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SUMMARY
A full account is given of the unusual disorder in the text of Cicero’s speeches on ff. 124–239 of Madrid Bibl. Nac. 10119. The origin of the manuscript is then discussed together with its closest relatives and the history of its text.
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RESUMEN
Se ofrece una descripción exhaustiva del inusual desorden del texto de los discursos de Cicerón de los ff. 124–239 de Madrid Bibl. Nac. 10119 y se estudia el origen de este manuscrito junto con otros testimonios muy cercanos y la historia del texto.
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Madrid Bibl. Nac. 10119 is a 15th-century parchment manuscript of 248 leaves that contains in 24 quires of five bifolia, ff. 1-240, most of Cicero’s speeches. Though it has been described in print at least five times, none of the descriptions reveals the tiresome fact, which I pointed out in 1984, that from f. 124r to f. 239v no fewer than 67 units of text are jumbled because of misplaced leaves in its exemplar or a remoter ancestor. I added that ff. 202


2 “The manuscripts of the Pro Cluentio”, CR n. s. 34, 1984, 42. I saw the manuscript on the spot in May 1983 but later ordered a microfilm, which I thank the Biblioteca Nacional
and 209 of the manuscript itself have changed places; they form the second bifolium of a quire, and it was inserted the wrong way round. In 1983 for my own purposes I had listed the contents in order and reconstructed in a paper model the quires of the exemplar or remoter ancestor. Since then, I have not had occasion to use the jumbled section, but other scholars may find it easier to use if I publish my results. I take the opportunity of considering where and when the manuscript was produced and where it belongs in the textual tradition of the speeches.

**The disorder in *Madrid Nac. 10119***

The exemplar or remoter ancestor contained 24 speeches and the *Commentariolum petitionis*. The original order began as follows:

*Pro lege Manilia, Pro Milone, Pro Plancio, Pro Sulla, Pro Archia, Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro rege Deiotaro, Pro Cluentio, Pro Quinctio, Pro Flacco, Post reditum ad Quirites, Post reditum in senatu.*

Of these thirteen speeches, all known to Petrarch and widely attested in this order after his death\(^3\), the first twelve were not affected by the misplacement, but it affected the last and then the *Commentariolum* and the other eleven, where the original order was this:

*Commentariolum, Pridie (spurious), Post reditum ad Quirites (another version), De domo, In Vatinium, Pro Caelio, Pro Roscio Amerino, Pro Murena, Pro Balbo, De haruspicum responsis, De provinciis consularibus, Pro Sestio.*

The misplacement befell the last seven quires, which I shall call h-o because they were almost certainly preceded by seven others. Quire n had ten leaves, the rest twelve; they made a total of 82. The misplacement had the following results in the ancestor (on the left) and *Madrid Nac. 10119* (on the right)\(^4\):

---

\(^3\) I say more at the end here about the witnesses to these speeches.

\(^4\) The second figure in the references is the line of the *O. C. T.*, where *Pro Roscio Amerino, Pro Murena, and Pro Caelio*, appear in volume I of *Orationes*, 1905, the other genuine speeches in volume V, 1911, and the *Commentariolum* in volume III of *Epistulae*, 1958. For *Pridie* I use the edition of Orelli-Baiter-Halm, volume II 2, Zürich 1856, 1412-20; there is a Mondadori edition by M. De Marco, 1991, but I doubt if it is widely available.
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h: f. 1 ?? – Sen. 18.25 consules
f. 75 Har. 53.25 nomina – 60.9 paucis
f. 3 Sen. 30.2  egi (ei ms.) – Comm. 3.4 cura
f. 74 Har. 45.5 id – 53.25 certa
f. 4 Comm. 3.4 et saepe – 18.12 etiam
ff. 6-7 Comm. 33.13 quemque – Prid. 4.14 ut his
f. 9 Prid. 14.3 -tionem – 24.16 immortales
f. 79 Prov. 24.29 est igitur – 33.14 acerrimis
f. 10 Prid. 24.16 qui excellenti – Quir. 4.20 caritatis
f. 78 Prov. 15.12 alter – 24.29 num
f. 12 Quir. 16.12 unii – ??

j: f. 13 ?? – Dom. 11.6 consilii
f. 5 Comm. 18.12 si suffragandi – 33.13 optimum
f. 52 Mur. 22.14 de nocte – 29.15 actionibus
f. 26 Dom. 134.18 manu – 144.2 quocirca
f. 14 Dom. 11.6 capere – 20.1 defenderet
ff. 30-31 Cael. 1.6 non posset – 21.12 alieno
f. 23 Dom. 103.20 disturbare – 113.27 comportarent
f. 35 Cael. 49.7 ocularum – 57.22 redundet
f. 57 Mur. 61.3 et egregia – 69.17 gratuitam non
f. 8 Prid. 4.14 nisi – 14.3 conspира-
ff. 14 Dom. 114.27 venio – ??

k: f. 25 ?? – Dom. 134.18 tremebunda (teme- ms.)
f. 15 Dom. 20.1 bello – 30.10 calamitatem
f. 27 Dom. 144.2 Capitoline – Vat. 7.7 denique
f. 17 Dom. 40.19 omnis – 50.24 tetigit
f. 29 Vat. 23.29 arma – Cael. 1.6 stare
ff. 18-19 Dom. 50.24 digit – 70.6 retulit
f. 32 Cael. 21.12 dolori – 31.1 sollicitavat
f. 20 Dom. 70.7 iudicavit – 82.23 modo in
f. 34 Cael. 39.20 vitam – 49.7 flagrantia
f. 22 Dom. 93.11 quam de – 103.20 vestris
f. 36 Cael. 57.22 id igitur – ??

