

MANUSCRIPTS OF PLINY'S *NATURAL HISTORY* IN SPAIN*

to Carmen Codoñer
on her 70th birthday

A recent service of Carmen Codoñer's to scholarship is her contribution to a book about one of her distinguished predecessors at Salamanca, Pintianus¹. His notes on Books 2–36 of Pliny's *Natural history*, published in three instalments at Salamanca in 1544–45 and often reprinted², advertised the importance of a 'very old' manuscript (*archetypum vetustissimum, exemplar antiquissimum*) that he borrowed from Toledo Cathedral about 1542 with the help of a canon, Juan de Vergara. This is one of the seven manuscripts currently in Spain that present or once presented a continuous text of the *Natural history*, and it will be the first that I discuss here.

*This article supplements a more comprehensive one forthcoming in the *Revue d' Histoire des Textes*, "The editing of Pliny's *Natural history*". Another supplement, "The Ambrosiani of Pliny's *Natural history*", will appear in the *Atti* of a Colloquio held in October 2005 at the Ambrosiana and the Cattolica. I have several people to thank for their generous help: Peter Linehan for putting me in touch with Francisco Hernández, who inspected material for me in Madrid; Jonathan Alexander for discussion and a copy of his notes on *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1593-94*; Suzanne Reynolds for commenting on a draft; and Robert Ireland for lending me a film of *Le Mans 263*.

¹ J. Signes Codoñer, C. Codoñer, A. Domingo Malvadi, *Biblioteca y epistolario de Hernán Núñez de Guzmán (el Pinciano): una aproximación al humanismo español del siglo XVI*, Madrid 2001.

² I have consulted them in the edition of the *Natural history* printed by Petrus and Iac. Chouet, Geneva 1615.

Madrid Nac. 10042 (formerly Toledo 47.14)

Rezzonicus, who saw this manuscript at Toledo in 1760, said that Pintianus had described it as *sexcentorum annorum*³, but there is no statement to that effect in Pintianus's dedicatory address, first note on Book 2, or first note on Book 16, where it became his only manuscript. In a letter of 1543 to Hieronymus Surita he described it as 250 years old⁴, and the same view was taken, whether independently of Pintianus or not, by the dean and treasurer of Toledo Cathedral when Rezzonicus consulted them: they dated it round about 1290. Undeterred, Rezzonicus pushed it back even beyond what he represented as Pintianus's date, to the 9th century.

When German scholars launched an ambitious programme of collation in the 1820s, Rezzonicus's date for the *Toletanus* led Julius Sillig to give it high priority, and two priests at Toledo were engaged to collate it in full, which they did in 1830-31⁵. *Toledo 47.14* therefore became *T* to editors before migrating in 1869 to the Biblioteca Nacional, where it is 10042⁶. The collation was kept with it at Toledo but has its own shelfmark at the Biblioteca

³ Antonius Joseph Comes a Turre Rezzonici, *Disquisitiones Plinianae*, Parma 1763-67, II, 254-6. Rezzonicus also said that for putting the manuscript at his disposal Pintianus thanked the dedicatee, Francisco de Mendoza y Bovadilla; but for the acknowledgement to Juan de Vergara see Pintianus's first note on Book 16. Domingo in Signes, *Biblioteca* (n. 1), 399-402, 416-7, can be consulted on both these figures.

⁴ Signes, *Biblioteca* (n. 1), 309 no. 27.

⁵ *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII*, Hamburg - Gotha 1851-58, I, x-xiii. Sillig and his associates quickly published in *Isis von Oken* their correspondence about manuscripts of Pliny; for *T* and other manuscripts in Spanish libraries see 22, 1829, 326-7; 23, 1830, 540-4; 24, 1831, 895-900.

⁶ On the migration to Madrid see G. Fink-Errera, "A propos des bibliothèques d'Espagne: tables de concordance", *Scriptorium* 13, 1959, 89-118, at 90 n. 8.

Nacional, 10068⁷; what must be a copy survives among Sillig's material at Dresden as *Dd 203*⁸.

The collators put *T* between the 11th century and the 13th⁹, but perhaps even as they were at work Gustav Haenel's date, the 13th, appeared in print¹⁰. It seems right. *T* is a handsome manuscript written by one scribe in a roundish hand suggestive of Italy or southern France. The text occupies 230 leaves made up entirely of regular *quaterniones* except for ff. 217-22, a *ternio*; f. 2 begins with *non cecilianiana* (*Praef.* 22), and f. 229 ends with *obsidianos. vii.* (36.196). A less formal hand of the 14th century wrote on f. 230r *Iste liber est domini E. archiepiscopi*, an entry that I have seen mentioned in print just once and without discussion¹¹. From the 13th century to the 15th, only two archbishops of Toledo had names that began with E in Latin: Eximius de Luna, consecrated in 1328, and Egidius Albornoz, who after succeeding him in 1338 resigned in 1351 on becoming a cardinal and died in 1367¹². In his first note on Book 16, Pintianus says that Albornoz bequeathed *T* to Toledo Cathedral, but how did he know? Rezzonicus claims to have seen at Toledo a catalogue of 1350 that included it, but no such catalogue seems to have survived¹³. If Albornoz did give *T*

⁷ Ch. Fierville, "Renseignements sur quelques manuscrits latins des bibliothèques d' Espagne", *Archives des Missions Scientifiques* III 5, 1879, 85-110, at 105; L. Rubio Fernández, *Catálogo de los manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España*, Madrid 1984, 364 no. 438; P. Hernández Aparicio, *Inventario general de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional XIV*, Madrid 2000, 321.

⁸ F. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Die Handschriften der königl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden I*, Leipzig 1882, 339.

⁹ Sillig, *C. Plini ... libri XXXVII* (n. 5), I, xii.

¹⁰ *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum qui in bibliothecis Galliae, Helvetiae, Belgii, Britanniae M., Hispaniae, Lusitaniae asservantur*, Leipzig 1830, 994.

¹¹ Fierville, "Renseignements" (n. 7), 105. It is not even mentioned by Hernández Aparicio, *Inventario XIV* (n. 7), 308.

¹² K. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi I-II*, Münster 1913-14, I, 487, II, 252.

¹³ R. Beer, "Handschriftenschätze Spaniens", *SBAW* 129 IV, 1893, 26-8; R. González Ruiz, "La biblioteca capitular toledana en el siglo XIV", *Toletum* 6, 1973, 29-56 (Peter Linehan kindly lent me an offprint).

to Toledo Cathedral, one would not expect to find it either in his bequest to the Colegio de España at Bologna or in an inventory drawn up there in 1369, and indeed neither includes Pliny¹⁴.

At this point, Francisco Hernández came to my aid. A 16th-century document preserved in *Esc. L I 13* has been said to include lists of books given to Toledo Cathedral by each of the two archbishops in question¹⁵. Hernández has consulted it on film and reports this entry from f. 120r, lines 20-1: 'Plinio de mano antiguo, que dio el cardinal don Gil de Albornoz a la yglesia'. He suspects, however, that the person who drafted the entry had no evidence beyond the *ex libris*. He has also inspected *T* itself and detected proof that it belonged to Toledo Cathedral by 1360: partly erased notes entered at beginning and end by Mateos Ferrández, who in that year impounded the possessions of Archbishop Vasco on the orders of Pedro I¹⁶. On the other hand, he observes that no copy of Pliny appears in an inventory drawn up by a new treasurer when he took office between October 1338 and June 1339¹⁷. He concludes that all the signs point to Gil de Albornoz.

¹⁴ M.-H. Laurent, *Fabio Vigili et les bibliothèques de Bologne au début du XVI^e siècle* (Studi e Testi 105), Rome 1943, 175-9; A. García y García, "El legado de libros del Cardenal Gil de Albornoz al colegio de España de Bolonia", *Studi Senesi* 84, 1972, 7-43, at 26-39. González Ruiz, "*Biblioteca capitular*" (n. 13), 44-5, mentions Albornoz, but not in any way that helps. In a will of 1248, an archbishop of Toledo, Juan de Medina de Pomar, wrote "Recognoscimus nos teneri ad restitutionem librorum ecclesie Burgensis, scilicet Plinii ..."; see F. J. Hernández - P. Linehan, *The Mozarabic cardinal: the life and times of Gonzalo Pérez Gudiel*, Florence 2004, 434. González Ruiz, however, in *Hombres y libros de Toledo (1086-1300)*, Madrid 1997, 216, prefers to regard it as a manuscript of the Younger Pliny's letters.

¹⁵ J. M. Millás Vallicrosa, *Las traducciones orientales en los manuscritos de la Biblioteca Catedral de Toledo*, Madrid 1942, 21, 37.

