

A NEGLECTED MANUSCRIPT OF THE GLOSSARY OF PLACIDUS AND THE HISTORY OF THE TEXT*

ABSTRACT

This paper identifies a neglected manuscript, Viterbo, Centro Diocesano di Documentazione (CeDiDo), Capitolare 51 (R), as the extant archetype of the Libri Romani version of the glossary of Placidus. It first demonstrates that R is the parent of the three witnesses to the Libri Romani text used by editors, and it considers the implications of the neglected manuscript for future editions of the text. It then corroborates the importance of R by tracing its travels in humanistic and antiquarian circles in Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This history provides a framework for future research on the textual transmission of the Libri Romani text of Placidus.

Keywords: Placidus; glossary; textual transmission; Council of Basel; Latino Latini; Scipio Tettius

Few classicists nowadays read the late antique Latin ‘glossary’ attributed to Placidus,¹ and those who would are soon confronted by the fact that Placidus cannot easily be read. The most recent edition, which appeared in W.M. Lindsay’s *Glossaria Latina* series, patched together an original text of Placidus in a manner that few readers, if any, have found convincing.² Most default instead to the fifth volume of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, in which Georg Goetz gave essentially diplomatic editions of three versions or, better, three sets of evidence for Placidus. Those sets of evidence are printed under the titles *Placidus Librorum Romanorum* (= CGL 5.3–43), *Placidus Libri Glossarum* (= CGL 5.43–104) and *Placidus Codicis Parisini* (= CGL 5.104–58).

* The following special abbreviations are used in this paper: CGL=G. Goetz, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (Leipzig, 1888–1923); DBI=*Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* (Rome, 1960–). We cite the text of *Placidus Librorum Romanorum* from Goetz’s edition and according to his system of reference, by page- and gloss-numbers. Owing to limits of space we sometimes cite only a single recent contribution that leads onwards to the rich bibliography on e.g. the sixteenth-century humanists and their books. Thanks are due to the journal’s referee and editor, whose comments on this paper strengthened the presentation of our argument. This research was facilitated by support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

¹ This is something of a pity. The text falls into two parts, each of which would benefit from a fresh assessment. The ‘shorter Placidus’ glosses have been valued highly, and perhaps overvalued, as a source of information about Republican Latinity, while the much-denigrated ‘longer Placidus’ notes offer a fascinating, if often eccentric, document of Imperial Latin scholarship. Representative assessments of each part are on offer in W.M. Lindsay, ‘The shorter glosses of Placidus’, *Journal of Philology* 34 (1918), 255–66.

² J.W. Pirie and W.M. Lindsay (edd.), *Glossaria latina iussu Academiae Britannicae edita IV: Placidus, Festus* (Paris, 1930). An accurate judgement is expressed by J.E.G. Zetzel, *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology, 200 BCE–800 CE* (New York, 2018), 239: ‘Goetz did not try to reconstruct a single version of this [text]; Lindsay tried and failed.’ See also F. Stok, ‘Su alcune glosse di Placido’, *Orpheus* 8 (1987), 87–101, at 87–9, with references to further bibliography, to which one may add Lindsay (n. 1) for illumination of that scholar’s priorities in the Placidus, and J. Whatmough, ‘Review of *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* by James Wilson Poultney’, *CPh* 55 (1960), 282–4 for further insight into the history of the edition of Placidus for Lindsay’s series.

Goetz's study of six extant manuscripts of the *Libri Romani* text and information about a lost seventh manuscript led him to the conclusion that they all descend from a single book that had come to light somewhere and at some time in the fifteenth century,³ and, moreover, that only three of the manuscripts merited the status of independent witnesses to this version of the text. Those three manuscripts, all preserved in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, are:

- T** Vat. lat. 1552. Contains (1) Paulus Diaconus' epitome of Festus' *De uerborum significatu*, (2) 'glosae Placidi grammatici' and (3) Fulgentius, *Expositio Virgilianae continentiae*. Written on parchment in a single fifteenth-century hand. The colophon to Paulus (fol. 93v) indicates that that text was completed on 1 July 1453 in Perugia; the colophon of Fulgentius (fol. 134v) is written in an identical script.
- W** Vat. lat. 3441. The relevant section of the manuscript contains only the 'glosae Placidi grammatici', although that unity has been bound together with several other texts from the library of Fulvio Orsini, who annotated the manuscript. Written on paper in a single sixteenth-century hand.
- Y** Vat. lat. 5216. The manuscript originally contained, in this order, the grammatical texts (1) Velius Longus, (2) 'Adamantius siue Martyrius', (3) the excerpts of Arusianus Messius transmitted under the attribution 'Cornelii Frontonis exempla elocutionum' (henceforth 'Fronto'), (4) Fortunatianus, (5) Donatianus, (6) Caesius Bassus, (7) Iulius Seuerianus, (8) 'glosae Placidi grammatici' and (9) Fulgentius, *Expositio Virgilianae continentiae*. It was at some time separated into two parts and later rebound, with the first three texts now set at the end of the book. Written on paper in a single sixteenth-century hand.

In the year following the appearance of Goetz's edition, Léon Dorez described a fifteenth-century parchment manuscript at Viterbo that contains four texts written in the same hand.⁴ These texts are: (1) Paulus Diaconus' epitome of Festus' *De uerborum significatu*, written according to its colophon *die XVI mensis nouembris 1433. Basilee* (fol. 70v); (2) 'glosae Placidi grammatici'; (3) Fulgentius, *Expositio Virgilianae continentiae*; and (4) Pomponius Mela, *De chorographia*. On fol. 135r a much later hand has added various short poems.⁵ The manuscript—now Viterbo, Centro Diocesano di Documentazione (CeDiDo), Capitolare 51 (here **R**)—has corrections and marginal notes in several unidentified hands⁶ and in the hand of the Viterban humanist Latino

³ *CGL* 5.vi: 'Saeculo decimo quinto harum glossarum codex ex nescio qua bibliotheca protractus est, qui cuius aetatis fuerit ignoramus; ex illo quotquot nunc exemplaria exstant ducta sunt omnia, cum ipse misero fato perierit.'

⁴ L. Dorez, 'Latino Latini et la Bibliothèque Capitulare de Viterbe (2^e article)', *Revue des bibliothèques* 5 (1895), 237–55, at 246–7. See also L. Buono, R. Casavecchia, M. Palma and E. Russo (edd.), *I manoscritti datati delle province di Frosinone, Rieti e Viterbo* (Florence, 2007), 147, with plate 24 (fol. 98v, *explicit* of Fulgentius).

⁵ These are Auson. (*Epigrams*) 13.59 Green (*Armatam uidit Venerem Lacedemona* [sic] *Pallas*); 'Quidam in quendam statuum marmoream fractam pulcherrimam in pala[...]' beginning *Veneri uixi aemula* and published as being 'in horto ducali' at Pesaro by F. Sweerts, *Selectae Christiani orbis deliciae* (Cologne, 1608), 127; an unidentified poem beginning *Quod genus hoc hominum? quae corpora? gracios una*; 'Hectoris epitaphium' beginning *Defensor patriae iuuenum fortissimus Hector*; 'Achillis Epitaphium' beginning *Pellides ego sum Tethidis notissima proles*.

⁶ Dorez (n. 4), 247 noted only a single fifteenth-century hand; the annotators are discussed more extensively below.

Latini (1513–1593),⁷ who was active in Rome and was closely connected with Fulvio Orsini and other leading figures of the Roman intellectual community in the third quarter of the sixteenth century. On Latini's death it and other items of his library were left to the Archivio Capitolare in Viterbo.

In his influential study of the rediscovery of the Latin classics in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Remigio Sabbadini took note of the manuscript at Viterbo and connected it generally with Goetz's text of *Placidus Librorum Romanorum*,⁸ but its importance for editing the glossary has not been recognized. When preparing to edit Placidus for Lindsay's series, J.W. Pirie could write 'we should like, if possible, to see either a Placidus MS of another family, or, failing that, an earlier MS of the same family' to improve the text, and the evidentiary foundations of the glossary have received no augmentation in the years since.⁹ One part, at least, of Pirie's wish can be granted, for **R** will prove to be an earlier manuscript of the same family. Although the relationship of **R** to Goetz's three witnesses means that its fresh contributions to a new edition of Placidus will be modest, the manuscript will, all the same, simplify a future editor's task and clear away some problems that the known manuscripts have left unresolved. Moreover, the Viterbo manuscript throws new light on the circulation of the text in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and its history, in turn, offers important information about early modern readers of Placidus and their sources for the text. In this paper we show that **R** is the parent of **TWY**, and we discuss the kinds of gains to be had in a new edition produced from it. We then turn to the history of the manuscript in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; by tracing the travels of Placidus in humanistic and antiquarian circles, we aim to corroborate the claim that **R** provides the only independent evidence for the glossary in this period, and that Placidus therefore drew readers who had no evidence to work with other than **R**.

