

MICHAEL D. REEVE

FIVE FRAGMENTS OF CICERO'S LETTERS *AD FAMILIARES*

So narrow in the Middle Ages is the tradition of Cicero's letters *Ad familiares* that fragments have been accorded unusual weight, if not for the text, at least in studies of the transmission. The latest editors cite three under the symbols I, L, and S, which go back to what is still the most informative edition, Ludwig Mendelssohn's (Leipzig 1893). All three had been reported from the covers of printed books in German libraries:

I = *fragmentum Hamburgense*, a leaf of Book 5 in the Stadtbibliothek assigned by M. Isler to the end of the 11th century or the beginning of the 12th¹;

L = *fragmentum Heilbronnense*, a leaf of Book 12 in the Gymnasialbibliothek described by Chr. E. Finckh², who had read Isler's article and was struck by the resemblances between the two fragments, namely elegant script, 32 lines to the page, 46-50 letters to the line, hyphens at the end of lines for words that spill over, *e* for *ae*, *i* often dotted; he did not date L but left readers to assume from the resemblances that he accepted Isler's dating of I for L too;

S = *fragmentum Freierianum*, a bifolium of Book 2 owned by Dr Freier, a schoolmaster at the time in Frankfurt an der Oder and before that in Schweidnitz (now Świdnica in Poland); writing from Schweidnitz, A. Golisch, who assigned it to the 12th century, said it had 34 lines to the page and was «in sächsischer Schrift», whatever he meant by that; it used & even for *-et* in the endings of verbs³.

As Mendelssohn had already bestowed the symbols HFG on fuller manuscripts, he may have chosen S for Schweidnitz and L as the second consonant of Heilbronn. He collated I afresh and moved it to the end of the 12th century, and he remains the only editor to have seen any of the three. None since has mentioned his surmise, already perhaps Finckh's, that I and L came from the same manuscript; despite pointing out that it

¹ Isler 1857, 289-291.

² Finckh 1857.

³ Golisch 1867, 701-703.



would then have covered both halves of the collection, Books 1-8 and 9-16, he stopped short of admitting that in the Middle Ages the combination is attested only in M (Laur. 49, 9, s. IX). Quite as rare in the Middle Ages, and this he failed to point out, is dotted *i*, though in the 12th century *apices*, strokes that look like acute accents, were often placed over *ii*.

As it happens, I survives at Hamburg in the modern successor of the Stadtbibliothek and is described under the shelfmark Scrin. 17 fr. 3 in a catalogue earlier than W. S. Watt's *O. C. T.* (1982) and D. R. Shackleton Bailey's Teubner edition (Leipzig 1988)⁴:

Schriftraum 18,5 x 11,5 – 32 Zeilen – humanistische Schrift, Italien 15. Jh.

From a photograph of the recto I judge that it was written in the third quarter of the century in north-eastern Italy, perhaps the Veneto⁵.

I have not been able to trace L⁶. On the other hand, details that match I are given for a fragment of Book 10 in Munich, Clm 29220(9) at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek⁷:

Früher Clm 29001(4b). 15. Jh. | Schriftraum 18,5 x 12. 32 Zeilen. Humanistische Kursive.

I therefore sent the photograph of I to Juliane Trede of the Staatsbibliothek, who replied that despite some resemblance she found differences between the two hands. Though they could have been at work on the same manuscript, especially since Books 5 and 10 are widely separated, I give no further space here to Clm 29220(9) beyond conceding that the case for assigning I and L to the same manuscript is not much stronger than the case for assigning it and I to the same manuscript.

Nevertheless, as Isler turns out to have made the mistake, common at the time, of dating a humanistic hand three centuries too early⁸, it is easy

⁴ Brandis 1972, 56.

⁵ I thank Katrin Janz-Wenig for sending the photograph.

⁶ Sabine Graham, librarian at the Stadtarchiv, Heilbronn, kindly searched for it at my request, but without success.

⁷ Hauke 1994, 40; the *incipit* he gives belongs not to «XX 20» but to 10, 21, 7 (10, 21a). I came across this fragment when I followed up Isler's remarks on fragments of *Ad Atticum* given to the library by Dr Reuss of Würzburg and collated by Spengel 1846, 916-919; they receive Hauke's previous entry, 29220(8), and Juliane Trede kindly tells me that the names of Reuss and Spengel, missing from his bibliography, are recorded on a slip kept with them.

⁸ See for instance the remarks of Müller 1961, x, on Otto Jahn's Messanensis of Petronius. The mistake was still being made in 1974 and 1983; I withhold details to spare blush-

to suppose that Finckh implicitly did the same. Even if not fragments of one manuscript, then, **I** and **L** should be regarded as descendants of **M** by way of its direct copy **P** (Laur. 49, 7), written at Milan or Pavia in 1392 for Coluccio Salutati, chancellor of Florence. At 12, 19, 2 editors since Mendelssohn have printed *quid enim* from the German manuscripts **H** (B. L. Harl. 2682, s. XI²) and **D** (Vat. Pal. Lat. 598, s. XV²)⁹:

Sed de Parthici belli suspicione quod scribis sane me commovit. **Quid enim** copiarum haberes cum ipse coniectura consequi poteram tum ex tuis litteris cognovi.

M and the original text of **P** have nothing at that point, but it would have been obvious to Salutati that both *copiarum* and *haberes* needed a construction, and his insertion of *quantum* was an apt and economical conjecture¹⁰; it recurred in **L**. Some other readings of **I** and **L** can be found in descendants of **P**, for instance 5, 10b, *causam meam* (**P**¹) for *meam causam* (**MP**²) in Laur. 90 sup. 74, Leiden Voss. Lat. Q 4, Paris B. N. Lat. 8533; 5, 11, 1, *officia mea esse* for *mea esse officia* (**MP**) in Berlin Diez B Sant. 73, Laur. 49, 1, 49, 15, 90 sup. 74, B. N. Lat. 8533, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500, 1504, Vat. Lat. 3247; 12, 21, *Antonius* for *Anicius* (**MP**) in Vat. Lat. 1687 and 3247.