l: f. 37 ?? – Rosc. 9.6 conqueri neque satis
f. 73 Har. 38.13 non fuit – 45.5 excluserat
f. 38 Rosc. 9.6 libere – 22.17 familia
f. 16 Dom. 30.10 etiam – 40.19 tua
f. 2 Sen. 18.25 vestra – 30.2 universis
ff. 76-77 Har. 60.9 bonorum – Prov. 3.12 quorum
f. 11 Quir. 4.20 quid voluptatis – 16.12 unus
f. 21 Dom. 82.23 civium (cum ms.) – 93.10 gloriari
f. 47 Rosc. 123.30 diligenter – 137.11 non
f. 80 Prov. 33.14 nationibus – 41.7 assentiebar
In the ancestor, thanks doubtless to catchwords, the outer bifolia of each quire stayed in the right place. Furthermore, the inner bifolia all remained inner bifolia, even when they moved to another quire. When I was working out my reconstruction, Bruce Barker-Benfield suggested a convincing explanation: as sometimes happens\(^6\), the outer and inner bifolia were parchment but the rest paper, and whoever assembled the bifolia in their

\(^5\) I mentioned above that ff. 202 and 209 have changed places. I treat them here as though they had not.


---
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jumbled order recognized that any parchment one without a catchword belonged in the middle of a quire. If each inner bifolium and each pair of leaves where quires meet is counted as a unit of text, the 82 leaves contained 69 units of text. As it was not just the seven outer bifolia that kept their place – eight units, namely the first and last and the six where quires meet – but also, presumably by mere chance, ff. 3 + 10, 27 + 34, 29 + 32, 54-55, 65-66, the misplaced units numbered 53, but the effect was the jumbling of all but the first and last of the 69 or even, since there is no continuation to anchor the last, of all but the first. That is how I arrived at the figure of at least 67.

In the table I have indicated where each passage falls in Madrid Nac. 10119, but anyone hunting for a specific passage will probably be more grateful for the following table, drawn up by reference to the original order in the ancestor:

| ?? – Sen. 18.25 consules | ?? - 124r 5 |
| Sen. 18.25 vestra – 30.2 universis | 180r 12 - 181v 7 |
| Sen. 30.2 egi (ei ms.) – Comm. 3.4 cura | 125v 2 - 127r 13 |
| Comm. 3.4 et saepe – 18.12 etiam | 128v 13 - 130r 24 |
| Comm. 18.12 si suffragandi – 33.13 optimum | 141v 12 - 143r 24 |
| Comm. 33.13 quemque – Prid. 4.14 ut his | 130r 24 - 133v 5 |
| Prid. 4.14 nisi – 14.3 conspira- | 155r 28 - 156v 12 |
| Prid. 14.3 -tionem – 24.14 immortales | 133v 5 - 134v 19 |
| Prid. 24.14 qui excellenti – Quir. 4.20 caritatis | 136r 6 - 137r 25 |
| Quir. 4.20 quid voluptatis – 16.12 unus | 184r 14 - 185r ult. |
| Quir. 16.12 uni – ?? | 138v 15 - ?? |
| ?? – Dom. 11.6 consiliii | ?? - 141v 12 |
| Dom. 11.6 capere – 20.1 defenderet | 146r 23 - 147v 17 |
| Dom. 20.1 bello – 30.10 calamitatem | 159v 20 - 161r 8 |
| Dom. 30.10 etiam – 40.19 tua | 178v 24 - 180r 12 |
| Dom. 40.19 omnia – 50.24 tetigit | 163v 21 - 165r 8 |
| Dom. 50.24 digitu – 70.6 rettulit | 165r 8 - 167v 28 |
| Dom. 70.6 iudicavit – 82.23 modo in | 169r 26 - 170v 18 |
| Dom. 82.23 cum numero – 93.10 gloriari | 185r ult. - 187r 4 |
| Dom. 93.11 quam de – 103.20 vestris | 172r 1 - 173r 33 |
| Dom. 103.20 disturbare – 113.27 comportarent | 150v 15 - 152r 23 |
| Dom. 114.27 venio – ?? | 156v 12 - ?? |
| ?? – Dom. 134.18 tremebunda | ?? - 159v 20 |
| Dom. 134.18 manu – 144.2 quocirca te | 144v 18 - 146r 23 |
| Dom. 144.2 Capitoline – Vat. 7.7 denique | 161r 8 - 162r 36 |
| Vat. 7.7 ipsius – 23.29 Sullana | 225r 5 - 226v 12 |
| Vat. 23.29 arma – Cael. 1.6 stare | 162r 36 - 163v 21 |
| Cael. 1.6 non posset – 21.12 alieno | 147v 17 - 150v 15 |
| Cael. 21.12 dolori – 31.1 sollicitavit | 167v 28 - 169r 26 |
Cael. 31.1 quos potuit – 39.20 hanc tu
Cael. 39.20 vitam – 49.7 flagrantia
Cael. 49.7 oculorum – 57.22 redunet
Cael. 57.22 id igitur – ??
?? – Rosc. 9.6 conqueri neque satis
Rosc. 9.6 libere – 22.17 familia
Rosc. 22.17 qui neminem – 34.25 expositam
Rosc. 34.25 consideremus – 49.27 artificio
Rosc. 49.28 accusatorio – 60.10 et citro
Rosc. 60.9 et citro – 84.2 reperio
Rosc. 84.2 tecum – 96.17 possum
Rosc. 96.17 inquit – 111.10 non minus
Rosc. 111.10 turpe – 123.30 facio neque
Rosc. 123.30 diligenter – 137.11 non
Rosc. 137.11 debo – ??
?? – Mur. 5.14 eam quam
Mur. 5.14 mihimet – 13.13 quibus
Mur. 13.13 praeterea – 22.14 vigilas tu
Mur. 22.14 de nocte – 29.15 actionibus
Mur. 29.15 anteponenda – 34.16 operam
Mur. 34.16 non minus – 51.26 quia timebant
Mur. 51.27 cum erupit – 61.3 divina et
Mur. 61.3 et egregia – 69.17 gratiam non
Mur. 69.17 modo dignitati – 78.1 apprehensurum
Mur. 78.2 arbitrararetur – 88.23 vertet
Mur. 88.23 domumne – ??
?? – Balb. 17.23 civitatis
Balb. 17.24 nostrae – 25.14 alienigenarum
Balb. 25.14 nos hominum – 33.11 potest
Balb. 33.12 nisi – 41.8 fingi
Balb. 41.8 orationem – 59.24 iustum
Balb. 59.24 et debitam – Har. 2.3 vulnerari
Har. 2.3 quam est – 10.19 maximis
Har. 10.19 prope iam (propria ms.) – 16.27 sit mihi
Har. 16.28 data – ??
?? – Har. 30.20 optimo
Har. 30.20 per te – 38.13 dolori
Har. 38.13 non fuit – 45.5 excluserat
Har. 45.5 id – 53.25 certa
Har. 53.25 nomina – 60.9 paucis
Har. 60.9 bonorum – Prov. 15.12 quorum
Prov. 15.12 alter – 24.29 num
Prov. 24.29 est igitur – 33.14 acerrimis
This table makes it clearer than the other that Madrid Nac. 10119 breaks off early in Pro Sestio. It does so at the end of a quire, but unlike the previous quires this one has no catchword: only a set of concluding squiggles. As the last page is much longer than usual and the writing cramped, the scribe must have wanted to avoid embarking on a new quire for a few sentences. In that event, the rest of Pro Sestio must already have been missing from the ancestor, and it seems that the ancestor must have had the same word as Madrid Nac. 10119 at the end of its last quire, whether in the body of the text or as a catchword. At first sight, Sest. 1.6 bonum – 14.19 quiescunt is too long to have been accommodated in a single leaf, but B. L. Harl. 4927 (s. xii), from which it ultimately came, has many omissions in the passage. Nevertheless, it still looks too long, and I have not yet hit on a satisfactory explanation.