The unusual pairing of the glosses of Placidus with the *Expositio Virgilianae continentiae* of Fulgentius in **RTY** immediately suggests a close relationship among at least those manuscripts, which each have those two texts in the same order. Full collation of **RTWY** corroborates that impression and, moreover, confirms that **R** stands above **TWY** in the stemma, for each of those three manuscripts preserves all of **R**'s readings or adds new errors of their own.¹⁰ Limitations of space preclude our presenting the full collation and, since Goetz edited the *Libri Romani* essentially diplomatically (by reconstructing the shared ancestor, with all its faults, of **TWY**), only the complete collation could demonstrate that **R** both has all of the readings that Goetz hypothesized on the basis of **TWY** and has no uncorrectable readings that cannot be hypothesized from them.¹¹

⁷ The identification of Latini's hand was reported already by Dorez (n. 4), 247. On Latini generally, see M. Ceresa, 'Latini, Latino', *DBI* 64 (2005), 14–16.

⁸ R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1905–1914), 1.134 with n. 34, 2.231.

⁹ J.W. Pirie, 'New evidence for the text of Placidus', *ALMA* 2 (1926), 185–90, at 186. His 'new evidence' was Vat. lat. 1469, a collection of grammatical and glossographical extracts that was known to Goetz but not used by him (see *CGL* 5.xviii–xix). There is no mention of **R** in Pirie and Lindsay (n. 2), Stok (n. 2), P. Gatti, 'Trasmissione di alcuni testi lessicografici', *Filologia mediolatina* 9 (2002), 1–14.

¹⁰ A small number of errors were removed by conjecture especially in the sixteenth-century apographs: e.g. 11.7 dixerint] dixerunt **RT**, evidently corrected by **WY** on the basis of *quamuis*, and 30.12 genere neutro] genere neutri **RT**. Goetz's apparatus criticus provides a convenient repository of individual errors of **TWY**.

¹¹ We will gladly supply our evidence to any reader not inclined to take this part of our claim on faith.

In lieu of printing the complete collation, we shall demonstrate, from peculiarities in the textual layout and in the *ductus litterarum* in **R**, that each of **TWY** descends from **R** and that they were in fact copied directly from it. **R**, like many other manuscripts of glossographical texts, sometimes engages in the economizing practice of writing the end of a note in blank space after a previous or subsequent note, a style sometimes called ‘head-under-wing’. This practice often generates errors of transposition in derivative manuscripts, when the trailing part of one note is wrongly added to another, and errors of omission, when a copyist overlooks either the end of a note or a line of text adjacent to it.¹² A striking example of the latter is provided by Placidus 17.14 *Decrepiti non qui a senec-] om. T*. That error arose from the layout of Placidus 17.13–14 in **R**, reproduced here:

Dumis arboribus uel siluis ple-
rumque spinosis et obscuris po-
Decrepiti non qui a senec- || nitur
tute auulsi sunt sed iam qui ...

T passes from *ponitur* to *-tute*, and thereby conflates the two glosses into one. Similarly, the following errors in **TWY** are explained by the layout of the text in **R** (unless otherwise indicated, the error affects an entire gloss):

7.4] *om. T*
12.18] *om. W^{oc} : add. post 12.24 (in margine inferiori) W^{pc} : hic add. W²*
13.32] *post 13.33 traiec. T*
15.21 deo] deo appellatione (*ex 15.23*) **T**
15.23 primigeni appellatione] *om. TY*
16.27] *om. W*
22.25 cedunt] *post 22.26 exassulat traiec. TW*
41.2] *post 41.6 traiec. W*

Particularly significant evidence comes from the two transpositions—or, more precisely, two omissions that were soon corrected by the original copyist—that were made by **W** at 12.18 and 41.2. In each instance, the layout of **R** caused the copyist of **W** first to omit a gloss; when that individual reached the end of a page in **R**, he ‘checked his work’ and, noticing the omission, added the missing gloss to the relevant page in **W**.¹³ These errors confirm that **TWY** descend from **R**, for it is reasonable to assume that these peculiarities of layout belong to it alone. That fact, when taken in tandem with the absence of similar errors that cannot be accounted for from the layout of **R**, suggests that **TWY** were copied directly from **R**.¹⁴

Many other readings in **TWY** can be explained from peculiarities in the lettering or corrections of **R**. Errors of this sort put the descent of **TWY** from **R** beyond doubt; their preponderance, in combination with evidence previously reviewed and with the absence of errors that cannot be explained from the appearance of **R**, establishes as securely as is

¹² For the utility of this practice in eliminating transposition in derivative manuscripts, see M.D. Reeve, *Manuscripts and Methods: Essays on Editing and Transmission* (Rome, 2011), 155.

¹³ Placidus 41.6 is the last complete note on **R** fol. 89v; **W** adds 41.2 *in contextu* after that entry. The addition of Placidus 12.18 in the lower margin of **W**, below 12.24, is consistent with the copyist having noticed the omission after copying all of **R** fol. 75v, on which the last complete note is Placidus 13.7: having written two full pages in **W**, that copyist wrote 12.24 in slightly smaller lettering in the lower margin, at the point nearest to its proper location.

¹⁴ If our explanation of the transpositions of Placidus 12.18 and 41.2 is correct, there can be no doubt that **W** was copied directly from **R**.

possible that they were copied directly from **R** itself. We list here a sampling of these distinctive errors and explain any that are not self-evident, beginning with the evidence of **T**:

- 6.4 Allaterati] adlaterati **R**^{ac} : alaterati **T**
 12.1 Chelidri diri] chelindrⁱ diri **R** : cheli dicitur idiri **T**
 16.1 Conlatius] consatius **R**^{ac} : compacius **T**
 19.5 graecus] $\bar{g}r$ sic scr. **R** : igitur **T**
 20.20 uel publice secretum quid dicere] bis scr. **T**
 21.36 Facili] falla **R**² : falla facili **T**^{pc} : falla falili **T**^{ac}

At Placidus 6.4 a 'surgical' correction through the bowl of the 'd' in **R** (meant to be read as *allaterati*) was understood by the copyist of **T** as a deletion of the entire letter. At 16.1 the correction of *consatius* to *conlatius* in **R** is executed in such a way that it easily reads as *compacius*. At 20.20 **T** writes twice a single line of text in **R**.

In the case of **WY**, the copyists of those manuscripts often encountered difficulties over the same features of **R**, such that it will be convenient to treat their errors together:

- 6.32 conspirationum factionum] conspiratoūm factioūm sic scr. **R** : conspiratorum
 factorum **W** : conspiratorum factio___ **Y**
 7.11 Ambulacris] ambulacis **W**^{ac}
 7.25 petauro] p&auro sic scr. **R** : pet et auro **T**^{ac} : et auro **T**^{pc} : p__ auro **Y**
 7.34 Arueniet adueniet] arueni& adueni& sic scr. **R** : arueniaet aduenicet (*an adueniaet?*) **W**^{ac} : arueniae adueniae **Y**
 7.45 Altriplicem] altiplicem **W**
 8.8 autem est] est autem **R**^{ac}**W**^{ac}
 13.8 Concitos] conatos **WY**
 19.11 basi] basis **R**^{ac}**W**
 19.16 cum garatulitate] regratulitate **R**^{ac} : ai garatulitate **W**^{ac} : cum garulitate **W**^{pc} :
 cum ___ **Y**
 25.15 lases] _ases **Y**
 34.13 nihilo aliter] n° aliter sic scr. **RW** : non aliter **Y**

Two tendencies are worth noting. **W** often records an uncorrected reading of **R**, generally also with its correction, as at 8.8 and 19.11.¹⁵ The copyist of **Y** often left lacunae when the reading was in doubt; at 25.15, *lases* in **R** is written in such a way that it could be read as *sases*, whence **Y**'s uncertainty. Unusual suspensions or ligatures account for most other errors in this list, but even the perfectly ordinary superscript *i* to indicate *-ri-* (at 7.11 and 7.45) sometimes caused trouble for **W**. At Placidus 19.16, the first reading of **R** was corrected to *cū garatulitate*, with the first word written in such a way as to account for *ai garatulitate* **W**^{ac}, and in the word *Concitos* (13.8) the letters *-ci-* are written so closely together in **R** as to easily be read as an *a*.

