the speech, at 147.23, where p has a brace under the *uicu* of *quicum* and k omits the word by the same misunderstanding as I illustrated on II 5. Elsewhere in II 4, however, p has errors not shared by k:

- 37.31 *homini perditum* p: *homini perduto* R $\delta$ k  
 39.6 *facta dicebat optime* p<sup>1</sup>: *facta optime dicebat* p<sup>2</sup>: *optime facta dicebat* R $\delta$ k  
 45.24 *sint* p $\delta$ : *sunt* Rk  
 58.24 *Valentius eius interpreti* p: *Valentio eius interpreti* R $\delta$ k  
 58.5 *nulla domo ... locuples fuit* p: *nulla domus ... locuples fuit* R $\delta$ k  
 74.30 *veramtamen* p: *verumtamen* R $\delta$ k  
 75.3 *flagaret ... coepit* p: *flagrare ... coepit* R $\delta$ k  
 85.27 *senatus Sopatros responsum nullum dat* p: *senatus Sopatro responsum nullum dat* R $\delta$ k

- 86.2 *sopatrem* p: *sopatrum* Rδk  
 102.18 *est mirum* p: *mirum* Rδk  
 103.13 *praeponendo restituendosque* p: *reponendos restituendosque* δk: *reportandosque* R  
 113.1 *more veterem* p: *morem veterem* Rδk  
 121.16 *cum homini* p: *cum homine* Rδk  
 124.12 *multa et graves* p: *multae et graves* Rδk  
 131.22 *summo ingenio ... ac disciplinae* p: *summo ingenio ... ac disciplina* Rδk  
 145.21 *C. Verre decreta* p: *C. Verri decreta* Rδk  
 150.31 *potuerunt* p: *poterunt* Rδk

Over half of these errors, though, are simple breaches of concord, and 103.13 *praeponendo* and 150.31 *potuerunt* are not much different. At 45.24, where the divergence is of an everyday kind, the agreement of δ with p suggests that the reading of k, if right, was a lucky slip. At 102.18 I am not sure that *est* was not expunged in p, though the dots eluded the scribe of q if it was; but the addition or omission of *est* is another error of an everyday kind. At 39.6, however, there was no reason to adjust the order of p<sup>1</sup> or p<sup>2</sup> except that *optime facta dicebat* gives a better clausula, a fact unlikely to have struck a medieval scribe. Just possibly the first pair of superscript strokes in p was meant to cover *facta dicebat*, not *dicebat* alone as the scribes of q and Vat. Lat. 1754 assumed centuries before Peterson<sup>65</sup>; nor can a lucky slip be ruled out, because the many errors of k in this scribe's portion include several transpositions. Altogether in II 4, then, the evidence for the independence of k seems no better than in II 2-3.

To sum up my findings on k, each of the four speeches yields evidence of descent from an earlier state of p than its present state, and only in II 5 are there errors peculiar to p that could not have been corrected without recourse to another manuscript. It surprises me that there should be so few of these and not either none or more, but I see no alternative to deriving k from p by way of an intermediary into which a few readings in II 5 had been imported from elsewhere. Errors peculiar to k are so numerous throughout that it would be a waste of space even to give a sample, but they include no omissions for which skipping a line of the exemplar would be the readiest explanation.

I mentioned above that k preserves some readings of p<sup>1</sup> obliterated by p<sup>2</sup>. Two examples: at II 2.106.19, where p<sup>2</sup> restored *videte* in place of a shorter word, k has *unde*, and at II 3.9.12, where p<sup>2</sup> restored *qui cum*, k has *.o. vicum*, an error doubtless caused by a pre-medieval script. How far the readings of p<sup>1</sup>

<sup>65</sup> At II 4.96.5 the French family has *perparvulum signum ex aere*, p apparently *ex aere perparvulum* (*parvulum* p<sup>1</sup>) *signum* (so too Vat. Lat. 1754), k *perparvulum ex aere signum*; but in p faint traces of superscript strokes can be made out, and q has the strange misinterpretation *ex perparvulum aere signum*.

matter to editors, though, largely depends on whether Peterson's *deteriores* are independent of p. If they are, their agreement with the French family will override p<sup>1</sup>, whatever its historical interest. Time, then, to look at them.

### 2.2.0. The Italian family (ii): the *deteriores*

Apart from pqrk and Vat. Lat. 1754, all the Italian manuscripts that I have seen except Vat. Lat. 1751 and parts of Frauenfeld Y 227 and Vienna 156 are *deteriores*, and so are Reims 1110, written at Konstanz in 1417 (the earliest dated manuscript); Brussels 10007-11, copied from it at Reims; the large supplement in Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7786, written by a French hand; and the corrections in another French manuscript, Esc. R I 2, which run to II 1 26.5. The *deteriores* number over 60, and I have already said that they form a closely knit sub-family.

So far in this article I have used the symbol  $\delta$  interchangeably for the sub-family or for its source, an ambiguity best avoided. Peterson defined it in his *sigla* as 'deteriores, e. g. Lagomarsiniani (*Lgg.*) et ceteri omnes e quibus initio constitutus est textus in libros impressos receptus', a sloppy formulation that derives the printed editions from all the *deteriores*. I defined it above (§ 2.1) as the sub-family that has a particular set of readings in my three passages of II 3-5, but I would rather not have to collate every *deterior* before attributing a reading to the sub-family. From now on, therefore, I shall mean by  $\delta$  the source of the sub-family. In the earlier stages of my investigation I took the agreement of two manuscripts available on line, Laur. 48.27 and 48.14, to give the reading of  $\delta$  in that sense, and fortunately I have met few passages where it does not or may not. I am far from believing, however, that either has a special claim to attention.

The evidence of the three short passages that I collated appears to make  $\delta$  an independent relative of pk. If instead it conflated the texts of pk and the French family, it ought to share at least a few errors with the French family in so long a work; but no edition gives a full enough apparatus to reveal whether or not it did. In the event of conflation, a less important question would arise: whether p itself was involved or a relative of p, which might even have been k. In theory,  $\delta$  might have conflated p or a relative with a member of an otherwise unattested third family, but only conflation with the French family would allow editors to ignore it where it agrees with the extant members of that family.

In my review I cited two readings of  $\delta$  that I thought might show it to be an independent relative of p, which omits them: II 1.127.1 *ordine*, which it shares with the palimpsest V (Vat. Reg. Lat. 2077) but puts after *nomine*, and II 5.167.5 *semper*, which it shares with Gellius. Both readings occur in passages missing today from the French family, but it is unsafe to assume that either passage was always missing there. The first could have been present in the original state of R and S, the second in the original state

of C if C was independent of R as it seems to have been<sup>66</sup>. The second is open to a further objection, that it could have been imported from Gellius 1.7.2<sup>67</sup>. Gellius's work is transmitted in two blocks, Books 1-7 and 9-20, and the first block not only appears in French and English manuscripts of the 12th and 13th century but was also known in Italy to Benzo of Alessandria, Guglielmo da Pastrengo, Petrarch, Salutati, Domenico di Bandino, and Giovanni Dominici<sup>68</sup>. In 1.7 Gellius is pressing the claims of a reading found *in oratione Ciceronis quinta in Verrem in libro spectatae fidei Tironiana cura atque disciplina facto*; the reading in question is II 5.167.11 *futurum*, not *semper*, but anyone prompted by Gellius's fanfare to check the text of the passage might have noticed *semper*. Some of the *deteriores*, for instance Bologna Univ. 2232 (dated 1419) and Laur. 48.27 (written by 1418; see below, § 2.2.1-2), give the *Divinatio in Caecilium* a title that includes the phrase *de constituendo accusatore*, which seems likelier to have come from Gellius 4.9.7 *in oratione de accusatore constituendo* or 13.25.9 *in libro ... qui de constituendo accusatore est* than to have survived from Antiquity in the tradition of the *Verrines*, because p has the title *M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem lib. I* and no member of the French family differentiates the speeches by anything more than their place in the set<sup>69</sup>. Doubtless Gellius was echoing

<sup>66</sup> Reynolds, *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), 68; Reeve, "A lost manuscript" (n. 30), 385.

<sup>67</sup> Stephen Oakley points out to me that A. C. Clark, *The Vetus Cluniacensis of Poggio*, Oxford 1905, xlvi, traced to Gellius 20.10.4 the correction *pellitur* at *Pro Murena* 30.11 in Laur. 90 sup. 69.1, a Florentine manuscript written by the "Puccini" scribe, on whom see n. 101 below.

<sup>68</sup> P. K. Marshall in *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), 176-80; R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, Florence 1905-14, reprinted with an introduction by E. Garin and additions and corrections from an annotated copy of the author's, 1967, II, 225-6; S. Scipioni, *I codici umanistici di Gellio*, Rome 2003, 30. Sabbadini and Scipioni mention that in 1375 Salutati had got wind of a complete manuscript in the estate of Giovanni Calderini, but the inventory published by M. Cocchetti, "La biblioteca di Giovanni Calderini", *Studi medievali* III 19, 1978, 951-1032, includes only *Defloratio excerpta ex libro Agelii Nocium acticarum*, no. 63 II on p. 974 (the widespread misconception that A. Gellius was Agellius survived into the age of print). Nothing of 1.7 appears in any of the medieval florilegia described by F. Cavazza, "L'elenco finora conosciuto dei florilegia medioevali che comprendono anche excerpta gelliana o solo excerpta gelliana" (I omit three misleading commas), *Maia* 52, 2000, 99-126, and Leofranc Holford-Strevens kindly tells me that he has met no florilegium that includes it.

<sup>69</sup> "Septem ... Verrinarum libros numerant codices PQH [= pqr]" says Klotz (n. 12) iv, but in fact p has at the end of the first speech *M. Tulli Ciceronis de accusatore liber I exp. incip. lib. II* (f. 9r), at the end of the second *M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem actio prima* (corrected to II) *explic. incip. actio II* (corrected to III) (f. 14<sup>bis</sup>v), at the end of the third *M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem lib. III* (later II?) *explicit incip. lib. IIII* (later III?) *felicit.* (f. 38r), and thereafter (ff. 69v, 112r, 141v, 173v) no rubric at all. The only original title in O (Laur. Conv. Sopp. 79) is *Liber Verrinarum* at the beginning of II 2; the others were added much later (by Lagomarsini?). L. Piacente, "Numerazione e titoli delle Verrine", *Boll. dei Class.* III 1, 1980, 134-44, does not mention either the titles in any of the manuscripts or Gellius's way of referring to the *Divinatio in Caecilium*. I shall return below (§ 2.2.2.4) to this title and the

what Cicero himself says in 10, *dicendum necessario est de contentione nostra, ut in constituendo accusatore quid sequi possitis habeatis*. At II 5.167, however, it may be thought to tell against use of Gellius that none of the earlier *deteriores* adopt *futurum*, though it does appear for instance in the text of Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1, Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 ('A. Gellius' in the margin, written by the scribe), Budapest Univ. 2, and the *editio princeps* (Rome 1471), and in the margin of Laur. 48.14 ('sic legit A. Gellius' or 'sic legit Agellius', probably written in the 16th century). About Gellius, therefore, *non liquet*.

At the moment I have no other evidence for or against either position that  $\delta$  may occupy in the stemma. In his apparatus Peterson does not mention that at II 3.228.30, where he prints *etiamne frumentum pro empto gratis dare? etiamne in cellam cum cupiant gratis dare ultro pecuniam addere?*, only  $\delta$  has the whole of it: Op<sup>1</sup>k omit *etiamne in cellam cum cupiant gratis dare*, and in p a corrector expunged *frumento pro empto* and wrote above it *in cellam cum cupiant*, with the result that p + p<sup>2</sup> omits *etiamne frumentum pro empto gratis dare*; but here too it is unsafe to assume that the French family in its entirety omitted what O omits. In general, though, I would rather not postulate contamination when an unobjectionable stemma can be drawn up without it. I therefore issue a challenge to devotees of contamination: produce evidence.

If  $\delta$  is independent of p, one source of corrections in p must have been  $\delta$  or a relative, with which p<sup>2</sup> shares these readings not accepted by editors:

- II 2.35.8 *venisse relictam* p<sup>2</sup>k<sup>2</sup>: *venisse*  $\delta$ : *relictam* p<sup>1</sup>k<sup>1</sup>O
- II 2.177.12 *condicio* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *contentio* p<sup>1</sup>kO
- II 3.83.4 *eripiet* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *non eripiet* p<sup>1</sup>kO
- II 3.121.20 *minore* (-res  $\delta$ ) *remansisse* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *remansisse* p<sup>1</sup>kO
- II 3.163.21 *ita ut* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *ita in* p<sup>1</sup>kO
- II 3.213.3 *voluntatem* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *utilitatem* p<sup>1</sup>kO
- II 4.59.9 *neque/nec vulgo* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *nea et vulso* p<sup>1</sup>k: *neti lyso* R
- II 5.38.2 *creditam* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *sibi creditam* p<sup>1</sup>k: *tibi creditam* R
- II 5.45.28 *responsio* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *res p.* p<sup>1</sup>kR
- II 5.46.14 *naviculariam* <te> p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$
- II 5.51.18 *imperaretur* p<sup>2</sup> $\delta$ : *imponeretur* p<sup>1</sup>k: *imponebatur* R

Already at *Caecil.* 8.25 p<sup>2</sup> restores *vim ... iudiciorum*, missing by *saut du même au même* from the descendants of S as well as from p<sup>1</sup>; but  $\delta$  may not have been alone in preserving it, because the omission in S need not have occurred in any ancestor of S. Presumably, though, when p<sup>2</sup> restores words present both in  $\delta$  and in the French family, they came from the same source

---

others that go with it.

as the readings just listed. In fact I have met few passages like *Caecil.* 27.21, where *ipse*, added by p<sup>2</sup>, is present in the French family but absent from δ; and in such passages p<sup>2</sup> could be following a less corrupt relative of δ rather than a member of the French family.

Can the descendants of δ be reduced to a small number of independent representatives and light be shed in that way on the discovery and diffusion of the Italian text? I will first run quickly through the external evidence known to me<sup>70</sup>.

I have rejected elsewhere the notion that the *Verrines* were read by Paolo da Perugia and Boccaccio<sup>71</sup>. They are not among the works of Cicero's assembled at Bologna in the mid 14th century by Giovanni Calderini<sup>72</sup>. By the mid 1350s, however, Petrarch had read II 2-3<sup>73</sup>, presumably in an ancestor of O<sup>74</sup>; and when Salutati in 1379 asked Lombardo della Seta for Petrarch's copy of *De lege frumentaria*, he must have been echoing the title from a list supplied by Lombardo<sup>75</sup>. As it happens, II 3.176, the passage that Petrarch had in mind at *Fam.* 20.1.10 when he wrote that *peccandi consuetudo iocundissima apud Ciceronem dicitur*, is marked with *Nō* (*Nota*) in two of the earliest complete manuscripts, Modena Est. Lat. 328 and Laur. Strozzi 44, on which more *passim* below (§ 2.2.1.1 and beyond); but other readers too could have been struck by it. A marginal note in O apparently testifies to knowledge of II 4, whether or not it goes back to Petrarch as I have tentatively suggested<sup>76</sup>. Antonio Loschi mentions the *Verrines* in the dedication of his *Inquisitio*, composed in 1399 or thereabouts when he was secretary to Gian Galeazzo Visconti, but does not even imply that he or anyone else has read them<sup>77</sup>. Apart perhaps from the marginal note in O, then, none of the 14th-century evidence sheds any light on the emergence of p or δ.

<sup>70</sup> The fullest summary that I have met is C. Griggio's in "Due lettere inedite del Bruni al Salutati e a Francesco Barbaro", *Rinascimento* II 26, 1986, 27-50, at p. 39 n. 20.

<sup>71</sup> "Cicero's *Verrines*" (n. 34).

<sup>72</sup> Cocchetti, "La biblioteca" (n. 68), index, p. 1021.

<sup>73</sup> U. Bosco, "Il Petrarca e l'umanesimo filologico", *GSLI* 120, 1942, 65-119, at pp. 104-5 = *Saggi sul Rinascimento italiano*, Florence 1970, 203; S. Rizzo, *La tradizione manoscritta della Pro Cluentio di Cicerone*, Genoa 1979, 37-8 (on p. 129 "3, 79" is a slip or outdated reference for II 2.79).

<sup>74</sup> "A lost manuscript" (n. 30), 384.

<sup>75</sup> Rizzo, *La tradizione*, 30 n. 20, 37 n. 47.

<sup>76</sup> "Recovering annotations by Petrarch", *Quaderni Petrarqueschi* 9-10, 1992-3 (publ. 1996), 333-48, at pp. 342-3.

<sup>77</sup> Sabbadini, *Scoperte* (n. 68), II, 123, put the start of his service in 1391 and composition in 1395, but on p. 278 these dates are corrected to 1398 and 1399. The entry in the *Diz. biog. degli italiani* 66, 2006, 154-60 (P. Viti) ignores not only Sabbadini's corrections but also D. Girgensohn, "Antonio Loschi e Baldassarre Cossa vor dem Pisaner Konzil von 1409", *IMU* 30, 1987, 1-93, at pp. 15-30, who says that the earliest document signed by Loschi bears the date June 26th 1398, though he mentions a previous tenure, undated. The *terminus ante quem* appears to be early 1404.