**British Library Harl. 4927, Petrarch, and the Text of Madrid Nac. 10119**

Before continuing with Madrid Nac. 10119, I must say more about Harl. 4927. It includes a run of ten speeches that had travelled together since Antiquity: Pridie, Post reditum ad Quirites, Post reditum in senatu, De domo, In Vatinium, Pro Caelio, Pro Balbo, De haruspicium responsis, De provinciis consularibus, Pro Sestio. The most conspicuous peculiarities of its text are that Post reditum ad Quirites opens with 2 Quirites etsi and Pro Caelio ends with 70 commissa vobis. Most Italian manuscripts of the ten speeches owe them wholly or partly to it, but some of the ten also reached Italy from different sources in versions defective at other points. Who in Italy first used Harl. 4927, and when, has not yet been established. Doubt has recently been cast on the view that Petrarch owned and annotated it, and certainly he is unlikely to have owned it, because in 2010 I identified

---

7 On the transmission of Cicero’s speeches see R. H. Rouse & M. D. Reeve in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and transmission*, Oxford 1983, 54–98, where 57–61 deal with the ten speeches in question. For other versions of In Vatinium and Pro Caelio that circulated in Italy see my article “Before and after Poggio: some manuscripts of Cicero’s speeches”, *RFIC* 112, 1984, 266–84; for another of Pro Sestio, T. Maslowski’s Teubner edition, Leipzig 1986, xviii; for another of Pro Balbo, my preface to his posthumous Teubner edition of De provinciis consularibus and Pro Balbo, Berlin & New York 2007, vii, where I also refer to what I have written about another of De provinciis consularibus and De haruspicium responsis.

it as a manuscript described in papal inventories of about 1411 and 1423 from Peñíscola. The papal manuscript ‘fuit venditus Johanni Munionis’, Juan Muñoz, an associate of the Aragonese pope Benedict XIII. In addition, Harl. 4927 may also have been the manuscript that Jean de Montreuil in 1403-4 was trying to obtain from a friend in Avignon, which had belonged to Pierre d’Ameil, Galeotto Tarlati da Pietramala, and Nicola Brancacci; he described it in his letter as \textit{volumen quoddam operum quam multorum Ciceronis correctissimum, respectu tamen incorrectionis aliorum} and in another letter, addressed to a dignitary in Paris, as \textit{volumen ... in quo libri morales Tullii pluresque orationes sue continentur ... , scriptum, quod aiunt, littera nec antiqua nimis nec nova et satis correctum, respectu tamen incorrectionis aliorum}. If the identification is right, then three owners are known before the papal library, which must have acquired it from the last of them, Nicola Brancacci († 1412), a close associate of Benedict XIII.

However the text of Harl. 4927 entered circulation, there are three respects in which Madrid Nac. 10119 stays closer to it than most Italian manuscripts. Despite putting after \textit{Pro Flacco} a complete version of \textit{Post reditum ad Quirites} taken from a different source, it keeps (or restores)

---


10 M. H. Jullien de Pommerol & J. Monfrin, \textit{La bibliothèque, loc. cit.} and 1, 422 no. 283. The identification reopens the question whether it later belonged to the Catalanian scholar Petrus Galeus, whose manuscripts, or some of them, were appropriated in 1593 or soon after by the earliest institution that has left a mark of ownership in it, namely the Jesuit college at Agen; see H. Omont, “La bibliothèque de Pedro Gálés chez les Jésuites d’Agen”, \textit{Journal des Savants} n.s. 3, 1905, 380-84. Even if it did, though, he travelled so widely in Italy and worked for so long at Geneva and in the south of France that he need not have acquired it in Catalonia.