Much evidence therefore demonstrates that **TWY** not only descend from **R** but also are direct copies of that manuscript. In his edition of *Placidus Librorum Romanorum* Goetz aimed at a diplomatic reconstruction of the common source of **TWY**; armed

¹⁵ Since this habit provides significant information about the antigraph of **W**, we provide a fuller list of these readings here. **W** preserves the uncorrected reading of **R** along with its correction in the following passages (= **R**^{ac}**W**^{ac}): 11.12 calciamenti] calciamentum; 12.4 argentarius qui] qui argentarius; 12.19 caries enim] *ut nouum lemma*; 15.2 acraeorum] sacraeorum; 16.25 dumosum] *ut nouum lemma*; 21.28 Efflictim] efflictam; 21.29 Exanclata] exanglata; 27.9 candenti designare] designare candenti; 28.38 Iterant] interant; 29.43 Lorarius] lolararius; 31.2 herbi] herbae. In the following passages **W** preserves the uncorrected reading of **R** without its correction (= **R**^{ac}**W**): 5.36 inante uadit] idest in ante uadit; 19.13 exertus] expertus; 27.19 emhiteus] emhites; 29.15 Inter stat] inter est stat.

with, as it turns out, three independent apographs, he was able to restore the readings of **R** with a high degree of accuracy. In that respect, a future diplomatic edition of *Placidus Librorum Romanorum* would still look much like Goetz's text did before **R** was known: there is no 'new Placidus' here. But a future edition of the text will still draw many benefits from **R**, in the simplification of the apparatus criticus, in the corroboration of many of Goetz's intuitions about the text and, occasionally, in the correction of points on which the truth could not have been seen through **TWY**. In the following six notes we discuss occasions where **R** springs a surprise; for each we give Goetz's text and a limited apparatus criticus reporting important readings from **R**, followed by short explanations:

Placidus 6.39 Annitas adiutas interdum senectus est.

adiutas] *secl.* **R**². The correction, made also by **Y**², restores sense to the gloss, although material assembled at *CGL* 6.72 suggests that the corrector erred in making it.

Placidus 10.3 ... in quo paricidae cum simia et gallo et serpente inclusi in mare proiciuntur alias praecipitabantur.

proiciuntur alias praecipitabantur (*sic T*)] proiciuntur **R** : alias praecipitabantur *in margine R*². Goetz followed **T** against **WY**, which imitate the layout of the first reading and its variant in **R** (cf. *CGL* 6.292).¹⁶

Placidus 14.34 Cadula frustra et adipe cada enim a ruina dicitur.

frustra] frustra **R**. The same reading is found in **TWY**^{pc}, despite Goetz's reports (cf. *CGL* 6.160).

Placidus 18.11 Elephans nulli dubium est quod per .p. et h. soli solitum scribitur quam non per .f.

scribitur] scribatur **R** : scribi **R**² quam non] quam **R** : non **R**². In each case a faint expunction in **R** has been missed or misunderstood by its apographs. Elsewhere in the tradition of Placidus one finds *scribatur*; the infinitive *scribi* evidently was meant to depend on *solitum*. Incidentally, a line-break intervenes between *soli* and *solitum* in **R**: the repetition of *soli* might well be an uncorrected dittography (cf. *CGL* 6.380).

Placidus 22.2 Forco quam nunc fallis cum appellamus nunc cultra. alias secularis qua pontifices in sacris utuntur dicta ab eo quod ferianda petat.

secularis] securis **R**². The dots expunging *-la-* are not faint; since all of **TWY** have *secularis*, the correction may postdate them.

Placidus 31.13 Lancino est lanio frequenter lancinare per lances diuidere.

lancinare per lances diuidere] *om.* **R** : *add. in margine R*². These four words are preceded by a paragraphus and were evidently meant at least as a separate gloss (cf. *CGL* 6.622). They may not belong in the text at all, for the other versions of Placidus know only the words *Lancino est lanio frequenter*.¹⁷

R also yields new information about the division of individual glosses. In perhaps the most important of these, at Placidus 5.36, **R** marks the end of a gloss after *fugit* and sets

¹⁶ Similarly, Placidus 15.29 (*erit uel exit*] *erit R* : *al' exit R*²) and 33.14 (*fingitur uel fungitur*] *fungitur R* : *uel fin R*²). The hand that wrote *praecipitabantur* in **R** is very similar to the original hand. The temptation to regard it as a variant entered by collation should be resisted. Although *praecipitabantur* is found in other versions of Placidus edited by Goetz, we have found no evidence elsewhere for the variants *exit* and *fingitur*; if they are not purely conjectural, they may well have been found in the antigraph of **R**.

¹⁷ J. Gruter, *Animaduersiones in L. Annaei Senecae opera* (s.l., 1595), 195, ad Sen. *Ep.* 32.2 cited a similar gloss from a Cologne manuscript: 'lancinamus, id est diuidimus, a lance, quia lance diuidimus.' The words *lancinare per lances diuidere* therefore may not have a lengthy history.

Aduerbium as the second word of the next gloss, confirming for this branch of the tradition the division hypothesized by a corrector of **W** and found in the other evidence for Placidus' glosses.¹⁸

Although Goetz already intuited much of the truth about **R** from the three apographs at his disposal, access to the manuscript thus provides better insight into the text of Placidus that came to light in the fifteenth century, and a better means of distinguishing archetypal readings (of the *Libri Romani*) from early improvements to the text. The readings of **R** that were effaced by early readers, and therefore are not found in the texts of **TWY**, themselves have value, for they may give a future editor insight into the earlier history of the *Libri Romani* text and provide ways of diagnosing and correcting the abundant errors in it.

While **R** simplifies the editor's task by providing new information, it also reveals new problems. Chief among these is the question of whether **R** and its descendants alone account for knowledge of Placidus in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, or some other source for the text—the antigraph of **R** that reached Basel, for example, or another independent witness—was available to the readers whose intermittent but focussed attention on the text of Placidus left its mark in the many corrections and annotations in **R**. The history of **R**, from its production in Basel through the death of Latino Latini in 1593, therefore takes on particular importance not only for the history of scholarship on the text but also for the editor's assessments of the tradition and its readings. We believe that full consideration of the history of **R** confirms that that manuscript alone provided independent evidence for the text, and that humanist scholars interested in Placidus had only it and their *ingenium* to work with. Establishing the history of **R**, then, both corroborates the stemmatic argument advanced here and provides a framework for further study of the text of Placidus. The evidence for Placidus, including any evidence that may yet come to light, needs to be assessed against the history and readings of **R**, which must be presumed to account for knowledge of Placidus in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries until evidence that does not fit this framework is found.

That history begins at Basel on 16 November 1433, when, according to the colophon of Paulus in **R**, that text was completed. Since all four texts in **R** are in the same hand, it has long been regarded as certain that they were written on the same occasion. Discussing anonymous discoveries of Latin texts, Sabbadini indicated without much fanfare that the *Glossae* of Placidus had come to the attention of the humanists by that year.¹⁹ Notes in some fifteenth-century manuscripts of Paulus that are closely related to **R**, but independent of it, connect that text more precisely with the Council of Basel.²⁰ Those notes, which suggest a manuscript written in 1434, together with a letter of Francesco Pizolpasso to Nikolaus von Kues written in Basel on 17 December 1432 that pleads for help in obtaining a copy of Festus Pompeius (*sic*),²¹

¹⁸ Divisions or conflations of glosses, for better or for worse, occur in **R** at e.g. Placidus 4.12, 5.15, 7.33, 11.1, 12.19, 12.37, 17.11, 20.13, 20.27.

¹⁹ Sabbadini (n. 8), 1.134.

²⁰ In the margin of Cologne, Fondation M. Bodmer, codex 186, fol. 72r a later hand added the words: *Reliquum quod sequitur repertum fuit anno salutiferae natiuitatis ihesu christi M CCCC XXXIII tempore concilii Basiliensis*. The same words appear in the text in Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Lat. XIII 11 (= 4103), fol. 39r and in Berlin, SBPK, Ham. 524, fol. 55r.