Had p emerged first, it would probably have built up a larger family regardless of who found it or where. Above (§ 2.1) I gave a reason for thinking that it was not just owned in the 16th century by Celso Cittadini of Siena but already there in the 13th; I do not know, however, where q or Vat. Lat. 1754 was written. Curiously, it was from Siena that Bruni wrote two letters in October 1407, one on the 8th to Niccoli about a copy in the possession of Bartolomeo Capra, ‘volumen ... preclare scriptum orationum Ciceronis contra Verrem et quarundam aliarum invectiviarum’, which he asks Niccoli to have furnished with decorated initials, and one on the 7th to Nicola de’ Medici about a copy that he describes as follows<sup>78</sup>:

Mitto tibi orationes Ciceronis in Verrem recte quidem scriptas sed ut videbis male emendatas; qui enim corrigere voluit eas plane corruptit. Quamobrem tuae diligentiae erit non quae postea mutata sunt sed quae prius erant transcribi iubere.

This copy must have been Laur. Strozzi 44, where he wrote the following note at the end (f. 104v)<sup>79</sup>:

Hic liber cum ab initio recte scriptus fuisset postea corruptus est ab homine qui cum vellet eum corrigere corruptit. Quare priorem litteram accepta, correctiones reiice.

He may already have used it in February 13th 1406, when he quoted from *Caecil.* in a letter sent from the curia at Viterbo to Salutati<sup>80</sup>. The copy

<sup>78</sup> The two letters have a chequered history in print. L. Mehus, *Leonardi Bruni Arretini epistolarum libri VIII*, Florence 1741, printed them as II 10 and 13, both addressed to Niccoli and neither with a date; in II 10 the content of Capra’s volume is described merely as speeches of Cicero’s. Retaining Niccoli as the addressee of both, R. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, Catania 1914, 50–51 = ed. 2, Padua 1971, 40–41, gave a different text of II 10, which he dated October 8th 1407, and for no stated reason put II 13 in November 1407. The dates and addressees that I give are those of F. P. Luiso, *Studi su l’epistolario di Leonardo Bruni*, ed. L. Gualdo Rosa, Rome 1980, 33–5, where Mehus’s numbering gives way to II 12 (10) and 11 (13); for Sabbadini’s fuller version of II 12 (10) see p. 191. On Nicola de’ Medici, whom Griggio (n. 70), 37, confuses with Niccoli despite knowing Luiso’s book, see the *Diz. biog. degli italiani* 73, 2009, 146–9 (R. Zaccaria). The passage of II 11 (13) that I am about to quote was mentioned by Io. Casp. Orelli in his edition of II 5, Leipzig 1831, v–vi, but he did not know Strozzi 44.

<sup>79</sup> Griggio, “Due lettere” (n. 70), opposite p. 42, and J. Hankins in *Autografi dei letterati italiani*, Rome 2013, 2 I, 97, give a plate. In *Manuscripts and methods* (n. 17), 265, I quoted the note in translation; see also *R. F. I. C.* 114, 1986, 170 n. 1. Griggio, “Due lettere”, 37 n. 18, gives the fullest available description of Strozzi 44. Peterson, “The MSS. of the *Verrines*” (n. 11), viii n. 1, misattributes Bruni’s note to Conv. Soppr. 79, probably because Zumpt (n. 16), I, xxxii, had misidentified Strozzi 44, from which he quoted it, as Lag. 42, which was actually Conv. Soppr. 79. On Lagomarsini and his numbers see n. 10 above.

<sup>80</sup> Griggio, “Due lettere” (n. 70), 29, 36–39, 47. I do not understand why he describes the letter as roughly three years earlier than the one sent on October 7th 1407 and Strozzi 44 as

that he wrote to Niccoli about must have been different, because Strozzi 44 contains only the *Verrines*, apparently belonged already to Bruni himself, and is decently enough written at the beginning but not throughout; nor could the same manuscript have been sent on the 7th of October to Nicola de' Medici and on the 8th to Niccoli. Though bishop of Cremona at the time, Capra was attached to the curia, which happened to be in Siena, and it is hard to say how or where he might have acquired his copy<sup>81</sup>. It could even have belonged to the French family, two Italian members of which do include other invectives: Vat. Lat. 1751 continues with the *Catilinarians* and the spurious exchange of insults with Sallust (*Graviter et iniquo animo ...* and *Ea demum magna voluptas ...*), and Frauenfeld Y 227 begins with the *Philippics*, the *Catilinarians*, and the spurious exchange. On his death in 1433, however, a “liber Marci Ciceronis de denominatione” was found among the books at his house in Milan, and I shall reveal below (§ 2.2.2.4) that there is an alternative to the suggestion made by the scholar who published the inventory in question that *De divinatione* was meant<sup>82</sup>. Later, when he became archbishop of Milan, he may have put his manuscript at the disposal of acquaintances in Lombardy or further afield in the north. Certainly many of the extant *deteriores*, especially the earlier ones, seem to be northern. Is even Strozzi 44 Florentine?

I have not searched either correspondence or inventories for copies of the *Verrines*, but I have noticed some in passing. The books that Humfrey Duke of Gloucester presented to the University of Oxford in 1439 included a copy of the *Verrines* and *Philippics*, ‘secundo folio in iudicium’ (*Caecil. 6.10*)<sup>83</sup>. Aurispa owned at least one copy of the *Verrines* when he died in 1460<sup>84</sup>. An unusual volume was registered in 1451 and again in 1481 at the Biblioteca Capitolare, Bologna: ‘Item alius liber Tulii intitulatus De natura deorum, de divinatione, de re militari, de legibus et contra Venerem et aliis

---

“anteriore in ogni caso al 1405”. Already at *Studi sul Boccaccio* 14, 1983–4, 380 he had said of the *Verrines* that “Leonardo Bruni ne venne in possesso qualche anno prima del 1405”.

<sup>81</sup> *Diz. biog. degli italiani* 19, 1976, 108–13 (D. Girgensohn).

<sup>82</sup> M. Speroni, “Il testamento di Bartolomeo Capra e la sua biblioteca”, *IMU* 19, 1976, 209–17, at p. 217.

<sup>83</sup> A. Sammut, *Umfredo duca di Gloucester e gli umanisti italiani*, Padua 1980, 35 n. 42, 70 no. 121. Extant manuscripts that contain just the *Verrines* and *Philippics* in that order are q (§ 2.1), Berlin Ham. 172 (§ 2.2.1.3.1), Cesena S. 18.2 (§ 2.2.2.2), Florence Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1 and its copy Bologna Univ. 2234 (§ 2.2.1.3.1), Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577 (§ 2.2.1.3.2), Vat. Lat. 1749 (§ 2.2.1.3.1).

<sup>84</sup> R. Sabbadini, *Biografia documentata di Giovanni Aurispa*, Noto 1890, 159 no. 27 “Item Verinam Ciceronis copertam de rubeo precii ducatorum quinque”; A. Franceschini, *Giovanni Aurispa e la sua biblioteca*, Padua 1976, 121 no. 360 “Item Verius Ciceronis, in cartis membranibus deauratis, cum albis cohoptis brasili”. Franceschini reports several other manuscripts of *orationes*, but with the possible exception of 120 no. 352, “Item omnes orationes Ciceronis, perpulcre, in membranibus deauratis, cum albis cohoptis brasilli”, it can probably be assumed that they did not include the *Verrines*.

operibus in pergameno in mediocri volumine; incipit *Quam multe res et finit accusare necesse sit* [the end of II 5]. Copertus de rubeo<sup>85</sup>. Unless it was dismembered, it has not survived; but the cataloguer's transformation of Verres into Venus must be one of the strangest incidents in the transmission of classical texts.

#### 2.2.1.1. Laur. Strozzi 44 (F) and Modena Est. Lat. 328 (M)

Back to copies that survive. In my review I surmised that Strozzi 44, which I will call F, might turn out to be the source of the Florentine manuscripts, and collation of the passages from II 3-5 used above (§ 2.1) led me to think that it might actually be the source, if not of all the other *deteriores*, at least of most, because in those passages it has no errors absent from the rest. As Bruni complained, however, someone corrected it not always advisedly. Most of the corrections are purely cosmetic, such as the substitution of abbreviations for full forms; but some do affect the text, and these need to be stratified before elimination can proceed. To take a conspicuous example, *descenderim* in the very first sentence, the corrupt reading not only of p and the French family but already of the text to which Pseudo-Asconius pegged his commentary<sup>86</sup>, was corrected in erasure to *descendere*, but many other manuscripts, among them several written in the second half of the 15th century, have *descenderim*. On the other hand, some of the corrections would have to antedate all the other *deteriores* or most of them, because the original text has errors of its own, such as *Caecil. 2.16 [saepe] ostendisse*, II 3.6.6 [*etiam*], II 4.60.23-24 [*non ad avaritiam non ad cupiditatem*]. In the quire that contains II 3.114.23 *ad hoc* – 225.17 *quidem neque*, ff. 54-67, an unusual number of omissions and other slips were corrected, perhaps from the exemplar when the scribe had finished. By an odd coincidence, stratifying the corrections in F is the same problem as I raised above (§ 2.1) over the relationship of k to p; but the solutions may differ.

In the meantime, however, I have found the exemplar of F. F was written by several hands, and blank spaces at the ends of quires show that it was copied from separate quires of the exemplar<sup>87</sup>. The quires of a manuscript written without such blank spaces, Modena Est. Lat. 328 (α F 8 6), correspond throughout, and it often agrees with p against F, for instance in having II 3.2.9 *sibi hoc*, 3.2 *rerum voluntates*, 4.16 *hoc ego*,

<sup>85</sup> P. L. Schmidt, *Die Überlieferung* (n. 10), 370 n. 19, from A. Sorbelli, "La biblioteca capitolare della cattedrale di Bologna nel sec. XV: notizie e catalogo", *Atti e mem. della R. Dep. di Storia Patria per le Province di Romagna* III 21, 1903, 439-616, at pp. 526-27 no. 24.

<sup>86</sup> He added, however, that "multi non *descenderim* legunt sed *descendere*". See Th. Stangl, *Ciceronis orationum scholiastae*, Vienna-Leipzig 1912, 186, with the comments of J. E. G. Zetzler, *Latin textual criticism in Antiquity*, New York 1981, 173, and my own in my review, *CPh* 80, 1985, 85-92, at p. 88.

<sup>87</sup> Griggio, "Due lettere" (n. 70), 37 n. 18.

9.15 *is*, which F corrupts to *sibi, voluntates rerum, hoc, ipse*. I will call it M. When I collated M in my passage of II 5, more instances emerged:

156.26 *excogitata* (*cog-* F), 164.26 *ac* (*atque* F), 165.16-17 *crucis ut* (om. F), 168.22 *adservasse[s]* (p) corrected to *-es* (F), 173.7 *nolo <hoc>* (*nolo* F), 174.12 *ex hoc loco est* (*est ex hoc loco* F)

Now that I have collated it throughout, the list could be made far longer, but I will cite just some omissions and additions of F:

I 54.7 [*haec*], II 1.99.19 [*ea*], II 2.46.1 [*aliquanto*], 52.9 [*ut*], 81.6 [*te*], 96.30 [*omnes*], 176.26 *<et>* *argenti*, II 3.29.13 *etiam <sine>*, 37.15 *quidem <non>*, 42.7 [*vendideris*], 57.15 [*ethne*], 137.29 [*esse*], 140.12 [*ut*], 152.16 [*per*], 176.9 [*quidem*], 178.11 [*illa*], 191.7 [*potius*], 212.17 [*ne*], 214.14 [*non modo*], 222.24 [*recte*], II 4.72.22 [*esse*], 141.19 [*qui*], II 5.1.4 [*etiam*], 87.30 [*fame*], 118.23 [*suorum*], 143.21 [*et dignitatis*], 188.11 [*mea*]

M also shares many primitive readings of F that achieved little or no circulation elsewhere, and often shares them without the correction made in F:

*Caecil.* 1.2 *mirantur* (pDF<sup>1</sup>: *-atur* F<sup>2</sup>, cett.), I 5.28 *fecit* (pDF<sup>1</sup>: *patefecit* F<sup>2</sup>, cett. *ferē*), 27.2 *meus* (*consul* vel *cos.* pD, cett.), II 1.35.12 *scios* for *suos* (pD: *syllanos* F<sup>2</sup>: *socios* cett. *ferē*), 149.18 [*ante*] ... *quam* (F<sup>1</sup>: [*ante*] ... *<prius>* *quam* F<sup>2</sup>: *post* ... *quam* cett. *dett.*), II 2.141.1 *improbata* (pF<sup>1</sup>: *-ba* OF<sup>2</sup>, cett.), II 5.185.27 *perge* (pRF<sup>1</sup>: *pergame* F<sup>2</sup>, cett.)

Readings of M<sup>2</sup> adopted in the text of F include these:

*Caecil.* 55.20 *nomenque* (*nomine* pD: *nomen* M<sup>1</sup>), II 1.42.6 *aliquam* (*aut ad quam* pD: *aut aliquam* M<sup>1</sup>), 157.7 *audes* (*audeam* p: *tandem* M<sup>1</sup>), II 2.57.15 [*facere cum*] (*[facere] cum* M<sup>1</sup>), 71.11 *aliter iuri* (*alter iuri* for *alterutri* M<sup>1</sup>), II 3.77.10 *exhausti* (*adflcti* pO: om. M<sup>1</sup>), 202.15 *tum* (*iam* pO: *tam* M<sup>1</sup>), II 4.29.30 *minus <invidiae>*, 41.26 *<praesentes>* *reos*, 57.23 *incredibile <m rem>* ... *claram*, 93.6 [*quidem*], 95.18 *tantum mali* for *tam mali*, 101.5 *or[n]andi*, 127.9 *ha[e]c*, II 5.7.4 *illum <se>*, 39.14 *<non>* *ut*, 53.19 *omnes <praetores>*, 67.7 *et quem audisti* (*ecquem scis* pR: *et questis* M<sup>1</sup>), 69.26 *coniecerat <contradi>*, 75.25 *esse potuit* (*esset* p: *esse* M<sup>1</sup>), 78.1 *non* for *nunc* [*cuiquam*], 95.7 *cum* for [*qui*], 105.5 *<potius>* *suscipiam* (pMF have *totius* for *potius* shortly before), 161.11 *comperisse <ait>*, 164.23 *secundum* (*ad* pR: om. M<sup>1</sup>).

Like F, M has in the margin at II 5.33.3, 6, 8, the same glosses as p on *aera*, *abduci*, *aere dirutus*.

Two obstacles seem to present themselves, but they occur on leaves written in a different hand from the adjacent leaves. The passage from II 2.127.16 *familiaris* to 135.5 *quadruplatorum*, which occupies f. 43, has not only gaps for missing words but also a number of startling errors absent from pF, some of them plainly guesswork: 127.29 *e duabus* for *educi*, 1 *solum* for *scriptum*, 2 *indigenis* for *indignum*, 128.9 *iam neque* for *ille atque*, 129.29 *solummodo* for *hoc modo*, 30 *adverteret* for *oporteret*, 132.25 *addidit* for *ostendit*, 134.25 *furandi* for *fuisse*. Presumably the original leaf suffered damage after the copying of F and was replaced with the present leaf, a not very successful copy of the damaged one; like the rest of M, the present leaf has readings shared with p but corrupted by F, such as 128.12 *et* (*ac* F), 134.15 *habuerit* (*habuit* F). At II 1.127.18–21 M but not F omits *Verres utrum ... quid est* before *Verres quod planum*; but the bifolium ff. 24–5, which runs from II 1.118.30 *-nibus non* to 138.26 *loquitur Mustius*, is again in a different hand, probably the one that wrote f. 43. A stain in the margin, fainter on the other side of the leaf and not repeated on the adjacent leaves, might suggest that either the passage itself or offset from an inserted slip was once there, but nowhere else in M does anything seem to have been washed off the margin. Even if what resembles a *caret* mark in the text really is one and not an optical illusion brought about by colliding strokes from above and below, it is hard to believe that the passage was ever restored. Why a new bifolium should have become necessary I have no idea, but the omission is not the only error here against pF: add 126.5 *ipsum* for *ipse*, 129.21 *querimonia[que]*, 132.26 *testamenta* for *-to*. Agreements of pF against M elsewhere, few in number, can be put down to conjecture or lucky accident: I 13.14 *eo* (*eis* M or perhaps M<sup>1</sup>), II 1.152.27 *te tam* (~ M), II 2.178.20 *quidem tibi* (~ M), II 3.6.19 *ullas inimicitias* (~ M).

M is laid out in two columns on paper, but I searched in vain for watermarks<sup>88</sup>. It has two *ex libris* of a family well attested in Venice: f. 1r ‘Hic liber est Marci Antonii Basadona q(uondam) Pauli’, f. 121v ‘Liber domini Petri Basadona’, in very similar hands. I would put both in the 15th century or at latest the early 16th, but the only Basadona of that date that I have found associated with any manuscript is a Giovanni who published five dialogues at Venice in 1518 and apparently owned Venice Marc. Lat. XI 39 (3929), which contains other speeches of Cicero’s<sup>89</sup>. Up to f. 70 M has later notes in the

<sup>88</sup> None is mentioned in the brief description available on line in *Manus*.

<sup>89</sup> S. Rizzo, *Catalogo dei codici della Pro Cluentio ciceroniana*, Genoa 1983, 167–8 no. 156; and see the published catalogue. A Pietro Basadona is recorded in 1433 as *podestà* of Monselice; see R. Valandro, “Monselice nei primi due secoli di dominazione veneziana”, in R. Valandro, ed., *Venezia e Monselice nei secoli XV e XVI: ipotesi per una ricerca*, Monselice 1985, Parte prima, at p. 16.

margin added by someone whose interests were lexical and rhetorical; a few rhetorical terms are capably written in Greek (ff. 4r, 12r, 56r, 58r, 65r, 66r, 66v). An earlier annotator, or at most two, picked out a few *notabilia*. What then of the scribe or scribes? I have already mentioned that ff. 24–25 and f. 43 are later replacements. Elsewhere in a few places, though not at the end of any quire, there seems at first sight to be a change of hand, pen, or ink: after f. 12, f. 30, f. 32, and f. 104va. In all probability, however, there is only one change of hand, after f. 12. After that point *r* invariably has a foot (a hook to the right at the base of the first stroke), which it seldom has before that point. The scribe of ff. 24–5 and f. 43, who gives it a foot, differs from the second scribe chiefly in greater regularity and in not sharing the slight lean to the right seen in the rest of M; a lapse of time may account for these differences. The first two hands suggest the influence of Salutati rather than of anyone active in the Veneto, but short of speculating about Niccoli's cursive hand in the undocumented period of his scribal career, say from 1385 to 1405 (he was born in 1364/65), I have no candidate to offer for either<sup>90</sup>.