Giuseppe Kirner and Dante Nardo, however, drew the opposite conclusion from readings of **P**²**L**: that **P**² used a manuscript like **L**. With the help of **L** Kirner professed to have shown that there were already medieval copies of **M** perhaps corrected here and there from the family of **HD**¹¹, and Nardo moved **L** still further from **M** by making it a member of the same family as **HD** or even of a third family alongside **M** and **HD**¹². These conclusions fitted a view they shared on the corrections in **P**: that any available in **M** where **P**¹ miscopied it are unlikely to have come from **M** itself because there is no evidence that Salutati or anyone else in Flor-

es. In Phillipps 1837, 140, manuscript 8875 of *Ad fam.*, now Berlin lat. fol. 609 (s. XV¹), is assigned to «s. XV. (or ? XII.)».

⁹ They have two less useful relatives: Mendelssohn's F (Berlin Staatsbibl. Lat. fol. 252, s. XII, north-western Germany), which on ff. 176-189 has the end of the collection from 13, 78 (preceded by the second version of 12, 29 and 21 from 29, 2, *deinde omnia*), and Yale 1057 (s. XII¹, German), a leaf discussed and illustrated by Babcock 2012, which has 26 lines on the visible page (I accept his verdict on date and origin).

¹⁰ The evidence that he corrected **P** goes back to notes cited from Laur. 49, 15 and 90 sup. 74 by Bandini 1774-1778, II 470, III 660. Confirmation has been offered many times since the 1860s, most recently in the account of **P** given by Zamponi-Daneloni 2008.

¹¹ Kirner 1901, 415-424.

¹² Nardo 1965-1966, 341-355; 1966, 71-72.

ence had access to it before Politian saw it in the private library of the Medici¹³. Nardo also regarded use of another manuscript as a better explanation than conjecture both for some of Salutati's corrections and for some of those made by a later annotator, now known to be Niccolò Niccoli¹⁴; but Kirner's «perhaps» acknowledges the possibility of conjecture. I shall return to the corrections in P when I have dealt with the remaining fragment that editors continue to cite, S.

No more than L have I been able to track down S¹⁵. Its text fell in the first half of the collection, Books 1-8, where the manuscripts available for comparison besides M and its descendants are G (B. L. Harl. 2773, s. XII¹), R (Paris B. N. Lat. 17812, s. XII), and a copy of R, Tours Mun. 688 (s. XII). Most of the variants reported from S are transpositions not obviously erroneous, none of them shared by P or P²; but P² does share 2, 1, 2, *revertare* for *revertere* MGR and presumably P¹, *nisi meis* for *meis* P¹M, 2, 3, 1, *in meam* for *aut meam* P¹M¹, 2, 3, 2, *meam quidem sententiam* for *me quidem sentiam* P¹ (after another shot, *in ea quid enim sentiam*) *equidem sentiam* M¹, 2, 4, 1, *tuarum rerum domesticos* for *tuarum enim rerum domesticarum* P¹M, 2, 17, 7, *omnibus* for *omnis* P¹M, 2, 18 tit., *Q. Thermo propretori* for *Thermo propter* P¹ *Q. Thermo propter* M¹. As Golisch collated S against Orelli's first edition (Zürich 1829), his silence implies that S also shared with PM² 2, 4, 1, *intellego* for *intellegat* M¹ (perhaps the scribe of M repeated the *-at* of *deceat* three words earlier but caught the slip in time) and with P² 2, 1, 1, *condemnabo* for *commendabo* P¹M, 2, 3, 2, *plurimis* for *plurime* P¹M¹, 2, 18, 2, *tuis* for *studiis* P¹M. As these agreements are numerous enough, and some of them significant enough, to rule out coincidental conjecture, either S descended from P + P² or P² used a manuscript related to S. What I have shown about I and L inclines me to the former option, but Nardo just as predictably championed the latter¹⁶; Kirner did not discuss S. For the dating of S the use of & in the endings of verbs is not decisive except that it makes the 12th century unlikely and

¹³ Politian 1489, cap. XVIII. Mendelssohn 1884², 849-850, and Kirner 1901, 399, both knew that Filelfo, said by Politian to have owned M, died in 1481, and Speranzi 2016, 67, published documentary evidence that the Medici received his library in 1482.

¹⁴ Ullman 1960, 76 with plate 39.

¹⁵ Dr Denny Becker of the Stadtarchiv, Frankfurt an der Oder, kindly told me that the library of the Friedrichsgymnasium passed to the Stadtarchiv but the fragment is not traceable there. As Świdnica is near Wrocław, I sent an inquiry to the Biblioteka Uniwersytecka on the off-chance that S found its way there, but Michal Broda kindly replied that it did not.

¹⁶ Nardo 1965-1966, 365-382.

speaks instead for a date either before about 1100 or after about 1400¹⁷; and I do not know what to make of the “Saxon script”¹⁸. Whatever the date of S, the variants that agree with G or R or neither against P + P² are of little moment, and the most striking of them, 2, 17, 7 <egere se> *inquit* (prompted by 6, *eguisse auxilio meo*), betrays incomprehension of the sense and syntax¹⁹.

I ventured a long shot. As I write, a leaf recently owned by Marvin Colker († 2020), who acquired it from Maggs Brothers in 1972, is about to be auctioned²⁰. Once more, it had served as the cover of a German book, an *Itinerarium totius Italiae*, presumably the *Itinerarium Italiae totius* published at Cologne in 1602. Like S, it has 34 lines to the page and uses & in the endings of verbs. To quote from the description:

Schrift: Minuscula humanistica italiana [...] Italien (wohl Florenz), drittes Viertel des 15. Jahrhunderts.