12 On Brancacci see the \textit{Dizionario biografico degli italiani} 13, 1971, 793-6 (D. Girgensohn).

13 In fact it is the composite version of \textit{Paris B. N. Lat. 7778} (s. xiv²), where a corrector added the end of the speech after 23 \textit{verum etiam} from Harl. 4927 or a descendant. See my Teubner edition of \textit{Pro Quinctio}, Stuttgart & Leipzig 1992, xi. I illustrated the hands in “Recovering annotations by Petrarch”, in \textit{Il Petrarca latino e le origini dell’umanesimo = Quaderni petrarcheschi} 9-10, 1992-93, 333-48, where the plate opposite 336 shows the comparable transition at \textit{Post reditum in senatu}.
the headless version, which at first glance appears to be a different speech\(^{14}\); it keeps *In Vatinium* after *De domo*, whereas many Italian manuscripts, among them early ones such as *Vat. Barb. Lat. 142, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1476*, and *Vicenza Bertol. G 24 2 1*, put it after *Pro Balbo*; and it keeps *Pro Sestio* after *De provinciis consularibus*, whereas many Italian manuscripts, among them the same early ones, put it after *Pridie\(^{15}\)*. In fact the only change it makes in the Harleian speeches, as I shall call them, is to drop *Post reditum in senatu*, already taken from a different source. This fidelity to *Harl. 4927* makes unlikely any connexion with perhaps the earliest Italian descendant of *Harl. 4927*, namely *B. L. Add. 19586*(s. xiv/xv), which puts *De haruspicum responsis* at the end, after the *Caesarians, Philippics*, and *Paradoxa*. Four other manuscripts, though, have all the same speeches as *Madrid Nac. 10119* from *Pro lege Manilia* to *Pro Sestio* except that they also drop the headless version of *Post reditum ad Quirites*; they are *Cesena S. 19.2, Palermo Naz. IV G 7, Parma Palat. 59*, and *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1486*. In *Oxford Linc. Lat. 40* only *Pro Archia* is absent from the sequence (lost after f. 58, the end of a quire?\(^{16}\)), and in *Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 255* the earlier speeches of the sequence are lost before *Post reditum ad Quirites 21.23 -rent laudi*\(^{17}\).

\(^{14}\) I have met it in 18 Italian manuscripts, but unlike *Madrid Nac. 10119* most of them restore the true opening of the speech after 11 *pertulerunt*; so at least *Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. S. 2002 4*(which also has the complete version), *Florence Laur. 48.18* and S. *Croce 14 sin. 9, Florence *Nazz. II II 65*, *Oxford Ball. 248A*, *Paris B. N. Lat. 17154*(which also has the complete version), *Pistoia A 32, Siena H XI 64, Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1991*, *Vat. Lat. 1746*, most of which are Florentine. *Paris B. N. Lat. 7778* and 17883 have in the margin at 2 *Quirites etsi* the note ‘quidam libri habent hic principium (+ huius 17883) orationis et quod est supra non habent’. The scribe of *Naples Naz. IV B 8*(s. xiv/xv), on which see L. Guido Rosa, *Molto più preziosi dell’oro: codici di casa Barzizza alla Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli*, Naples 1996, 24-5 no. 4 with plates 17-18, copied out the headless version, but Gasparino Barzizza or someone close to him restored missing passages in the margin, among them the opening. *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1463* and *Vicenza Bertol. G 24 2 1* have the complete version twice. Two manuscripts that usually have a sophisticated text, *Vatican Pal. Lat. 1480* and *Munich Lat. 15734*, surprisingly have the headless version.

\(^{15}\) *Naples Naz. IV B 8*(n. 14) now begins with *Post reditum ad Quirites* but does not include *Pro Sestio*, which it must have put after *Pridie* in the missing section; and it too puts *In Vatinium* after *Pro Balbo*. Another early manuscript now lost, *Dresden Dc 109*, did the same, as I learnt in 1983 when the Sächsische Landesbibliothek supplied me with J. C. Götze’s description, *Die Merkwürdigkeiten der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden*, Dresden 1743, I, 491.

\(^{16}\) When I saw the manuscript about 30 years ago, I noted the quiring as 2-50\(^{10}\) (with a leaf cut out after f. 48), 51-58, 58bis-307\(^{10}\).

\(^{17}\) S. Rizzo, *Catalogo*, 32 on *Cesena S. 19.2*, mentions that I drew her attention to the sequence attested by *Madrid Nac. 10119* and these other six manuscripts. In M. D. Reeve, “The manuscripts”, 42 on no. 9 (*Cesena S. 19.2*), I retracted part of what she reports on my authority about transpositions in *Pro Sestio* and *In Pisonem*; more on these below. *Canon. Class. Lat. 255* treats *Pro Caelio* as *Pro Marcello*, a confusion also found in *Palermo Naz. IV G 7* and *Reg. Lat. 1486*; but I have no further information about titles in the group except
On the other hand, Madrid Nac. 10119 and the other six manuscripts interrupt the Harleian speeches after Pro Caelio by inserting Pro Roscio Amerino and Pro Murena, unknown in Italy till 1415, when the text of a manuscript found at Cluny began to circulate\textsuperscript{18}. The Commentariolum too, it seems, began to circulate at much the same time\textsuperscript{19}, and they put it before the Harleian speeches. After the Harleian speeches the other six manuscripts add speeches unknown in Italy till 1417, when Poggio found them in Germany: Cesena S. 19.2 adds In Pisonem, De lege agraria, Pro Rabirio Postumo, Pro Caecina, Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo, the rest In Pisonem, Pro Rabirio Postumo, Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo, Pro Caecina. As the jumbled ancestor of Madrid Nac. 10119 seems to have lost quires after Pro Sestio 14.19 quiescunt, it may well have lost some of Poggio’s German speeches too.