#### 2.2.1.2. Descendants of M but not of F

Only three descendants of M are free from the errors of F in my passage of II 3, though instead of misplacing 3.2 *rerum* they omit it:

New York Columbia Plimpton 10  
 Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 233 (a. 1449)  
 Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 254 (a. 1458–60)

Besides that error, they all have 1.1 <in> *alterum*, 6 [*continentiae*] (though by *saut du même au même*), 7 *ut*<*i*>, 3.13 *cerneremus* for *teneremus*, 4.1 *iudicaris* for *vind-*, 7.16 *ipsius ad tuam* for *ad tuam ipsius*, 17 *ac* for *atque*, 8.3 *vestri* for *vestro*. Plimpton 101 and Canon. Class. Lat. 254, neither of which can descend from the other, were never taken beyond II 3.45.18 *illius provinciae necessarios*<sup>91</sup>, and the agreement of Canon. Class. Lat. 233 and 254 (and doubtless Plimpton 101) continues up to that point: 40.28 *necessitates* for *iniquitates*, 9 *decum(an)as praeco* for *praeco decumas*,

<sup>90</sup> When I saw M for the second time in February 2015, I jotted down “hand changes f. 12/13?”, and Teresa De Robertis, who has kindly discussed M with me, has convinced me that it does. She also takes the view that one scribe wrote the rest except for the later replacements, and she would put M close to 1400 and more happily among younger Florentine contemporaries of Salutati than in the north. I was led to consult her by her observations on Ricc. 264 of Lactantius and her plate of its first page; see “Nuovi autografi di Niccolò Niccoli”, *Scrittura e civiltà* 14, 1990, 105–21. The brief description of M cited above (n. 88) assigns the whole of it to one scribe.

<sup>91</sup> I thank Consuelo Dutschke for the information about Plimpton 101, and Gareth Williams for channelling my inquiry.

43.21 [*etiam*], 44.2 *et* for *ut*. Up to that point they descend from M but not by way of F, as is shown by their having 42.7 *vendideris*, which F omits; by the passages that occupy ff. 24-5 and f. 43 of M, where they differ from M chiefly in ignoring the gaps that M leaves; and by their omission of II 1.68.14-15 *si ... essent*, which M omits between the recto and verso of f. 18 (other things omitted by M occur at similar points: II 2.13.8 *traditos* between the recto and verso of f. 29, II 5.6.15 *locorum* between the columns of f. 99r). Furthermore, after II 3.45.18, where the other two break off, Canon. Class. Lat. 233 shares omissions and transpositions with F against M: 57.15 [*Aetnae*], 67.12 *minis ac vi* for *vi ac minis*, 85.1 [*in*], 119.6 *plus sibi ~*, 121.22 [*eos*], 137.29 [*esse*], 140.12 [*ut*], 146.21 *virorum bonorum ~*, 147.5 *verbo decumas ~*, 152.16 [*per*], 176.9 [*quidem*], 178.11 [*illa*], 191.7 [*potius*], 212.17 [*ne*], 214.14 [*non modo*], 222.24 [*recte*]. It must therefore descend from a manuscript that originally stopped at the same point as the other two but was then supplemented. I will come back to the character of the supplement (§ 2.2.2.1). As Canon. Class. Lat. 254 was written at Sibenik in Croatia, it seems likely that the common source of the three manuscripts was copied from M in the territory of Venice, obviously no later than 1449.

### 2.2.1-2. The two families of *deteriores*

Before I had identified M as the exemplar of F, I collated F throughout and checked in Laur. 48.27 every passage where F has an error absent from p. I chose Laur. 48.27 partly because it is available on line, partly because I had already noticed that it did not share all the errors of F, and partly for its date. ‘Liber Cosme Iohannis de Medicis’ (f. 107r, at the end of II 4), it must surely be the ‘Verrine di Tulio di lettera antica’ listed in an inventory of 1418<sup>92</sup>, and Albinia de la Mare at first thought it might well have been written by Poggio as early as 1403-8, but later she said ‘I am now less certain that the scribe is Poggio himself’ and put it ‘? before 1410’<sup>93</sup>. Surprising for that date, and even more surprising if Poggio did indeed write it, is its large number of errors:

II 3.3.11 *accusarunt* for *-rint*, 5.10 *oris oculorum ~*, 7.8 *<ali>qua*,  
13 *postul<ab>at*, 21 *depressam* for *depressam*, 10.18 *dicentur*

<sup>92</sup> F. Pintor published the inventory in 1902, and it was reprinted in “Per la storia della libreria medica nel Rinascimento: appunti d’archivio”, *IMU* 3, 1960, 189-210, where the manuscript is no. 21 on p. 197. Pintor himself, p. 194, proposed the identification, though with “XLVII” in the shelfmark, and it was proposed again by B. L. Ullman, *The origin and development of humanistic script*, Rome 1960, 134. A. C. de la Mare, “Humanistic script” (n. 46), 94-5, judged it probable.

<sup>93</sup> Loc. cit. (n. 92); “Cosimo and his books”, in F. Ames-Lewis (ed.), *Cosimo ‘il Vecchio’ de’ Medici, 1389-1464*, Oxford 1992, 115-56, at p. 141 no. 8, p. 151 no. 60. I have not encountered any descendant.

<vobis>, II 4.62.14 *voca[vi]t*, 21 *popias* for *copias*, 65.28 *animo et ~*, 4 [*et pulcherrimis*], 66.18 *audiret* for *audisset*, 25 [*ante noctem*], 67.29 *arbitratur* for *-etur*, 7 *ipsum Iovem ~*, 14 *clarissimo* for *maximo*, II 5.156.28 *et* for *atque*, 157.10 *vitae[que]*, 11 *pericula subeunda ~*, 158.30 [*omnium*], 160.1 [*esse*], 165.3 *datum* for *datur*, 166.20 *qui<d>*, 23 *se esse ~*, 168.12 [*civibus Romanis*], 169.2 *homini* for *nom-*, 170.19 *hic* for *his*, 175.28 *istam vestram ~*, 2 *hoc* for *hi*

Whether the scribe committed them, however, depends on what was in the exemplar, not yet identified if it still exists. Be that as it may, I drew up a list of passages where F has an error not shared by Laur. 48.27 and augmented it outside II 2-3 from Halm's reports of Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79 (Lag. 42) and Ricc. 499 (Lag. 5)<sup>94</sup>. I then checked in other *deteriores* as many of these passages as time or opportunity allowed, and I also collated the beginning of *Caecil.* up to 11.19 *est constitutum*. A broad division emerged: F and many others omit *Caecil.* 6.6 *me*, 13.10 *meae*, II 1.42.7 *Carbonem sortem in Cn.* (by *saut du même au même*), 68.14-15 *si ... essent* (not by *saut du même au même*), but are free from errors that unite Laur. 48.27 and many of the rest, such as *Caecil.* 1.7 *ac<cusa>torem*, 15.29 *mihi obiciatur ~*, 27.18 [*quoniam*], 20 *accusat* for *-et*, 31.32 *tua ista ~*<sup>95</sup>, 32.12 *Verris* for *vere*, 33.17 *crimen* for *crimini*, 38.29 *huius* for *eius*, 48.10 *vidimus* for *-emus*, 51.6 *illo* for *isto*, 65.7 *quem actorem <idoneum>*, 67.29 *nos* for *animos*, 1 *atque* for *ac*, 72.17-19 *hunc ... hanc ... hanc* for *habet ... habet ... habet* (*ññ ... ññ... ññ F*), I 20.11 *me colloquebantur* for *mecum loquebantur*, 21.26 <con>*gratulatio*, 30.9 *a prope* for *et prope*, II 1.73.21 *ut* for *et*, II 4.66.17 *ab* for *ex*, II 5.157.10 *spe<cie>s*, 159.7 *assumpserim* for *con-*, 169.9 *qui* for *quoniam*. I will call F and its relatives the first family, Laur. 48.27 and its relatives the second.

#### 2.2.1.3.0. The first family of *deteriores*: the descendants of F

M already has the four errors by which I have just defined the first family. As it would be astonishing if F were not a direct copy of M, any member that shares errors of F absent from M must descend from M through F. I listed above (§ 2.2.1.1) four such errors in my passage of II 3.

The descendants of F can be sifted with the help of a passage where F<sup>1</sup> wrote nonsense that provoked successive corrections:

<sup>94</sup> On Lagomarsini's numbers see n. 10.

<sup>95</sup> Peterson reports that D<sup>1</sup> also had this transposition, and B. N. F. Lat. 16226 and 16674 have it too, which suggests that *ista tua* corrected by superscript strokes already appeared in S. Esc. R I 2 has *tua ista* with PMF.



II 1.30.1-3 *Interposuistis accusatorem qui, cum ego mihi c et x dies solos in Siciliam postulassem, c et viii sibi in Achaïam postulare.*

*in achaïam* pD: *nala* F<sup>1</sup> (*nalam* M<sup>1</sup> ut vid.); *hic alter* F<sup>2</sup> (M<sup>2</sup>); *in achaïa* F<sup>3</sup>

I shall not use again the symbol F<sup>3</sup>, which I have used here because F has more than one correction and it is clear which came first. By F<sup>2</sup> I shall mean any corrector of F, not a particular corrector that I feel able to recognize. Here F<sup>2</sup>, probably the scribe, inserted *hic alter* above the line (a poor conjecture, because *postulare* already has *qui* as its subject), but later it was erased, presumably by whoever put *in achaïa* in the margin. This later correction appears in the text of many calligraphic manuscripts largely written in Florence, to which I devote the next section.

#### 2.2.1.3.1. Descendants of F that have *in achaïa* at II 1.30.1-3

Many of the calligraphic manuscripts in the following list have been assigned to particular Florentine scribes by Albinia de la Mare<sup>96</sup>:

Berlin Ham. 172	Oxford Balliol 248B (a. 1447)
Besançon 531	San Daniele del Friuli 58
Bologna Univ. 2234	Vat. Pal. Lat. 1487
Budapest Univ. 2	Vat. Urb. Lat. 321
Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1	Vat. Lat. 1749
Laur. 48.14	Venice Marc. Lat. Z 430 (1833) (a. 1445/46)
Laur. Fies. 187	Venice Marc. Lat. XI 36 (4518)
Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8	

Up to a point early in I Balliol 248B had a different source, to be discussed below (§ 2.2.1.3.2), and Vienna 139, though harder to pin down, had the same two sources. Another manuscript not copied from one exemplar throughout, Vat. Chig. H VIII 249, can be added to the list in my passages of II 4-5.

In these largely Florentine manuscripts I have found no innovations that they all share against F but several more besides II 1.30.3 *in Achaïa* that they share with F<sup>2</sup> against F<sup>1</sup> and the other family, such as *Caecil. 4.9 adductum* for *adduci* (pMF<sup>1</sup>D), II 1.141.14 *tectum* for *verum* (pMF<sup>1</sup>), II 2.122.25 [*de*

<sup>96</sup> “New research on humanistic scribes in Florence”, in A. Garzelli, *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento 1440-1525: un primo censimento*, Indici e cataloghi toscani 18-19, 1985, I, 393-600, p. 547, 88 no. 3, on Bologna Univ. 2234; p. 526, 58 no. 1, on Budapest Univ. Lat. 2; p. 533, 64 no. 5, on Laur. 48.14; p. 501, 29 no. 20, on Conv. Soppr. J IX 8; p. 497, 24 no. 28, on Balliol 248B; p. 530, 62 no. 2, on Marc. Lat. Z 430. Vat. Urb. Lat. 321 makes a fleeting appearance in a footnote where she lists some Florentine manuscripts owned by Federico da Montefeltro: “Vespasiano da Bisticci e i copisti fiorentini di Federico”, in *Federico da Montefeltro: lo stato, le arti, la cultura. La cultura*, Rome 1986, 81-96, at p. 82 n. 5.

*censu*] (why did F<sup>2</sup> make this change?), II 4.62.15 *-que triclinium* (so pR, rightly) for *quatriclinium* (MF<sup>1</sup>), II 5.26.5 *non modo extra <cubiculum sed ne> lectum quidem (non modo extra [tectum sed ne extra] lectum quidem* pMF<sup>1</sup>, cett. dett.: recte R). Made in the margin, this last correction has been attributed to Bruni<sup>97</sup>. At II 4.62.15 F<sup>2</sup> erased the original reading of F before substituting *-que triclinium*, but *quatriclinium* can still be made out. In view of the credulity shown by the many witnesses to *exornat ample magnifice quatriclinium*, the agreement of all these largely Florentine manuscripts on *-que triclinium* can hardly be dismissed as polygenetic (the result of independent correction by various scribes). Though in theory F could have been corrected from one of the others, it cannot be an accident that they share corrections made in F but among themselves only such errors as appear in F. That they descend from F would therefore be likely even without the near certainty that the errors of F against M arose in F.

Surely a copy of F itself is Conv. Soppr. J IX 8, which agrees with F<sup>1</sup> in omitting *non ad avaritiam non ad cupiditatem* at II 4.60.23-24 and in reading *fecit* at I 5.28 with pM and the French family against *patefecit* in F<sup>2</sup> and most other *deteriores* that I have checked; did the scribe take Bruni's admonition to heart? Several of the rest cannot have been copied directly from F + F<sup>2</sup>, not least because four descend from others. Bologna Univ. 2234 descends from Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1; they share II 3.1.7 *ut<i>*, 2.12 *hominibus* for *omnibus*, 4.17 *licentia* for *laetitia*, 5.7 *in iudicium* for *indicium*, [non], 9 *in* for *mihi*, 8.28 and 29 *viri* for *vestri*, 9.12 [cum], and the former adds II 3.2.12 [eiusmodi], 4.16 *ceteros<que>*, 21 *semper erit ~*, 10.18 *alio dicentur loco*<sup>1</sup> *alio loco dicentur*<sup>2</sup>, II 4.65.28 [et] *puerili*, 7-8 [quod cum ... referrent] (a line of S. Croce 23 sin. 1, the last of a page, begins with this, and only punctuation and *iste ait* follow). Budapest Univ. 2 descends from Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8, written by Giovanfrancesco Marzi and owned by Giorgio Antonio Vespucci; they share II 3.2.15 [voluntate], 4.20 *aliquem* for *alterum*, 6.19 *esse*, 7.15 *possint* for *-sunt*, II 4.62.19 *arbit[ra]retur*, 20 *iste* for *ipse*, 22 [quae], 25 *aurea* for *-eo*, 64.10 [est], 13 *nondum [etiam]*, 65.25 *a<b>*, 67.11 [oculos], and the former adds II 3.6.16 *descenderem* for *-erim*, 7.17 *ac* for *atque*, II 4.63.28 [illud], 66.16 *impudentiam<que>*, 67.3 [se], 9 *huius unius ~*, 15 *e<x>*. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1487 (s. xv<sup>2</sup>), from the Veneto and written in a distinctive cursive<sup>98</sup>, descends from Venice Marc. Lat. XI 36 (4518), which if Florentine must already have been in the Veneto; they share II 3.4.23 *asperior in re* for *in re asperior*, II 4.65.30 *obtulerunt* for *att-*, and the former incorporates

<sup>97</sup> At least, I presume it is one of the notes that Hankins, *Autografi* (n. 79), 87, has in mind when he says that notes in Bruni's hand occur on both columns of f. 88v.

<sup>98</sup> J. Fohlen, "Un atelier vénitien anonyme dans la seconde moitié du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Scriptorium* 27, 1973, 301-6 with plate 24.

corrections made in the latter, for instance II 3.2.13 <a> *re publica*, 3.17 *ita<que>*, II 4.61.3 *quod* for *ad se et*. In turn, San Daniele 58 descends from Pal. Lat. 1487; at II 5.171.6 they share the conjecture *silvestria animalia*, and at II 5.163.1, where Marc. Lat. XI 36 has *deligatur* for *-atus*, Pal. Lat. 1487 has *-atur* in its text but corrects it to *-aretur*, which appears in the text of San Daniele 58. Battista da Cingoli had written San Daniele 58 by 1461<sup>99</sup>, which becomes the *terminus ante quem* for the other two. Then three manuscripts in my list do share errors absent from F and the rest: II 5.166.21 *susplicabare* is omitted by the two Marciani and Urb. Lat. 321, and at II 4.62.18 for *et*, unambiguously written in F, Marc. Lat. Z 430 and the first hand of Marc. Lat. XI 36 have *ē* and Urb. Lat. 321 *est*. Marc. Lat. Z 430, signed by the Florentine scribe Petrus Stroza but owned by Bessarion<sup>100</sup>, has a few slips absent from the other two and either not worth correcting or not correctable without recourse to another manuscript, such as II 3.2.10 *a[b]*, 3.11 *accusarunt* for *-arint*, 4.22 *quendam* for *quempiam*, II 4.68.22 *ceteris* for *exteris*, II 5.168.15 [*quod velit*], 174.22 *longe* for *longius*. For *susplicabare* at II 5.166.21 Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 has *speculabare*, but this slip, caused by *speculatorem* two words before, is hard to connect with the omission of *susplicabare* in the manuscripts just discussed if Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 was copied directly from F. Behind those that omit *susplicabare* must have been a lost copy of F, perhaps a “Puccini” manuscript (one written, that is, by the scribe of many that have the 16th-century *ex libris* of Bernardus de Puccinis). As the other speeches are all represented by a “Puccini” copy probably written in the 1430s, and so too most of Cicero’s other works, it would be astonishing if the “Puccini” scribe did not copy the *Verrines*, though no such copy has come to light<sup>101</sup>. The hypothesis would also account for any disagreement among these manuscripts where the readings of both F<sup>1</sup> and F<sup>2</sup> are still available, because the “Puccini” scribe equipped his copies with variants in the margin.