I agree, and the text fits where legible (on the verso almost everywhere, on the recto in patches): it runs from 6, 6, 11, *quo igitur haec* to 6, 7, 4, *res-tituti*, and besides two innovations of P², 6, 7, 1, *quando* for *quō* P¹M (*quom* Niccoli, *quoniam* edd.) and *cum emendandum* for *commendandum* P¹ *commendum* M (*cum mendum* edd.), includes in 6, 7 the errors 2, *immolaret<ur>*, 3, *me ipse <me>*, *beneficium* after *parcissime*, 4, [*metu*], of which the last two appear in three certainly Florentine manuscripts, Laur. 49, 5 (s. XV^{med.}), Ricc. 501 (signed by Landino)²¹, and Oxford Balliol

¹⁷ Tessa Webber and Mirella Ferrari have kindly given me their opinion, and they concur: final & goes out about 1100. Italian humanists revive it; Stephen Oakley has kindly sent me instances, and I have since noticed more.

¹⁸ I thank David Ganz for sending my inquiry round acquaintances familiar with German manuscripts, but none of the answers fully convinced me. Can anyone refer me to a work on Latin paleography that illustrates something labelled “Saxon script” and assigns it to the 12th century?

¹⁹ At 2, 3, 2, where Mendelssohn 1893 in his apparatus and Nardo 1965-1966, 371, interpret Golisch’s collation as giving *esse <civis tuos>*, either Golisch or the printer neglected to leave a space after *esse*. The emphatic spacing of *civis* shows that S had it where Orelli prints *cives* a few lines on.

²⁰ Bassenge Auctions, Berlin, April 17th 2024, lot 2920; I thank Selma El Sayed and Harald Damaschke for sending me an image of the side not illustrated in the auction catalogue. David Ganz kindly alerted me to the leaf and to lot 2900, also from Marvin Colker, who acquired it from Maggs Brothers in 1982: four leaves, two of them from Books 4 and 7, each of «19 Zeilen in leicht kursiver humanistischen Minuskelschrift [...] Italien, [...] ca. 1460», I think from the north-east (Ferrara?), in a format that suggests they came from a selection. His ms. 500, acquired in 2002 from Renzo Rizzi, was the first bifolium of another humanistic *Ad fam.* (s. XV¹), Christie’s Nov. 28th – Dec. 12th 2022 lot 120.

²¹ Sanzotta 2013, 226 no. 16, 233 plate 3.

248C (s. XV^{med.}). I therefore looked in these manuscripts for the errors that Golisch reports from S, and in Ricc. 501 I found almost all of them: 2, 1, 1, *putarim* for *-rem*, 2, *rogo [ut]*, *in tuo amore atque adolescentia* for *in amore atque in adulescentia tua*, 2, 2, [*a*] *vita*, 2, 3, 1, *rationem* for *sententiam* (before *adducam*), *tuum reditum* ~, 2, [*in*] *expectatione*, 2, 4, 1, *tria* for *multa*, *inventa* after *ipsa*, *sentiam* for *-tio*, 2, *tibi gravis* ~, *facillime una re* for *tu una re facillime*, 2, 17, 5, *tardius* for *tarde*, 6, *esse videtur* ~, *a me* after *sine causa*, *retulerunt* for *de-*, [*in*] *exercitu*, *videri* <*se*>, *te officio quaestorio adiunctum* for *officio quaestorio te adductum*, *tractare[re]*, *litteram nullam* ~, *periculum* before *eius*, *amicissimus Bibulo* ~, 7, *populi* <*R.*>, *commutaretur* for *per-*, <*egere se*> *inquit*, [*quia*] *senatus*, 2, 18, 1, [*tibi*] *homini*, 2, *suscepturus* for *-turum*, *perspicere* (Ricc.¹) for *-cio*, 3, [*tempora* [...] *fore*] (Ricc.¹), [*incidere*], [*quaestoriis*], *si[n] quid*, *cum in Ciliciam* for *quod in Ciliciam*, 2, 19, 1, *quam* [*tu*]. A long shot it may have been, but it has scored a bullseye.

No need, then, to find S, because Colker's leaf surely came from the same manuscript²²; but if anyone knows what has become of L, or where it might be profitable to look, I should be grateful for the information.

Now that ILS have turned out to descend from P + P², I return to P² and ask what source or sources it actually used. If I say that answering this question requires a full investigation of the Italian manuscripts, that will sound daunting, because these number over 300 even without dozens that offer not a continuous text but just selected letters. It is often said, however, that most of those hitherto inspected descend from M by way of P, and doubtless that will still be true if anyone does inspect the rest. The chief object of inspecting them should therefore be to find any that descend from M either not entirely or not at all. Ludwig Gurlitt said this²³, and Kirner too²⁴, but after over a century it still needs repeating. That some Italian manuscripts do not descend entirely from M, and one

²² In their description of Schlögl 50, owned by the younger Johann von Rabenstein and written at Bologna not after 1458 and probably not before 1454, Vielhaber-Indra 1918, 237-238 no. 134, say this: «Codex noster ex alio fluxisse videtur, qui in multis convenit cum fragmento, de quo agit A. Golischius [...], nec tamen interpolationes eiusdem fragm. prae se fert». In his apparatus Mendelssohn 1893 applies the phrase «*ex interpolatione*» to two readings of S, 2, 3, 2, *esse* <*civis suos*> and 2, 17, 7, <*egere se*> *inquit*, but the former is illusory (see n. 19). For speedily confirming the absence of *egere se* I thank Matthew Heintzleman of the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library.

²³ Gurlitt 1896, 542.

²⁴ Kirner 1901, 396, 431-433.

may not descend from it at all, has been known since Mendelssohn, and so it will have to be determined whether **P**² owes them any debt.

Mendelssohn listed eight manuscripts that in Books 9-16 share omissions against **M** with the German manuscripts **HD**, and these eight he assigned to the 15th century and dubbed *codices contaminati*, apparently not because in Books 1-8 they descended from **M** by way of **P** but because in Books 9-16 they shared some readings with **HD** and others with **M**²⁵. His list has not been added to, but I shall add to it in a moment. First, however, Kirner deserves credit for breaking it down²⁶.