¹⁶ C. L. - H. M. Wilkins, *Pero López de Ayala, Cronica del rey don Pedro*, Madison 1985, 118-9. Cf. A. García y García - R. González, *Catálogo de los manuscritos jurídicos medievales de la Catedral de Toledo*, Rome - Madrid 1970, 210; J. Janini - R. González, *Catálogo de los manuscritos litúrgicos de la Catedral de Toledo*, Toledo 1977, 122, 194; González Ruiz, *Hombres* (n. 14), 483-5 no. 25, 724-5 no. 46.

¹⁷ L. Pérez de Guzmán, "Un inventario del siglo XIV de la catedral de Toledo", *BRAH* 89, 1926, 373-419; most of the manuscripts, if not

In *T* the *Natural history* is preceded by a *summarium* (a brief statement of what each book contains), Suetonius's *Vita*, and two biographical extracts from Jerome; it ends in the left-hand column of f. 230r with the *incipit* of Book 37, written across the whole page. These were the original contents of *Paris B. N. Lat. 6797* (s. xii), known as *d*, and the textual resemblance between *T* and *d* already struck the Spanish collators¹⁸. Indeed, it has often been said, and sometimes argued, that *T* descends from *d*. Some variants reported from *d* by the Budé editor of Book 35 imply the independence of *T*, but the reports are false¹⁹. Though the scribe of *T* repaired some omissions, I noticed only two of any length that could be used in a stemmatic argument: 1.6.7 *Meotis et gentes circa Meotum*, 9.82 *attollit e mari sesquipedanea fere cornua que ab hiis nomen traxit*. Strangely, *d* has the former passage in different ink, though probably not in a different hand; it has the latter as a separate *capitulum*. At *Praef.* 18 for *quae et T* has *quaeque*, probably caused by the obscurity of the superscript ampersand in *d*; and at *Praef.* 29 *T* omits *ut nomen ... inde natum*, easily done after *tantum* but very easily if the exemplar was *d*, which has each *-tum* at the beginning of a line. Later entries in the margin of *T* are confined to *notabilia* such as *Beculonenses qui et Barchinonenses* at 3.23 (f. 26r), the longer of them arranged in triangles.

The small and still controversial family of which *d* is the oldest member and *T* another seems to descend from a corrected relative of *D + V* (*Vat. Lat. 3861 + Leiden Voss. Lat. F 61*, s. viii/ix) and *F* (*Leiden Lips. 7*, s. ix¹), but at least five of the other six manuscripts that I shall discuss here belong to a more prolific branch of the tradition: they descend fundamentally from *E* (*Paris B. N. Lat. 6795*, s. ix/x). An ancestor of *E* had already lost 27.113–24 and 28.39–51, and by the 11th century *E* itself had lost a leaf or more in no fewer than ten places. Furthermore, the early corrector who repaired another omission had failed to include 6.148–52. In consequence, thirteen passages were missing:

all, appear in two sections of the inventory, 390–1, 397–403. Hernández supplies the date, more precise than the one given by Pérez de Guzmán.

¹⁸ Sillig, *C. Plini ... libri XXXVII* (n. 5), I, xii.

¹⁹ "Editing", in the section "d and its relatives".

3.38-70	25.117-41	30.107-19
6.148-52	26.64-84	31.49-62
21.161-22.65	27.113-24	everything after 32.149
23.37-54	28.39-51	
23.166-24.7	28.73-182	

Subsequently, *E* lost another leaf at the end, so that it now ends in 32.135; but that loss is irrelevant here. With a single exception, the family of *E* consists of manuscripts that came in three successive waves.

(1) Six northern-European manuscripts of s. xi²-xii², probably related to one another and not connected to *E* by separate lines of descent, simply reproduced the defective state of *E*. Two of them break off before 32.149, at 31.49. Two others were supplemented.

(2) Still in the 12th century, and still in northern Europe, a sub-family of (1) emerges that restores the last five of the ten passages lost from *E* itself (26.64-84 and the last four of the thirteen passages listed above), so that the text continues not indeed to the end, 37.205, but to 37.199 *primum pondere*. That happens to be the point reached by the fullest manuscript on the other side of the tradition, *F*; but neither *F* nor any other manuscript outside the sub-family shares its omission of 34.83-96. At least one member had reached Italy by 1350, when Petrarch bought it at Mantua: *Paris B. N. Lat. 6802* (s. xiii²), probably written in Paris. A further characteristic of this sub-family is that after 29.77 it interpolates a long passage about the therapeutic uses of a dead vulture; in the tradition of the *Natural history*, the passage first appears in the margin of the oldest witness to version (1), *Berlin Ham. 517* (s. xi²).

(3) In Italy by 1389, the date of *Milan Ambros. E 24 inf.*, the process of supplementation begun in (2) had encompassed not only 34.83-96 but all the passages missing from *E* except 28.39-51, already missing from its exemplar; and the only substantial passages still missing were 36.62-6, 37.111-8, and the end beyond 37.199 *primum pondere*, all of these missing from *F*.

Two of the manuscripts that concern me here are uncomplicated witnesses, *Esc. Q 1 4* to version (2), *Madrid Nac. 10443* to version (3).

Esc. Q 1 4

This manuscript, Italian, can be identified from the first word of f. 2, *horis* (*Praef.* 18), and the last word of the penultimate leaf, *gemma-* (37.196), with a manuscript recorded in the papal inventory of 1369 from Avignon²⁰. I doubt if it is much older. The *Vita*, the Preface, and Book 1, run to f. 14r, and the rest begins on f. 15, numbered f. i in an old foliation. The policy of starting most books on a new quire entailed irregular quiring. Lest the space in between should give the impression that something was missing, notes were added such as this after Book 7: *Nichil defficit in tribus columpnis sequentibus. Sequitur liber octavus*. A note after 6.144 *interfluente* at the foot of f. liii v, *Dimicte sequentem cartam recipe aliam*, is an incomplete direction for reading ff. liv-lvii in the right order, ff. lv, liv, lvii, lvi. Neat corrections throughout, albeit written in a hand like the scribe's, came from the ed. Rom. 1470 or a descendant.

Madrid Nac. 10443

This manuscript belonged to Íñigo López de Mendoza (1398–1458), first Marquis of Santillana²¹. A non-Italian scribe who uses the Byzantine form of capital *M*, found in Italian manuscripts of about 1410–60, wrote it on paper in three sections: *Vita* to Book 10, rounded off by *Finito isto sit laus et gloria Christo. Amen. S* (ff. 1–132¹², 133–42¹⁰, 143–6⁴; ff. 145–6 blank); Books 14–25, rounded off by *Finito isto sit laus et gloria Christo* (ff. 147–326¹²; ff. 323–6 blank); Books 26–37, rounded off by *Plinius Naturalis historie*

²⁰ M. Faucon, *La librairie des papes d' Avignon* (Bibl. des Écoles Françaises d' Athènes et de Rome 43), Paris 1886–87, I, 176 no. 965; F. Ehrle, *Historia bibliothecae Romanorum pontificum tum Bonifatianae tum Avenionensis* I, Rome 1890, 361 no. 967.

²¹ M. Schiff, *La bibliothèque du Marquis de Santillane* (Bibl. de l' École des Hautes Études 153), Paris 1905, 145.

explicit (ff. 327-458¹², 459-68¹⁰, 469-75 loose). The watermark that I noted from ff. 145, 326, and 475, which resembles Briquet 3528 and 3540 ('Char'), is unhelpful. The second leaf begins with *Praef. 12 mee quidem temeritati*, and the penultimate leaf ends with 37.195 *varie maculis*. At first sight, the last words of the text look unusual, but they turn out to be words that the scribe had omitted from 37.195-6, *multiplici ductu ... ad omnium observacionem*, and they follow 199 *pondere primum*, the usual end except that the usual order is *primum pondere*. The structure of the manuscript does not reveal whether it ever included Books 11-13. The only other detail of note is that the tables of *capitula* for Books 24 and 25 come at the end of their book, as the scribe points out: f. 297v ... *tabula presentis libri in fine reperietur*, f. 309v *Hec est tabula precedentis libri*, f. 310v *Tabula presentis libri in fine reperietur*, f. 321v (after *Finito ... Christo*) *Sequitur tabula precedentis libri*. There is no sign that anyone ever read the text.

The next three manuscripts are contaminated beyond the contamination that already underlies (2) and (3), but each in a different way.