²¹ The letter is published in R. Sabbadini, 'Niccolò da Cusa e i conciliari di Basilea alla scoperta dei codici', *RAL* 20 (1911), 3–40, at 9–14; A. Paredi, *La biblioteca del Pizolpasso* (Milan, 1961), 198–202; E. Meuthen (ed.), *Acta Cusana: Quellen zur Lebensgeschichte des Nikolaus von Kues: Band I Lieferung 1: 1401–1437 Mai 17* (Hamburg, 1976), 85–8.

corroborate the impression that **R** must have been put together from texts available in diverse manuscripts in Basel during the Council. Moreover, a peculiar feature of this manuscript seems explicable only in such circumstances: **R** contains four texts attributed to Paulus, Placidus grammaticus, Fabius Planciades Fulgentius (or something similar)²² and Pomponius Mela, four authors with names beginning with ‘P’ arranged in strict alphabetical order.²³ That such an arrangement was possible must be the result of a remarkable confluence of books.²⁴

There is no evidence to suggest that any of the four texts travelled to Basel in the same manuscript. Only the similar subject matter of Paulus and Placidus suggests a reason for any of them to have stood together before 1433, and even this pairing is fragile.²⁵ Without further evidence about the antigraphs of **R** the question must be left open, but there seems to be little reason to believe that the other three texts will necessarily reveal information about an earlier copy of the *Libri Romani* version of Placidus, nor that it, in turn, will throw light on the descent of those texts. Results may yet emerge, however, from more information about the possessors of the antigraphs of **R**, and the following modest indications are offered in the hope that they may point a future editor toward further information about this book and its texts.

Little information, whether because apparently none exists or because none has yet been uncovered, is available to situate **R**’s texts in the transmissions of Paulus, Fulgentius and Pomponius Mela. The Fulgentius certainly gave rise to the copies of the text in **T** and **Y**. The text in **R** is marked by many distinctive readings, most of which were reported by Helm from the descendants of **R** he labelled *deteriores*.²⁶ It is not possible to connect **R** with any of the known medieval witnesses of the *Expositio Virgilianae continentiae*, and Fulgentius’ route to Basel remains a mystery.²⁷

Paulus and Pomponius Mela offer moderately better prospects for individuating the sources of those texts, but for the present they must remain merely prospects. The fifteenth-century tradition of Paulus’ epitome is rather different than has yet been

²² **R** identifies the author in a way consistent with alphabetization by ‘Planc-’ rather than by ‘Fulg-’ (*Virgilianae continentiae secundum philosophos moralis expositio A Fabio Planci de Fulgentio uiro clarissimo aedita explicat*, fol. 98v). Two other pieces of evidence, probably connected ultimately to **R**, suggest that readers of this manuscript called him ‘Planciades’: (1) Biondo Flavio’s confusion of Placidus and ‘Placiades’ is discussed below; (2) Florence, Riccardiana, 893, fols. 20r–24v is a copy of Fulgentius’ *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* (= *Serm.*). On fol. 20r, a reader crossed out the titulus and added in the inner margin ‘Sunt qui M. Fabii Placidii hunc libellum esse dicant.’ The name ‘M. Fabius Placidus’ is almost certainly a confusion of ‘Placidus’ and ‘Fabius Planciades’, and can hardly have arisen independently of **R** and its descendants. That the confusion spread to *Serm.* (not found in **R**) suggests that the name ‘Planciades’ was in wider use for Fulgentius.

²³ We know of no other manuscripts produced at Basel that show comparable arrangements.

²⁴ For evidence of an increase in manuscript production during the Council of Basel, see P. Lehmann, ‘Konstanz und Basel als Büchermärkte während der großen Kirchenversammlungen’, in id., *Erforschung des Mittelalters: Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1941–1962), 1.253–80; J. Miethke, ‘Die Konzilien als Forum der öffentlichen Meinung im 15. Jahrhundert’, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 37 (1981), 736–73; U. Neddermeyer, *Von der Handschrift zum gedruckten Buch: Schriftlichkeit und Leseinteresse im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit: quantitative und qualitative Aspekte* (Wiesbaden, 1998), 1.280–2 and diagrams 36a–d at 2.654–5.

²⁵ At least two copies of Paulus other than **R** reached Italy after the Council of Basel. One might reasonably expect another copy of Placidus to have joined them if Placidus and Paulus were contained in the same manuscript before 1433.

²⁶ R. Helm (ed.), *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii V. C. opera* (Leipzig, 1898).

²⁷ We are grateful to Gregory Hays for confirming that none of the earlier manuscripts of the *Cont.* can individually account for the text in **R**.

recognized,²⁸ and a full account of the manuscripts will alter the narrative such that only preliminary statements are possible here. The text of **R** cannot be connected with any of the known medieval witnesses and it seems not to align consistently with either the α or the β manuscripts of that text. The question must therefore be left open for the moment.

The medieval circulation of Pomponius Mela has been so well explained as to require no recapitulation of the history and travels of Vat. lat. 4929 and of a copy of the text annotated by Petrarch around 1335.²⁹ Some aspects of the subsequent transmission of the *De chorographia* have been partially described, others not at all.³⁰ Although we cannot yet relate **R** to any extant fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript, some eliminations are possible, for it is not related to the manuscripts connected to Coluccio Salutati, Niccolò Niccoli, Simon de Plumetot, Jean de Montreuil, Guillaume Fillastre, or Giordano Orsini.³¹ If the antigraph of **R**'s Pomponius Mela does survive, two omissions seemingly of a single line in length—Pomponius Mela 1.21 *uasta est magis quam frequens mare quo cingitur* and 1.50 *Nilus est et cum diu simplex saeuusque descendit circa*—and an interpolation (1.30 *Numidia*] *Numidia a graecis appellata METIOSOPITHG [sic]*) that shows up occasionally³² in the tradition will perhaps help to identify it.

At present, then, we can say only that the *Libri Romani* version of Placidus was noticed during the Council of Basel, where someone plucked it from among the available books and copied it along with three other texts whose authors' names began with 'P'. Important evidence for demarcating phases in the history of **R** after Basel comes from the accumulated strata of annotations in the manuscript. Although Dorez observed only two annotators at work in **R**, in our view at least three and perhaps as many as six different hands annotated the Placidus in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Nearly all of these annotations are modest, consisting of individual words and conjectures. They are not known equally to **TWY**, which instead reflect different stages in the history of **R** and in the scholarly improvement of its text. Sorting these annotations and their presence in the descendants of **R**, then, will establish a preliminary chronological framework for work on the text, which we will subsequently fill out with information drawn

²⁸ Our remarks on the fifteenth-century tradition of Paulus and on the position of **R** within it are based on study of about one hundred and forty manuscripts; we hope to say more about the problems in this tradition soon. For the orthodoxy, see Sabbadini (n. 8), 1.134 n. 34; A. Moscati, 'Problemi filologici nell'epitome di Paolo Diacono del *De verborum significationibus* di Sesto Pompeo Festo', in M. Simonetti (ed.), *La cultura in Italia fra tardo antico e alto medioevo* (Rome, 1981), 1.467–74; C. Woods, 'A contribution to the king's library: Paul the Deacon's epitome and its Carolingian context', in F. Glinister and C. Woods (edd.), *Verrius, Festus, & Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship, and Society* (London, 2007), 109–35, with further references.

²⁹ See C.W. Barlow, 'Codex Vaticanus Latinus 4929', *MAAR* 15 (1938), 87–124; G. Billanovich, 'Ancora dalla antica Ravenna alle biblioteche umanistiche', *IMU* 36 (1993), 107–74; C.M. Gormley, M.A. Rouse and R.H. Rouse, 'The medieval circulation of the *De chorographia* of Pomponius Mela', *MS* 46 (1984), 266–320.

³⁰ The most substantive information on record is had from Gormley, Rouse and Rouse (n. 29), 302–20.

³¹ These manuscripts are numbers 17, 22, 73, 104, 79 and 88, respectively, in the catalogue of P. Parroni (ed.), *Pomponii Melae De chorographia libri tres* (Rome, 1984), 59–81, who also provides limited bibliography for each. We have collated passages in about sixty of the manuscripts listed by Parroni, none of which shows close connections with **R**; published information eliminates several more.