Kirner showed that the list included a manuscript written centuries earlier, Oxford C. C. C. 283, which has excerpts from Books 9, 10, and 13; that Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 244 did indeed share some omissions in Books 9-16 with **HD** and others with **M**²⁷; and that the same was true of Bologna Univ. 2517, absent from the list. More important, he assigned four of the other six (he knew nothing about the two at Wolfenbüttel, Ebert's 226 and 228, now Gud. Lat. 87 and 154) to a group characterized by disorder between 13, 59 and 13, 71, *miserrimo tempore*. The four were Dresden Dc 112, Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 210, and Paris B. N. Lat. 7783 and 14761²⁸. Furthermore, he pointed out that Canon. Class. Lat. 210 and probably B. N. Lat. 7783 had only Books 9-16 and that the former omitted everything between 13, 76, 1, *coniunctius* and 15, 13, 2, *dignitas et meus magnus honos*; evidently he did not know that in B. N. Lat. 14761 Books 1-8 and 9-16 are separated by other works or that both Parisini have at the end the note *.X. libri (sunt) hic*, which is how they present Books 9-16 and the works appended (so too 7783 in the table of contents, ff. 1v-5r).

The long omission in Canon. Class. Lat. 210 led Kirner to a shrewd argument that had a debatable premise but nevertheless arrived at a true conclusion. Mendelssohn had cited the omission of 15, 2, 5, *et tamen [...] essem* in Dresden Dc 112 as evidence of contamination from **M**, which

²⁵ Mendelssohn 1893, XXVI-XXVII.

²⁶ Kirner 1901, 384-396.

²⁷ On this manuscript see, below, n. 31.

²⁸ The disorder in Dresden Dc 112, namely the inversion of 13, 60 – 13, 64, 1, *hominem innocentem* and 13, 68 – 13, 71, *mihi est causa* round 13, 64, 2, *summa huius* – 13, 67, had been described by Gurlitt 1896, 544 n. 29; Kirner 1901, 388-391, added what G. W. Wheeler of the Bodleian told him about Canon. Class. Lat. 210. The short passages of 13, 64, 1 and 13, 71 missing from these two manuscripts at the joins, *ad alicuius [...] tua esse usum* and *T. Agusius et comes meus fuit illo*, are present in the two Parisini, about which Kirner received information only in outline. The common ancestor must have had 13, 64, 1, *ad alicuius* – 13, 67 on the middle bifolium of a quire and the other passages on two bifolia inverted round it.

shares it²⁹, and Kirner might have objected that it was caused by *saut du même au même*, which could have happened independently in both **M** and an ancestor of Dresden Dc 112. By not using this objection he accepted a debatable premise; but if he had used it, he would not have needed to add the shrewd part of the argument, namely that if an ancestor of Dresden Dc 112 shared the long omission with Canon. Class. Lat. 210 the scribe might have been driven to look elsewhere for the passage, have found it in the family of **M**, and so have taken over the omission at 15, 2, 5, which falls in the passage. As he knew nothing about Dresden Dc 112 beyond what Gurlitt had reported, he could not go on to check its text elsewhere in the passage but reasonably assumed that the whole of it came from the family of **M**. Had he known that Dresden Dc 112 puts Book 14 after Book 8³⁰, he would have seen the assumption confirmed. Evidently the passage was added to a manuscript of Books 9-16 like Canon. Class. Lat. 210, where the beginning or end would probably have been the most convenient place for adding anything as substantial as Book 14. Two other manuscripts that put Book 14 after Book 8 are Vat. Reg. Lat. 1626 and 1696 (both of s. XV²), and in Book 14 they share many errors with **M** against **HD**³¹. Outside the long passage, too, Kirner was right: Mendelssohn had not proved contamination from **M** in manuscripts that share omissions with **HD** but sometimes agree with **M** against them. I add only that for Kirner's sake readings shared with **M** needed to be not errors but either true or closer to the truth.

²⁹ Mendelssohn 1884¹, 110.

³⁰ See the first note on Book 9 in Benedict 1795, 1. This placing is not mentioned by Schnorr 1882, 314, Mendelssohn 1884¹, 110, or Gurlitt 1896, 544 n. 29.

³¹ Gurlitt 1896, 544 n. 29, reports that Dresden Dc 112 repeats 13, 71 after 13, 76, and these two manuscripts do the same; perhaps they descend from it. G. W. Wheeler, cited by Kirner 1901, 388 n. 1, reported that Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 244 passed from Book 13 to Book 15 but not that it has Book 14 after Book 8 (it has lost amongst others the leaf that contained 14, 1, 2, *beatissimi viveremus* – 14, 2, 3, *alios qui possunt*); before continuing with Book 9 it has 16, letters 4, 6, and 17-18, but it gives 13, 59-79 in order without repeating 12, 29 and 21 after 13, 77, and Kirner added this information about its text of Book 13 to the evidence for contamination given by Mendelssohn 1893, xxvii n. 1. Though Vat. Reg. Lat. 1657 (s. XV^{2/4}) has Book 14 after Book 8, it gives 13, 59-79 in order, repeating 12, 29 and 21 before 78, and altogether in Books 9-16 shows few signs of not descending from **M**: I have noticed only that it has 9, 15, 1, *esse* [...] *tibi*, missing from **M**, and does not interrupt the end of 9, 15 with any of the letters missing from Book 8. Florence Ricc. 502 (s. XV²) also has Book 14 after Book 8; see Mazzanti-Tanganelli 2022, 176-177 no. 82. Brescia B VI 5 omits it and repeats 13, 71 after 13, 76 but also omits 13, 57-59, 68-71, and 64, 2-67 (the order of Dresden Dc 112), and Forshall 1840, 51, says that B. L. Burney 144 omits Book 14, but unfortunately it is a “select” manuscript and therefore still unavailable to readers after the cyber-attack in October 2023.