Esc. R I 5

This manuscript, written by several Italian hands, presents in its illuminated initials the earliest cycle of illustration, which Lilian Armstrong has discussed in an important article²². She assigned it to Bologna round about 1300 and reproduced its first leaf, where the second column opens with *Praef. 5 verius*. Once again, there is a match in an old inventory: Ameil de Lautrec, bishop of Castres and governor of the Marca Anconitana, owned

²² "The illustration of Pliny's *Historia naturalis*: manuscripts before 1430", *JWCI* 46, 1983, 19-39, at 19 n. 2, 22-6; see also G. Z. Zanichelli, "Ugolino da Mantova", in M. Bollati, *Dizionario biografico dei miniatori italiani*, Milan 2004, 969-70.

such a manuscript at his death in 1337²³. The quiring, irregular for the same reason as in *Esc. Q I 4*, accounts for the loss of whole books: Book 11 between f. 84 and f. 85 (though f. 85 opens with its *explicit*), Books 25-6 between f. 164 and f. 165. Of Book 20 all that survives between f. 139 and f. 140 is the end from 263 *-pitias replet*.

In Books 27-37, the manuscript is an uncontaminated witness to version (2), though in Books 35-6 it omits many passages, the longest of them 35.85-119. It shares these omissions with another Italian manuscript of the 14th century, *Vat. Lat. 1954*, where some of them were repaired²⁴. Fundamentally, Books 22-4 tell the same story. A 15th-century annotator marked the omission of 23.37-54 (*hic deficiunt septem capitula, in quibus continentur variae vinorum medicinae ante quam dicatur de aceto*); the omission of 23.166-24.7, marked by an earlier annotator, was repaired in the 14th century; and the same annotator marked the omission of 22.48-65 after *precipue senum* (*Usque ad cap. 13 Pigris ab insigni ab isto cap. Et anchuse radix deficiunt columne 2 et linee 19*). Only this last omission is at all puzzling. *E* has lost 21.161-22.65, and f. 149 of *Esc. R I 5* opens at the point in 22.65 where *E* resumes; but 21.161-22.48 was written by the original scribe. Much the same things happen in *Vat. Lat. 1954*: a note after 23.36 says *Hic deficiunt quasi quatuor columpne; incipiunt vino aluntur vires et finiunt ibi plurimum fotu medetur*; 23.166-24.7 was restored later; and though a note at 21.161 says *Ab hinc usque ad capitulum de pigride deest in alio libro et ibi incipit xxii*, the original hand continues to 22.48 *precipue senum*. In the earlier books, too, both manuscripts contain supplements in their original text: 3.38-70, 6.148-52. A significant difference is that before 23.54 *plurimum fotu medetur Esc. R I 5* has in its text the interpolation *acetum*, a later addition to *Vat. Lat. 1954*.

²³ M. H. Jullien de Pommerol - J. Monfrin, *Bibliothèques ecclésiastiques au temps de la papauté d'Avignon II*, Paris 2001, 136 no. 337.8 B 27, 140 no. 337.8 C 43.

²⁴ D. Detlefsen, "Die Naturalis historia des Plinius" (Jahresbericht), *Philologus* 28, 1869, 284-337, at 299, mentioned the omission of 35.85-119 from *Vat. Lat. 1954*.

In the Preface, *Esc. R I 5* betrays contamination more clearly than *Vat. Lat. 1954* by frequent conflation:

7 <*alius vel*> *iunium* <*nivium al. vel iunium
nimium*>
7 *mutuandum* <*vel nuntiandum*>
11 <*vel verum diis*> *verecundis*
12 <*vel causus*> *causas*
20 <*vel aut fide vel*> *a fine*
24 *velut* <*vel ut vel*>
31 *potuit* <*vel posse*>.

Serious damage to *E* in the Preface, combined with editorial silence about the readings of version (1), makes it hard to name innovations of version (2), but I have no doubt that a copy of version (2) underlies the contaminated texts of *Esc. R I 5* and *Vat. Lat. 1954*. Early in Book 5, they both have the innovations that I have reported from versions (1) and (2)²⁵.

In the Preface, *Esc. R I 5* has notable corrections by an informal hand perhaps still of the 14th century, written in a lightish-brown ink now somewhat rubbed or faded. After § 6 *similis est* it has *in quo utique vituperatio uniuscuiusque continetur*, part of a gloss that occurs in *E* and the other main witnesses after § 7 *stili nasum*; a correction in *d* gave rise to the misplacement, found not only in two descendants of *d*, *Valenciennes 319* (s. xiv) and *Vat. Lat. 1953* (s. xiv/xv), but also, through contamination, in two witnesses to version (2), *Paris B. N. Lat. 6802* and *6803* (both of s. xiii²)²⁶. Two variants that must have originated as conjectures, § 14 *iter* for *inter-* and § 22 *tuliana* for *ciciliana*, have been printed by recent editors from other sources. Marginal notes on f. 17r and f. 51v cite ‘Cato’ and Mela; on Book 3 place names in Spain, France, and Italy, are picked out, in Book 7 Saguntum; on 2.232 there is the note *et in Valderoures prope Dertusam fons optimi saporis* (f. 22r), on an interpolation after 7.211 from 18.320-5 (*Quia divus affatim dicta sunt ... hec erit*

²⁵ “*Editing*”, in the section on *E* and the section “32.149-37.199 in a large family”.

²⁶ In “*Editing*” I describe what happened in *d*.

ratio lunaris) *Non video quomodo istud c. possit hic locari* (f. 61r), on Book 8 *Canis sevitia mitigatur si homo humi sedeat* with a drawing of a dog (f. 67v) and *Porci non vivunt in Africa. Ideo Sarraceni forte non comedunt porcos* with a drawing of a pig (f. 70r), on Book 24 *Ros marinum aliter dicitur anthos in vulgari nostro romani* (the vernacular is Catalan).

Esc. VI 14

Esc. VI 14, also Italian, has been assigned to the end of the 14th century²⁷, but it too, like *Esc. Q I 4*, can be identified with a manuscript recorded in the papal inventory of 1369: the second leaf opens with *-curitatem* (*Praef. 27*), and the penultimate leaf ends with *oculo he-* (37.187)²⁸. Indeed, a date even before 1300 seems possible to me, because there is little space between words and altogether the pages look uninvitingly crowded. Sadly, the manuscript has suffered damage. Originally it consisted entirely of *quaterniones* except for ff. 8-13, a *ternio* that completes Book 1, and ff. 53-6, a *binio* that completes Book 7 (space follows the end of the book in the second column of f. 56v). It now opens, however, with *-curitatem*, because the first leaf is missing; ff. 3-7 should precede f. 2; and the first leaf of Book 2 is missing between f. 13 and f. 14, which opens with 2.30 *subtilitate nosci potuerunt*.

The reason for the two losses becomes plain when one goes further: a vandal cut out the illumination. It must have been elaborate on the recto of those leaves to judge from the initials of each book, where it extended to the lower margin and often survives just there. Only through an oversight can the initial of Book 5 have survived entire; like the initial of Book 2 in *Esc. R I 5*, it represents fortified cities divided from one another by rivers. Something led the vandal to spare the herbalist of Book 22 even though the extension to the lower margin succumbed. Had

²⁷ G. Antolín, *Catálogo de los códices latinos de la Real Biblioteca del Escorial*, Madrid 1910-23, IV, 171.

²⁸ Faucon, *Librairie* (n. 20), I, 154 no. 694; Ehrle, *Historia* (n. 20), 341 no. 696.

the full cycle of illumination survived, it would probably have made *Esc. VI 14* famous. The damage occurred after 1627 if the manuscript has been correctly identified with one then owned by the Conde-Duque de Olivares: 'Plinii Secundi Novocomensis historiae naturalis, elegantissimus codex, in membranulis ex bibliotheca Ducis de Calabria, fol. regio, M 1'²⁹. I shall come back to this identification.

The text of *Esc. VI 14* is contaminated in two different ways. From at latest 24.154 it reproduces version (2), but it is complete in Books 21-4. It omits 3.38-70 and 6.148-52, but in the early part of Book 5 it does not share the errors of either version (2) or version (1), and at 9.106 it has *praecipue ... rubri*, which they both omit. Evidently, then, it falls into two sections that descend from *E* by different routes, and in at least one section the text had been supplemented. Can they be defined? I started from the catchwords. Up to f. 152 they are placed in the centre of the lower margin except on f. 56, where there is a clear break in composition, and on f. 144, where Book 19 ends at the end of a quire; at both these points, they are placed towards the right-hand corner. The one on f. 160 succumbed to the vandal who mutilated the illumination at the beginning of Book 22. From f. 168 to f. 232 they are placed in the right-hand corner. The last two, on ff. 240 and 248, are placed in the centre. With the new placing from f. 160 or f. 168 goes another change. Up to f. 152, the last page of each quire also has the note *cor.*, which recurs in the inner margin of f. 159r beside 21.155; and up to that point the text was indeed corrected. Corrections are then absent, except for some probably made by the scribe at the time of writing, until the last two quires, where *cor.* appears once more on f. 248. Where the change of source is likely to have occurred depends on which of these three features provides the best evidence, if any of them provides any at all: the apparent break in composition after Book 19; the new placing of catchwords after f. 152 or f. 160,

²⁹ G. de Andrés, "Historia de la biblioteca del Conde-Duque de Olivares y descripción de sus códices", *Cuadernos bibliográficos* 28, 1972, 131-42, and 30, 1973, 5-73, at 59-60 no. 1024.

from which it would follow that the change occurred somewhere between the latter part of Book 20 and the middle of Book 23; or *cor.* at 21.155.