³² We have seen comparable readings also in New Haven, Beinecke Library, Marston 76 and in Paris, BNF, NAL 783; neither manuscript is especially close to **R**.

from the history of those descendants. Named and arranged from their first annotation in the text of Placidus, these groups of annotations are:

- [a] ‘Accipenser’ (fol. 71v): written in slightly rough lettering, often using the symbol ‘+’ to tie annotations to the main text. The same hand added the following notes, which we report in their entirety: *antes* (fol. 72v), *cohercere* (fol. 75v), *Silones Non(ius) Marcel(lus)* (fol. 76r), *.c. explicuit* (fol. 79v), *hera* (fol. 79v), *Ianus autem* in correction of *Ianua* (fol. 82v), *non sic* (fol. 82v) and *proprie pedum* (fol. 87v); perhaps also *al praecipitabantur* (fol. 74r) and *epythia* (twice, fols. 79v and 83r).³³ These annotations are known to all of **TWY**.
- [b] ‘Aporria’ (fol. 71v): written in a small and graceful sixteenth-century hand that is at least close to, and possibly identical with, the hand that wrote **W**. The same hand added: *Ad incitam, iter, trutiniae* and *modum* (all on fol. 72v), as well as *tenebantur* (fol. 78v), *exerto humero* (fol. 79v), *f. fracibus* (fol. 80r), *f. Q. Fabius Eburnus* (fol. 88r), *f. fulguratus* (fol. 88r) and *Scythia* (fol. 90r). These annotations are known to **W** alone; a few of them have been added to **Y** in obviously later hands, and there is no reason to suspect that they were present in **R** when **Y** was first copied.
- [c] ‘Echini’ (fol. 79r): written in brown ink in the hand of Latino Latini. In Placidus, Latini annotated just two pages, adding *expopulariter iactas id est, uulgoque* and *Equitium*, deleting *ost* (all on fol. 79r) and also adding *rubor* and *erogantem* (fol. 90v). Only **W** knows these annotations.
- [d] ‘De mensium appellatione’ (fol. 82v): marginal annotations and additions, often preceded by a paragraphus, that are written in a hand close to, but not necessarily identical with, the ‘Accipenser’ group. The hand has written the annotations *Lancinare per lances diuidere, magnalia uile uerbum* (both fol. 85r), and *Nuptiae quamquam a nubendo dicantur scribuntur tamen per .p. quia .p. littera mitior est quam b* (fol. 86v). As these annotations are known to all of **TWY**, they may well belong with the ‘Accipenser’ group.
- [e] ‘Ius praetorium’ (fol. 82v): large letters written in dark ink, not precisely connected to the main text. The same hand is responsible for *forte illibus sicut hibus* (fol. 83v), and is perhaps a corrector contemporaneous with the first hand of **R**. These annotations are known to all of **TWY**.
- [f] ‘Iuuentus’ (fol. 83r): large, perhaps slightly inexpert lettering written directly adjacent to the text block to indicate insertions. The same hand wrote *sicut* (fol. 87r) and perhaps *Senectus est a senectute appellatus a Romulo* (fol. 89v), unless this belongs instead with [d]. These annotations are known to all of **TWY**, although their response to individual annotations varies.³⁴

³³ A curious problem is posed by the two annotations *epythia*. **T** once had *epythia* written in its margin on fol. 108r in a hand strikingly similar to, perhaps even identical with, the hand in **R**, but the other annotations of this group have influenced the original text of **T**, and we have found no other traces of the hand in **T**. If the hands are indeed identical, the annotator could convincingly be situated in Perugia in 1453.

³⁴ [iuuentus] iuuentus in contextu **T** : iuuentus in margine **W** : om. **Y**; sicut] sicut in contextu **TWY**. For the annotation *Senectus* (etc.), as for the annotation *Nuptiae* (etc.) of group *d*, **W** copies the notes

The annotators thus fall into two larger groups divided by their presence in the apographs of **R**. Groups *a*, *d*, *e* and *f* are known to all three apographs, and so must be presumed to have been added to **R** in or before 1453. Conversely, the annotations of Latino Latini and those of the ‘Aporria’ group (that is, groups *b* and *c*) are known at first hand only to the copyist who wrote **W**, who is perhaps identical with the ‘Aporria’ annotator. Two important points emerge from this evaluation of the annotations. First, scholarly work on **R** falls into two broad phases, one early and represented by the state of the text as copied by **T** in the fifteenth century and by **Y** in the sixteenth, and the other later and represented by the state of the text as copied by **W**. Second, nearly all of the annotations are modest: they offer conjectures of the sort that would be within the reach of readers working from the corrupted text of **R** alone. Only a few of the annotations of the earliest phase have even the possibility of offering independent evidence for the text of Placidus.³⁵ But their very paucity is a mark against that possibility, and it seems safer to assume that these early and limited corrections represent conjectures or, at best, access to the antigraph of **R**, and not evidence from a different part of the transmission, from which more extensive correction might be expected.

From the annotations of **R** and from its apographs, it becomes possible to establish stages in the history of the manuscript, which will corroborate the impression that **R** was the only source of information about Placidus available to Italian humanists. When and with whom **R** left Basel is not known. The manuscript was next certainly at Perugia in the summer of 1453, when its texts of Paulus, Placidus and Fulgentius were copied in the same hand in **T**, and when an annotator of **R** may have written *epythia* in the margin of **T**, if those hands are indeed identical.³⁶ **T** reached the Vatican before 1475, and its descendants show no signs of acquaintance with **R**.³⁷

At around the time **T** was written, the glossary of Placidus came to the attention of Biondo Flavio (1392–1463). Placidus, whom Biondo calls a ‘grammaticus non incelebris’,³⁸ is named as an authority eight times in the *Roma Triumphans* (c.1453–1459); little evidence suggests that Biondo knew Placidus much before his work on that text.³⁹ Four of those eight citations have nothing to do with our text of Placidus, and probably nothing to do with Placidus at all.⁴⁰ The four citations left standing, however, lead back

in the margin, **Y** omits the notes entirely, and **T** adds the annotation *in contextu* after the reading of the first hand in **R**.

³⁵ These are the annotations beginning *Lancinare* (but cf. above, page 427), *Nuptiae* (but the corrupt text of **R** admits of easy correction, with assistance from Placidus 36.4) and *Senectus* (but *a Romulo* is obviously necessary given the following words *qui uel fundauit uel auxit Romam*).

³⁶ See above, n. 33.

³⁷ **T** is listed in the Vatican inventory of 1475; J. Fohlen, ‘Les manuscrits classiques dans le fonds Vatican Latin d’Eugène IV (1443) à Jules III (1550)’, *HumLov* 34 (1985), 1–51, at 44. Vat. lat. 1889, fols. 91r–108v, is a fifteenth-century apograph of its Placidus joined to unrelated texts: B. Nogara, *Codices Vaticani Latini tomus III: Codices 1461–2059* (Rome, 1912), 338–9. Vat. lat. 3898, fols. 133r–141v, is a sixteenth-century copy of its Fulgentius owned by Angelo Colocci: M. Bernardi, ‘Angelo Colocci (Jesi [Ancona] 1474 – Roma 1549)’, in M. Motolese, P. Procaccioli and E. Russo (edd.), *Autografi dei letterati italiani: Cinquecento II* (Rome, 2013), 75–110, at 81. The excerpts of Paulus in Vat. lat. 1558 were copied in the sixteenth century (or later) from **T**.

³⁸ *Roma Triumphans* (Basel, 1531), 50. All references to Biondo’s text are given from this edition.

³⁹ See A. Mazzocco, ‘Some philological aspects of Biondo Flavio’s *Roma Triumphans*’, *HumLov* 28 (1979), 1–26 for the date and for references to the citations of Placidus. F. Muecke, ‘Biondo Flavio on the Roman theatre: topography and terminology’, *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 3 (2018), 241–73, at 247 n. 17 reports that there is no trace of Placidus in Biondo’s earlier works.

⁴⁰ The citations attributed to Placidus in Biondo’s text at 17 and 195 probably come from Nonius Marcellus 3.26 and 548.10 Mercier, respectively. The citation at 101 certainly comes from Paulus 519.10 Lindsay. Most curious is the citation at 189: the views on the word *zeta* attributed there to

to Placidus, and often specifically to the *Libri Romani* text of the glossary. These are the citations at 13, on *amphitrite* (= Placidus 4.10, admittedly not distinguishable from *CGL* 5.47.5); at 50–1, on *scaena* (= Placidus 41.9 *scena—exclamationibus tragicis*, with the distinctive reading *criminis* [R] for *carminis* in evidence at *CGL* 5.98.3 and 5.148.5);⁴¹ at 94, on *ergastulum* (= Placidus 19.9, with the reading *damnantur*);⁴² and at 196, on *murex* (evidently a simplification of Placidus 32.5).

If equal measures of accuracy and inaccuracy in Biondo's citations prompt doubts about his acquaintance with this version of Placidus or with R, a mistaken citation of 'Placiades' (that is, Fulgentius) in the *Roma Triumphans* shows that, whatever degree of confusion reigns in the attributions, it is beyond doubt that Biondo had his knowledge of Placidus from R or from a manuscript very similar to it. The citation illustrating the word *culleus* follows immediately on that of *ergastulum* (94):

Culleumque dicit Placiades genere masculino dici, saccum ex corio factum, in quo parricidae cum simia et gallo et serpente inclusi in mare proiciuntur.