<sup>99</sup> L. Casarsa, M. D’Angelo, C. Scaloni, *La libreria di Guarnerio d’Artegna*, Udine 1991, 265–6.

<sup>100</sup> For a plate see (with a magnifying glass) S. Marcon, “La miniatura nei manoscritti latini commissionati dal cardinal Bessarione”, in G. Fiaccadori, ed., *Bessarione e l’umanesimo*, Naples 1994, 171–95, at p. 174 fig. 42; on p. 173 she discusses the illuminator and the date of acquisition.

<sup>101</sup> The point was made to me very forcefully by Stephen Oakley, who has identified Laur. 48.33 as the “Puccini” copy of the *Philippics* and found that Urb. Lat. 321 and Marc. Lat. Z 430 descend from it; see now his article “The ‘Puccini’ scribe and the transmission of Latin texts in fifteenth-century Florence”, in R. Black, J. Kraye, L. Nuvoloni, eds., *Palaeography, manuscript illumination and humanism in Renaissance Italy: studies in memory of A. C. de la Mare*, London 2016, 345–64, at pp. 347–8. For the other speeches see Rizzo, *Catalogo* (n. 81), 52–53 no. 32, and M. D. R., “Before and after Poggio: some manuscripts of Cicero’s speeches”, *RFIC* 112, 1984, 266–84, at pp. 280–82.

2.2.1.3.2. Descendants of F that have *hic alter* at II 1.30.1-3

The earlier correction in F at II 1.30.3, *hic alter*, appears in all the other *deteriores* of both families. The relatives of F that have it include two not written in Italy:

Reims 1110 (a. 1417)

Brussels 10007-11

Reims 1110, the earliest dated manuscript of the *Verrines*, has this note on f. 1v: 'Scriptum Constancie in concilio generali anno domini millesimo CCCC<sup>mo</sup> decimo septimo et dicti concilii tercio', and then in an informal hand 'Ego Guillelmus cardinalis sancti Marci olim decanus Remensis hunc librum dono librerie ecclesie Remensis scriptum manu propria Constancie in concilio generali die primo Octobris anno suprascripto. G. cardinalis sancti Marci'. The donor, then, was Guillaume Fillastre, and the absence of punctuation before *scriptum* in the informal note may suggest, as it did to the cataloguer<sup>102</sup>, that he was also the scribe; but quite apart from the superhuman effort that would have been needed for copying out the seven *Verrines* and five other speeches in a day, similar notes in other manuscripts show that *scriptum ... Marci* just certifies *Ego ... ecclesie Remensis*<sup>103</sup>. Brussels 10007-11 I have not seen and shall not go out of my way to see, because it has the same unusual content (the *Verrines* followed by five other speeches) and on f. 273r the note 'Hunc librum feci conscribi in libraria ecclesie Remensis'<sup>104</sup>. These are the errors of Reims 1110 in my passages of II 3-5:

II 3.3.6 *qua[m]*, 4.1 *vindica<ve>ris*, II 4.65.29 [*in*], 67.31 *e<st>*,  
 II 5.158.31 *omnium[que]*, 160.19 *regum* for *legum*, 167.10 *secutos*  
 for *se tutos*, 168.22 *custodi[i]s*, 169.3 *causa[e]*, 171.9 *debere* for  
*-eo*, 172.14 *commovebantur* for *-bamur*, 173.26 *tanto* for *ratio*,  
 174.22 *me* for *ne*

Two passages originally omitted but restored in the same hand and ink strongly suggest, without quite proving, that it is a direct copy of F: II 3.38.8 *profiterentur ... vim*, of which everything but *pro-* occupies a line in F, and 73.28 *ita ... tritici*, of which in F *ita* is the second word of its line after *dari* and *tici* begins the line below. Perhaps, then, F made an excursion to Konstanz for the benefit of delegates interested in Cicero's speeches. So

<sup>102</sup> H. Loriquet, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* XXXIX, Paris 1904, 300.

<sup>103</sup> Loriquet, *Catalogue général*, 469 (1320), 471 (1321); Ch. Samaran, R. Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste* V, Paris 1965, 297 (1110), 301 (1320, 1321).

<sup>104</sup> P. Thomas, *Catalogue des manuscrits de classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles*, Ghent 1896, 50-51.

far as I am aware, Bruni is attested at Konstanz only at the end of 1414<sup>105</sup>, but Poggio was there for the duration of the council<sup>106</sup>. In any event, Reims 1110 provides a *terminus ante quem* for some readings of F<sup>2</sup>, for instance three that appear in all the largely Florentine manuscripts discussed above (§ 2.2.1.3.1): *Caecil. 4.9 adductum* for *adduci*, II 2.122.25 [*de censu*] (unless the scribe jumped *du même au même*), II 5.185.27 *pergame* for *perge*.

Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7786, accurately written, supplements and corrects its French text from an Italian source, and the main result is that it has an Italian text, albeit in a French hand, from II 1.111.24 to the end of II 3. Readings such as II 2.54.12 *amicorum suorum* ~, 141.1 *improba* (F<sup>2</sup>: *improbata* pMF<sup>1</sup>), and II 3.5.9 [*mihi*], show that it descends from F + F<sup>2</sup>, but it originally omitted for no obvious reason several passages of the same length, namely II 2.33.4 *et Siculis ... cum cive*, 73.23 *gravius ... invidiamque*, 114.15 *testimoniis ... absolutus*, 152.2 *qui tibi ... dicet et*, which must each have occupied a line of an exemplar written not in two columns like F here but across the page like Reims 1110, where the lines are slightly longer. At II 2.151.19 it shares with pMF and Reims 1110 the true reading *maximam*, for which the second family has *mox eximiam*.

The other manuscript that supplements the French text from an Italian source is Frauenfeld Kantonsbibliothek Y 227, but instead of beginning at II 1.111.24 and stopping at the end of II 3 the supplement begins with II 2 and continues to II 4.7.9 *viderit tot pr.*, and it is very corrupt. It too shares the errors of F against M. Like Reims 1110, it has *.c.* for *et* at II 3.3.3, but the script of F invites this misunderstanding. At II 2.151.19 it has *maximam*, not *mox eximiam* with the second family. The watermark on f. 216 is Briquet 10500, 'lion' (Bologna and Ferrara 1420–32), confirmation, if it were needed, of an origin in northern Italy and a date in the first half of the 15th century.

Above I cited three readings that F<sup>2</sup> must have introduced by 1417, the date of Reims 1110. The first, *Caecil. 4.9 addu(c)tum*, appears in Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IV 4, which also shares with MF<sup>1</sup> *Caecil. 2.16 [saepe] ostendisse* and I 5.28 *fecit (patefecit F<sup>2</sup>, cett. fere)*. It never included II 3–5. Reported sporadically by Peterson as b and more fully in G. Lopez's edition of II 2 as B<sup>107</sup>, it is very corrupt, so much so that it may descend from F at several removes; but in view of *hic alter* it must descend from an early state of F. Outside the *Verrines*, or at least in most of the other speeches that it contains, it belongs to a family at home in northern Italy<sup>108</sup>. No surprise, then, that in the *Verrines* it has a much earlier relative probably written in

<sup>105</sup> Luiso (n. 78) 81–82.

<sup>106</sup> H. Walser, *Poggius Florentinus: Leben und Werke*, Leipzig 1914, 40–70.

<sup>107</sup> See n. 60.

<sup>108</sup> See my edition of *Pro Quinctio*, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1992, xv. Rizzo (n. 89), 57–9 no. 37, reports the view of Albinia de la Mare that it has “Florentine decoration of c. 1450–60”. Wide of the mark was Peterson's date in his edition (n. 4) xiii: “Videtur circa annum 1420 esse exaratus”.

the Veneto, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1476. This large collection of Cicero's speeches and some of his rhetorical and philosophical works is usually dated s. xiv or s. xiv/xv, but its three forms of capital *M* include the Byzantine form (like an *H* with a descender from the middle of the crossbar), occasionally found in Latin manuscripts from about 1410 to about 1460; in some of the speeches it has marginalia that go back to Petrarch<sup>109</sup>. Shared errors in *Caecil.* and the next two speeches include these:

*Caecil.* 2.10 *nominis[que]*, 3.6 *hoc uno ~*, 5.28 [*mihi*], 6.5 <*necessitatis*> *necessitudinis*, 10.10 *reprehendis* for *repetundis*, 11.15 *tacet si* for *tametsi*, I 2.1 [*atque*], 3.9 <*fecit*> *factae*, 3.10 *in ea* for *mea*, 4.17 [*populo Romano*], 5.25 [*quod*], 6.6 *in eo* for *meo*, 10.5 *non* for *vero*, 11 [*fore*], II 1.6.7 *mendet* (Pal.) or *mendati* (Conv. Soppr.) for *respondet*, 71.23 *cui ipse* for *audisse* (blotted in F), 80.13 [*causam*], 119.10 [*ita*], 149.15 *istam diem ~*, 19 *factus est ~*

In my passages of II 4 and II 5, however, Pal. Lat. 1476 belongs to the second family. The simplest explanation for this change of allegiance would be that like Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 its first exemplar did not go beyond II 2, but in fact the agreement between the two does not continue to the end of II 2: at 151.19 Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 has *mox eximiam* with the second family against *maximam* in MF and Pal. Lat. 1476. I cannot say where before II 2.151.19 Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 changes its allegiance; at II 2.122.25 it has *de censu*, which Pal. Lat. 1476 omits with F<sup>2</sup> and Reims 1110, but as omission by *saut du même au même* is a possibility anywhere in the tradition, the passage cannot safely be used as evidence that the change occurred before that point. I mention for completeness, not because it sheds any light on the matter, that Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 omits II 2.184.5 *vobis* – 190.20 *haec omnia*<sup>110</sup>. Similarly, I cannot say where after II 2.151.19 Pal. Lat. 1476 changes its allegiance. In my passages of II 3 and II 4 it has these errors:

II 3.4.19 *postulatum* for *-tur*, 4 *alis* for *altero*, 6.11 *inimicos* for *-us*, 7.8 *sin* for *an*, 12 *r. p.* for *populus Romanus*, 13 <*sed*> *pro*, 8.29 [*hunc*] *liberti*, 2 [*eos*], 9.13 *certe[t]*, 10.19 *reliqua*<*m*>, II 4.62.9 [*est*], 68.23 *impuni*<*ta*>*ta*

I shall come back to its other exemplar when I deal with the second family (§ 2.2.2.1).

<sup>109</sup> Rizzo, *Catalogo* (n. 89), 139–41 no. 129. It has just become available on line at [digi.bu.uni-heidelberg.de](http://digi.bu.uni-heidelberg.de).

<sup>110</sup> So my note says, but Lopez in his edition (n. 60) reports that the omission starts three words later.

The reading of F<sup>2</sup> at *Caecil.* 4.9 obliterated *adduci*, but *adduci* appears in a large sub-family that descends from F. This sub-family must therefore descend from a state of F earlier than 1417, the date of Reims 1110, which has *adductum*. Nine manuscripts belong to it:

Leiden B. P. L. 16D	St Gallen Vad. 314
B. L. Burney 158	Turin Naz. D IV 2
Montecassino 340	Vat. Lat. 8509
Bodl. E. D. Clarke 21	Vat. Lat. 11421
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 17154	

They share these errors:

II 3.4.22 *quendam* for *quempiam*, 4.3 *fervidus* for *ferendus*, 5.9 [mihi], 8.22 [ita], 9.4 *cuiquam ferendum* ~, II 4.65.23 *quo*<d>, 66.16 *insignemque* <eius>, 67.28 *forte me* ~

In my passage of II 5 I have not collated Montecassino 340 or Turin Naz. D IV 2, but the rest share these errors:

160.14 [in vincla], 163.3 *illius acerba* ~, 164.28 [et], 165.8 *alius* for *aliud*, 177.16 *perfecta* for *-specta*, *neque* <de>

A striking feature of the sub-family is the subscription *M. T. Ciceronis eloquentie fontis uberrimi in C. Verrem septima et ultima oratio repetundarum pro Siculis feliciter explicit*, found in Bodl. E. D. Clarke 21, B. N. F. Lat. 17154, Vad. 314, and Vat. Lat. 11421. Its most accurate member, and probably the source of the rest, is Vad. 314; 'iste liber est Marci Nicolucii de Remeriis (?) de Castilione Aretino quem propria manu scripsit in alma urbe Roma', but on f. 1r it has an initial typical of early humanistic manuscripts produced in Florence<sup>111</sup>. More precisely than was usual at the time, and in fact very reasonably, Io. Casp. Orelli dated it 'circa annum MCCCCXX'<sup>112</sup>. I cannot prove that it is a direct copy of F, but if it is indeed the source of the rest, was it perhaps copied from F in 1405-7 or 1411-13 while Bruni was in Rome at the curia? Montecassino 340, which certainly descends from it and was probably written in the 1420s or 1430s, has errors shared by Vat. Lat. 8509, written no later than the second quarter of the 15th century:

<sup>111</sup> *Katalog der datierten Handschriften in der Schweiz in lateinischer Schrift vom Anfang des Mittelalters bis 1550*, Dietikon-Zürich 1991, III, 241 no. 740 with plate 845.

<sup>112</sup> See n. 78.

II 3.2.16 *qua*<*e*>*dam*, 3.5 *invitus* for *munitus*, 7.15 <*esse*>  
*animum*, II 4.61.6 *primum* for *patrium*, 64.18 *pervenire*<*n*>*t*,  
 65.27-28 [*esse facturum ... improbitate*], 1 *involucris eiectis*  
 for *involucrisque reiectis*, 7 *qui cum* for *quod cum*, 66.19  
*maximoque* for *maximo quod*.

In my passages of II 3 and II 4 some of the few differences that I find in my collations may be due to carelessness on my part, but I can vouch for II 4.63.2 [*ex*]*spoliatum* in Vat. Lat. 8509, an innovation with respect to the reading of F, Vad. 314, and Montecassino 340, even though right (pMR have it). Vat. Lat. 8509 may therefore be a copy of Montecassino 340. Leiden B. P. L. 16D and Turin D IV 2 share the subscription *Ut gaudere solet ...* (a quatrain, Schaller-Könsgen 16856) and also a few errors: II 3.6.20 [*dis*]*similitudines*, 7.10 [*contra*], II 4.63.27 *gaudere* <*coepit*>, 65.9 *ait se ~*. The former, which has more errors and originally omitted *Caecil. 4.10-11 spes ... petissent*, descends from the latter, which has *spes ... petissent* on a line and omits II 3.7.10 *contra* between lines; indeed, it must be a direct copy, because it was the scribe who restored *spes ... petissent*. As Vat. Lat. 11421 at first omitted II 2.138.12-14 *sic census ... posset ad-* (f. 53r), which the scribe restored (*sic census ... posset* in the margin, *ad-* by overwriting in the text), it must be a direct copy of Vad. 314, which has the sequence on a line (f. 51v)<sup>113</sup>. In my passage of II 3 a relative and probably descendant of Vat. Lat. 11421 is Vat. Chig. H VIII 249, which in its original text shares with it 2.10 *reprehenda*<*n*>*t*, 16 *etiam ut ~*, 4.18 <*h*>*ac*, 24 *iudicare* for *videare*, 5.10 <*in*>*omnibus*, 9.6 [*beneficia*], 12 [*ornet*]; but in my passages of II 4 and II 5 Chig. H VIII 249 belongs with the largely Florentine manuscripts discussed above (§ 2.2.1.3.1)<sup>114</sup>. A member of this sub-family provided q<sup>2</sup> with *Caecil. 28.5 cum* (Vad.<sup>2</sup>) for *quod* (pq<sup>1</sup>M: om. F, Vad.<sup>1</sup>), 1.35.7 *periculos*<*issim*>*um*, 41.18 <*et*> *iudicibus*, II 1.42.5 <*de*> *hoc*, 62.10 *fastigia* for *ves-*, 81.28 *aut* <*ab*>, 83.28 <*te*> *teste*, 88.17 *causas* for *-am*, 151.18 *concitaret* (Vad.<sup>1</sup>) for *commoverem* (pq: *concitarem* MF), 153.11 *cuiuslibet* for *cuiusque*<sup>115</sup>; another, used in II 2-3, provided a corrector of O (Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79) with II 3.4.22 *quendam* for *quempiam*, 8.22 [*ita*], 9.4 *cuiquam ferendum ~*; and another was used up to II 1.26.5 by the corrector of Esc. R I 2, whose

<sup>113</sup> By kindly sending me an image Marco Buonocore confirmed that the restoration in Vat. Lat. 11421 was made by the scribe.

<sup>114</sup> The decoration on f. 1r is signed by Jacopo da Fabriano, and J. Ruyschaert, "Miniaturistes 'romains' sous Pie II", in *Enea Silvio Piccolomini – Papa Pio II*, Siena 1968, 245-82, at pp. 247, 249, argued that he did the work for Gilforte Bonconti of Pisa, who died in 1462, and that the arms of Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini were superimposed later.

<sup>115</sup> The corrections in II 5 also came from a *deterior* but are few in number and less distinctive, unless the reading of Vad. 314 at II 5.24.4, *et species* (*ac species* MF), is peculiar to this sub-family. Apart from corrections made by the scribe, all apparently from the exemplar, I find none that could not have come from a *deterior*.