As I had done no collation hereabouts, I was going to leave the answer in suspense, but it came to hand from outside the manuscript. Only one other descendant of *E* has so far been identified that does not attest any of versions (1) – (3): *Paris B. N. Lat. 6796A* (s. xii), known as *e*. It consists of 13 regular *quaterniones* (ff. 1-103; f. 81 bis); on the last page the text originally filled both columns and ran to 21.155 *modicis*, but a different hand of much the same date appended two further lines, up to *addi oporteat*. If *e* had stopped at *modicis*, one would have assumed that the rest of it was simply lost; but I cannot account satisfactorily for the extension. If the exemplar had continued to *addi oporteat* but no further, one would have expected the scribe of *e* to adjust the spacing and avoid overrunning the column. A marginal note in mid column at 20.250 (f. 99va), *cucumeris. Hic incipit xxi^{us} quaternus et ultimus*, looks at first sight as though it referred to the exemplar, but the hand seemed to me considerably later (s. xiv?); certainly the note is not true of *E*, the immediate or remoter source of *e*. Whatever the meaning of the note, though, and whatever the reason for the two-line extension, it is alongside 21.155 *addi oporteat* that *Esc. VI 14* has its one instance of *cor.* in mid page. The first section of *Esc. VI 14* must therefore descend from *e* or the same source, probably *e* itself, because 5.100 *montana ... civitas mira*, which the scribe of *Esc. VI 14* omitted, occupies the last two lines of a column in *e* (f. 27va). In *Esc. VI 14* Book 21 opens with a table of *capitula*, but an annotator marked the beginning of the book itself and wittily commented *Iste rubrice sunt xx libri; ideo erubescat scriptor*. The mistake already occurs in *e*. The relationship between *e* and *Esc. VI 14* makes me wonder if it is a coincidence that according to my notes the 21st quire of *Esc. VI 14*, admittedly by no means the last in the present state of the manuscript, begins near the end of Book 20 (f. 153). Is its first word by any chance 20.250 *cucumeris*?

As all three manuscripts at the Escorial attest version (2) in Book 29, they include after § 77 the interpolation about the

vulture, but 15th-century notes cancel it in *R I 5* and *VI 14*³⁰. The passage is accurately demarcated in *VI 14*, where the note says *Vacat quia ista verba non sunt Plinii*; less accurately in *R I 5*, where it says *Vacat* and *Ista verba non sunt Plinii*. The annotator in both places looks the same to me, but I have no idea where the two manuscripts could have met in the 15th century, or who could have annotated both at that date if they did not meet.

Two manuscripts remain, both of them later than those so far discussed and both written for the Aragonese court at Naples. The second will bring me to a more famous manuscript written for the same court.

Madrid Nac. Res. 5

Elegantly written and lavishly decorated, this manuscript has a frontispiece with a full border: white vine-stem decoration harbours parrots and rabbits and at the foot of the page frames the Aragonese arms in version 14³¹, surmounted by a crown. If the crown is original, the manuscript belonged from the outset to Fernando I; if it was superimposed on a cardinal's hat, first to his son Giovanni³². As De Marinis included two manuscripts at Madrid in his volumes on the Aragonese library at Naples³³, I do not understand why he missed *Res. 5*, because the coat of arms had been mentioned not only by Rezzonicus but also by J.

³⁰ M. Fiorilla, *Marginalia figurati nei codici di Petrarca*, Florence 2005, 48 n. 114.

³¹ T. De Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d' Aragona*, Milan 1947-52, II, plate B at the front.

³² A. C. de la Mare, "The Florentine scribes of Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon", in C. Questa - R. Raffaelli (ed.), *Il libro e il testo*, Urbino 1984, 243-93, at 249, 293. When I saw the manuscript in December 2005, I had not yet noticed this complication and therefore did not peer at the crown.

³³ *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 10, 61.

Domínguez Bordona: 'Bello ejemplar humanístico, con escudo de los reyes de Nápoles'³⁴.

The composition is regular enough: i-78¹⁰, 79-310⁸, 311-16⁶, 317-19 + two stubs + 1⁶⁷; 37 lines up to f. 62, then 36. Not so the distribution of *notabilia* in red, dense up to f. 63r, on ff. 111r-29r and f. 135, and from f. 247v, but absent elsewhere. The title reads *Plinii Secundi Novocomensis Naturalis historiae liber sextus decimus finit, incipit decimus septimus*, but the other volume has not come to light. As the numbering of books did not always take account of Book 1 (a table of contents for the rest), a copy of Books 2-17 might have appeared to contain Books 1-16 and the next volume been made to begin with Book 17 through a misapprehension, but I do not know of any manuscript that ends with Book '16'; *British Library Add. 11994*, written at Florence by Giovan Marco Cinico for Antonello Petrucci, secretary to Fernando I³⁵, begins with Book '1' and ends with Book 17, but the numbering is correct from *Incipit liber decimus* (f. 124v).

Documents from the Aragonese court twice mention a separate copy of volume 2. On April 6th 1474 'Johanne de Gigante' was paid for 'lo miniar e capletrar ... del segon volum del Plini ...', and between 1501 and 1504 a copy of volume 2 was sold to Cardinal Georges I d'Amboise³⁶. The latter has been identified with *Paris B. N. Lat. 6798* (s. xii), which contains Books 16-37³⁷. Could *Madrid Nac. Res. 5* not be the former? In all likelihood, as De Marinis argued³⁸, 'Johanne' in the name of the illuminator

³⁴ *Disquisitiones* (n. 3), II, 258; *Manuscritos con pinturas*, Madrid 1933, I, 315 no. 814.

³⁵ A. C. de la Mare, in A. M. Brown - A. C. de la Mare, "Bartolomeo Scala's dealings with booksellers, scribes and illuminators", *JWCI* 39, 1976, 237-45, at 243.

³⁶ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 263 no. 524, 203 no. 77.

³⁷ F. Lehoux, "Un manuscrit des rois aragonais de Naples et des archevêques de Rouen", *BEC* 101, 1940, 229-33, at 233; De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 213-4; R. W. Hunt, "A manuscript from the library of Coluccio Salutati", in A. S. Osley (ed.), *Calligraphy and palaeography: essays presented to Alfred Fairbank on his 70th birthday*, London 1965, 75-9, at 77, where Ferdinand III should be Frederick III.

³⁸ *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 62.

was a slip for ‘Joachim(o) de Johanne’, because Gioacchino de Gigantibus, to give him the name that he is usually known by, appears in Aragonese documents from 1471 to 1480³⁹. Parrots were a speciality of Gioacchino’s.

The scribe may also be recorded. From 1470 to 1473 Aragonese documents refer to a copy that was being written by Antonio Sinibaldi, illuminated by Cola Rapicano, and bound by Athenasio Passaro⁴⁰. It has been suggested that they were referring to *Esc. h I 3* and 2, an Aragonese copy of Landino’s Tuscan version, which he dedicated to Fernando I⁴¹; but he did not begin it till 1474 or finish it till 1475⁴². Perhaps, therefore, all the documents of 1470–74 refer to a single copy of the Latin text and Cola Rapicano illuminated only the first volume. Collaboration between him and Gioacchino would not be surprising, because they collaborated on two manuscripts now in *Paris, B. N. Lat. 5827* and *12946*⁴³. In any event, the copy of volume 2 may well be *Madrid Nac. Res. 5*. If the copy of volume 2 was indeed volume 2 of the copy referred to in the documents of 1470–73, then the scribe of *Madrid Nac. Res. 5* ought to be Antonio Sinibaldi, whose copy has been described as lost⁴⁴. To the best of my knowledge,

³⁹ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 61–2; J. Ruysschaert, “Miniaturistes ‘romains’ à Naples”, in T. De Marinis, *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d’Aragona: Supplemento*, Verona 1969, 1.261–74; F. Pasut, “Gioacchino di Giovanni de’ [sic] Gigantibus”, in Bollati, *Dizionario* (n. 22), 265–7.

⁴⁰ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 253 no. 327, 255 no. 391; 251 nos. 293 and 296, 253 no. 336, 255–6 no. 392, 258–9 no. 449, 261 no. 491; 261 no. 501.