That the two Parisini met this requirement was shown by L.-A. Constans, who collated 14761 under the symbol **V** for his Budé edition, launched in 1934³². He thanks H. Omont for confirming his impression that the scribe of 7783 was also the main scribe of **V**. His stemma derives them not from the common source of **HD** but from a shared ancestor further back, and **V**, which he judged the more accurate of the two³³, has since established its place in editions. I have collated both in the whole of Book 14, where 7783 shares all the errors of **V** and adds over 20 more. No editor has yet mentioned another copy of Books 9-16 disordered in Book 13, Montpellier 359, it too written by the same scribe³⁴; a note by Pierre de Virey, who commissioned it, shows that it was written in Paris between 1450 and 1458, perhaps in 1456, the date that appears at the foot of f. 1r³⁵. A different part of **V** was written by Girolamo da Matelica, who wrote other manuscripts at St Germain, Paris, in 1457 and 1460-61³⁶. Épinal Bibl. Intercommunale 95 (207), which has all 16 books, again has the disorder in Book 13 and is said to be French³⁷; doubtless it belongs here. Constans also collated Oxford C. C. C. 283, which he derived from the common source of **HD** rather than from the remoter ancestor. It is now put in the 13th century before 1277, when it was given to St Augustine's Canterbury, and regarded as French³⁸.

V, B. N. Lat. 7783, Montpellier 359, and Épinal 95, do not share the long omission of Canon. Class. Lat. 210 in Books 13-15, which may well serve to define their Italian relatives as a group. Canon. Class. Lat. 210 might seem to be the source of its Italian relatives, because it alone has just Books 9-16 and furthermore, as Kirner reported, its long omission

³² Constans 1934, 18-23. See also Constans 1930, 345-350.

³³ He cited no errors of either against the other, but Kirner 1901, 418-420, 425, had cited six in Book 12 from 7783 (his p₂). Two of them, 12, 19, 3, *iam* for *idem* and 12, 22, 1, *contionatus* for *-tur*, are illusory, but the others stand: 12, 20 [*quod*], 12, 21, *ei[us]*, *erit [id]* MHDV 7783¹ (MHV have *erit id* when they repeat 12, 21 before 13, 78) *id erit* 7783², 12, 22, 1, [*de*] *te*.

³⁴ G. Ouy cited by Rouse-Rouse 1978, 342 n. 28. Montpellier 359 has 12, 21, *id erit* and the other three errors of B. N. Lat. 7783 cited in the previous note, but the scribe restored in the margin 14, 18, 1, *quid faciatis [...]* *vos esse tuo* (for *tuto*), missing from 7783.

³⁵ Rizzo 1983, 78-79 no. 57. She says that she did not see the date, but I saw it in 1983, and it can now be seen on line.

³⁶ De la Mare 1985, I, 498 no. 26 (2) and (9). Matelica gives the date 1457 «more ytalico»; as the year began at Easter in France, the day he gives, March 23rd, would still have been in 1456.

³⁷ Jeudy-Riou 1989, 617-618. They mention that it nowhere supplies the chunk missing between 8, 2, 1, *modo inquis* and 8, 9, 3, *mihī litteris* – no surprise, because its exemplar for Books 9-16 did not include the chunk after 9, 15, 5, *in parietibus*, where P¹ had it.

³⁸ Hunt 1975, 77-78 no. 137 with plate XXIV; Rouse 1983, 142; Thomson 2011, 144.

occurs between a recto and a verso (f. 53), so that the scribe could have lost his place in turning the page (Kirner postulated loss of a quire); but there are obstacles, which I see no prospect of surmounting³⁹. I therefore move on to the character and history of the wider family.

V, B. N. Lat. 7783, and some of their Italian relatives, append to *Ad fam.* the *Epistula ad Octavianum*, the *Commentariolum petitionis*, and from Gellius 9, 3, 5 Philip's letter to Aristotle about the birth of Alexander, this last among other short pieces in the Italian manuscripts⁴⁰. The first two are also appended in HD; Montpellier 359 appends Philip's letter and *Ep. ad Oct.* but not the *Commentariolum*, Épinal 95 *Ep. ad Oct.* and Philip's letter, separated by letters transmitted in the other collection, but again not the *Commentariolum*. Constans pointed out that contamination from M was impossible in either *Ep. ad Oct.* or *Comm. pet.* because it does not contain them, so that any preferable and unconjecturable readings of V against HD prove its independence; but it remains theoretically possible that in *Ad fam.* 9-16 it added contamination from M to its independence of HD. Constans found no evidence of contamination, but Nardo has since argued for it⁴¹, without convincing the next editor⁴².

It has not been determined when or from where Italian humanists obtained the alternative text of *Ad fam.* 9-16, the *Ep. ad Oct.*, or the *Commentariolum*. Probably the three manuscripts written in Paris all belong to the 1450s, but Bern 254, which appends the *Ep. ad Oct.* to a large collection of Cicero's speeches, has been assigned to «a. 1414-15 circiter» and connected with Jean de Montreuil and Nicholas of Clemanges⁴³, and Vat. Ross. 957, which amid speeches of Cicero's includes *Comm. pet.* and Philip's letter, was written at Konstanz in 1415 during the Council⁴⁴. The

³⁹ See n. 44 below.

⁴⁰ Watt 1958 brought Canon. Class. Lat. 210 into the editing of *Ep. ad Oct.* and *Comm. pet.* under the symbol B, which it retains in Lamacchia 1967; 1968, and in Nardo 1969; 1970; 1972. Like everyone else who has mentioned B and its Italian relatives, Watt acknowledges that they often tamper with the text. Who showed this enterprise and when?

⁴¹ Nardo 1966, 66-70.

⁴² Shackleton Bailey 1977, 10-15. He answers the case for contamination that Nardo makes in 1966, 66-70, a full enough restatement of the case he had made shortly before in 1965-1966, 382-392. Lamacchia 1967, 14, mentions Kirner when she dismisses contamination in V, but Kirner of course was arguing against contamination in *Ad fam.* from M, which does not include the *Epistula*; what contamination, then, was she dismissing?

⁴³ Lamacchia 1967, 16-17.

⁴⁴ Reeve 1992, xxviii n. 28. None of the nine *deteriores* that Nardo uses in his editions of *Comm. pet.*, 1970; 1972, is dated. They include B, from which in 1969, 19-24, he correctly reports errors absent from the others: 1, *cogitavi* for *-tanti*, 2, *maxima* for *-me*, 3, [*cura*], *vere* for *fere*, 5, *quid*, 8, *discreto* for *diserto*, 9, *maiore<m>*, *maius* for *manius* or *inanius*.