The five manuscripts that end or once ended with Pro Caecina have In Pisonem 30.27 privatis – 68.24 audistis and 20.4 barbaro – 30.27 quae lex after Pro Sestio 108.2 contionem\textsuperscript{20}. The two passages are also missing from In Pisonem in Vienna 3122 and 3148, which I saw in 1983, but 3148 does not include Pro Sestio, and in 3122 I did not check the text at 108.2. Written in 1461 by Jeronimus de Surim (or Gurim), 3122 ends with the same eleven speeches as the five manuscripts in question, from De domo to Pro Caecina\textsuperscript{21}. Did the transpositions come about in the ancestor of Madrid Nac. 10119 before those that affected only Madrid Nac. 10119? No: I have checked the length of the passages, and it does not match the length of the passages misplaced in Madrid Nac. 10119.

that Canon. Class. Lat. 255 muddles other speeches too and Madrid Nac. 10119, though it bestows no title on any speech, does bestow an appropriate subscription on a few, among them Pro Caelio.

\textsuperscript{18} Stephen Oakley will soon publish an article on the transmission of these two speeches, but meanwhile the fullest treatment of the lost Cluniacensis is Rizzo’s, La tradizione manoscritta della Pro Cluentio di Cicerone, Genoa 1979, 49-82.

\textsuperscript{19} See my edition of Pro Quinctio (n. 13), xxviii n. 28. L. Frati, “Indice dei codici latini conservati nella R. Biblioteca Universitaria di Bologna”, SIFC 16, 1908, 103-432, at 375 no. 867, assigns Bologna Univ. 1677 to s. xiv, but Comm. pet. is not in the same hand as Ovid’s Ars amatoria, which antedates a jotting on f. 26v apparently made in 1299 or 1300 (“… millesimo ducentesimo indictione duodecima te&lt;m&gt;pore domini Bonifatii pape ottavi die septimo mensis Martii …”), and the M of the subscription DEO GRATIAS AMEN, which I take to be in the same hand and ink as the text of Comm. pet., has the Byzantine form attested in Italy from about 1410 to about 1460.


\textsuperscript{21} S. Rizzo, Catalogo, 173, omits Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo from her description.
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THE TEXTS AT THE END OF MADRID NAC. 10119 AND THEIR BEARING ON ITS DATE

After the speeches of Cicero's Madrid Nac. 10119 has these four pieces:

ff. 241r-242v (untitled and undated): Sunt quos iuxta te stare rex Romane vides venerandus vicecamerarius illustri senator conservatores magnifici et magistratus urbis ceteri cum quibus populus Romanus ad salutandum te nos cives suos misit meque iussit apud te gaudium quod eis adventus tuus attulit detegere ..., addressed to the emperor Frederick III in March 1452 when he came to Rome for his coronation;

ff. 243r-246r (untitled and undated): Si solus huic oneri ..., a speech addressed to Charles VII of France at Bourges on August 28th 1440 by a delegation from Eugenius IV, introduced by a preamble that names its members, reverendum patrem dominum episcopum Melden., spectabilem militem et comitem et utriusque iuris doctorem celeberrimum dominum Iohannem Franciscum de Capitibus Liste, et reverendum patrem magistrum Iohannem de Turrecremata sacre theologie professorem famosissimum et scolarum sacri palatii apostolici magistrum, et me humilem capellanum tuum; the first three were Pierre de Versailles, Gianfrancesco Capodilista from Venice, and Juan de Torquemada, and the speaker was Bartolomeo Zabarella, archbishop of Florence;

f, 246v (untitled): Apparuit temporibus nostris ..., the Letter of Lentulus (a medieval invention), so called because the preamble Temporibus Octaviani Augusti Cesaris ..., found here and in many other humanistic manuscripts, names him as the author; he appears here not just as Lentulus but as P. Lentulus;

22 L. Bertalot, *Initia humanistica latina*, Tübingen 2004, II 2, no. 21971, who cites only this manuscript.
23 L. Bertalot, *Initia humanistica*, no. 22697, who knows the speech only from Salzburg St Peter b VIII 15. On the convocation at Bourges see *Monumenta conciliorum generalium seculi decimi quinti*, Basel 1932, III, 504–12; N. Valois, *Le pape et le concile (1418-1450)*, Paris 1909, II, 224–42. That Zabarella was chaplain to the king, or had been, I have not read in any modern work, but the sources name him as a member of the delegation, and it may be that the manuscript at Salzburg attributes the speech to him.
24 E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder: Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, Leipzig 1899, 308**–330**, listed dozens of manuscripts and several editions, edited the text, and discussed the origin and diffusion of the work; his list, which consists mainly of northern-European manuscripts, does not include Madrid Nac. 10119. On 327** he mentions P. as a rarity.
ff. 246v–248r (added in what appears to be a different hand; untitled and undated): *Quantum dedecoris quantumque detrimenti ...*, a letter sent by Frederick III to Charles VII, dated January 9th 1454 in other copies.

As the last of these pieces seems to be a later addition, it is the first of them that provides the *terminus post quem* for the speeches of Cicero’s: March 1452. Possibly the *terminus ante quem* for the whole manuscript is the death in 1458 of Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marquis of Santillana, presumed to have owned it; but though some manuscripts were acquired for him in Italy by Nuño de Guzmán, ‘une sorte d’agent du Marquis’, Nuño’s presence there is not attested after 1446. On the other hand, the Marquis’s second son, who became the first Conde de Tendilla, attended the Council of Mantua in 1459 and may already have been at the court of Pope Nicholas V in 1454. However and whenever Madrid Nac. 10119 was acquired, if any of the other six manuscripts like it are earlier, it is not by much.