⁴¹ G. Pugliese Carratelli, “Due epistole di Giovanni Brancati”, *Atti dell’Accademia Pontaniana* n. s. 3, 1949–50, 179–93, at 180–1; G. Toscano, “Rapicano, Cola”, in Bollati, *Dizionario* (n. 22), 893–6, at 895. For a description see De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 130–1.

⁴² R. Fubini, *Quattrocento fiorentino: politica diplomazia cultura*, Pisa 1996, 303–32, at 313–9, 328–9.

⁴³ Pasut, “*Gioacchino*” (n. 39), 266; Toscano, “*Rapicano*” (n. 41), 895.

⁴⁴ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 54; A. C. de la Mare, “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), Florence 1985, I, 393–600, at 487.

Madrid Nac. Res. 5 has not been illustrated in print, but many of Sinibaldi's manuscripts have⁴⁵, for instance one dated 1473 or 1474⁴⁶.

Madrid Nac. Res. 5 runs to 37.203 *ambitu mari*, and all passages omitted up to that point by *E* or *F* are present, but at 37.114 it conflates the authentic text with the passage of Isidore used in version (2) for bridging the gap seen in *F*. When it was produced, sources independent of *E* had been available in Italy for a generation: an augmented relative of *d* known as *L* (*Florence Laur. 82.1-2*, s. xii/xiii), which runs to 37.199 *desinens nitor*, and a relative of *E* still waiting to be used by an editor, *Florence Laur. Edili 165* (a. 1433, Basel), which runs to 37.203 *ambitu mari*. I have not tried to work out whether *L* as well as *Edili 165* contributed to its text. My excuse is not indifference but a strong suspicion that the work should be carried out instead on *Paris B. N. Lat. 6804*, a copiously annotated *chartaceus* of roughly the same date that Albinia de la Mare believed to have been written at Naples⁴⁷; on flyleaves it has the *ex libris* of Antonello Petrucci and the date 1473⁴⁸. Throughout the two passages of Book 37 that I have collated, §§ 93-8 and §§ 199-203, it agrees with *Madrid Nac. Res. 5*, and they share an error that I have not found elsewhere, § 95 *et[iam]*.

In the tradition of the *Natural history*, as in many another, roads lead sooner or later to the Bibliothèque Nationale, where a few months ago I had the agreeable surprise of encountering Carmen. If only they still led as quickly to manuscripts as to microfilms! Back, however, to Spain.

Valencia Univ. 691

In May 1987, when I visited the University Library at Valencia, I seem to have had time on my hands, because I made

⁴⁵ De la Mare, "New research" (n. 44), 484-7.

⁴⁶ J. Kirchner, *Scriptura latina libraria*, München 1955, plate 52a; B. L. Ullman, *The origin and development of humanistic script*, Rome 1960, plate 65.

⁴⁷ I have consulted her files, deposited in the Bodleian.

⁴⁸ De Marinis, *Supplemento* (n. 39), 1.242-3.

detailed notes on this unusual manuscript even though the transmission of Pliny did not yet interest me. I think it must have been the occasion when the manuscript of Livy that I went to see turned out to have been lent for an exhibition – in London. I have not seen the Pliny since, but my notes supply me with almost everything that I need here except readings that might have indicated the character of its text.

First, the shelfmark. None appears in Gutiérrez's catalogue, where 1803 is just the number of the entry⁴⁹. Older works give it as 151 or 787, but it has been 691 since 1979, when all the shelfmarks were changed⁵⁰. The first person to publish the current shelfmark was probably Rubio⁵¹.

The manuscript has fascinated art historians because it consists of 64 leaves at various stages of illumination. In particular, f. 1r and f. 3r are both unfinished frontispieces, each in a different style⁵²; f. 3r has been associated with Giovanni Todeschino and dated about 1492-93⁵³, f. 1r with either Cola Rapicano or Cristoforo Majorana⁵⁴ and variously dated 1470-73⁵⁵, close to Cola's death in 1488, 'verso gli inizi degli anni ottanta', or about

⁴⁹ M. Gutiérrez del Caño, *Catálogo de los manuscritos existentes en la biblioteca universitaria de Valencia*, Valencia 1913, III, 38-9.

⁵⁰ G. Toscano, "La librairie des rois d' Aragon à Naples", *Bull. du Bibliophile*, 1993 fasc. 2, 265-83, at 282.

⁵¹ *Catálogo* (n. 7), 569 no. 695.

⁵² Gutiérrez, *Catálogo* (n. 49), III, plate XX; De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 129-30; IV, plates 193-4; J. J. G. Alexander, *The painted page: Italian Renaissance book illumination 1450-1550*, München - New York 1994, plate 106; T. D' Urso, "Un manifesto del 'classicismo' aragonese: il frontespizio della *Naturalis historia* di Plinio il Vecchio della Biblioteca di Valenza", *Prospettiva* 105, 2002, 29-50, plates 3, 14, 17.

⁵³ Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 209-11; D' Urso, "Manifesto" (n. 52).

⁵⁴ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 146, and Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 209-10; D' Urso, "Manifesto" (n. 52), 29, 46 n. 10.

⁵⁵ De Marinis inferred this date from the documents cited above (n. 40) in connexion with *Madrid Nac. Res. 5*. It goes back to G. Mazzatinti, *La biblioteca dei re d' Aragona in Napoli*, Rocca S. Casciano 1897, 152 no. 484, who assigned all the illumination in the manuscript to Cola. Gutiérrez, *Catálogo* (n. 49), III, 39, followed suit.

20 years before f. 3r⁵⁶. De Marinis called f. 3r 'il documento artistico più interessante fra i codici della biblioteca Aragonese', and D'Urso has studied its imagery in detail. Beyond that, little has been said about the contents of the manuscript, and some of that little is wrong⁵⁷.

It consists mostly of bifolia (ff. 1-8, 19-64), none out of place but many inverted. The first four present two copies of the same text, which match leaf for leaf but not page for page: ff. 1 + 2 = ff. 3 + 4, ff. 5 + 6 = ff. 7 + 8. My notes do not tell me which of ff. 5 + 6 and ff. 7 + 8 go with which of ff. 1 + 2 and ff. 3 + 4, nor whether it is ff. 1 + 2 or ff. 3 + 4 that go with ff. 9-64 – in other words, whether the two spare bifolia are earlier or later than the rest. I did not record any difference between the scribe of ff. 1 + 2 and the scribe of ff. 3 + 4, and whether they differ has been controversial; the answer may turn out to be that they are the same but years intervened. Stubs reveal that each of ff. 9-18 is one leaf of a bifolium: four stubs precede ff. 9-12, three ff. 13-15, three ff. 16-18. Each bifolium in this section must have had the beginning of a book on its other leaf, and the enclosing of some in others must be a step taken for convenience after their mutilation, not a true reflection of their original position. Laborious calculation, which I carried out with the help of the ed. Ven. 1472 because it seemed likely to have much the same amount of text laid out in much the same way, showed that the original manuscript consisted of 56 *quiniones* and whatever was needed for the end of Book 37, as follows:

ff. 1 + 10	<i>Praef.</i> 1-11, 1.13.1-15.12
ff. 24 + 27	1.35.59-37.46, 2.1-12
[f. 64 +] f. 67	4.33-45
[f. 75 +] f. 76	5.5-17
f. 82 [+ f. 89]	5.73-85
f. 104 [+ f. 107]	6.185-98

⁵⁶ Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 209-10; D' Urso, "Manifesto" (n. 52), 29; D' Urso, *ibid.*, 46 n. 10.

⁵⁷ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 129; de la Mare, "Cardinal Giovanni" (n. 32), 292 no. 6; P. Cherchi - T. De Robertis, "Un inventario di libri della biblioteca aragonese", *IMU* 33, 1990, 108-347, at 217; D' Urso, "Manifesto" (n. 52), 46 n. 10.