*boni* for *idonei* at *Caecil.* 9.3 appears in Montecassino 340, Vat. Lat. 8509, and Leiden B. P. L. 16D (Vad. 314 has *idonei*, but I have not checked all the other members of the sub-family). Burney 158 has been assigned to Rome<sup>116</sup>, and both it and E. D. Clarke 21 were owned by the Maffei of Volterra, who kept a library in Rome<sup>117</sup>; but E. D. Clarke 21 was previously owned by a Sacrati of Ferrara, and its decoration has been assigned to Florence<sup>118</sup>. After *istius et* at II 2.156.9 E. D. Clarke 21 originally omitted *varias ... dixerunt*, which occupies a line in Vad. 314; a hand different from the scribe's restored it (after *istius* and with <et> before it, so that an unwanted *et* follows *dixerunt*). In *Caecil.* up to at least 48.9 Burney 158 steps out of line by sharing with Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577, on which see below, 1.3 *sum* for *sim*, 4.16 <idem> *id* (the reading of the French family, unlikely to be polygenetic), 5.24 *quo<rum>*, 1 *nec* for *et*, 8.29 <et>*iam*, 11.15 *utriusque* for *utrumque*, 14.25 *commitata* for *communicata*, 38.27 *paratrarit* (*patrarit* Burn.<sup>2</sup>) for *peccarit*, 45.29 [*sit*], 47.17 *mihi hodie ~*, 48.9 *gregis* for *Graecis*; but the agreement probably stops short of 49.17, where it has *detracturus ... denique se* with MF and Vad. 314 against *detractaturus ... se denique* in Ottob. Lat. 1577, and certainly of 51.6, where it has *illo* with Vad. 314 against *isto* in MF and Ottob. Lat. 1577. In my passages of II 3-5 some errors of Burney 158 are shared by Paris B. N. F. Lat. 17154: II 3.4.18 [*ego*], 6.20 *ac* (*et* MF, Vad.), 29 *omnia* for *omnes*, 3 *explicatione* for *expilatione*, II 5.165.4 [*cum*], 5 *numquam* for *inquam* (corrected in Burney 158), 15 *nemini* for *ne tantum*, 166.28 *profu<g>isset* (corrected in Burney 158). There will be more to say about Vad. 314 when I tackle contamination between the first and the second family (§ 2.2.5.1).

Two Florentine manuscripts written in the 1440s, Balliol 248B and Vienna 139, belong in part to this sub-family and in part to the wave of calligraphic manuscripts that have II 1.30.3 *in Achaia* (§ 2.2.1.3.1). In *Caecil.* they share errors that I have not found in other *deteriores*: 8.27 *vindicandas* for *iudic-*, 29 *asperius [antea]* (restored in Vienna 139 before *asperius*), 10.8 *mea* for *nostra* (restored in Vienna 139), 31.31-32 [*audebis ... possis*] after *fecisti*, probably because in Vad. 314 the question mark after *possis* comes immediately below the one after *fecisti*<sup>119</sup>. At II 1.30.3, however, Vienna 139 has *hic alter*, and of the readings I listed above that appear in the same manuscripts as *in Achaia* (§ 2.2.1.3.1) it has only II 4.62.15 *-que triclinium*. On the other hand, it shares with the two Marciani and Urb. Lat. 321 the omission of II 5.166.21 *suspocabare*. It was sold by Vespasiano and owned

<sup>116</sup> See the *Catalogue of illuminated manuscripts* that the British Library has put on line.

<sup>117</sup> J. Ruysschaert, "Recherche des deux bibliothèques romaines Maffei des XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècles", *La bibliofilia* 60, 1958, 302-55, at p. 322 no. 20, p. 326 no. 39.

<sup>118</sup> Ruysschaert, "Recherche", 326 no. 39; O. Pächt, J. J. G. Alexander, *Illuminated manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford 2*, Oxford 1972, 24 no. 239.

<sup>119</sup> I thank Dániel Kiss for checking Vienna 139 at this point.

and annotated by Filippo Podocataro<sup>120</sup>, who probably made the corrections to be seen on the first few pages. At *Caecil.* 3.1 Balliol 248B shares with Montecassino 340 and Vat. Lat. 8509 *Ex se*, a corruption hard to account for until one notices how *Sese* is written in Vad. 314. It deserts Vad. 314 between I 10.5, where they share *non* for *vero*, and 20.19, where it has *non* with F, not *num* with Vad. 314 and the second family; perhaps it used just the first quire of Vad. 314, which ends at 11.18 *consulem* (f. 8v), or used Vad. 314 just up to 12.4, where a quire of its own ends (f. 82v).

Two further manuscripts, Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750, share three of the four omissions by which I defined the first family (not *Caecil.* 13.10 [*meae*]) and also have *fecit* with pMF<sup>1</sup> at I 5.28 against *patefecit* in the second family (imported into Vat. Lat. 1750 by a corrector) and *maximam* with pMF at II 2.151.19 against *mox eximiam* in the second family. That they descend from F is shown by [*haec*] at I 54.7 and *ad* (F<sup>2</sup>) for *ante* (M: om. F<sup>1</sup>) at II 1.61.27, and *adduci* at *Caecil.* 4.9 shows that like the family just discussed they must descend from a state of F earlier than 1417. Vat. Lat. 1750, which has an unidentified coat of arms<sup>121</sup>, originally omitted two passages that form a line in Ottob. Lat. 1577, II 2.146.16-17 *ut statuas ... pollicerentur* and II 3.76.20-21 *civitates ... praebeat*; as they were restored in different ink, and probably by the hand that restored a passage missing from Ottob. Lat. 1577, II 2.45.13 *primum ... necesse est*, it may not be a direct copy. In any event, it cannot descend entirely from Ottob. Lat. 1577. At least up to *Caecil.* 11.19 Ottob. Lat. 1577 has errors absent from it: 1.3 *sum* for *sim*, 4.16 <*idem*> *id* (the reading of the French family, unlikely to be polygenetic), 5.24 *quo<rum>*, 1 *nec* for *et*, 8.29 <*et*>*iam*, 11.15 *utriusque* for *utrumque* (I listed these above in connexion with Burney 158, which shares them). Between *Caecil.* 11.19 and II 2.45.13 I have checked both only in the four places mentioned above, and so I cannot say whether the differences came about through contamination in an intermediary or through a change of exemplar. In my passage of II 3 they share these errors:

3.10 *vita sit* ~, 14 [*nobis*] (restored in Vat. Lat. 1750 by a corrector),  
4.25 *quid* for *quod*, 5.7 *libidinis iudicium* for *indiciam libidinis*,  
7.9 [*ei*], 9.4 *putas esse* ~

At II 4.66.17, however, *ab* in Ottob. Lat. 1577 against *ex* in Vat. Lat. 1750 shows that Ottob. Lat. 1577 has gone over to the second family. Then in II

<sup>120</sup> Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis*, VIII vi 3, Leipzig 1932, 47-48 no. 41; de la Mare, "New research" (n. 96), p. 546, 86 no. 17, and p. 567 no. 16.

<sup>121</sup> *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, Paris 1991, III, 1, plate 13c.

5 they are back together, and Vat. Lat. 1750 shares errors not only with the original text of Ottob. Lat. 1577 but also with a corrector:

158.28 [*enim*] (Ottob.<sup>2</sup>), 159.12 *obloquentia* for *e-*, 160.15 *Messanam[que]*, 23 [*vos*], 161.5 *progress[ur]us*, 15 *undique hominem* ~, 162.21 *vero* for *non*, 164.17 [*tua*], 165.7 [*Romanum*], <*non*> *fuisse* (Ottob.<sup>2</sup>), 166.19 *neg[leg]o*, 29 *esse[st]*, 168.22 *hominum* for *-nem*, 169.1 [*tum*], 170.17 [*prope*], 27 <*in*> *locis* ... <*in*> *celebritate*, 171.10 [*iste*], 22 [*et*] *eligere*, 27 *sua* <*in*>, 172.21 *-que* for *denique*, 173.24 *non tuo* for *neque metuo*, 30 *Februarii* for *-rias*, 1 *inde* for *mihi*

Laborious comparison in the section of text that falls between my passages of II 3 and II 5 revealed errors shared against F up to II 3.139, for instance 129.29 *provincia* for *Sicilia*, 131.11 [*tam*] *nummarium*, 132.20 *tibi reliquum* ~, 133.14 *tibi hoc* ~, 137.20 *et in* for *in quo*, 138.18 *idoneum iudicem* ~, 139.27 *meae* (*me* Ottob.<sup>1</sup>) for *tuae*. They then part company somewhere between II 3.140 and 143 in a way that suggests a change of exemplar rather than contamination in an intermediary, but they come back together between II 4.110.30 and 111.7. No physical explanation offers itself in either<sup>122</sup>. Provisionally, I limit myself to two conclusions: that they belong to the first family up to II 3.139; and that Vat. Lat. 1750 descends from Ottob. Lat. 1577 everywhere except in II 3.140/143 – II 4.110/111, though with some contamination at the beginning of *Caecil.* and perhaps beyond. I shall return to them (§ 2.2.3).

#### 2.2.1.4. The first family: a telltale reading

An apparently trivial reading sheds light on the internal relationships of the first family. At II 3.5.9 M has *modo* with *mihi* as a correction. F too originally had *modo*, but someone ran a line through *odo* and put an *i* above the *m*. That is what I think happened, but at first sight the corrector just deleted *modo*. No member of my large sub-family has the word in either form, nor has B. N. F. Lat. 7786. In Reims 1110 *mihi* is inserted above the line, presumably because the scribe at first overlooked the superscript *i*. Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750 have *mihi*, and so has Frauenfeld Y 227 if I can trust the silence of my collation. Among the calligraphic descendants of F only Laur. 48.14 has *modo* (corrected much later to *mihi*); it is omitted by Balliol 248B, by Marc. Lat. Z 430 and its relatives, and by Vienna 139; S. Croce 23 sin. 1, its copy Bologna Univ. 2234, and Fies. 187, have *in*;

<sup>122</sup> Vat. Lat. 1750 originally omitted on f. 127r II 3.201.25 *magnum* – 209.3 *placeat*, restored by a corrector on two leaves inserted for the purpose, ff. 125-6. The passage must have formed a unit of layout in an ancestor.

and unless I collated without due care, *mihi* appears in Berlin Ham. 172, Besançon 531, Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 and its copy Budapest Univ. Lat. 2, and Vat. Lat. 1749. Such variation is just what one expects if all these calligraphic manuscripts descend from F but not through a common intermediary, and similar variation occurs in the other descendants of F.

#### 2.2.2.0. The second family of *deteriores*

This is the family that has errors absent from MF but not all the errors of MF (§ 2.2.1-2). It had come into existence by 1419, the date of its earliest dated member, but some other members look quite as old, and I have mentioned that Laur. 48.27 may go back as far as about 1410 (§ 2.2.1-2). I begin with two sharply defined sub-families.

##### 2.2.2.1. Bologna Univ. 2232 and its relatives

This sub-family had come into existence by 1419:

Bologna Univ. 2232 (a. 1419)	Vat. Pal. Lat. 1490 (a. 1466) (II 4 only)
Escorial N II 16	Vat. Lat. 1753
B. L. Harl. 5428 (a. 1469)	Venice Marc. Lat. XI 99 (3830)
The Hague 75 C 63	Vienna 64
Naples Naz. IV B 15	

It has these errors:

II 3.5.12 [*iudices*], II 4.61.5 [*non*], 62.12 *ad usum* <*ad*> (*ad* [*usum ad*] Harl. 5428, *ad usum* Vienna 64 and a corrector of Naples IV B 15), 18 *ipse* for *ita*, 24 *praegrandi* for *per-*, 64.11 [*e*], *clarissimum* for *-mis*, 15 *ut* [*et*], II 5.157.3 *post*<*ea*> ... *post*<*ea*>, 4 [*sed*], 165.3 <*et*> *eo*, 167.6 [*tamen*], 10 [*se*], 169.16 *ac fixum* for *ea fixum*, 170.24 *non*[*ne*], 171.6 [*et*] *tam*, 174.20 [*et*] *coepta*, 23 *tuo* for *hoc*, 177.12 *me*[*i*]

Esc. N II 16 must descend from Vat. Lat. 1753, because it adds errors of its own to these shared errors:

II 3.3.6 <*ab*> *ineunte*, 5.7 *vitium* (a correction in Vat. Lat. 1753) for *indiciu*/*iudiciu*, 6.25 *aeque* for *aequo*, 7.11 *sum* for *sim*, 8.26 [*tum*], 9.15 *quam* <*quod*>, 16 [*vobis*], II 4.62.21 [*omnes*], 63.29 *discessus* for *-um*, 64.8 *quo*<*s*>, 14 *non* ... *non* for *neque* ... *neque*, 18 *et* for *ut*, 65.27 *non* for *neque*, 66.26 <*per*>*venturos*, 67.28 *me* after *crimine* (before *forte* the others), 11 <*conventu*> *comitatu*, 68.16 [*hoc*], II 5.159.7 *non* for *neque*, 163.10 *tum* before *egomet*, 166.2 *etiam* for *esset*, 167.5 *non noti* for *neque noti*,

168.26 *non* for *neque*, 169.2 *at* for *ac*, 172.16 *quem* for *quoniam*,  
173.26 *haec ratio me* for *in hoc me ratio, causam suam ~*, 176.12  
*esse* for *est*.

As Harl. 5428 has II 3.5.7 *vitium* and most of the others, it too probably descends from Vat. Lat. 1753. The Hague 75 C 63, written in the second quarter of the 15th century for an unidentified 'G. G.', is Milanese<sup>123</sup>. Pal. Lat. 1490 was written at Pavia *per me G. Salinum Ala<sup>m</sup> (Alamannum ?)*. Johannes de Polonia, who signed Bologna Univ. 2232, and Johannes Ersford de Wissenfels de Almania alta, who signed Harl. 5428, do not say where they made their copies<sup>124</sup>. Script and decoration show that Marc. Lat. XI 99, no later than the first third of the 15th century, comes from northern Italy, but I hesitate to say whether from Lombardy or the Veneto. Vienna 64, decorated in Ferrarese style<sup>125</sup>, is accurately written in a neat and regular hand. A further member of the sub-family is a manuscript once at Meiningen. The manuscripts from the ducal collection there are said to be lost<sup>126</sup>, but in 1785 and 1787 J. F. Facius published readings from the

<sup>123</sup> Rizzo, *Catalogo* (n. 89), 64 no. 42, describes it, but on its origin see my review, *CR* 98, 1984, 40–43, at p. 42. At the foot of f. 1r an *ex libris* of Petrus Francius († 1704) can be made out despite erasure, and the manuscript can be identified as lot 479 in the *Catalogus selectissimorum librorum celeberrimi viri Petri Francii*, Amsterdam 1704, p. 119, "M. T. Ciceronis orationes omnes mss. in membrana bonae notae". On returning to the description in the *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum bibliothecae Universitatis Rheno-Trajectinae* I, Utrecht–The Hague 1887, 206–7, I find the information that it was acquired (by whom?) from the Emtinck sale at Amsterdam in 1753; see *Bibliotheca Emtinckiana, sive catalogus librorum ... quos ... collegit et reliquit ... M<sup>r</sup> Simon Emtinck Toparcha in Noordwykerhout* Part 4, 'Libri in folio', p. 17 lot 157, "Orationes M. T. Ciceronis omnes integrae. MS. in pergamento". C. D. Beck, on whose edition see n. 128 below, used a collation of a manuscript owned by Balthazar Huydecoper († 1778) that had readings characteristic of the *deteriores* and also included the *Philippics* and other speeches; it seems likely to have been lot 157 = 479. Lot 480 in the Francius sale, "eiusdem Orationes XII. *eleganter scriptae in charta*", must be lot 158 in *Bibliotheca Emtinckiana*, "Ciceronis orationes duodecim, *eleganter scriptae in charta. Liber olim D. Franc. Barbari, et Dni Danielis*", and this fuller description enables it to be identified as Deventer 101 G 11, which I described in "Before and after Poggio" (n. 101), 271 n. 3. Zumpt (n. 16), I p. xxii, noticed that J. G. Graevius in *M. Tullii Ciceronis orationes* I 1, Amsterdam 1699, cites more than one Francianus on II 1.42.7 and 93.15, and the other must have been lot 481, "Orationes XV. aliae, *item* Sallustii bellum Catil. et Jugurthinum *partim in membrana partim in charta mss.*", now Leiden Periz. F 12, on which see § 11.

<sup>124</sup> In Bologna 2232 the two central bifolia of the third quire were folded the wrong way, and the right order is 21-3, 26-7, 24-5, 28-30.

<sup>125</sup> So I learn from Albinia de la Mare's files, which I consulted at the Bodleian. Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis*, VIII vi 1, Leipzig 1930, 48–49 no. 32 with plate XXVI 1, assigned the decoration to Mantua or Verona.