**WHO WROTE MADRID NAC. 10119 AND WHERE?**

The scribe, Petrus de C. (f. 137r, at the end of *Pridie*), has not been identified, and no-one who signs his name in that way appears in the standard repertory; but his hand does not look Italian, and in my experience the formula *et sic est finis*, which he uses in two subscriptions (f. 8r *et sic est finis totius Pompeyan* e, f. 21r *et sic est finis istis [sic] Milioniane divine orationis*), is a mark of German scribes.

Nor has it been established where he wrote the manuscript. Albinia de la Mare tentatively assigned Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 255 to the scribe of Laur. Fies. 44, active in Florence round about 1460, but Iacobus Pergulitanus, to whom she assigned Cesena S. 19.2, seems likely to have written it at Cesena about 1453, and her verdict on Linc. Lat. 40 was

---

25 L. Bertalot, *Initia humanistica*, no. 17749, who cites a handful of manuscripts but not this one.
28 M. Schiff, *La bibliothèque*, lxxxvii n. 2; but E. Meneses García, *Correspondencia del Conde de Tendilla I (1508-1509)*, Madrid 1973, 14, suspects that the earlier attestation is a confused version of the later.
30 “New research on humanistic scribes in Florence”, in A. Garzelli, *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento 1440-1525: un primo censimento*, Indici e cataloghi toscani 18-19, 1985, I, 393-600, at 547. Xavier van Binnebeke kindly tells me that she later found a name for the scribe of Fies. 44: Michael Riccius.
‘probably Padua, s. xv²/⁴ (?1440s)’[^32]. The other three may also belong to north-eastern Italy. So too *Vienna 3148*, which has in the margin at the beginning of *Pro Marcello* (f. 8v) the note ‘audita a Cristofero de Vincentinis a me Bonon. N. S. D. O.’. This N. S., whose initials frame the coat of arms on f. 1r, is identified by two entries on the verso of the flyleaf: ‘Liber doctoris Nicolai Schult. canonici Wratislawiensis’ and ‘Reverendus pater dominus Johannes episcopus Wratislawiensis hunc librum cum multis alis monasterio canoniconor regium Sancte Dorothee Wienne ex relictis doctoris Nicolai Scultet canonici et cantoris Wrat. ibidem seporti assignati et illuc traduci curavit anno 1488’. Perhaps he acquired the manuscript at Bologna. Also relevant here is the Venice edition of 1471. If it did not include Poggio’s German speeches but did include the *Commentariolum*, it would have the same content up to *Pro Sestio*, and in the same order, as *Cesena S. 9.2*, *Palermo Naz. IV G 7*, *Parma Palat. 59*, and *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1486*, but after *Pro Archia* it puts *De lege agraria* 3, after *Pro Marcello*, *De lege agraria* 1, and after *Pro Sestio* the rest of its German speeches in an order not attested so far as I know in any manuscript: *De lege agraria* 2, *Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*, *Pro Caecina*, *In Pisonem*, *Pro Rabirio Postumo*. It ends with the spurious exchange of insults between Sallust and Cicero and then the *Catilinarians*. It is signed off with a poem in elegiacs about the printer (Christopher Valdarfer) and Cicero’s oratory; the date *M.CCCC.LXXI*; and the name *LODO. CARBO*. Lodovico Carbone, a pupil of Guarino, taught at Ferrara from 1456 to his death in 1485 except for a year spent at Bologna, 1465–66[^33]. Presumably, besides composing the elegiacs, he prepared the speeches for publication. Nothing is known about his exemplar, but he surely acquired it in north-eastern Italy.

The first page of *Madrid Nac. 10119* has a full though unelaborate border, and a decorated initial opens every speech of Cicero’s and every piece at the end except the letter of 1454, confirmation that it was added later. Unhelpfully described as ‘de tipo humanístico’[^34], the decoration may well be Spanish[^35].


[^33]: *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 19, 1976, 699–703 (L. Paoletti).


[^35]: For this opinion I thank Karl-Georg Pfändtner of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, with whom Stella Panayotova kindly put me in touch. Assuming that it was more likely to be Italian than anything else, I had sampled a dozen or so exhibition catalogues, manuscript catalogues, and volumes on Italian illumination, without finding anything closer than *San Daniele Guarn. 37*, probably written at San Daniele about 1449, for which see G. Mariani Canova,
Before taking leave of the manuscript, let me return to the first thirteen speeches, which it transmits almost entirely as it should. No manuscript that has all thirteen is earlier than the end of the 14th century. In my edition of Pro Quinctio I derived from Vat. Lat. 9305 all the others that have them in the same order. Vat. Lat. 9305 itself has lost its final leaves after Post reditum ad Quirites 17 paene sensit, but descendants show that it must have run to the end of Post reditum in senatu. Three of the manuscripts concerned are French:

Carpentras 358  Paris B. N. Lat. 7780  Paris B. N. Lat. 16226

Paris Lat. 7780 is the only surviving manuscript that has just these thirteen speeches, but an Italian manuscript, Louvain Univ. 119, would be another if it had not perished in 1940, after the I. R. H. T. had photographed the beginning and end of every speech. The other Italian manuscripts concerned, besides Madrid Nac. 10119 and four relatives of it that I have been discussing, are these:

Holkham Hall 389  Vat. Barb. Lat. 142
Modena Est. Lat. 442  Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1510 (excerpts)
Paris B. N. Lat. 7778  Vat. Pal. Lat. 1477
Strängnäs F 7

In my edition of Pro Quinctio I derived all the rest of these from B. N. Lat. 7778 because their texts of the two speeches Post reditum, which conflate in the same way the incomplete texts of Troyes Mun. 552 (s. xiv) and B. L. Harl. 4927, can be seen to have originated in it.