[f. 124 +] f. 127	8.37-50
[f. 142 +] f. 149	9.97-110
f. 155 [+ f. 156]	9.178-86
[f. 171 +] f. 180	11.125-39
[f. 191 +] f. 200	12.131-35
[f. 201 +] f. 210	13.141-14.11
ff. 211 + 220	14.11-28, 15.1-13
ff. 221 + 230	15.13-27, 16.1-11
ff. 243 + 248	16.188-202, 17.1-13
ff. 263 + 268	17.204-15, 18.1-11
ff. 294 + 297	19.1-13, 42-55
ff. 303 + 308	19.123-37, 20.1-11
ff. 324 + 327	20.227-41, 20.264-21.9
ff. 342 + 349	22.1-11, 88-100
ff. 355 + 356	22.160-23.10
ff. 362 + 369	23.79-94, 24.1-12
ff. 383 + 388	25.1-10, 60-73
ff. 394 + 397	25.142-54, 26.1-11
ff. 401 + 410	26.49-62, 27.1-10
ff. 422 + 429	28.1-10, 82-95
ff. 445 + 446	29.1-22
ff. 454 + 457	29.107-21, 30.1-12
ff. 461 + 470	30.45-58, 31.1-10
ff. 481 + 490	32.1-11, 112-24
ff. 494 + 497	33.1-12, 37-50
ff. 504 + 507	33.131-46, 34.1-12
ff. 521 + 530	35.1-12, 115-29
ff. 534 + 537	35.169-80, 36.1-13
ff. 553 + 558	36.203-37.10, 37.62-75

Leaves are present, then, from all books except 3, 7, and 10, but no more than three from any. They include the beginning of the Preface, of Book 2, and of every book from 14 to 37, always on a recto, and therefore on a new leaf when the previous book ended on a verso or too low on a recto, which Books 13, 20, and 36, did not. Book 5, though, cannot have begun on a recto if the text was in the right order. There are variants in the margin, on average less than one to a page but three on f. 56r (originally f. 497r); they appear to be in the hand of the scribe.

The manuscript has the *ex libris* of San Miguel de los Reyes, the monastery to which on his death in 1550 Fernando, third

and last Duque de Calabria, left what remained of the Aragonese collection. What remained in 1527 had been transported to Valencia from Ferrara, and the scrupulous inventory drawn up for the purpose has recently entered the public domain⁵⁸. Pliny occurs twice in it:

no. 165 Plinio de naturali historia, de volume de foglio reale, scripto de littera antica in carta bergamena. Miniato nella prima faza de oro macinato et azuro de uno casamento con la imagine de Vespesiano in medaglia et con lo cavallo de Theseo alato et altre imagine et con le arme aragonie reale, et miniato in tutti li principii de libri. Comenza de littere maiuscole de oro *C. Plinii Secundi naturalis historia* et finisce *duxerim Hispaniam quecumque ambitur mari*. Coperto de broccato vecchio, con due chiudende de argento indorate de tre pezi. Signato IO.

no. 169 ... 14 fogli reali miniati con le historie de li principii de libri de Plinio miniato de oro macinato et azuro, compreso uno foglio lo quale è la imagine de santo Hieronimo et de Rufino presbitero, et scripti ditti fogli de littera antica; et piú 26 altri fogli de ditto volume scripti de littera antica de la historia naturali de Plinio.

The editors identify both these manuscripts with *Valencia Univ. 691*, but neither of its two frontispieces, f. 1r and f. 3r, has the *incipit* of no. 165⁵⁹. Furthermore, no. 169 on its own adequately corresponds if one interprets the 'fogli' as bifolia, a common enough sense⁶⁰. The likeliest reason for the mutilation of ff. 9-18 is that the initials up to Book 13 had been illuminated; my notes do not tell me whether Book 14 has an illuminated initial, but no later book has, and Book 14 does not affect the calculation anyway, because its initial fell on the same bifolium as the initial

⁵⁸ Cherchi - De Robertis, "*Inventario*" (n. 57).

⁵⁹ D' Urso, "*Manifesto*" (n. 52), 46 n. 10, raises this objection and others but does not draw the conclusions that I am about to draw.

⁶⁰ S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti*, Rome 1973, 33-5.

of Book 13. However the opening duplicates and their various states affected the calculation, the number of illuminated initials will have been close enough to 14, and ff. 19-64, 23 bifolia, are close enough to the other 26. It therefore remains to identify no. 165, and in a moment I shall try; but first I must introduce a manuscript that I have not seen.

Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1593-94 is a copy in two volumes, with the break after Book 16 as in the copy whose second volume survives as *Madrid Nac. Res. 5*. In its present state it has illumination done for Cardinal Georges I d'Amboise⁶¹, but the illuminated leaves are replacements or supplements, and if replacements then perhaps, it has been thought, replacements for Gasparo Romano's famous cycle of illustration done for Cardinal Giovanni of Aragon, who died in October 1485⁶². Praising the cycle in 1524 at second hand, Pietro Summonte described

la Natura, dipinta cum le parti e circostanzie sue,
ordinate per un huomo docto di quel tempo, messer
Lucio Fosforo, ch'è delle belle e rare cose che si vedono
ad nostri tempi. Questa è una donna assectata, di
admiranda bellezza, al garbo antiquo, che avante lo
sino tene un mondo e con le cicce li sparge latte.

Similar images of Nature, probably inspired by Gasparo Romano's, appear in two Neapolitan manuscripts and an illustrated incunable⁶³; from one of the manuscripts, dated 1496, it has been inferred that Cardinal Giovanni's manuscript, which

⁶¹ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 85-6, II, 183-4, IV plates 294-6; de la Mare, "*Cardinal Giovanni*" (n. 32), 257 n. 46, 259-60, 281-2 no. 51.

⁶² De Marinis as above; H. Walter, "An illustrated incunable of Pliny's *Natural history* in the Biblioteca Palatina, Parma", *JWCI* 53, 1990, 208-16, at 215 n. 45.

⁶³ H. J. Hermann, "Miniaturhandschriften aus der Bibliothek des Herzogs Andrea Matteo III. Acquaviva", *Jahrbuch der kunsth. Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 19, 1898, 147-216, at 158-9, and *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich* VI 4, Leipzig 1933, at 62-3; Walter, "*Illustrated incunable*" (n. 62), 214-6; T. Haffner, *Die Bibliothek des Kardinals Giovanni d' Aragona*, Wiesbaden 1997, 98-101.

on his death would have entered his father's collection at Naples⁶⁴, was still there at the time⁶⁵. 'Gasparo Romano' is usually taken to be Gaspare da Padova, who worked at Rome from 1466 or 1467 to about 1493 and did indeed accept commissions, and from March 1485 a stipend, from Cardinal Giovanni⁶⁶. An objection has been raised, however, to the identification of Cardinal Giovanni's manuscript with *Ottob. Lat. 1593-94*: such original decoration as survives is in the vine-stem manner, which does not fit Gaspare da Padova⁶⁷. The objection looks serious, but I cannot assess it without seeing the manuscript. Instead, I have another objection.

On noticing that the last words of f. 1 and f. 3 in *Valencia Univ. 691, Praef. 11 deum colere quoquo modo*, are also the last words of f. 1 in *Ottob. Lat. 1593*, I checked other particulars of the two manuscripts. Lines: both 41. Measurements: *Ottob.* 423 x 283, *Val.* 420 x 285⁶⁸. Script: though Albinia de la Mare held that the original parts of *Ottob.* were written by Gianrinaldo Mennio but f. 3r of *Val.* probably by Clemens Salernitanus⁶⁹, it is hard to find differences in the plates⁷⁰. Contents: in the first volume of *Ottob.*, 232 leaves survive, 13 are missing, and 18 were replaced; in the second volume, 306 survive (305 + 99bis), 15 are missing, and 26 were replaced⁷¹. To cut a laborious comparison short, the details of missing or replaced leaves turn out to fit my analysis of *Valencia Univ. 691* on two simple assumptions: that after f. 24 of the first volume not one leaf is missing but three, and that quire 56, unless the foliation is wrong thereabouts, was a *quaternio*. Splitting the manuscript after Book 16 entailed

⁶⁴ Haffner, *Bibliothek* (n. 63), 132.

⁶⁵ Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 126 no. 53.

⁶⁶ Haffner, *Bibliothek* (n. 63), 96-100, 105-6, 108; B. Bentivoglio-Ravasio, "Gaspare da Padova", in Bollati, *Dizionario* (n. 22), 251-8, at 251, 252, 255.

⁶⁷ Haffner, *Bibliothek* (n. 63), 99 n. 21.

⁶⁸ É. Pellegrin, *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* I, Paris 1975, 626; Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 109.

⁶⁹ "Cardinal Giovanni" (n. 32), 281-2, 292.

⁷⁰ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), IV, 194, 296.

⁷¹ Pellegrin, *Manuscrits classiques* (n. 68), 626.

splitting a quire; the first volume had 247 leaves (240 + 7), the second apparently 321 (3 + 300 + 8 + 10). Rather than list all the sections of text that the leaves of *Val.* present, I will give just two in case anyone wishes to check both volumes of *Ottob.* before I have the opportunity myself: f. 11 (originally f. 82) 5.73-85 *aliorum vitae poenitentia est ... fractum expellit in meridiem*, f. 40 (originally f. 388) 25.60-73 *medetur ita morbis comitialibus ... dea arthemisiam cogno-*.