<sup>126</sup> S. Krämer, *Latin manuscript books before 1600*, Munich 1993, 585; "1945" says the web site of Meiningen "wurde die Herzogliche öffentliche Bibliothek Opfer der Kriegswirren und ist bis auf wenige Bände verschollen". Manuscripts from Meiningen were put up for

manuscript of the *Verrines*<sup>127</sup>, and C. D. Beck drew on an older collation for his edition (Leipzig 1795)<sup>128</sup>. A contemporary description reveals that the manuscript was laid out in two columns, had 30 parchment leaves, broke off at II 2.113.20 *quod propter*, and was bound with three texts about Jerome written across the page by a different hand<sup>129</sup>; the date ventured by Facius and in the description, s. xii/xiii, can be taken with a pinch of salt, because in *Caecil*. I have checked against Esc. N II 16 the readings that Facius reports<sup>130</sup>, and they share 3.2 *cum* for *quod*, 31.29 *alteri*<*us*>, 44.20 [*ego*], 47.22 *feceris* for *fuertis*, 71.7 [*hoc*]. Omissions in *Caecil*. that may reveal a closer relationship with other members of the sub-family are 19.31 [*id*], 21.13 [*tuam*], 27.16 [*omnium*], 37.28 [*et*] *oratione*, 40.16 [*haec*], 46.13 [*fore*], 47.25 [*hoc*], 27 [*et paratissimus*], 53.23 [*iniurias*], 27 [*illud*], 63.14 [*ita*]. All these manuscripts, I suspect, descend from Naples IV B 15, written on paper about 1400 or not long after and annotated by Gasparino Barzizza († 1430), who from 1407 to 1421 worked at Padua and before and after that at Pavia<sup>131</sup>; but various hands corrected it so heavily, often in erasure, that its

---

sale, however, by Reiss & Sohn in their Auktion 80, October 23rd-26th 2001, nos. 318-69. Christopher de Hamel kindly told me that Messrs Quaritch might have a copy of the catalogue, and indeed they have; I saw it by courtesy of Anke Timmermann. The manuscripts were almost entirely modern, though, and I looked through them in vain.

<sup>127</sup> “De codice IV. Verrinarum Ciceronis in Bibliotheca Ducali Meiningsensi asservato, eiusque lectionibus variantibus”, in two *Programmschriften* entitled *Anniversaria gymnasii academici Casimiriani sacra* and published at Coburg; they are available on line from Munich. Old collations tend to pass over variants helpful for affiliating witnesses but not for improving the text, such as transpositions that do not affect the sense or omissions that damage sense or syntax. Facius, however, does report enough omissions to reveal the affiliation of the manuscript if it has close relatives.

<sup>128</sup> As the digital copy available on line from Munich is puzzlingly selective, Dominic Berry kindly checked for me the printed copy at the National Library of Scotland, the only one in Britain. He reports that the first five speeches appear in volume I, II 4-5 in volume II, 1800, which on pp. 400-490 includes a list of readings from a *Leidensis*, the *Huydecoperanus*, and the *Meiningsensis*. On the *Huydecoperanus*, also cited, he tells me, in the notes under the text, see n. 123 above.

<sup>129</sup> “Verzeichnis einiger auf der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Meiningen befindlichen Handschriften und codices”, *Historisch-litterarisch-bibliographisches Magazin* 7-8, 1794, 160-81, at pp. 160-62. No mention in L. Grobe, *Die Schätze der Herzoglichen öffentlichen Bibliothek in Meiningen*, Meiningen 1896, available on line from Düsseldorf.

<sup>130</sup> I owe most of my information about the text of Esc. N II 16 in *Caecil*. to Ben Watson. See n. 26.

<sup>131</sup> The correct order of leaves in the first quire is 1-2, 8, 7, 5-6, 4, 3, 9-10. Giliola Barbero, who has prepared the entry on Gasparino for a volume on Italian literary autographs, happened to be at the Biblioteca Nazionale when I was studying the manuscript; she had not previously seen it but confirmed that many of the notes in the margin are his. Two notes on f. 79r refer to his son Guiniforte (1406-63). Notes on ff. 15r, 32r, 38r, cite Asconius (on the *Verrines* Pseudo-Asconius), discovered in 1416 by Poggio and his friends on an excursion from the Council of Konstanz; see *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), 24-5. On Gasparino see the *Diz. biog. degli italiani* 7, 1965, 34-9 (G. Martellotti) but on the date of his death R. G. G. Mercer, *The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, London 1979, 135-6. Mercer several times mentions

descendants, especially Bologna Univ. 2232, Marc. Lat. XI 99, and Vienna 64, give a clearer picture of its original text. Its subscription, *M. T. Ciceronis Verrinarum .vii<sup>a</sup>. et ultima explicit*, recurs in Marc. Lat. XI 99; though the wording does not look distinctive, no other manuscript has it. Vienna 156, which I mentioned above in my discussion of the French family (§ 1.1), has the text of this sub-family in my passages of II 3 and II 4 but conflates it with a French text at the beginning of *Caecil.* and in my passage of II 5. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1476, which I discussed among the descendants of F, may be related to the sub-family in my passage of II 5: 165.3 <et> *eo*, 170.24 *non[ne]*, 171.6 [et], 176.9 [hoc]. If it is, the same may be true throughout II 3-5. Another probable relative is Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 233. I argued above (§ 2.2.1.2) that like its two close relatives it descends from M independently of F up to II 3.45.18 *necessarios* but that beyond that point it descends from F. In II 5 it has 156.1 *noto* for *notus*, 162.23 *inquam* <inquam>, 165.3 <et> *eo*, 171.6 [et], 176.9 [hoc], errors amply even if not unanimously attested in the sub-family under discussion. Quite heavily corrected, it is also the only Italian manuscript to have in its original text at II 5.160.25 *consciam* with the French family against *sociam* in pM.

#### 2.2.2.2. The family of Ricc. 499

The second of my two sub-families consists of Florence Ricc. 499 and six descendants:

Cesena S. 18.2  
Laur. Edili 208  
Naples Naz. IV B 10

Toledo Capit. 100-17  
Vat. Reg. Lat. 1525  
Vat. Lat. 1752

They have these errors:

II 3.4.4 *ipso* for *ipse*, 7.16 *monere* for *mov-*, 9.7 *undique rebus omnibus* (*rebus undique omnibus* Naples IV B 10) for *rebus omnibus undique*, II 4.63.6 [se]

Ricc. 499, notably accurate, was attributed by Ullman to Poggio but by Albinia de la Mare to his 'good French scribe', and she dated it 1426-27<sup>132</sup>. It includes some corrections made later by Poggio himself, for instance II 3.1.3 *non* <*solum*>, 7.12 *cum* for *cui*, and these appear in Edili 208, written at

Pseudo-Asconius's commentary (see his index under "Pedianus") but nowhere the *Verrines* themselves. G. W. Pigman III, "Barzizza's studies of Cicero", *Rinascimento* II 21, 1981, 123-63, does not mention them either but publishes the life of Cicero that he composed about 1420, which does (p. 149 "Verrinae septem").

<sup>132</sup> Ullman, *The origin* (n. 92), 37-40; A. C. de la Mare, *The handwriting of Italian humanists*, Oxford 1973, 1, 70, 82-4.

Florence by Ormannus de Erfordia<sup>133</sup>. Of the rest, Naples Naz. IV B 10, no less accurately written on paper in an accomplished and regular cursive, stands alone; it must descend from Ricc. 499, because the scribe omitted, but someone else restored, II 1.39.14–15 *prospicere ... ad exercitum*, which occupies a line in Ricc. 499. Watermarks that resemble Briquet 6641 ‘fleur’, 11652 ‘monts’, 5955 ‘enclume’, point to the second quarter of the century. The other four have II 3.1.6 *virtutum[que]*, 4.22 *avaritiae suspicio ~*, 23 *erit semper ~*, 3 *audiendus* for *ferendus*, 5.12 *fuisse videar ~*, 6.28 *o[r]bitis* vel sim., 7 *[fixas]*, 7.9 *ei inimicum ~*, 9.7 *teneamus* for *tueamur*. Reg. Lat. 1525 and Cesena S. 18.2 share many errors: II 3.3.9 *[quam]*, 10 *quam* for *quanto*, 6.16 *[ad]ductus*, 28 *obicis* before *ex tensarum*, 7.19 *ac* for *et*, 8.2 *hoc* for *quo*, 9.4 *non* for *nos*, II 4.60.27 *atque* for *ac*, 61.30 *[filios]*, 1 *[id]*, 62.21 *copias omnes ~*, 26 *[Q.]*, 64.12 *[reges ... attulissent]*, 20 <maximum> *eximium*, 67.4 *est* for *esse*. Cesena S. 18.2 was probably written at Ferrara in the early 1450s<sup>134</sup>. Toledo 100-17 was bought a *Petropaulo librario Romae die xxv Februarii 1450 ducato uno* (f. 183r) and has later notes by customs officers. Vat. Lat. 1752 was written by Giovanni da Itri in the 1460s, if not at Rome, then presumably at one of the papal establishments near Rome<sup>135</sup>. Perhaps the four manuscripts that share errors descend from a copy of Ricc. 499 made during Poggio’s time in Rome, whereas Edili 208 was copied from it after his return to Florence in 1453. Another descendant of Ricc. 499 at least in the first three speeches is the *editio princeps* (Rome 1471), in which Giovanni Andrea Bussi assembled all the speeches known at the time. The following list of errors that it shares with Ricc. 499 includes two that appear there as corrections:

8.29 *idque* for *id iam*, 24.15 <per>*ferre*, 33.15 *solum non ~* (Ricc.<sup>1</sup>), 51.5 *[e]nunties* (Ricc.<sup>2</sup>), 56.26 *Veneri<s>* (Ricc.<sup>2</sup>), 2 <h>*ac*, 60.9 *statuere* (Ricc.<sup>1</sup>) for *statuent*, 61.21–22 *te* before *hanc*, 63.17 *prout* for *quod ut*, 19 *super* (Ricc.<sup>1</sup>) for *semper*, 71.12 *hoc* for *nihil*, I 5.1 *cum* for *tum*, 29.16 *eximia* (Ricc.<sup>1</sup>) for *ex vestra*, 46.28 *tenuissime* for *-mum*, II 1.35.5 *reiectionem* for *relictionem*, 60.4 *sese* for *saepe* (MF, Laur. 48.27: *se p* and the French family), 90.30 <de> *illo*, 111.23 *ita iam* (*iam* M, F in the margin, p, the French family: *itaque* F in the text, Laur. 48.27, Bologna Univ. 2232),

<sup>133</sup> De la Mare, “New research” (n. 96), p. 524, 56 no. 10.

<sup>134</sup> A. C. de la Mare, “Lo *scriptorium* di Malatesta Novello”, in F. Lollini, P. Lucchi, eds., *Libreria domini. I manoscritti della Biblioteca Malatestiana: testi e decorazioni*, Bologna 1995, 35–93, at pp. 48–51, 84. Another manuscript at Cesena that must have some connexion with Poggio is S. 20.4 of Lucretius, on which see my article “The Italian tradition of Lucretius revisited”, *Aevum* 79, 2005, 115–64, at pp. 140–141, 150.

<sup>135</sup> P. Cherubini, “Giovanni da Itri: armigero, fisico e copista”, in *Scrittura, biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento: aspetti e problemi. Atti del seminario 1-2 giugno 1979*, Vatican 1980, 33–63, at pp. 33 n. 1, 50–51, plates 1c, 3.



2 *voluntates vivorum* ([*testamenta*] *vivorum* MF: *vivorum voluntates* Laur. 48.27, Bologna Univ. 2232), 139.10 [*re*], 149.27 *in<de>*, 154.26 *Marcelli* for *Metelli*

Further collation might establish a closer link with a descendant of Ricc. 499 than with Ricc. 499 itself. In other speeches it has been established that Vienna 4 descends from the ed. Rom., and the same holds for the *Verrines*<sup>136</sup>. I shall therefore ignore it when I come to the text of the ed. Rom. after II 1 (§ 2.2.3).

### 2.2.2.3. Other members of the second family

Two individual manuscripts earlier than most seem to be equipollent with the two sub-families just defined:

Florence Laur. 48.27

Milan Ambros. B 121 sup.

I discussed Laur. 48.27 above (§ 2.2.1-2). Errors of Ambros. B 121 sup. include these:

II 3.3.2 <*con*>*vocavisset*, 12 *posse modo* for *possemus*, 4.1 *videaris* for *vindicaris*, 6.19 [*inimicitias*] (between a recto and a verso), 8.28 [*ianitores ... vestri*], II 4.63.26 *quof[d]que*, 66.25 *praemoveri* for *per-*, *repente hominem ~*, 67.4 *aut* for *et*, 12 *aut* for *et*

In every quire the text ends short, clear evidence that the quires of the exemplar were copied simultaneously. A strange thing happens, though: f. 12r runs to II 1.20.13 *vestra mihi*, yet ff. 12v-16r proceed in this order, embedded in the text:

30.2 *-terposuistis accusatorem ...* 40.18 *mos maiorum*  
 20.13 *dignitas ...* 30.1 *fecerim in-*  
 52.10 *-eaque se causam ...* 64.4 *libidines qui*  
 40.18 *ferebat ...* 52.10 *Samum post-*  
 64.4 *miro artificio ...*

In the exemplar the two bifolia in the middle of a quire must have been transposed. Such transpositions are by no means rare, but this is the first I

<sup>136</sup> Stephen Oakley kindly lent me a microfilm; on the other speeches see Rizzo, *Catalogo* (n. 89), 170-71 no. 160. See also *Manuscripts and methods* (n. 17) 175-83 "Manuscripts copied from printed books", 185-207 "A proposal about Modestus, *scriptor rei militaris*", especially pp. 195-8; on p. 196 I disgraced myself as a scribe by miscopying two words from the original article (in all three quotations read *potuit* for *posuit*, caused by the next word, *pusilla*, and in the third *disciplino* for *discipulo*).

have met that begins in a copy at the beginning of a verso. Is that just a coincidence, or can some physical explanation be devised?

Berlin Lat. 4<sup>o</sup> 154, a fragment of a parchment bifolium written in a formal Italian hand of the mid 15th century, contains II 4.100-107 and 137-44. When I saw it in 1991, I made no transcription and checked no readings, but I have now seen images of it<sup>137</sup>. As it shares *cum[que]* at 142.3 with Laur. 48.27 and the two manuscripts at Naples (*cumque* pMFR), it should belong to the second family, and its narrower allegiance may emerge from further errors such as 101.4 [*adire*], 102.15 *audisse* for *nosse*, 103.28 *ad in extrinum* for *textrinum* (Laur. 48.27 and Naples Naz. IV B 10 have *in textrinum*; I did not check Naples Naz. IV B 15), 105.8 [*criminum*], 14 *provincia tota* ~, 141.20 *ita esse* ~, 143.12 *facta sunt* after *Peducaeo*.

#### 2.2.2.4. The titles in the second family

In the second family the speeches receive titles that indicate their content: *De constituendo accusatore*, *De damnatione*, *De praetura urbana*, *De iudiciis*, *De re frumentaria*, *De signis*, *De suppliciis*. There are four ways of accounting for them: that they were made up from a reading of the speeches, that they were taken from ancient references, that some arose in one of these ways and some in the other, or that their transmission goes back to Antiquity but somehow bypassed the French family as well as p and M. An objection to the second possibility, and perhaps also to the fourth, is that two titles used in Antiquity, *Divinatio* for the first speech and *De praetura Siciliensi* for II 2, nowhere appear either in the family under discussion or elsewhere among the *deteriores*. An objection to the first is the agreement with a wide range of ancient evidence on *De praetura urbana*, *De signis*, and *De suppliciis*, together with the similarity of *De re frumentaria* to the titles attested in Antiquity, *Frumentaria* (so for instance Priscian) and *De frumentaria* (so Pseudo-Asconius). Already in the 16th century editors of Pseudo-Asconius proposed *De re frumentaria*, whether aware or not that it appears among the *deteriores*; but with *Frumentaria* either *causa* or *oratio* must have been understood, and *De frumentaria* may have resulted from corruption or misunderstanding of it<sup>138</sup>. I mentioned above (§ 2.2.0) that *De constituendo accusatore* for the first speech could have been taken either from Gellius or from the speech itself at 10.8, but I have

<sup>137</sup> With the permission of the Staatsbibliothek, Stephen Heyworth kindly supplied me with them. For a description see R. Schipke, *Die lateinischen Handschriften in quarto der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz*, Wiesbaden 2007, I, 131.

<sup>138</sup> Klotz, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta* (n. 12), vii, n. 2, asked “an fuit ab initio *de re frumentaria?*”, but Piacente, “Numerazione” (n. 60), 141, n. 23, drew attention to *causam frumentariam* at II 3.10.25 and *frumentaria causa* at 11.1. On Boccaccio’s mention of *De re frumentaria*, which he mistakes for a philosophical work, see “Cicero’s *Verrines*” (n. 34), 135-6.

no explanation to offer of *De damnatione* or *De iudiciis* except that the latter phrase does appear at II 2.118.4. Whatever the truth, the full set of titles appears in Bologna Univ. 2232, Esc. N II 16, Harl. 5428, Naples IV B 15 (with *De damnatione* misguidedly corrected to *De divinatione*; the speeches are also listed by title and *incipit* in a marginal note at the top left corner of the first page, with *De damnatione*), Vat. Lat. 1753, and Vienna 64<sup>139</sup>; the title of I stops short at *De* in Laur. 48.27, but it has the others; Marc. Lat. XI 99 lacks only *De constituendo accusatore*; Ambros. B 121 sup. has the first three (with *De divinatione* for the second); and Pal. Lat. 1490, which contains only II 4, duly has *De signis*. Ricc. 499 just numbers the seven books of what it calls *accusationes*, and those of its descendants that have titles do the same; doubtless, therefore, Ricc. 499 was the *Liber accusationum qui vocatur Verrine in pergameno copertum coreo rubeo* that belonged to Poggio when he died in 1459<sup>140</sup>. Outside this family I have met a full set of titles that indicate content only in Vienna 139 and Besançon 531. The simplest explanation for their presence in Vienna 139 would be contamination from this family. Besançon 531, a calligraphic descendant of F, calls I *De testibus* and II 2 *De iure dicundo*; the latter may well have come from Pseudo-Asconius, discovered in 1416<sup>141</sup>, and the former is not hard to make up, whether from the speech itself or from Pseudo-Asconius's introduction to it. Three relatives and probably descendants of Vad. 314 have just *De constituendo accusatore*: Leiden B. P. L. 16D, Turin D IV 2, and Vat. Lat. 8509. If Vat. Lat. 8509 is a copy of Montecassino 340 as I suggested above (§ 2.2.1.3.2), the absence of titles from the latter will account for the importation from elsewhere in the former; and as Leiden B. P. L. 16D and Turin D IV 2 are contaminated, for instance in having *saepe ostendisse* at *Caecil. 2.16* against [*saepe*] *ostendisse* in F<sup>1</sup>, Vad. 314, Montecassino 340, and Vat. Lat. 8509, they may descend from Vat. Lat. 8509, with which they share [*ex*] *spoliatum* at II 4.63.2. There is a snag, though: Vat. Lat. 8509 alone of the three has the transposition *De accusatore constituendo*. I mentioned above (§ 2.2.0) that a “*liber Marci Ciceronis de denominatione*” was registered in Bartolomeo Capra's estate at his death in 1433, and I wonder if *de denominatione* was another misreading of *de damnatione*, the first title, as it happens, in Marc. Lat. XI 99.