“L’ornato rinascimentale nei codici guarneriani”, in La Guarneriana. I tesori di un’antica biblioteca, San Daniele 1988, 35-46, at 35-6, 104 plate 9, and plate XXIX in L. Casarsa & others, La libreria di Guarnerio d’Artagna, Udine 1991, and two manuscripts that Giovanni Marcanova says he commissioned at Padua, Venice Marc. Lat. IX 6 (3117) in 1440 and VI 160 (2816) in 1449, for which see S. Marcon, “La miniatura nei codici di Giovanni Marcanova”, in La miniatura a Padova dal Medioevo al Settecento, Modena 1999, 481-93, at fig. 5-6. In connexion with Guarn. 37 Mariani Canova speaks of ‘manoscritti decorati “alla moderna”, cioè ancora in chiave tardogotica’, a manner that she describes as ‘un ornato fogliaceo ancora legato ai tradizionali moduli veneto-bolognesi in uso, sia a Venezia sia nel retroterra della Serenissima, nel secondo quarto del Quattrocento’. More precisely, ‘tale tipo d’ornato, in uso ancora negli anni quaranta, scompare quasi completamente, o per lo meno perde il suo moderno, nella seconda metà del decennio successivo’. The likely date of Madrid Nac. 10119 and the character of its text seemed to fit, but I have no eye for decoration.

36 M. D. Reeve, “Recovering annotations”, x-xvii.
37 M. D. Reeve, “Recovering annotations”, xiv. S. Rizzo, “Un codice veronese del Petrarca”, L’Ellisse 1, 2006, 37-44, showed that Troyes 552 was probably written at Verona between
Whether the same relationship holds throughout the thirteen speeches is a question of a kind that I have discussed elsewhere for its methodological interest\textsuperscript{38}. No manuscript older than Petrarch, whose library made it possible to copy all thirteen, presented more than four of them as a block, and any account of the tradition that starts from older manuscripts will break them up into six elements:

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{Pro lege Manilia, Pro Milone, Pro Plancio, Pro Sulla}
    \item \textit{Pro Archia}
    \item \textit{Pro Marcello, Pro Ligario, Pro rege Deiotaro}
    \item \textit{Pro Cluentio}
    \item \textit{Pro Quinctio, Pro Flacco}
    \item \textit{Post reditum ad Quirites, Post reditum in senatu}
\end{itemize}

Perhaps, therefore, the relationship between \textit{B. N. Lat. 7778} and the rest needs investigating in each element. \textit{Pro Milone} may even have to be treated as a seventh element\textsuperscript{39}.

Published evidence does not go far. Only in E. Olechowska’s edition of \textit{Pro Plancio} are the late as well as the early manuscripts assigned to different families\textsuperscript{40}. \textit{Vat. Lat. 9305}, which I regard as the source of her \textit{familia quarta} and \textit{quinta}, was one of the manuscripts that she did not use, but to her \textit{familia quarta} she assigned the three French manuscripts and to her \textit{familia quinta} not just \textit{B. N. Lat. 7778} and \textit{Madrid Nac. 10119}, together with its relatives \textit{Linc. Lat. 40} and \textit{Vat. Reg. Lat. 1486}, but also four other manuscripts that appear in my list: \textit{Louvain Univ. 119, Strängnäs F 7, Vat. Barb. Lat. 142, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1477}. Few, however, of the readings by which she defines this family actually occur in \textit{B. N. Lat. 7778}: just those shared with her \textit{familia quarta} (but at 29 ‘pietas om.’ should be ‘est om.’, and at 39 quidni and quid enim appear in the margin as

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{38} “Dionysius the Periegete in miscellanies”, in E. Crisci & O. Pecere (ed.), \textit{Il codice miscellaneo: tipologie e funzioni = Segno e Testo} 2, 2004, 365-78, at 365-69. See also M. Zaccarelli, \textit{Alcune questioni di metodo nella critica dei testi volgari}, Verona 2012, 150-64. Over 80 short works attributed to Lucian are transmitted, and É. Marquis, “Les textes de Lucien à tradition simple”, \textit{RHT} n. s. 8, 2013, 1-36, draws stemmatic conclusions from their order in various manuscripts.
    \item \textsuperscript{40} Fasc. 25 of the Teubner edition, Leipzig 1981, viii, xii. In her monograph ‘\textit{Pro Cn. Plancio}’ et ‘\textit{Pro C. Rabirio Postumo}’: \textit{la transmission des textes}, Wroclaw 1984, she describes her manuscripts and gives more readings in some parts of the speech, but the monograph is hard to use, because she lists the manuscripts by country without providing an alphabetical table of her symbols.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
corrections for *quin enim*) and 80 *nisi [qui], 81 [aut umquam fuerunt]⁴¹, 95 *aliud* for *illud, 101 ali*<qu>os. Most of these, among them the last four, occur in *Madrid Nac. 10119*, and the last four are errors absent from *Vat. Lat. 9305*; against *Vat. Lat. 9305* they also share 16 [eam] libertatem, et quam for perquam, 18 et alias et *<etiam>* in, 31 [pater ut in dimicacione fortunarum], 38 quae non for non quae, 48 tibi [ipsi], 58 illa tibi for *ita tibi* (*Vat. Lat. 9305* has *i*<sub>a</sub> tibi), 62 si[n] minus, 64 floru[er]it, 69 tibi non for tibi tantum (*Vat. Lat. 9305* has tibi tamen), 75 ipsum [id], 76 ut oppugnator for non oppugnator, 79 sed *[etiam], 83 num vobis for non vobis, 84 non nimium for quod nimium, 85 [me id perdidisse], 98 via[m], 101 *custodiam* [etiam], meae noctis for tuae noctis. The Venice edition of 1471, the only relative of *Madrid Nac. 10119* immediately accessible to me, has a few of the same readings: 16 [eam] libertatem, 18 et alias et *<etiam>* in, 38 quae non, 48 tibi [ipsi], 58 illa tibi, 62 si[n] minus, 76 ut oppugnator, 83 num, 101 *custodiam* [etiam], meae noctis. Besides errors, *B. N. Lat. 7778* also has among its corrections some that must be conjectural, and those made between the lines rather than in the margin recur in *Madrid Nac. 10119* and the edition, for instance 44 *quod <non> eas*, 54 *<a> Plancio*. This sharing of both errors and conjectures makes descent from *B. N. Lat. 7778* very likely, and it would be put beyond doubt if proof could be found that *B. N. Lat. 7778* was copied directly from *Vat. Lat. 9305*, which would entail that any further errors shared with *B. N. Lat. 7778* originated there. On the other hand, *Madrid Nac. 10119* and the edition do not repeat the two most striking errors that Olechowska’s *familia quarta* and *B. N. Lat. 7778* inherited from *Vat. Lat. 9305*, namely 90 *[mortem]* and 103 *licentiam* for *laetitiam*. It follows that they cannot descend entirely from *B. N. Lat. 7778*. One of the other manuscripts that appear in my list, *Modena Est. Lat. 442*, is assigned by Olechowska to her *familia nona*, which she does not define but splits into four smaller *classes*; she puts it in IXd. As it has none of the errors that I have cited except 58 *illa tibi* (with *ita tibi* as a variant), it must again be contaminated if it descends from *B. N. Lat. 7778* at all.