If Books 13 and 14 had not both happened to begin on the same bifolium (ff. 201 + 210), 37 illuminated bifolia would have been needed: one for the frontispiece, none for Book 1 (the table of contents), 36 for Books 2-37. The 36 actually needed became *Val.*, which has lost the one that included the beginning of Book 3 (ff. 51 + 60) and the illuminated halves of the next ten. 36 were produced afresh for *Ottob.*, but 28 lack their illuminated half, and also missing is an unilluminated bifolium from the original manuscript (ff. 25 + 26, which preceded Book 2). The loss of leaves from *Val.* does not account for the absence of leaves from *Ottob.*, which must have been mutilated in turn. To take one example, ff. 221 + 230 of the original manuscript survive in *Val.* and so had to be replaced in *Ottob.*, but only the replacement for f. 221 survives (as f. 207): its companion, which presented the beginning of Book 16, has gone (after f. 215). The illumination in the manuscript therefore suffered twice: not only did someone after 1527 cut it away in Books 3-13 from *Val.*, but someone else at an unknown date cut away most of the new cycle made for Georges I d'Amboise.

I cannot account for the duplication at the beginning of *Val.*, but the state of the illumination neatly explains why Georges I d'Amboise replaced it, whether he acquired the manuscript without the unfinished leaves or himself chose to discard them. The same fate seems to have befallen a manuscript of Jerome. Besides leaves from a Pliny, no. 169 included one from a Jerome, and it can hardly be a coincidence that a manuscript of Jerome in two volumes, *Paris B. N. Lat. 1890-91*, also had its frontispieces replaced for Georges I d'Amboise⁷².

⁷²L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la bibliothèque impériale* I, Paris 1868, 252; De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 184, 323, and

If I prove to be right, then *Ottob. Lat. 1593-94* never belonged to Cardinal Giovanni, because the arms in *Valencia Univ. 691* are those of his brother Alfonso Duca di Calabria on f. 1r and of his father Fernando I on f. 3r; and whether or not 'Gasparo Romano' was Gaspare da Padova, it is not the famous manuscript that he illustrated. Could this have been instead no. 165 in the inventory of 1527? I think it very well could, as I shall explain.

I have mentioned that Fernando Duque de Calabria, who died at Valencia in 1550, bequeathed what remained of his collection to San Miguel de los Reyes. An inventory of the bequest includes two copies of Pliny⁷³:

no. 387 Un Plinio de naturali historia, de forma de pliego grande, cubierto de brocado, con las manezillas de plata

no. 389 Otro Plinio de naturali historia, grande, cubierto de pergamino

The former looks very much like no. 165 in the inventory of 1527. If it went to San Miguel de los Reyes, however, it certainly did not go from there to Valencia University Library; and as it happens, there are two other possibilities on record, though one of them can almost certainly be ruled out.

T was far from being the only manuscript of the *Natural history* known to Pintianus. Among others, he knew of one owned by Gonzalo Pérez, which he thought might have come from Seville⁷⁴. After Pérez died in 1565 or 1566, Ambrosio de Morales described it as 'un Plinio grande escrito en pergamino de muy grande autoridad, y que habiendo yo cotejado algunas cosas de los impresos más enmendados con él, he hallado cosas extremadamente corregidas y verdaderas'; and Gonzalo's son

Supplemento (n. 39), 1.55; de la Mare, "New research" (n. 44), 522-3 no. 55.13-4.

⁷³ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 216.

⁷⁴ Signes, *Biblioteca* (n. 1), 332 no. 43 (26.11.1544), 335 no. 45 (15.12.1544), 337-8 no. 48 (28.12.1544), 338-9 no. 49 (29.12.1544), 339-40 no. 50 (18.1.1545), 341 no. 51 (4.2.1545).

Antonio, who sold his father's library to Philip II in 1574, mentioned that his father had inherited part of it from the Duque de Calabria⁷⁵. The manuscripts that Philip II gave to the Escorial in 1576 included among 'Philosophi latini, manuscripti in folio, litteris antiquis' two of Pliny⁷⁶:

16 Plinius de naturali historia literis grandioribus et vetustioribus. Videtur autem scriptus, ut in principio legitur, anno MCLX

17 Eiusdem de naturali historia aliud volumen etiam antiquum

One of these must have come from Gonzalo Pérez, very likely no. 16⁷⁷. An inventory compiled at the Escorial before the end of the 16th century included 'C. Plinii II historia naturalis cod. 400 annorum membr.'⁷⁸, surely no. 16 again; but as no manuscript of Pliny now at the Escorial fits the description of no. 16, it must have perished in the fire of 1671⁷⁹. Whether it or no. 17 was Pérez's copy, however, the Duque de Calabria is not mentioned, and neither matches no. 165 in the inventory of 1527.

⁷⁵ R. Beer, "Die Handschriftenschenkung Philipp II an den Escorial vom Jahre 1576", *Jahrbuch der kunsthist. Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 23, 1902, II, xiii-xiv; Antolín, *Catálogo* (n. 27), I, xii, V, 42-7; De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 203 n. 29.

⁷⁶ Beer, "Handschriftenschenkung" (n. 75), lvi no. 112; G. de Andrés, *Documentos para la historia del Monasterio de San Lorenzo el Real de El Escorial VII*, Madrid 1964, (1) *Entrega de la librería real de Felipe II (1576)*, 116-7 nos. 2068-9.

⁷⁷ Beer, "Handschriftenschenkung" (n. 75), xiv.

⁷⁸ Antolín, *Catálogo* (n. 27), V, 440.

⁷⁹ *Vienna 9478*, on which see *Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum* VI, Vienna 1873, 50, and Antolín, *Catálogo* (n. 27), I, 1, is an unpublished inventory compiled at the Escorial just before the fire: "Praecedit epistola Sebastiani de Uzeda prioris conventus S. Laurentii ad Leopoldum I. Imperatorem d. d. 7. Aprilis 1671". I hoped that it might describe manuscripts of Pliny, but the entries on f. 293 all concern printed books, as I learn from a reproduction very kindly supplied by Friedrich Simader of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek.

There is a stronger possibility, but it may lead to the same depressing conclusion. I mentioned above that Andrés identified with *Esc. VI 14* a manuscript owned in 1627 by the Conde-Duque de Olivares: 'Plinii Secundi Novocomensis historiae naturalis, elegantissimus codex, in membranulis ex bibliotheca Ducis de Calabria, fol. regio, M 1'. Of the 1291 manuscripts in the inventory, no other is said to have been owned by the Duque de Calabria, and I do not know what led Andrés to his identification. *Esc. VI 14* has the *ex libris* of Surita (1512-80), and at the end Surita or someone else wrote *Es del monasterio de Nuestra Señora de Aula Dei: de la Cartuxa*. Years before his death, Surita gave his books to this monastery at Zaragoza, and they remained there until the Conde-Duque de Olivares took them over in 1626⁸⁰. *Esc. VI 14* might somehow have reached Surita from the Duque de Calabria, but there is no evidence that the Duque de Calabria ever owned a manuscript like it. Furthermore, the copy illustrated by 'Gasparo Romano' seems a likelier candidate for the compliment *elegantissimus* than *Esc. VI 14* would have been even in its unvandalized state; of the thirteen other manuscripts that the inventory of 1627 describes as *pulcher(rimus) codex*, *un muy hermoso códice*, *pulchra nota*, or *eleganti(s) nota(e)*, at least nine date from the 15th century or later (nos. 604, 819, 835, 837, 857, 947, 1032, 1179, 1256). Whatever it was, Olivares's copy would not inevitably have come to rest at the Escorial, but most of his collection eventually did⁸¹, and so the fire of 1671 can be blamed again if it was the missing copy illustrated by 'Gasparo Romano'.

If, regardless of its later fate, the missing copy is at least to be identified with no. 165 in the inventory of 1527, then Summonte's description no longer stands alone: the cycle of illustration opened with what the inventory calls 'lo cavallo de Theseo alato'. Representations of Pegasus appear not only among the sketches on f. 3r of *Valencia Univ. 691* but also in the frontispiece added

⁸⁰Ch. Graux, *Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l'Escorial* (Bibl. des Hautes Études 46), Paris 1880, 56-8, 331-3; Andrés, "Conde-Duque de Olivares" (n. 29), 135-6, 141.

⁸¹Andrés, "Conde-Duque de Olivares" (n. 29), 6-12.

at Naples to a Florentine Pliny, *B. L. Add. 11994*⁸², and in several Neapolitan manuscripts connected with the Accademia Pontaniana⁸³.

Copies of Pliny owned by the Aragonese court at Naples: conclusions

In discussing *Madrid Nac. Res. 5* and *Valencia Univ. 691*, I have had several things to say about the Aragonese library at Naples and several possibilities to consider. I will therefore summarize my conclusions about it, adding details that I have not yet needed to bring in.