<sup>139</sup> Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis* (n. 125), mistakenly reports *De dominatione* from Vienna 64.

<sup>140</sup> Walser, *Poggius* (n. 106), 418 no. 3.

<sup>141</sup> Stangl, *Ciceronis orationum scholiastae* (n. 86), 224.20-21 *de iure dicendo*, 240.7-8 *de iure dicundo*; in the latter form, which Stangl considers restoring in the former passage, the phrase also occurs at 257.17. On the discovery of Asconius and Pseudo-Asconius see n. 131 above.

### 2.2.3. Other *deteriores*

Six witnesses do not belong in their entirety to either of my two families as I have defined them, and more work is needed before they can be placed.

Two of them make up a fuzzy sub-family:

Florence Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79 ff. 44v-63v

B. L. King's 22

After the nicely written section of Conv. Soppr. 79 known as O, namely II 2-3 on ff. 5-44r<sup>142</sup>, a tiresome hand that uses a battery of abbreviations and leaves very little space anywhere on the page wrote II 4-5 on ff. 44v-47 + 59-62 + 48-51, *Caecil.* on ff. 52 + 63, and I – II 1.152.1 *praetexta* on ff. 53-58, after which the final leaf of II 1 is missing; f. 64 is blank except for the entry *Abbatie Florentine. S. 45. A(ntonius/-ii) C(orbinellus/-i)*, whose death in 1425 would provide a *terminus ante quem* if the quiring of ff. 45-64 could be made out<sup>143</sup>. With King's 22, written about 1460 probably in the Veneto and perhaps at Padua<sup>144</sup>, it shares these errors:

*Caecil.* 12.30 *eos* for *hos*, 17.10 *petisse* <*id*>, 18.18 *nunc minus aliquanto* for *minus aliquanto nunc*, 19.26 *eis* for *meis*, 36.14 *quod [est]*, 38.3 *senserint* for *senserunt*, 47.19 *codicibus* for *orationibus*, 57.14 *atque [ad]*, 60.6 *illas* for *eas*, 8 *in illius vita nullum* for *nullum illius in vita*, 62.7 *fere umquam* ~, 65.15 <*suorum*> *sociorum*, I 15.21 *inania mihi* ~, 41.18 *praetori<bus>*, II 1.4.16 *pernicies potest* ~ (*ulla om. M, cett. dett.*), 9.16 *sententia sua* ~, 10.21 *ineptus* for *victus*, 11.1 [*a*], II 4.63.3 [*ea*], 64.12 *Romam cum* ~, 19 *Iovi maximo* for *Iovis maximi*, 65.7 *satis iam* ~, 11 *tunc* for *tum*, II 5.157.18 *cognomen* for *togae nomen*, 164.17 [*est*], 165.4 [*ipse*], 14 *illum* <*se*>, 166.22 [*o*]ratione, 168.14 *alium quemlibet* ~, 171.6 *animalia* with no gap before it, 176.4 *tanta* for *tacita*.

<sup>142</sup> M. D. Reeve, "A lost manuscript" (n. 30); "Recovering annotations by Petrarch" (n. 76), 342-3. A microfilm of the whole manuscript passed to the Bodleian in the *Nachlass* of Albinia de la Mare.

<sup>143</sup> On Corbinelli see the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 28, 1983, 745-7 (A. Molho). For descriptions of Conv. Soppr. 79 see Griggio, "Due lettere" (n. 70), 38, who puts it in the late 14th or early 15th century, and G. Tanturli in T. De Robertis, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (ed.), *Coluccio Salutati e l'invenzione dell'umanesimo*, Firenze 2008, pp. 185-86 no. 48. Both misstate the contents of ff. 44v-63v: Griggio says that they contain II 4-5, Tanturli that ff. 5-63 contain II on ff. 5r-50v, 54r-63v, and *Caecil.* on ff. 51r-53v. Tanturli argues that ff. 5-64 probably came from Salutati and dates the whole volume as Griggio does without considering the possibility that the tiresome hand is decades later than O. In his account of the quiring he overlooks the jumbled order, but the original quiring has so far baffled me; as *Caecil.* and I – II 1 share no leaf, either could have been written first unless f. 52 has always come next after f. 51.

<sup>144</sup> G. F. Warner, J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of western manuscripts in the old Royal and King's collections in the British Museum*, London 1921, III, 8. See also the *Catalogue of illuminated manuscripts* on line.

Of the errors by which I defined the second family (§ 2.2.1-2) Conv. Soppr. 79 and King's 22 have *Caecil.* 15.29 *mihi obiciatur* ~, 27.20 *accusat* for *-et*, 31.32 *tua ista* ~, 33.17 *crimen* for *crimini*, 48.10 *vidimus* for *-emus* (restored by Conv. Soppr. 79 in the margin), 51.6 *illo* for *isto*, 65.7 *quem actorem <idoneum>*, 67.1 *atque* for *ac*, 72.17-19 *hunc ... hanc ... hanc* for *habet ... habet ... habet* (*h̄t ... h̄t ... h̄t F*), I 21.26 *<con>gratulatio*, II 1.73.21 *ut* for *et*, II 4.66.17 *ab* for *ex*, II 5.157.10 *spe<cie>s*, 159.7 *assumpserim* for *con-*, 169.9 *qui* for *quoniam*; Conv. Soppr. 79 also omits *Caecil.* 27.18 *quoniam* in the text but restores it in the margin. Somewhere in its ancestry, however, King's 22 acquired by contamination II 1.97.21-22 *istum ... putavit*, omitted by Conv. Soppr. 79 and the other *deteriores*. The scribe at first wrote before *istum* the word that belongs after *putavit*, namely *quo* – a sure sign that *istum ... putavit* was being incorporated from the margin of the exemplar. At first sight, its reading *protulit produxit* betrays contamination from the French family, because it was the original reading of S and survives in some of its descendants; but it could have appeared in the archetype of the Italian family and been deliberately or accidentally corrected by p to *produxit*. Nevertheless, I suspect that it did come from the French family, which by 1460 certainly had Italian members. A reading of the French family, I 14.1 *depopulatus*, appears in King's 22 as a variant on *depeculatus* (so pMF, Conv. Soppr. 79, cett.). At I 22.8 it alone with the French family has *meorum* (om. pMF, Conv. Soppr. 79, cett.). It also gives as a variant II 2.67.23 *ostendisset* for *possedisset* (pMF), but as the only extant witness to the French text at that point is the section of Conv. Soppr. 79 known as O, the variant can hardly have appeared in an Italian ancestor of the two manuscripts.

A sub-family so fuzzy that it hardly deserves the name can lay claim to a certain historical importance, because it includes the *editio princeps*:

Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577

ed. Rom. 1471

Vat. Lat. 1750

Up to II 3.139 I have already assigned Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750 to the first family (§ 2.2.1.3.2), and in at least the first three speeches I have already assigned the ed. Rom. to the family of Ricc. 499 (§ 2.2.2.2). In my passage of II 5, however, the ed. Rom. shares innovations with Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750: 162.22 *usurparet<que>*, 23 *crux <crux>*, 170.18 *tolli* for *tollere*, 176.7 *excusationibus* for *accus-*, of which the second is plainly a conjecture (a good one<sup>145</sup>), the third another (the previous three infinitives are in the passive, an error that goes back to M), and the other two either conjectures or imports from elsewhere. It also shares errors with Vat. Lat. 1750 in my passage

<sup>145</sup> I agree with P. Parroni, *RFIC* 106, 1978, 331-2.

of II 4: 61.5 [*quae*], 62.16 *ac* for *et*, 65.7 *orna[men]tum* (the reading of R, perhaps a conjecture here), 66.26 *piratas in Siciliam* before *ex eius regno*. I repeat, however, that this is at best a very fuzzy sub-family, undetectable (or at least not detected by me) before II 3.140; and for once Bussi's editorial work, not at all obtrusive, does not seem to be the main cause of the fuzziness. With more collation the sub-family might well crumble into miscellaneous pieces each comfortably assignable to a clearly defined branch of the first or second family.

A witness whose primary allegiance I have not yet determined is Vat. Ottob. Lat. 2842, written by Niccolò Perotti. Its idiosyncratic text must result from contamination. With Naples Naz. IV B 15 and some other members of that sub-family (§ 2.2.2.1) it shares the striking error *invidiam* for *mitto iam* at II 3.6.17 and also II 3.5.12 [*iudices*], 13 *iam mea* ~, 8.28 *an* for *ac*; with Ottob. Lat. 1577, II 4.62.26 *dicere audistis* ~, 66.13 *mittit rex* ~, II 5.161.15 *undique hominem* ~, 164.22 [*et*]; with F and its descendants, II 5.168.23 *Phaormo* for *Panhormo*. It originally had II 5.126.22 *quae ex urbibus* – 133.5 *tuus hospes* after 141.10 *ita*.

#### 2.2.4. Two unplaced manuscripts

There remain an incomplete manuscript that I have not seen and a complete manuscript likely to be in private hands:

Siracusa Archivio di Stato (fragments of II 2-3)

Phillipps 16070 = Sotheby's 9.7.69 lot 35, 13.7.77 lot 55

Seven of the eight leaves at Siracusa have been transcribed and one illustrated<sup>146</sup>; they belong to the mid 15th century and contain II 2.48-53, II 3.65-9, 73-7, 135-40, 182-7, 199-214. Though these fragments and those in Berlin (§ 2.2.2.3) nowhere overlap, script and layout show that they come from different manuscripts: these have at least nine lines fewer to a page, and the scribe uses only the upright *s*, whereas the other scribe uses the modern *s* at the end of a word.

The conclusions hitherto drawn about the allegiance of the manuscript at Siracusa rest partly on omissions and inaccuracies in the editions available<sup>147</sup>. At II 2.49.23, for instance, where Peterson attributes *suorum* to the French and *comitum* to the Italian family, *suorum comitum* is the reading not just of this one manuscript but of the whole Italian family; and at II 2.49.27

<sup>146</sup> C. Nicolosi, F. Carpenteri, "Un codice inedito delle 'Verrine' di Cicerone", *Sicilorum Gymnasium* 16, 1963, 65-83. I am much obliged to Vincenzo Ortoleva for sending me a copy of the article. Concetta Corridore of the Archivio di Stato kindly tells me that leaf VI<sup>bis</sup> has come to light since the article was written.

<sup>147</sup> For these conclusions see Nicolosi in Nicolosi & Carpenteri, "Un codice inedito", 68-72.

*non ita multum tecum fuit*, which the *deteriores* and not just the ed. Rom. share with O, is surely right against *non ita tecum multum fuit*, the perverse order that Peterson accepts from p. In fact the manuscript shares all the errors of F against M, namely II 2.52.9 [ut], II 3.67.12 *minis ac vi* for *vi ac minis*, 137.29 [esse], 183.12 *valent* for *velint*, 212.7 [ne], but I have not done enough collation of other manuscripts in the passages that survive to say whether it belongs to the first family or the second. The published transcription is also unreliable<sup>148</sup>.

Phillipps 16070, of which Sotheby's illustrated the first page in the earlier of their two catalogues, was written at Padua by Iohannes Nydena de Confluentia as a companion volume for Abbey J. A. 276 of the *Philippics*, which he dated 1476<sup>149</sup>. The plate shows errors characteristic of the *deteriores*.

#### 2.2.5.0. Contamination in the *deteriores*

In surveying the *deteriores* I have occasionally mentioned contamination in single manuscripts, but two problems of contamination arise on a larger scale, one in the second family as a whole, the other in Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79 and B. L. King's 22 (§ 2.2.3). I will devote a brief section to each of these problems.

##### 2.2.5.1. Contamination in the second family of *deteriores*

Many errors shown by M to have been introduced by F recur not just in all the other members of the first family but throughout the second as well. The phenomenon is so conspicuous in my passages of II 3-5 that it explains why I passed through a stage of thinking that F might be the source of all the other *deteriores*. It can already be observed, however, in the previous speeches, though in II 1-2 I have checked only Laur. 48.27, Harl. 5428, and King's 22 (up to the end of II 1 I have also checked Conv. Soppr. 79):

*Caecil.* 27.12 *specimen ceteris* (M<sup>1</sup>), 43.11 [o]ratione, 64.25 *causa honestior* (M<sup>1</sup>), I 4.18 *cona<ba>tur*, II 1.44.25 *iste (est M)*, 71.30 *eius filium* (~ M), 86.13 [a], 21 *rabio (fabio M)*, 87.1 <ex>*cogitabas*, 99.19 [ea], 109.28 *complecteris (am- M)*, II 2.15.6 *solis siculi* (~ M), 22.22 [et], 34.27 *gess[er]it*, 37.11 *es[se]t*, 46.1 [aliquanto], 52.9 [ut], 57.19 *fortunam (-as M)*, 74.15 *sua (summa Harl.: eius M)*, 81.6 [te], 90.23 *urbes (-em M)*, 91.1 *atque (ac M)*, 96.30 [omnes], 5 *forte (fortasse Harl.: fere M)*, 109.9 *et (atque M)*, 111.1 *isto tuo* (~ M), 123.12 *agrigeni (-tum M)*, 142.17 *consumpta adhuc* (~

<sup>148</sup> The plates of the last leaf show that at II 3.213.27 the scribe wrote not *defendere possit*, as in the transcription, but *possit defendere* with MF, and at II 3.210.23 not *hominum iurorum* but *virorum* with the superscript correction *hominum*.

<sup>149</sup> J. J. G. Alexander, A. C. de la Mare, *The Italian manuscripts in the library of Major J. R. Abbey*, London 1969, 121-4, no. 43.

M), 152.29 *non voluntate sua* (*voluntate sua non* M), 156.25 *est igitur* (~ M), 160.1 *ea[dem]*, 11 *[e]dictoque*, 176.26 *auri <et> arg-*, 181.23 *expectari a me* (*a me expectari* M), 183.1 *tibi tantum* (~ M), 191.10 *esse verrucium* (~ M)

The appearance of M accounts for some of these errors in F.

Furthermore, some of the errors that I have used for defining the second family occur in St Gallen Vad. 314, an early descendant of F:

*Caecil.* 15.29 *mihi obiciatur* ~ (with very faint strokes above), 27.18 *[quoniam]* (restored by a corrector), 31.32 *tua ista* ~, 32.12 *Verris* for *vere*, 33.17 *crimen* for *crimini* (restored by a corrector), 38.29 *huius* for *eius*, 51.6 *illo* (abbreviated) for *isto*, 64.4 *adopta<ve>rant*, 65.7 *actorem <idoneum>*, 67.1 *atque* for *ac*, I 21.26 *<con>gratulatio*, II 1.73.21 *al ut* for *et*

Note too these errors in *Caecil.* shared with Vad. 314 by Ricc. 499, Laur. 48.27, and Conv. Soppr. 79:

25.25 *causam* for *tamen*, 45.1 *[id]*, 57.12 *[esse]*, 64.4 *sibi Achaei* ~ (not Conv. Soppr. 79)

As Vad. 314 or a descendant must have gone to Florence by 1447, when it served as the first exemplar for Balliol 248B, it is perhaps no accident that Ricc. 499 and Laur. 48.27 are Florentine and Conv. Soppr. 79 may well be. Vad. 314, which in its original text has nothing absent from F but errors, is very unlikely to have acquired any of these readings from the second family.

Many of the errors in the second family must have originated, then, in F, and many of those by which I defined it must have originated either in Vad. 314 if it is a direct copy of F or in a lost intermediary between F and Vad. 314 if it is not.

On the other hand, as late as II 1.68.14-15 the second family unanimously has *si istius nefarium scelus Lampsaceni (in)ulti in manuque essent*, omitted by MF, and no member, to the best of my knowledge, shows any trace of its incorporation from elsewhere. It does appear, however, in the margin of Vad. 314, which also has other corrections early enough to pass into the text of its descendant Montecassino 340, among them the restoration of *Caecil.* 13.10 *meae* and II 1.42.7 *Carbonem sortem in Cn.*, likewise present in the second family<sup>150</sup>. Yet the second family does not share the errors of

<sup>150</sup> Vad. 314 also has conjectures introduced by *c* with a squiggle above (= *corrigere*), some of which happen to restore true readings transmitted elsewhere, for instance II 1.6.1 *discrimen* (pMD) for *discrimine* (F), II 3.127.2 *posteritatem* (pO) for *potestatem* (MF), or to anticipate conjectures that editors attribute to later scholars, for instance II 1.104.20 *P. Annius* (Naugerius)



Vad. 314 in my passages of II 3-5, and I have also found some in the earlier speeches that it does not share (from I and II 1, where there are more than in *Caecil.*, I cite only transpositions):

*Caecil.* 25.24 [vos], 70.21 in for iam, I 34.18 tua ista ~, 36.20 solent esse ~, II 15.20 magis meae ~, 59.27 tum esse ~, 69.26 nomen legationis ~, 74.26 defensorem reperire ~, 84.8 idem iste ~

If it descends from Vad. 314, therefore, the descent must be partial.