Ep. ad Oct. had already reached Salutati and other Italian humanists in the unrelated tradition of *Ad Atticum*, which may be why Ross. 957 does not include it, but the text of it in Bern 254 came from the tradition of *Ad fam.*, and *Comm. pet.* would have been altogether new to them. If descendants of **M** were already circulating, it is hard to believe that a new text of *Ad fam.* 9-16 would often have been copied in its entirety for the sake of the two appendages, but they surely came to light in a manuscript of *Ad fam.* 9-16, and the new text of these books is attested in Italy decades before the three Parisini were written. Mendelssohn agreed with the cataloguer's view that Dresden Dc 112 was «saec. 15. ineunte in Italia [...] exaratus»⁴⁵, and I have seen Canon. Class. Lat. 210, certainly written in the first third of the century. Neither is available on line, but the long omission of Canon. Class. Lat. 210 reappears in Vat. Pal. Lat. 1498, which is. Script and decoration point to northern Italy and the first half of the century. After *Ad fam.* 1-16 it has *Brut.* 1, 17 and 16, *Ep. ad Oct.*, *Comm. pet.*, Philip's letter to Aristotle, and the letters missing where they belong in Books 8 and 13-15. The accident in Book 8 goes back to **P**. After **P** was bound, 8, 2, 1, *non me hercules* – 8, 9, 3, *sui illam spem* occupied a quire misplaced after 9, 15, 5, *in parietibus*, to which Salutati added, from the beginning of the quire that should have followed, the last few words of the letter, *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*. Pal. Lat. 1498 omits 8, 2, 1 – 8, 9, 3 where it belongs and has the whole of 9, 15, these words included, but attaches to it the rest of 8, 2 before returning to Book 9; 8, 3 – 8, 9, 3, *sui illam spem* + 9, 15, 5, *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur* follows Philip's letter and is followed by 13, 76 – 15, 5, 3, *Atque ego*, after which the rest up to 15, 12 is lost. In the main body of the text the omission has been tidied up at the edges: the part of 13, 76 that survives in Canon. Class. Lat. 210 has gone, but the part of 15, 13 missing there has been supplied, and 13, 71, *T. Agusius et comes fuit illo* is also present⁴⁶. Perhaps other manuscripts too patch up the text of Canon. Class. Lat. 210 from the family of **M**.

None of this evidence, however, goes as far back as the lifetime of Salutati, who died in 1406, and anyway it all comes from Books 9-16, whereas most of his supplements appear in Books 1-8. Perhaps that is why no-one has suggested that he owed any of his supplements in **P** to this other Italian family. His failure to exploit it in Books 9-16 is easily

⁴⁵ See n. 29.

⁴⁶ See n. 28 for its omission in relatives.

explained: even if it had been available in his lifetime, it is northern, and he worked in Florence.

Apart from the family just discussed, only one slice of the Italian tradition has been thought independent of *M*. In 1897 one Iucundus Ferrarius reported from a manuscript in the Biblioteca Civica Berio, Genoa, a selection of 48 letters, which he collated against Mendelssohn's edition⁴⁷. From the collation he inferred that the text had nothing to do with Salutati's copy, *P*, but he did not disclose which of the readings that fill 24 of his pages led him to that inference, and he took all his information about the readings of other manuscripts from Mendelssohn's apparatus, where *P* is not regularly cited. Reviewing his monograph⁴⁸, Sabbadini associated the selection with Guarino, who had made it, he said, before his departure for Constantinople in 1403, even if the manuscript was written decades later; and he repeated that the text had nothing to do with *P*. If he and the author were right, an alternative text was indeed available before Salutati's death; but I cannot believe they were right. Not only does the selection cover both halves of *Ad fam.*, which *M* alone of the medieval manuscripts does, but at 10, 3, 3 the author reports the omission of *prudenter* without mentioning that *M* omits it against *HD*. This agreement is surely enough to show that in Books 9-10 and 13 (11-12 and 14-16 are not used) the selection did come ultimately from *M*. Similarly, in Books 2-6 (1 and 7-8 are not used) 5, 12, 3, *affici* with *P*² for *effecti P¹M deflecti G* (and editors) *-tum R* is surely decisive. The text of the selection is so inaccurate that the occasional agreement with *GR* against *MP* in Books 2-6 or with *HD* against *MP* in Books 9-10 and 13 could easily be coincidental.

Where does that leave the corrections in *P*? Undeniably Salutati and Niccoli each owed some of their corrections to another manuscript, not necessarily the same one: Salutati for instance his supplements *si cum pares [...]* *me quidem* at 1, 8, 2, *partim [...]* *respondeas* at 1, 10, *et prudentia [...]* *roganti de* at 4, 4, 3, *defendetur [...]* *quoad volet (quod advolet P¹)* at 8, 11, 3, *cum questor in mea [...]* *tribuno plebis (cum P¹)* at 15, 21, 2, Niccoli

⁴⁷ Ferrarius 1897. Mercifully, the Hathi Trust has put it on line. Dr Emanuela Ferro kindly tells me that the current shelfmark of the manuscript is m. r. VI 5 15 and that the "letters of Phalaris" in Griffolini's translation, which follow the selection from *Ad fam.*, appear to be in the same hand, though «la lettura è compromessa» because the ink has gone through the paper. The manuscript includes Griffolini's letter to Francesco Pellati, which he wrote no earlier than the second half of 1451; see Hinz 2001, 155-156.