Fulgentius' discussion of (neuter) *culleum* in the *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* (page 125.3 Helm) overlaps only trivially with this information. Biondo's information derives instead from the text of Placidus 10.3; we give here the text of R:

Culleus genere masculino geminato L dicitur. est autem ex corio factus in quo paricide cum simia et gallo et serpente inclusi in mare proiciuntur ('alias praecipitabantur' in *marginē R*²: proiciuntur alias praecipitabantur in *contextu T*)

Biondo therefore certainly knew this version of the glossary, and although *proiciuntur* is not the sturdiest of reeds on which to lean, it does suggest that Biondo knew Placidus not from T but from R or from a manuscript very similar to it.

R seems to have made little impact elsewhere at this time. No other fifteenth-century copies of its Placidus or its Fulgentius are known. The same may turn out to be true of its Pomponius Mela.⁴³ The impression that the manuscript was little read in a lengthy period after 1453 is not altered by the fact that just one other descendant of its Paulus is extant.⁴⁴ From the third quarter of the fifteenth century until the middle of the sixteenth century there is a gap in the history of R. The manuscript is next glimpsed

Placidus should perhaps be referred instead to Angelo Decembrio and the Ferrarese court; see M.T. Sambin De Norcen, 'De vocabulis: Angelo Decembrio e una singolare interpretazione della "zeta" di Plinio il Giovane', in M. Basso, J. Gritti and O. Lanzarini (edd.), *The Gordian Knot: Studi offerti a Richard Schofield* (Rome, 2014), 39–49, at 45–6.

⁴¹ Despite his claim, Biondo's information about *orchestra*, *mirmillones* and *pantomimi* in the same note shows only coincidental connections with Placidus.

⁴² The version at *CGL* 5.65.19, deriving from Isidore, has *deputantur*. Interestingly, the first hand in R gave *dominantur*; the word is expunged, but evidently no replacement was offered until the 'Aporria' annotator added '*tenebantur*' (an obvious guess) in the margin. The content of the gloss makes *damnantur* an easy correction, whether by Biondo himself or by someone working on a lost descendant of R.

⁴³ Cf. above, n. 31.

⁴⁴ Vatican City, BAV, Urb. lat. 1157 is a scholarly miscellany put together before 1474 for Federico da Montefeltro, subsequently duke of Urbino: M. Passalacqua, *I codici di Prisciano* (Rome, 1978), 326–7. Its text of Paulus (fols. 108r–173v) certainly descends from R (it has inherited some distinctive readings that derive from misunderstandings of the *ductus* of R), but it was probably copied from an intermediary: corrections in Florence, BML, plut. 90 sup. 6² derive from such a manuscript, and in the Urbinas the omission of Paulus 13.11 *diligi solent uidelicet* seems best explained as a skipped line of text in a manuscript other than R. Moreover, if R were the antigraph of the Urbinas, the decision not to copy Placidus would be difficult to explain. The manuscript contains Paulus and

in a list of unpublished Latin texts compiled probably, but not indisputably, in the 1550s. However, since the connection between that list and **R** is, at present, obscured by two small but significant errors, and since that connection can only be established retrospectively, we defer discussion of that evidence and return, instead, to Latino Latini. The Viterban humanist, as we have indicated, annotated **R** very sparsely, making only occasional notes in the texts of Paulus, Placidus and Pomponius Mela.⁴⁵ There is no external evidence known to us to suggest when and how the manuscript came into his possession, and the manuscript itself gives no evidence about when he annotated its texts.

Although **R** itself therefore reveals relatively little about its whereabouts before it came to Latino Latini, its two sixteenth-century apographs shine some light on the history of the manuscript and permit us to be a bit more precise about Latini's annotations. The argument is straightforward in the case of **W**, which will set a firm *terminus ante quem* for Latini's work on **R**. The individual who wrote the Placidus of **W** transcribed Latini's notes in the margins on fols. 77r and 95v, writing them in the same hand used for the main text and for its other inherited marginalia. Accordingly, there is no doubt that Latini annotated **R** before **W** was written. This Placidus, as is well known, was owned by Fulvio Orsini and annotated in his own hand.⁴⁶ It is less frequently remarked that Placidus had come to his attention before 1581. In several notes in the edition of Festus printed in Rome by Giorgio Ferrario in that year Orsini cites 'Placidus in glossis', quoting words that correspond to the text of **W**, sometimes with Orsini's own conjectures and corrections silently incorporated.⁴⁷ That sequence of events puts Latini's annotations in **R** a comfortable interval before the first printing of Orsini's edition of Festus.⁴⁸ The known descendants of the Placidus of **W** are consistent with that claim but do not permit further precision.⁴⁹

Rather more information emerges from the other sixteenth-century descendant of **R**. As we have observed, the copyist of **Y** seems not to know the annotations in our groups *b* and *c*, and therefore that manuscript was presumably copied before Latini

thirteen other texts on grammar, metre and lexicography, to which the glosses of Placidus would have made a welcome addition.

⁴⁵ See fols. 9r, 31r, 79r, 90v and 99v. Most of these are corrections to the text of **R**; of those not already mentioned the most interesting is Pomponius Mela 1.6 †*magno et paludi*†] *magnae paludi*. On fol. 9r the hand we call 'De mensium appellatione' wrote *Auidus non ut indocti auens aurum*, to which Latini added *uide ut sibi constet auctor cum supra in aueo sibi aduersetur* (a cross-reference to Paulus 13.17 Lindsay).

⁴⁶ For the manuscript, see P. de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris, 1887), 378, from the catalogue preserved as Vat. lat. 7205, fol. 39r; *CGL* 5.vii. The same small capital letters that Orsini uses for *notabilia* in Vat. lat. 3402 (see M. Ferrari, 'Le scoperte a Bobbio nel 1493: vicende di codici e fortuna di testi', *IMU* 13 [1970], 139–80, at 167) are found on fol. 86v in the Placidus.

⁴⁷ Corrections made in the copyist's hand are cited in Orsini's (regrettably unpaginated) *Notae in fragmentum for Nefrendes and Pullus*, and in the *Notae in epitomam for Agina*. Orsini's own annotations are reflected probably in the *Notae in fragmentum* for *Municas*, and certainly in the *Notae in schedas* for *Uruat*.

⁴⁸ The lengthy period in which Orsini's Festus was 'forthcoming' would make it reasonable to put his acquaintance with Placidus even earlier; that history is reviewed by D. Acciarino, 'The Renaissance editions of Festus: Fulvio Orsini's version', *Aclass* 59 (2016), 1–22, at 6–9.

⁴⁹ These are Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, 918 (not saec. xv, *pace* E. Narducci, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Biblioteca Angelica olim Coenobii Sancti Augustini de Urbe* [Rome, 1892], 393) and a manuscript in Hamburg about which inadequate information has been recorded; according to Goetz (*CGL* 5.x) they derive certainly from **W** after it had been annotated by Fulvio Orsini. Leah Stephens kindly supplied us with photographs of the Angelicus, allowing us to confirm Goetz's claim for that manuscript.

annotated **R**. Secure information about when **Y** was produced therefore would provide both a *terminus ante quem* for the resurfacing of **R** in the sixteenth century and a *terminus post quem* for Latini's annotations. Although an exact date proves elusive, greater precision is possible on the basis of some unrecognized evidence for the history of **Y**. An argument that necessarily follows a meandering path through Roman libraries and Roman intellectual circles of the 1550s and 1560s will establish that **Y** was written before 1563, that **R** must have resurfaced before that date and that therefore we will not miss the mark by much, if at all, if we put Latini's work on the manuscript in the period c.1563–1581.

Part of the history of **Y** is revealed by Vat. lat. 3402,⁵⁰ written in Rome around 1515 by the Friulian humanist Niccolò Liburnio (†1557). That manuscript contains texts of Velius Longus, 'Adamantius siue Martyrius', excerpts of Arusianus Messius ('Fronto'), Fortunatianus, Donatianus and Caesius Bassus, all copied from Naples, BNN, IV. A. 11, followed by the text of Iulius Seuerianus, copied from a manuscript related to Petrarch's text of that author.⁵¹ At an unknown time and by a route not traced, Liburnio's manuscript passed to Fulvio Orsini, who annotated it in his own hand and supplied the titles ATILII FORTVNATIANI ARS (fol. lxxix r), DONATIANI FRAGMENTVM (fol. lxxxi v) and perhaps also ARS FORTVNATIANI (fol. lxxxiii r).