Besides II 1.30.3 *hic alter*, F<sup>2</sup> shares with the second family not just other conjectures already present as corrections in M, such as II 5.23.25 *multo[s]*, 45.1 *nave* <opus fuit>, 124.18 *non erramus* for *noveramur* (M<sup>1</sup>, F<sup>1</sup>: *numeramur* pR), but also conjectures absent from M, such as *Caecil.* 16.7-8 *mallent ... mallent* (*malle* ... *malle* pMD), 22.29 <Q.> *Caecili*, I 3.3 *atque* (*ac* pMD), 7 *iudiciis* (*-ibus* pMD), 5.28 <pate>*fecit*, II 1.61.27 *ad* for *ante* (pMD: om. F<sup>1</sup>), II 2.141.1 *improba[ta]*, II 5.185.27 *perg<am>e*. Curiously, F appears to stand in exactly the same relationship as Vad. 314 to the second family, which shares errors with their original texts, has in its text others that they present as corrections, but is free from some of their errors. The same question therefore arises about the corrections in both: did they come from the second family (or an intermediary) or pass to it? Even if I were to carry out more collation, especially in II 1-2, I doubt whether I could decide. The most puzzling correction that I have met occurs at II 2.151.19, where for the reading of pMF, *maximam*, Vad. 314 has in the text *magnam* but in the margin, probably by a different hand or the same hand at a later date, the variant *mox eximiam*, the reading of the second family<sup>151</sup>. There is nothing obviously wrong with *magnam*, and no scribe who checked F would have miscopied from it a second time; but if *mox eximiam* was imported from the second family or an intermediary between F and the second family, two different corruptions of the unproblematical and perfectly legible *maximam* would have come about, which seems unlikely.

In fact, however, the contamination in the second family hardly matters. As the commonest form of contamination is addition, I have counted how often up to II 1.111, where S and its descendants break off before resuming with II 4, they have a word or group of words absent from pM or from M alone. Whereas pM omit only *Caecil.* 22.23 *alium* and I 22.8 *meorum*, both by *saut du même au même*<sup>152</sup>, M has over 60 omissions, but only

for *C. Annius*. At II 1.67.28 *prim<ari>us* may have come from Nonius. There is almost no annotation on the last four quires, ff. 105-36, which run from II 4.99.10 *sciebant* to the end of II 5.

<sup>151</sup> King's 22 has *maximam*, probably by contamination from the first family or the French family.

<sup>152</sup> I mentioned above (§ 2.2.3) that *meorum* appears in King's 22. In II 1 Peterson and

five are repaired by the second family: the four that I used for defining the first (§ 2.2.1-2) together with *Caecil.* 2.16 [*saepe*] *ostendisse*. This already rare contamination dwindles to nothing as the speeches roll on – or does it perhaps run to II 1.111? If a change of behaviour could be shown to take place at II 1.111, one might go on to look for agreements with the French family up to that point against pM. In order to help editors, however, the source of the contamination would need to be independent of S and p as well as M, and most forms of independence would be hard to detect. The contamination might have come, say, from the exemplar of M; but how would one be able to tell? Another possibility is suggested by the many corrections from a *deterior* in q (§ 2.1) up to II 2.8.11 *Romani*: perhaps corrections from q entered the *deterior* at the same time. If I was right, however, to date q round about 1425, it cannot antedate every member of the second family, which includes a manuscript dated 1419 and others unlikely to be so late.

#### 2.2.5.2. Contamination in Conv. Soppr. 79 and B. L. King's 22

Though I have cited errors that these two manuscripts share with the second family (§ 2.2.3), I had a reason for not immediately assigning them to it. Conv. Soppr. 79 was reported as Lag. 42 by Zumpt and in Halm's apparatus and *Supplementum apparatus critici ad quattuor priores orationum Verrinarum*, where I found it sometimes agreeing with p and the French family against all the other *deteriores*, for instance in having *Caecil.* 21.15 *in* after *et*, 24.23 *diutius*, II 1.3.9 *omnia*<sup>153</sup>. King's 22 shares these three readings and others, such as *Caecil.* 8.30 *et* (pD: *atque* MF, cett.), 39.14 *expromere* (pD: *exponere* MF, cett.), 50.20 *est* (pD: om. MF, cett.), 58.18 *denique* (pD: *deinde* MF, cett.), I 8.24 *in pecunia tantum* (*tantum in pecunia* pMF, cett.), 18.24 *et* (pD: om. MF, cett.), II 1.1.8 *convictus* (pD: *evictus* MF, cett.), 10.17 *hoc* (pD: om. MF, cett.), 20.13 *dignitas mihi* (pD: ~ MF, cett.). Conv. Soppr. 79 and King's 22 also have I 49.20 *constituta*, 53.30 *universos*, omitted by M and the second family. At *Caecil.* 56.16 Conv. Soppr. 79 but not King's 22 has as a variant a reading otherwise confined to the French family, *intrat* for *mittit*. Altogether, one or both of them up to II 1.111 repair 18 of the 60-odd omissions in M, a much better record than the second family achieves. Later, however, someone who was plainly collating another *deterior* (§ 2.2.1.3.2) put a line under *diutius* in Conv. Soppr. 79 and dots under *constituta* and *universos*. One does not expect omissions to

---

Klotz neglect to report that any witness omits 27.24 *C.* and 77.14 *ipse*, but DpM omit the former and D<sup>2</sup>pM the latter (the latter rightly in my opinion: *ipse* has a point in the next clause but none here). At I 39.20 DpM all omit *et*, and Peterson does not say where he found it; Zumpt (n. 16), II 1012, who says that Lambinus introduced it, also reports it, wrongly, from Lag. 42 (Conv. Soppr. 79).

<sup>153</sup> Orelli-Baiter-Halm, Zürich 1854, II 1, 103-461, where the edition was largely prepared by K. A. Jordan. It wrongly says that at I 23.14 Lag. 42 has *continuo*.

travel by contamination, but here are some that did. The possibility must therefore be entertained that Conv. Soppr. 79 was independent of M but after correction from a descendant of M gave rise to the second family. Further contamination would have to be allowed for, though, because Conv. Soppr. 79 has errors absent from the second family, such as *Caecil.* 1.7 [*mihi*], 11.27 *causae totius* ~, 28.26 [*omnes*], 32.12 *socios vere* ~ (*verre* Conv. Soppr. 79: *verris* the second family), 54.1 [*esse*], I 7.19 *-que* for *etiam*, 15.21 *inania mihi* ~, 20.21 *quidem tibi* ~, 23.13 [*etiam*], 41.18 *praetori<bus>*; one would also have to suppose that after II 1.152.1 not just the rest of II 1 is missing after f. 58 but also the whole of II 2-3. In my passages of II 4-5, however, Conv. Soppr. 79 behaves like a descendant of F.

Again, then, more collation is needed – unfortunately, because Conv. Soppr. 79 is a manuscript to wish on one's worst enemy.

### 2.2.6. A verdict on the *deteriores*

Given the availability of the French family and p, editors can afford drastic economies with the *deteriores*, and I doubt if much harm would be done if they were to use only M, which may indeed be the only *deterior* entitled to a hearing except in the two passages repaired later, II 1.118.30 *-nibus non* – 138.26 *loquitur Mustius* and II 2.127.16 *familiaris* – 135.5 *quadruplatorum*, where F has equal authority and better represents the original text of M. If a historical understanding of the *deteriores* is to be achieved, however, I recommend full collation not just of M but also of F and another six manuscripts:

St Gallen Vad. 314  
Bologna Univ. 2232  
Florence Ricc. 499

Florence Laur. 48.27  
Milan Ambros. B 121 sup.  
Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79

### CONCLUSIONS

I set out in the hope and indeed expectation of being able to eliminate most 15th-century members of the French family, all the relatives of p, and most of the *deteriores*. In the first hope I have not succeeded; in the second I probably have, except that k retains some utility for recovering p<sup>1</sup>; in the third I may have, and at the very least I have not only made a case for taking the *deteriores* seriously but also found an important manuscript and reduced the task of collating the rest to a manageable size. As for the discovery of  $\delta$  and the diffusion of its text, I have brought northern Italy into the picture but made no progress beyond that.

Nevertheless, if I am right about where  $\delta$  belongs in the stemma, editors can ignore p or  $\delta$  where the other agrees with the French family. They can also spare themselves agonies over the corrections in p, because I have found evidence that some of them came from  $\delta$  or a relative and none that any of

them came from outside the Italian family. On the other hand, the Italian family will need to be reported in full and not as selectively or inaccurately as in Peterson's apparatus.

In passing I have mentioned a few humanistic conjectures, but I doubt whether searching for more in this seldom puzzling text would repay the labour required.

\* \* \*

Stephen Oakley annotated more than one draft, and the two referees made helpful comments. My thanks to them all, and to the editors for not bridling at so long an article. Other acknowledgements appear in the footnotes.

#### POSTSCRIPT

In July 2016, by way of P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* I, London & Leiden 1963, 59, and VI, 1992, 217, I met three further manuscripts. Ferrara Civ. II 179 and 366 are described by G. Procacci, *SIFC* 19, 1912, 39–40 no. 25, 46–47 no. 39, and now on line in *Manus*. The ink used by the scribe of 366 (ch. xv<sup>1</sup>) has rendered much of it illegible, but the corrector used harmless ink, and the corrections together with the legible parts of the text suggest that it could be the missing link between Vat. Lat. 8509 and Turin Naz. D IV 2 (§ 2.2.1.3.2). 179 (ch. 1470, Modena), in my passage of II 3 a close relative of Frauenfeld Y 227 (§ 2.2.1.3.2), has many readings of the French family elsewhere but all the titles characteristic of Bologna Univ. 2232 and its relatives (§§ 2.2.2.1, 2.2.2.4). The manuscript at Siena in the collection of Domenico Maffei (1925–2009) is described by E. Mecacci, “Alcune notizie sul fondo manoscritti della raccolta Maffei”, in *Manoscritti, editoria e biblioteche dal medioevo all'età contemporanea: studi offerti a Domenico Maffei per il suo ottantesimo compleanno*, Rome 2006, 731–834, at pp. 734–35; I am greatly obliged to Paola Maffei not only for this reference but also for going out of her way, at short notice, to let me see the manuscript. Italian and a close relative of Frauenfeld Y 227 (§§ 1.1, 2.2.1.3.2), it has the speeches in the same order as far as II 3.89.18 *at Amestratinos homines*, where it breaks off at the end of the last recto after a change of hand on the previous page between 84.17 *ieiunii* and *decumas*; every leaf that had decoration has been entirely or partially removed.

APPENDIX 1: MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *VERRINES*

I mark with an asterisk those absent from the list drawn up by Lopez & Piacente (n. 9).

- \*Bamberg IX A 1 + Einsiedeln 1099 (44) fr. 1 + fr. in private hands: § 1.2
- Berlin Ham 172: § 2.2.1.3.1
- Berlin Lat. 2° 252 (E): § 1.2
- \*Berlin Lat. 4° 154: § 2.2.2.3
- Besançon 531: § 2.2.1.3.1
- Bologna Univ. 2232: § 2.2.0, § 2.2.2.1, § 2.2.6
- Bologna Univ. 2234: § 2.2.1.3.1
- Brussels 10007-11: § 2.2.1.3.2
- Budapest Univ. Lat. 2: § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
- Cesena S. 18.2: § 2.2.2.2
- Escorial N II 16: § 2.2.2.1
- Escorial R I 2: § 1.1, n. 95, § 2.2.1.3.2
- Florence Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79: n. 10, § 1.2, n. 69, § 2.2.1-2, § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.3, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.5.2, § 2.2.6
- Florence Laur. Edili 208: § 2.2.2.2
- Florence Laur. Fies. 187: n. 10, § 2.2.1.3.1
- Florence Laur. Plut. 48.14: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
- Florence Laur. Plut. 48.27: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1-2, § 2.2.2.3, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6
- Florence Laur. Plut. 48.29 (q): n. 10, § 2.1, § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.5.1
- Florence Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
- Florence Laur. Strozzi 44 (F): § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1 *passim*, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6
- Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 (b): n. 10, § 2.2.1.3.2
- \*Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
- Florence Ricc. 499: n. 10, § 2.2.1-2, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6
- Frauenfeld Kantonsbibliothek Y 227: § 1.1, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.2
- The Hague 75 C 63: § 2.2.2.1
- Leiden B. P. L. 16D: § 2.2.1.3.2
- Leiden Periz. F 12 (L): § 1.1, n. 123
- London B. L. Add. 47679 + Geneva Lat. 169: § 1.2, § 2.1
- London B. L. Burn. 158: § 2.2.1.3.2
- London B. L. Harl. 2682 (H): § 1.2
- London B. L. Harl. 2687 (r): § 2.1
- London B. L. Harl. 4105 (K): § 1.1
- London B. L. Harl. 4852 (Z): § 1.1
- London B. L. Harl. 5428: § 2.2.2.1
- \*London B. L. King's 22: § 2.2.3, § 2.2.5.2
- \*Meiningen (untraced): § 2.2.2.1

- Milan Ambros. B 121 sup.: § 2.2.2.3, § 2.2.6  
 \*Modena Est. Lat. 328 (M): § 2.2.1.1, § 2.2.1.2, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6  
 Montecassino 340: § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.5.1  
 Montecassino 361: § 2.1  
 \*Naples Naz. IV B 10: § 2.2.2.2  
 Naples Naz. IV B 15: § 2.2.2.1  
 New York Columbia Plimpton 10: § 2.2.1.2  
 Oxford Balliol 248B: § 2.2.1.3.1, § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 233: § 2.2.1.2, § 2.2.2.1  
 \*Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 254: § 2.2.1.2  
 Oxford Bodl. D'Orville 10: § 1.1  
 Oxford Bodl. E. D. Clarke 21: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 4588A (k): § 2.1  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7774A (R): § 1.1  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7775 (S): § 1.1  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7776 (p): § 2.1, n. 69  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7777: § 1.1  
 \*Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7786: § 1.1, § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7822: § 1.1  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7823 (D): § 1.1, n. 95  
 \*Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16226: § 1.1, n. 95  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16674: § 1.1, n. 95  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 17154: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 \*Phillipps 16070: § 2.2.4  
 Reims 1110: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 San Daniele del Friuli 58: § 2.2.1.3.1  
 St Gallen Vad. 314: § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6  
 \*Siracusa Archivio di Stato frr.: § 2.2.4  
 \*Stuttgart Donaueschingen 12: § 1.1  
 Toledo Capit. 100-17: § 2.2.2.2  
 Turin Naz. D IV 2: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Vatican Chig. H VIII 249: § 2.2.1.3.1, § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Vatican Ottob. Lat. 1577: § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.3  
 Vatican Ottob. Lat. 2842: § 2.2.3  
 Vatican Pal. Lat. 1476: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Vatican Pal. Lat. 1487: § 2.2.1.3.1  
 Vatican Pal. Lat. 1490: § 2.2.2.1  
 Vatican Reg. Lat. 1525: § 2.2.2.2  
 Vatican Urb. Lat. 321: § 2.2.1.3.1  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 1749: § 2.2.1.3.1  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 1750: § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.3  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 1751: § 1.1, § 2.2.0  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 1752: § 2.2.2.2

Vatican Vat. Lat. 1753: § 2.2.2.1  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 1754: § 2.1  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 8509: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Vatican Vat. Lat. 11421: § 2.2.1.3.2  
 \*Venice Marc. Lat. Z 430 (1833): § 2.2.1.3.1  
 \*Venice Marc. Lat. XI 36 (4518): § 2.2.1.3.1  
 \*Venice Marc. Lat. XI 99 (3830): § 2.2.2.1  
 Vienna 4: § 2.2.2.2  
 Vienna 64: § 2.2.2.1  
 Vienna 139: § 2.2.1.3.1, § 2.2.1.3.2  
 Vienna 156: § 1.1  
 Wolfenbüttel Extrav. 265.2 (G<sub>1</sub>): § 1.1  
 Wolfenbüttel Weissenburg 41 (G<sub>2</sub>): § 1.1

\*ed. Rom. 1471 (*ISTC* ic00541000; the abbreviation stands for the *Incunabula Short Title Catalogue*, on line from the British Library): § 2.2.0, § 2.2.2.2, § 2.2.3

I also mention two ancient fragments:

P. Mil. Vogl. Inv. 1190: n. 6  
 Vatican Reg. Lat. 2077 (V): n. 64, § 2.2.0

#### APPENDIX 2: OTHER MANUSCRIPTS CITED

Abbey J. A. 276: § 2.2.4  
 Deventer 101 G 11: n. 123  
 Florence Laur. Plut. 33.13: n. 47  
 Florence Laur. Plut. 36.23: § 2.1  
 Florence Laur. Plut. 42.14-16: § 2.1  
 Florence Laur. Plut. 48.33: n. 101  
 Florence Laur. Plut. 50.4: § 2.1  
 Florence Laur. Plut. 78.20: § 2.1  
 London B. L. Add. 25104: § 1.2  
 London B. L. Burney 160: n. 46  
 Paris B. N. F. Lat. 13062: n. 28  
 Paris B. N. F. Nouv. Acq. Lat. 99: n. 24  
 Prato Roncioniana Q II 2 (84): § 2.1  
 Reims 1320: n. 103  
 Reims 1321: n. 103  
 Rome Angel. 1895: § 1.2  
 S. Gimignano 62: § 2.1  
 Siena Com. H V 41: n. 47

Vatican Pal. Lat. 957: § 1.2  
Venice Marc. Lat. XI 39 (3929): § 2.2.1.1