⁴⁸ Sabbadini 1898, 198-199, cited in 1905, 72-73; 1971, 46.

single words already corrupt in **M**, not obviously missing, or hard to get right by conjecture, such as *ceteris* (om. **P**¹) at 1, 1, 1, *ad te* (om. **P**¹) after *scribam* at 1, 2, 4, *ex tuis* (om. **P**¹) at 1, 5a, 4, *cognosse* for *cognoscere* (**P**¹) at 1, 5b, 1, *quidem* (om. **P**¹) before *humanitas* at 1, 7, 3, *me cum illo* (*mecum* **P**¹) at 1, 7, 4, *consiliario fortasse* for *consilio forte* (**P**¹) at 1, 9, 2, *invasere* for *-vad-* (**P**¹) at 1, 9, 8, *tuae* (om. **P**¹) at 5, 21, 3, *devexata* for *deiecta* (**P**¹) at 10, 3, 3, *provinciam* (om. **P**¹) at 12, 15, 6, *pariana* for *patriam* (**P**¹) at 13, 53, 2, *reticuisent* for *renuntiassent* (**P**¹) at 15, 2, 6, *egerint* for *elegerint* (**P**¹) at 16, 24, 2. Nardo admitted that he could not explain why passages «di una certa ampiezza» missing from both **M** and **P** were restored in neither by any of the correctors⁴⁹. Well, no manuscript yet reported has a better claim to have provided the supplements and variants in **P** than **M**⁵⁰; and nothing will be gained by speculation about manuscripts independent of **M** as long as the whereabouts of **M** itself between 1392 and Niccoli's death in 1437 remain unknown and the other Italian manuscripts written in that period remain uncollated.

One manuscript, however, does invite speculation:

Epistole ad Lentulum papiro copertum corio viridi (*corrected to nigro*)

Either lost or not yet recognized, it was one of the *libri et opere tuliane* that Poggio left at his death in 1459⁵¹. For *Ad Atticum* we have not only Berlin Ham. 166, which he wrote himself in 1408, but also Vat. Ottob. Lat. 2035, written at Rome in 1425, which he commissioned and annotated, and Laur. 49, 24, copied from Ottob. Lat. 2035 in 1430-31 by his “good French scribe”, which he annotated⁵²; and Gabriele Rota has shown that

⁴⁹ Nardo 1965-1966, 384-385. Gurlitt 1896, 545-546, made this point about **M**, but his discussion of Mendelssohn's **M**^c (the corrections in **M** that reappear in **P**), some of which, he says, Mendelssohn «gewiss mit Recht» took to have come from another manuscript, leaves me confused: if it was not to be assumed «dass [...] die nordische Überlieferung bei **M**^c schon im Spiele sei», what did he imagine their source was? Most of them strike me as conjecturable, and those hardest to conjecture, hardest of all 1, 4, 3 <*hac*>, were probably made from the exemplar. In two of his passages **P** actually has the original reading of **M**: 1, 7, 6, *fuerat* (*ferat* **M**²**P**²), 12, 30, 6, *eius autem* (*autem eius* **M**²). At 1, 4, 2, *qui sciat* is a slip for *qui nesciat*, at 12, 14, 7, *fetigabor* for *defet-*.

⁵⁰ Neither Mendelssohn 1884², 851-852; 1893, xv n. 2, xvii, nor Schmidt 1885, 613, had qualms about deriving them from **M**.

⁵¹ Walser 1914, 419 no. 7.

⁵² In her entry on Ottob. Lat. 2035, Pellegrin 1975, 759, says «écriture humanistique primitive (?) assez ronde», which makes no sense to me. I think it is good French script and wonder if it came from the pen of the “good French scribe”. Pellegrin's bibliography did not include Ullman 1960, 44, or de la Mare 1973, 74, and was further overtaken by

a large part of the tradition descends from Ham. 166⁵³. Did Poggio and his manuscript really do nothing for *Ad familiares*?

Bibliography

- Babcock 2012: R. G. Babcock, *A new fragment of Cicero's Epistulae ad familiares (Book 13, epistles 6 and 7)*, «Codices manuscripti» 84, 2012, 1-5.
- Bandini 1774-1778: A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, Florentiae 1774-1778.
- Benedict 1795: T. F. Benedict, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistolarum octo posteriores libri*, Leipzig 1795.
- Brandis 1792: T. Brandis, *Katalog der Handschriften der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg VII*, Hamburg 1792.
- Constans 1930: L.-A. Constans, *Sur deux manuscrits des lettres de Cicéron*, «REL» 8, 1930, 341-350.
- Constans 1934: L.-A. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance I*, Paris 1934.
- Dunston 1965: A. J. Dunston, *The hand of Poggio*, «Scriptorium» 19, 1965, 63-70.
- Ferrarius 1897: I. Ferrarius, *De codice Beriano nonnullas Ciceronis litteras complectente*, Genuae 1897.
- Finckh 1857: Chr. E. Finckh, *Noch ein Bruchstück einer Pergamenthandschrift von Ciceros Epistulae ad familiares*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 3, 1857, 725-727.
- Forshall 1840: J. Forshall, *Catalogue of manuscripts in the British Museum. New series. Volume I part 2*, London 1840.
- Fumagalli 1995: E. Fumagalli, *Il codice Malatestiano S. XIX. 1 e la tradizione delle Epistulae ad Atticum di Cicerone*, in F. Lollini, P. Lucchi (a cura di), *Libraria domini*, Bologna 1995, 115-138.
- Golisch 1867: A. Golisch, *Drei handschriften-fragmente von lateinischen klassikern*, «Philologus» 26, 1867, 701-706.
- Gurlitt 1896: L. Gurlitt, *Zur Überlieferungs-Geschichte von Ciceros epistularum libri XVI*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie», Suppl. 22, 1896, 509-554.
- Hauke 1994: H. Hauke, *Katalog der lateinischen Fragmente der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München. Band 1: Clm 29202-29311*, Wiesbaden 1994.

Fumagalli 1995, 130-135, where he discusses the relationship of the three manuscripts and brings in Vat. Urb. Lat. 322. Laur. 49, 24, which Ullman 1960, 43-45, attributed to Poggio himself, was reassigned by Dunston 1965 to a scribe who had mastered Poggio's formal hand, and de la Mare 1973, 82, who gave more details of this scribe's products, called him Poggio's "good French scribe".

⁵³ Rota 2018, soon to appear as a book.