Collation of *Pro lega Manilia* 47-71 (the last third of the speech) yielded much the same result. *Madrid Nac. 10119* shares with *B. N. Lat. 7778* the following errors absent from *Vat. Lat. 9305*: 53 *nobis erant ~, 56 animus for annus, 59 una prope ~, 60 *[inquit], 70 eos maxime ~, ab hoc* for *ex hoc*. On the other hand, it does not share with *Vat. Lat. 9305* and *B. N. Lat. 7778* 47 *commemorasse* for *-are, 61 senatoris* for *-rio, 71 aliquam bonam gratiam [mihi]*. Only the errors at 53 and 56 occur in *Est. Lat. 442*, though at 56 it has *annus* as a variant; but at 55 like *B. N. Lat. 7778* it has in

⁴¹ *B. N. Lat. 7778* originally omitted *aut umquam fuerunt quae ... possint*, but *quae ... possint* was restored in the margin.
the text *putabat* and as a variant the true reading *pudebat*, unambiguously transmitted in *Vat. Lat. 9305*.

On checking *Madrid Nac. 10119* for the 28 innovations of *B. N. Lat. 7778* that I listed in *Pro Quinctio* I find that it has all except 3 *quod* for *quidem*, 71 *cum pio* for *cupio*, and 89 *et edicto* for *ex edicto*\textsuperscript{42}. I have also gone through my collation of *B. N. Lat. 7778* again and found more innovations that *Madrid Nac. 10119* shares: 30 *[cum] Sex. Naevio* (in a passage originally omitted by *saut du même au même*), 50 *hominis* for *homine*, 51 *vi atque* for *vi ac*, 53 *ipse [qu]idem te consuluisti*, 56 *discat atque* for *discat ac*, 82 *tu[m] mittere*, 89 *quamplures* for *complures*, 93 *oportet* for *comportat*. Descent from *B. N. Lat. 7778* in *Pro Quinctio* too would therefore be certain if *B. N. Lat. 7778* could be proved a direct copy of *Vat. Lat. 9305*, but the most I can say is that I found no reason why it should not be. The Venice edition of 1471, as might be expected from my account of it, agrees in almost all the passages that I have just cited with *Madrid Nac. 10119* and even has 3 *quod* for *quidem*. In 1990–91 I checked the text of the speech in a large number of manuscripts, but I made only scrappy notes on those that I judged to be *descripti* or at least *deteriores*. I did, however, record a few errors that *Modena Est. Lat. 442* and *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1477* share with *B. N. Lat. 7778*. The speech has not survived in *Vat. Barb. Lat. 142*.

Except that enterprising work on the transmission of *Pro Archia* is in hand\textsuperscript{43}, I have nothing to report about any of the other speeches. As I have mentioned in connexion with *Pro Plancio* and *Pro Quinctio*, it would help if evidence could be found that *B. N. Lat. 7778* is or is not a direct copy of *Vat. Lat. 9305*.

\textsuperscript{42} I must apologize for some mistakes in the list: at 42 *defatigatur* was not the original reading, the two passages of 62 are in the wrong order, in the second *eiectum* was not the original reading, at 63 the variant *constitutus* appears in the margin, at 79 *inquam* or *unquam* follows *dic*, not *minime*, and at 82 the reading could equally well be *titum satis daret*. At 63 *Madrid Nac. 10119* has *statutus vel constitutus* in the text, and at 79 what ended up as *inquam* appears originally to have been *inquam* or *unquam*.

\textsuperscript{43} J. De Keyser, “The descendants of Petrarch’s *Pro Archia*,” *CQ* n. s. 63, 2013, 292–328. ‘In due time’ he intends to test his stemmatic conclusions against the tradition of *Pro Sulla*. I thank him for giving me information about *Modena Est. Lat. 442* and other manuscripts not discussed here. I am also grateful to Stephen Oakley and the two referees for helpful comments on an earlier draft.