Much evidence indicates that Vat. lat. 3402 was in Orsini's possession at least by 1559, when copies of its 'Fronto' had begun to enter wider circulation both at Rome and elsewhere. Basilius Zanch(i)us (= Basilio Zanchi, 1501–1558)⁵² had a manuscript of 'Fronto' that was copied from Vat. lat. 3402.⁵³ That manuscript is lost, but excerpts keyed to it survive in Vat. lat. 7179, fols. 180r–181v, written in the hand of Petrus Ciacconius (= Pedro Chacón, 1526–1581) presumably after about 1570, when the Spanish scholar arrived in Rome.⁵⁴ Another copy of 'Fronto' travelled north. In the autumn of 1559 Orsini sent to Carlo Sigonio (c.1520–1584) a copy of that text in aid

⁵⁰ Vat. lat. 3402 is a manuscript well studied for its role in the transmission of the discoveries at Bobbio in 1493; in the rest of this paragraph we report information put on record mostly by G. Billanovich, 'Il Petrarca e i retori latini minori', *IMU* 5 (1962), 103–64, at 150–1 and by Ferrari (n. 46), and augmented variously by G. Morelli, 'Per il testo dell'*Ars Caesii Bassi De metris*', in L. Munzi (ed.), *Problemi di edizione e di interpretazione nei testi grammaticali latini: Atti del colloquio internazionale, Napoli 10–11 dicembre 1991* (= *AION*[filol] 14) (Rome, 1994), 131–48; G. Morelli, 'Metricologi latini di tradizione bobbiese', in M. De Nonno, P. De Paolis and L. Holtz (edd.), *Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Erice, 16–23 October 1997* (Cassino, 2000), 533–59; A. Di Stefano, *Arusiani Messi Exempla elocutionum: Introduzione, testo critico e note* (Hildesheim, 2011); M. Di Napoli, *Vellii Longi De orthographia: Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Hildesheim, 2011).

⁵¹ Description of and references to editions of the texts can be had from Ferrari (n. 46), 144–5.

⁵² On this individual, born Pietro Zanchi, see E. Pellegrin, *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* (Vatican City, 1975–), 3.2.655–6 (on Vat. lat. 7044); H. Hofmann, 'Le egloghe di Basilio Zanchi di Bergamo (1501–1558)', *StudUmanistPiceni* 31 (2011), 45–54. Admittedly nothing requires that Zanchi copied 'Fronto' after Vat. lat. 3402 came into Orsini's possession; the close connection between the two, however, makes that inference rather more likely than not.

⁵³ This, at any rate, is the view of Di Stefano (n. 50), lxxiv. The evidence recorded by A. Della Casa, *Arusianus Messius: Exempla elocutionum* (Milan, 1977) does not seem to support the position of Vat. lat. 7179 in her stemma (at 42).

⁵⁴ The identification of the hand was made by Campana; see A. Mazzarino, 'Due note filologiche', *Maia* 1 (1948), 64–7, at 64–5. On the manuscript, see Ferrari (n. 46), 180; Della Casa (n. 53), 27; Pellegrin (n. 52), 3.2.657–9; Di Stefano (n. 50), lxxiv. On Chacón in Rome, see G. Cardinali, «*Qui havemo uno spagnolo dottissimo*»: *Gli anni italiani di Pedro Chacón (1570ca.–1581)* (Vatican City, 2017).

of the latter's second edition of the *Ciceronis fragmenta*.⁵⁵ Before 1565 Sigonio's manuscript had passed by way of Iohannes Zamoscius (= Jan Zamoyski, 1542–1605) to Andreas Patricius (= Andrzej Patrycy Nidecki, 1522–1587); its whereabouts are now unknown.⁵⁶ Another copy of 'Fronto' deriving evidently from the same period, Vat. lat. 5170, has yet to reveal its history.⁵⁷

Y likewise derives in part from Vat. lat. 3402 as corrected by Orsini. When Y was first written it contained, in sequence, copies of the texts of Velius Longus, Adamantius, 'Fronto', Fortunatianus, Donatianus, Caesius Bassus and Iulius Seuerianus (all deriving from Vat. lat. 3402), to which were joined the texts of Placidus and Fulgentius copied from R.⁵⁸ Three recent and substantial editions of texts contained in Y have established three facts relevant to the date of the manuscript.⁵⁹ (1) These texts are written on paper with two different watermarks, one in common use throughout the period at least 1502–1587, the other in use in Rome in the period at least 1534–1546.⁶⁰ (2) From the Velius Longus in Y was copied Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, B. 104, fols. 205r–219v, written in the hand of Achilles Stadius (= Aquiles Estaço, 1524–1581). Although the date of that Velius is, strictly speaking, limited only by the death of the Portuguese scholar, the text is joined to a collection of epigraphic material that was transcribed in preparation for a work on Latin orthography and gathered probably in the 1560s and 1570s.⁶¹ (3) Y was apparently separated into two parts before 1597, about which more in a moment. Before that separation occurred, or at least at a time when the original arrangement of the manuscript was still perceptible, the great bibliophile Iohannes Vincentius Pinellus (= Gian Vincenzo Pinelli, 1535–1601) had a copy made of substantial portions of it, now Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, D 498 inf.⁶²

⁵⁵ *Fragmenta Ciceronis passim dispersa, Caroli Sigonii diligentia collecta et scholiis illustrata* (Venice, 1560). On the manuscript sent to Sigonio, see W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio: The Changing World of the Late Renaissance* (Princeton, 1989), 296 n. 8.

⁵⁶ H. Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols. (Leipzig, 1857–1880), 7.445–6. On the *Contubernium Polonorum* at Padova and its connections with Sigonio, see J. Slaski, 'Marian Leżeński, un polacco a Padova (1556–1559)', *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 38 (2005), 171–96 with references to further bibliography.

⁵⁷ The only discussion of its Arusianus known to us is Di Stefano (n. 50), lxxvi–lxxix.

⁵⁸ That description is an oversimplification; in particular, we pass over the messy history of fols. 24–33, recorded in Y in the Ranaldi catalogue but now bound in Vat. lat. 5170. That history has been traced by G. Morelli, *Caesii Bassi De metris, Atilii Fortunatiani De metris Horatianis* (Hildesheim, 2011–2012), clxxiii–clxxx, and matters very little for Placidus.

⁵⁹ For fuller discussion, see Di Napoli (n. 50), lix–lxi; Di Stefano (n. 50), lxxiii–lxxiv; Morelli (n. 58), clxxiii–clxxxv.

⁶⁰ See Morelli (n. 58), clxxv.

⁶¹ See Di Napoli (n. 50), lx–lxi. On Estaço, the epigraphic sylloge and his work on orthography, see A. Guzmán Almagro, 'A Portuguese contribution to 16th century Roman antiquarianism: the case of Aquiles Estaço (1524–1581) and Roman epigraphy', in M. Berbera and K.A.E. Enenkel (edd.), *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters* (Leiden, 2012), 353–73 with references to further bibliography.

⁶² Billanovich (n. 50), 150–1; Ferrari (n. 46), 168–9. No one has expressed an opinion on the date of the manuscript other than to say that it was written soon ('presto', 'in breve arco di tempo') after Y. On 29 November 1579, Pinelli wrote to Aldus Manutius the Younger that he still had 'quelli due libri di grammatici di V. S. che gli manderò un di questi giorni'; see E. Pastorello, *Inedita Manutiana 1502–1597: Appendice all'inventario* (Venice, 1960), 455–6 for the letter, a reference we owe to Di Napoli (n. 50), lx n. 94. Given the physical state of Y at the end of the sixteenth century, it is at least not impossible that Pinelli means the two parts of Y. On Pinelli and his library, see M. Callegari, 'Pinelli, Gian Vincenzo', *DBI* 83 (2015), 727–32, with references to further bibliography.

On a fourth point there is more to say. At the death of Aldus Manutius the Younger (1547–1597), many of his manuscripts and printed books were seized on the authority of Clement VIII, first becoming part of the papal collection and subsequently being added to the Vatican Library in the gift of Paul V.⁶³ It is now well established that **Y** is one of those manuscripts, because the fair copy of the inventory of books seized lists an *Altillii Fortunatiani Ars* (Vat. lat. 7121, fol. 1v), reflecting a striking error in the title of that text, which now stands at the beginning of **Y**.⁶⁴

Aldus Manutius the Younger was, or was at least represented as, a prodigy. Already in 1556 a collection entitled *Eleganze della lingua toscana e latina* appeared under his name. To his teenage years belong, among others, the small version of his *Orthographiae ratio* (1561), which was followed in 1566 by a much expanded version under the same title.⁶⁵ In the pages of the latter the authority of Velius Longus is cited twice.⁶⁶ And at Venice, in 1563, there appeared under the name of Aldus the Younger an edition of Sallust that included the fragments of that author's *Historiae*.⁶⁷ These include a fragment of the first book that is printed *nihil ob tamtam* [sic] *mercedem sibi abnuituros* (fr. I 50 Maurenbrecher = I 47 La Penna–Funari) together with the report that Aldus took those six words *ex Cornelii Frontonis de exemplis elocutionum libello, nondum edito, quem legi commodatum a Scipione Pettio, uiro optimo, & singulari quadam in peruestigandis ueterum libris diligentia praedito* (fol. [130v]).