- Hinz 2001: V. Hinz, “*Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput*”. *Antike Phalarislegende und Nachleben der Phalarisbriefe*, München-Leipzig 2001.
- Hunt 1975: R. W. Hunt and others, *The survival of ancient literature*, Oxford 1975.
- Isler 1857: M. Isler, *Zur Handschriftenkunde des Ovidius und Cicero*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 3, 1857, 288-291.
- Jeudy-Riou 1989: C. Jeudy, Y.-F. Riou, *Les manuscrits classiques des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Paris 1989.
- Kirner 1901: G. Kirner, *Contributo alla critica del testo delle epistole Ad familiares di Cicerone (l. IX-XVI)*, «SIFC» 9, 1901, 369-433.
- Lamacchia 1967: R. Lamacchia, *Pseudo-Ciceronis Epistula ad Octavianum*, [Milano] 1967.
- Lamacchia 1968: R. Lamacchia, *Epistola ad Octavianum*, Firenze 1968.
- de la Mare 1973: A. C. de la Mare, *The handwriting of Italian humanists*, Oxford 1973.
- de la Mare 1985: A. C. de la Mare, *New research on humanistic scribes in Florence*, in A. Garzelli (a cura di), *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento, 1440-1525: un primo censimento*, Firenze 1985.
- Mazzanti-Tanganelli 2022: F. Mazzanti, M. L. Tanganelli, *Catalogo dei manoscritti della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze: Ricc. 421-520*, Firenze 2022.
- Mendelssohn 1884¹: L. Mendelssohn, *Zur überlieferung von Ciceros briefen*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 30, 1884, 108-110.
- Mendelssohn 1884²: L. Mendelssohn, *Weiteres zur überlieferung von Ciceros briefen*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 30, 1884, 845-855.
- Mendelssohn 1893: L. Mendelssohn, *M. Tulli Ciceronis epistularum libri sedecim*, Lipsiae 1893.
- Müller 1961: K. Müller, *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*, München 1961.
- Nardo 1965-1966: D. Nardo, *Le correzioni nei due codici medicei 49,7 e 49,9 delle Familiars di Cicerone (una terza tradizione diretta?)*, «AIV» 124, 1965-1966, 337-397.
- Nardo 1966: D. Nardo, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad familiares liber duodecimus*, Bologna 1966 [his edition for Mondadori, printed in the same month under the same title, must rank as an *editio minor*].
- Nardo 1969: D. Nardo, *Per una edizione del “Commentariolum petitionis”*, Padova 1969.
- Nardo 1970: D. Nardo, *Il “Commentariolum petitionis”*, Padova 1970.
- Nardo 1972: D. Nardo, *Q. Ciceronis Commentariolum petitionis*, [Milano] 1972.
- Pellegrin 1975: É. Pellegrin and others, *Les manuscrits classiques de la Bibliothèque Vaticane I*, Paris 1975.

- Phillipps 1837: *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps, Bart., A. D. 1837*, Mediomontani 1837.
- Politian 1489: A. Politianus, *Miscellaneorum centuria prima*, Florentiae 1489.
- Reeve 1992: M. D. Reeve, *M. Tullius Cicero, Oratio pro P. Quinctio*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1992.
- Rizzo 1983: S. Rizzo, *Catalogo dei codici della Pro Cluentio ciceroniana*, Genova 1983.
- Rota 2018: G. Rota, *The textual tradition of Cicero's "Epistulae ad Brutum", "ad Quintum fratrem" and "ad Atticum"*, diss. Cambridge 2018.
- Rouse 1983: R. H. Rouse, *Epistulae ad familiares*, in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and transmission*, Oxford 1983, 138-142.
- Rouse-Rouse 1978: R. H. Rouse, M. A. Rouse, *The medieval circulation of Cicero's "Posterior Academics" and the De finibus bonorum et malorum*, in M. B. Parkes, A. G. Watson (eds.), *Medieval scribes, manuscripts & libraries: essays presented to N. R. Ker*, London 1978, 333-367.
- Sabbadini 1898: R. Sabbadini, review of Ferrarius 1897, «*Bollettino di filologia classica*» 4, 1898, 198-199.
- Sabbadini 1905: R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XVI*, Firenze 1905.
- Sabbadini 1971: R. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini*, Padova 1971².
- Sanzotta 2013: V. Sanzotta, *Cristoforo Landino*, in A. Bausi, M. Campanelli, S. Gentile, J. Hankins, T. De Robertis (a cura di), *Autografi dei letterati italiani. Il Quattrocento I*, Roma 2013, 221-235.
- Schmidt 1885: O. E. Schmidt, *Zur Geschichte der Florentiner Handschriften von Cicero's Briefen*, «*RhM*» 40, 1885, 611-619.
- Schnorr 1882: F. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Katalog der Handschriften der Königl. Öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden I*, Leipzig 1882.
- Shackleton Bailey 1977: D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero, Epistulae ad familiares I*, Cambridge 1977.
- Spengel 1846: L. Spengel, review (continued) of *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera quae supersunt omnia ex recensione Jo. Casp. Orelli*, «*Gelehrte Anzeigen*» 22, 1846, 913-920.
- Speranzi 2016: D. Speranzi, *Poliziano, i codici di Filelfo, la Medicea privata. Tre schede*, in P. Viti (a cura di), *Cultura e filologia di Angelo Poliziano*, Firenze 2016, 51-68.
- Thomson 2011: R. M. Thomson, *A descriptive catalogue of the medieval manuscripts of Corpus Christi College Oxford*, Cambridge 2011.
- Ullman 1960: B. L. Ullman, *The origin and development of humanistic script*, Roma 1960.

- Vielhaber-Indra 1918: G. Vielhaber, G. Indra, *Catalogus codicum Plagensium (Cpl.) manuscriptorum*, Lincii 1918.
- Walser 1914: E. Walser, *Poggius Florentinus: Leben und Werke*, Berlin 1914.
- Watt 1958: W. S. Watt, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae III: Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem, Epistulae ad M. Brutum, Fragmenta epistularum. Accedunt Commentariolum petitionis et Pseudo-Ciceronis Epistula ad Octavianum*, Oxonii 1958.
- Zamponi-Daneloni 2008: S. Zamponi, A. Daneloni, entry 68 on Laur. 49, 7 in T. De Robertis, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (a cura di), *Coluccio Salutati e l'invenzione dell'umanesimo*, Firenze 2008, 251-254.