If this Scipio Pettius ever existed, he has done a remarkable job of covering his tracks; no independent reports of his name are known to us. Scipio Tettius, on the other hand, is somewhat better known. That individual compiled, perhaps principally but not exclusively between the years 1550 and 1558,⁶⁸ an *Index librorum nondum editorum* that was based upon his inspection of libraries and inventories, including, *inter alias*, those of Fulvio Orsini and Achilles Statius.⁶⁹ In this document a lengthy

⁶³ On Aldus's library after his death, see J. Bignami Odier, *La bibliothèque Vaticane de Sixte IV à Pie XI: Recherches sur l'histoire des collections de manuscrits* (Vatican City, 1973), 81, 95–6, 118, 119. Preliminary research indicated to her that the manuscripts of Aldus are to be found before or after the Cabrera manuscripts (Vat. lat. 5009–Vat. lat. 5042), in the range up to about number 5400, which is consistent with the shelfmark of **Y**.

⁶⁴ Another suggestion recently advanced is plausible but not yet proven. Morelli (n. 58), clxxxiii suggests that the volume 'De orthographia' listed in the inventory of books seized from Aldus (Vat. lat. 7121, fol. 3r) represents the texts of Velius, Adamantius and 'Fronto' from **Y**.

⁶⁵ On Aldus Manutius the Younger, see E. Russo, 'Manuzio, Aldo, il Giovane', *DBI* 69 (2007), 245–50, with bibliographic detail on the *Eleganze* and *Orthographiae ratio* and with further references.

⁶⁶ Di Napoli (n. 50), lx.

⁶⁷ *C. Sallustii Crispi Coniuratio Catilinae et Bellum Iugurthinum. Eiusdem nonnulla ex libris historiarum. Fragmenta eiusdem historiarum, e scriptoribus antiquis ab Aldo Manutio, Pauli F. collecta* (Venice, 1563).

⁶⁸ If this range—suggested by A. Diller, 'Scipio Tettius' *Index Librorum Nondum Editorum*', *AJPh* 56 (1935), 14–27, at 15 n. 4—is correct, it certainly bears on the question of when **R** came to the attention of the sixteenth century. On the conflicting evidence for the date of Tettius's *Index*, see N. Zorzi, 'Appendice 2: Il codice Stroziano della Biblioteca di Fozio', in L. Canfora, *Il Fozio ritrovato: Juan de Mariana e André Schott* (Bari, 2001), 363–74, at 366 n. 11. We choose to reach a similar answer from different evidence, since there are indications that Tettius saw at least some of the libraries, or their inventories, mentioned in his *Index* after 1558. Notably, in 1566 Tettius borrowed from Latino Latini the inventory of the then-dispersed library of Rodolfo Pio da Carpi (†1564), returning it two years later; see G. Mercati, *Note per la storia di alcune biblioteche romane nei secoli XVI–XIX* (Vatican City, 1952), 122 n. 2.

⁶⁹ The *Index* was published by P. Labbé, *Nova bibliotheca MSS librorum, sive Specimen antiquarum lectionum latinarum et graecarum* (Paris, 1653), 166–74, from a copy written in the hand of Claude Dupuy (1545–1594) and surviving now as Paris, BNF, Dupuy 651, fols. 236–245.

list of Greek titles follows a short, but potent, list of twenty-two Latin *anecdota*. Six texts in that alphabetically arranged list are plainly relevant to this argument; we report them from Paris, BNF, Dupuy 651, fol. 236r, since the published version of the list makes a significant omission:

Adamantii siue Martyrii de B muta et V uocali liber i
Cornelii Frontonis exempla elocutionum per alfab.
Fulgentii Placiadis Virgilianae continentiae liber i⁷⁰
Iulii Seueriani ascitomata artis rhetoricae lib. i
Placidi grammatici glossae per alphabetum lib. i
Velii Longi de orthographia liber i

Each of these six texts appears in **Y**,⁷¹ and at least two of them were cited by Aldus in the 1560s. We can bid farewell to Scipio Pettius. Instead, it was Scipio Tettius—diligent, as reported, in locating manuscripts—who provided Aldus with the unpublished ‘Fronto’ before 1563; **Y**, which was copied directly from **R** and Vat. lat. 3402 and which was in Aldus’s possession at his death, must be the manuscript in which the text travelled.⁷²

Knocking the dust off of **Y** and its connection with Scipio Tettius therefore allows some light to shine on Placidus and Latino Latini. **R** had doubtless resurfaced before 1563 and perhaps even by the previous decade, if we could be sure that the relevant items in Tettius’s *Index* were compiled only in the period 1550–1558. Who owned **R**, and where it was, when Tettius saw it are questions still without answers. In subsequent years, and certainly before 1581, **R** was annotated both by Latino Latini and by an individual who perhaps also wrote the Placidus that belonged to Fulvio Orsini. That period cannot yet be narrowed.⁷³ At the risk of undue speculation, a moment worth considering is the summer of 1568, when Latini enjoyed the pleasant company of Orsini, Girolamo Mercuriale and Lorenzo Gambara ‘con le Muse al fresco’ at Caprarola.⁷⁴ Little else can yet be said about the history of **R** in the last decades of Latini’s life, before it passed to the Archivio Capitolare in 1593.

This account of the travels of **R** and the gaps that remain in it provide a framework both for the early modern history of Placidus and for the editorial assessment of any evidence that has not yet come to the attention of scholars. At the beginning of this

Labbé’s text contains significant errors; we have inspected Dupuy’s copy and Vat. lat. 3958, fols. 155r–162v, in microfilm.

⁷⁰ Omitted by Labbé but plainly original in Dupuy 651. The *editio princeps* of Fulgentius, *Cont.* appeared at Heidelberg in 1589: D.S. Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2010), 216 n. 89.

⁷¹ The other three texts in **Y**, namely Fortunatianus, Donatianus and Caesius Bassus, are absent from Tettius’s *Index*, since they had already been printed in Milan in 1504; Ferrari (n. 46), 168; Morelli (n. 50), 549 n. 73; Morelli (n. 58), cxc–cxcii.

⁷² Tettius perhaps provided Aldus with other *anecdota*. He recorded a ‘Plauti Comoedia Philodoxium in Bibliotheca Achillis Statii’, doubtless the *Philodoxeos fabula* printed in 1588 at Lucca by Aldus as a work of a comic poet Lepidus, but properly the first version of the play written by Leon Battista Alberti, for which see L. Cesarini Martinelli, ‘Leon Battista Alberti. Philodoxeos fabula’, *Rinascimento* 17 (1977), 111–234.

⁷³ In his notes on Pomponius Mela, Petrus Ciacconius cited readings of **R** both indiscriminately and as deriving from a ‘liber Latini Latini’, which corroborates Latini’s ownership of the manuscript in the 1570s but adds nothing new on its earlier history. For those notes, see e.g. A. Gronovius, *Pomponii Melae De situ orbis libri III* (Leiden, 1748), 404 and 407.

⁷⁴ The phrase is Latino Latini’s, from a well-known letter written to Orsini in July of 1569, surviving as Vat. lat. 4104, fol. 267r, cited also by Nollhac (n. 46), 15 n. 2.

paper we recalled Pirie's wish to see a manuscript of another family, or at least an earlier witness to the text of the *Libri Romani*. Our argument about **R** has confirmed the status of that manuscript as an earlier source—and, in fact, as the only independent source yet known—for the *Libri Romani* text. The three manuscripts on which Goetz relied to edit this version of Placidus were copied from **R** at different stages of its history, and their modest improvements to the archetypal text seem to be purely conjectural. Moreover, our reconstruction of the history of **R** corroborates the stemmatic argument about its descendants and provides a framework for assessing any further evidence for the text of Placidus. Since **R** and its apographs seem entirely to account for the circulation of Placidus in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it is a reasonable hypothesis that they will also account for any traces of Placidus not yet known. Should evidence come to light that cannot be explained from **R** and its history, it may well grant the other part of Pirie's wish.

University of Toronto

JARRETT T. WELSH
jarrett.welsh@utoronto.ca

University of Toronto

JESSE HILL
jesse.hill@mail.utoronto.ca