1. On the first page of Book 2 (f. 26r), Holkham 394, probably written at Naples in the mid 15th century, has a faintly sketched full border with the arms of King Alfonso in version 1⁸⁴. Whether it ever entered his collection is unclear. It is split into two volumes with the break after 18.2 *tela sua venenis*, and shelfmarks written on the first page of each, 15.4 and 15.5, show that it had already been split when it belonged to the Conde-Duque de Olivares,

⁸² De la Mare, “*Bartolomeo Scala*” (n. 35), 243, identifies the scribe as Giovan Marco Cinico and the coat of arms as that of Antonello Petrucci, who commissioned the manuscript from Vespasiano in 1463. Jonathan Alexander kindly tells me that the frontispiece was added at Naples in the 1470s; it also includes the Muses and three bearded poets outside a cave, one of them drinking from a stream.

⁸³ Hermann, “*Miniaturhandschriften*” (n. 63), 159 n. 1; *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis* (n. 63), 64 n. 2; A. W. Byvanck, “Les principaux manuscrits à peintures conservés dans les collections publiques du royaume des Pays-Bas”, *Bull. de la Soc. Fr. de Reproductions de Manuscrits à Peintures* 15, 1931, 82, plate XXIII; M. Buonocore, *Vedere i classici*, Rome 1996, 326-7 no. 76, fig. 296. The Pegasus that accompanies De Marinis’s quotation from Byvanck at *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 154 belongs not to Byvanck’s manuscript, *Leiden B. P. L. 6B* of Virgil, f. 51v, but to Buonocore’s, *Rome Casanatense 915* of Propertius, f. 2r. H. Timmer in E. Sesti, *La miniatura italiana tra Gotico e Rinascimento*, Florence 1985, I, 158-9, reproduces Byvanck’s plate when he identifies the first owner of *B. P. L. 6B* as Andrea Matteo Acquaviva of Aragon, a pillar of the Accademia Pontaniana.

⁸⁴ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 11, 129-30; II, plate A.

whose inventory of 1627 includes it: 'Idem [Plinius] duobus tomis, fol. regio, membr. Cax. 15, núms. 4, 5'⁸⁵.

2. Fernando I acquired a copy already split into two volumes when Coluccio Salutati owned it: *Bodl. Auct. T 1 27 + Paris B. N. Lat. 6798* (s. xii)⁸⁶. From Salutati it had passed by way of Leonardo Bruni to Antonio Panormita, whose services to the kings of Naples ended when he died there in 1471. In 1490 Politian collated both volumes at Florence⁸⁷. Between 1501 and 1504 the second was bought by Cardinal Georges I d'Amboise, but the whereabouts of the first between 1490 and 1685 are not known⁸⁸, unless it was still in Florence to be consulted by Filippo Strozzi between 1526 and 1538⁸⁹.

⁸⁵ Andrés, "*Conde-Duque de Olivares*" (n. 29), 60 nos. 1029-30. For permission to see it I thank Mr D. P. Mortlock and Dr Suzanne Reynolds, who will give more details in the catalogue that she is preparing. She tells me that the coat of arms was noticed and identified about 1970 by Jonathan Alexander.

⁸⁶ H. Walter, "La vicenda del *regius antiquus* di Angelo Poliziano (Bodl. Auct. T 1 27 / Par. Lat. 6798) e un presunto commentario di Guillaume Pellicier alla *Storia naturale* di Plinio il Vecchio (Par. Lat. 6808)", in Luisa Secchi Tarugi (ed.), *Poliziano nel suo tempo*, Florence 1996, 387-409 with illustrations on 489-94, at 394-5.

⁸⁷ J. M. S. Cotton, "Ex libris Politiani", *MLR* 29, 1934, 326-30, at 328, and "Ex libris Politiani II. Incunabula Bodleiana", *MLR* 32, 1937, 394-9, at 394-6, describes a copy of the ed. Rom. 1473, now *Bodl. Auct. Q 1 2*, in which the collation survives, though perhaps not in Politian's original. See also I. Maier, *Les manuscrits d' Ange Politien*, Geneva 1965, 351-2; M. C. Davies, "Making sense of Pliny in the Quattrocento", *Ren. Stud.* 9, 1995, 240-57, at 252-7 with illustrations on 254-5; and for another illustration V. Fera, "Un laboratorio filologico di fine Quattrocento: la *Naturalis historia*", in O. Pecere - M. D. Reeve (ed.), *Formative stages of classical traditions*, Spoleto 1995, plate II at the end.

⁸⁸ Lehoux, "*Un manuscrit*" (n. 37), 232-3; De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 213-4; Hunt, "*Coluccio Salutati*" (n. 37), 77-8. Lehoux and De Marinis were unaware that Politian collated both volumes in 1490.

⁸⁹ Walter, "*Regius antiquus*" (n. 86), 403-8. His argument holds only if Strozzi knew his manuscripts at first hand, not through an earlier collation. Certainly, as Walter says, the collation in *Bodl. Auct. Q 1 2* could not have supplied him with all the details that he reports; but Walter may be wrong to treat it as Politian's own (see n. 87).

3. I have argued that all the references to Pliny in documents of 1470-74 could well concern one manuscript and that in any event the copy of volume 2 referred to in 1474 seems likely to be *Madrid Nac. Res. 5*. On a flyleaf it has an *ex libris* no earlier than the 16th century, from which Rezzonicus, when he visited the royal library in 1760, implausibly transcribed the owner's name as *Balthassaris de Canillaus et Ventimiliis*⁹⁰. The last element is written as *Vigintimiliis*, but the middle one, likely to be more helpful, is hard to make out. For the moment let me just mention a Baltasar de Cañizares named in letters that Juan Páez de Castro sent to Surita in 1546, 1556, and 1567⁹¹. Rezzonicus goes on to say, however, that Juan Francisco Pacheco y Mendoza, Duque de Uceda, who governed Sicily from 1687 to 1696, acquired the manuscript there and brought it to Madrid; and it does indeed appear in the inventory made before his library was appropriated in 1711 by the royal library⁹²:

Naturalis historia Plinii Secundi Novocomensis; in folio magno, tomus secundus, commendabile quidem opus et sane regium propter egregiam membranam et scripturam

Ventimiglia is a name prominent in the nobility of Sicily, where Canizzaro is also found⁹³.

4. Manuscripts that Fernando pawned at Florence in 1481 included a copy in two volumes, doubtless either no. 2 or no. 3. As a note

⁹⁰ *Disquisitiones* (n. 3), II, 258.

⁹¹ G. de Andrés, "31 cartas inéditas de Juan Páez de Castro", *BRAH* 168, 1971, 515-71, at 524, 561-2, 568. Dr Pilar Hernández Aparicio of the Biblioteca Nacional kindly tells me that she too interprets the middle element as Cañizares, "pero no sabemos quién es".

⁹² G. de Andrés, "Catálogo de los manuscritos de la biblioteca del Duque de Uceda", *RABM* 78, 1975, 5-40, at 28 no. 240; J. M. Fernández Pomar, "La colección de Uceda de la Biblioteca Nacional. Nueva edición del catálogo de manuscritos", *Helmantica* 27, 1976, 475-518, at 505 no. 240.

⁹³ G. B. di Crollanza, *Dizionario storico-blasónico delle famiglie nobili e notabili italiane estinte e fiorenti*, Pisa 1886-90, I, 216-7, III, 77-8.

of Antonello Petrucci's attests, Fernando redeemed them all in the following year⁹⁴.

5. Cardinal Giovanni commissioned at Rome a much admired copy illustrated by 'Gasparo Romano'. When he died in 1485, it passed to his father's collection at Naples. If it still belonged to the collection in 1527, when Fernando Duque de Calabria moved what remained from Ferrara to Valencia, it perhaps reached the Escorial by way of the Conde-Duque de Olivares and perished in the fire of 1671. Certainly it has not resurfaced.

6. In 1492 Alfonso Duca di Calabria paid Gianrinaldo Mennio for adding blue and gold capitals to a copy⁹⁵, identified by D'Urso with *Valencia Univ. 691*⁹⁶ and easier still to identify with *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1593-94* if he wrote it as Albinia de la Mare held; I do not know whether blue and gold capitals survive in either part of the manuscript, but the inventory of 1527 describes no. 169, an earlier state of *Valencia Univ. 691*, as 'miniato de oro macinato et azuro'. For some reason, a duplicate was produced of the first two bifolia meant for illumination. If the earlier of the two frontispieces, f. 1r, which has the arms of Alfonso Duca di Calabria, was illuminated by Cola Rapicano, Cola's death in 1488 may account for the duplication⁹⁷. Though the later, f. 3r, has the arms of Fernando, D'Urso argues that Alfonso commissioned it in celebration of Fernando's pact with Pope Innocent VIII in 1492, which ensured that Alfonso would succeed him just as the dedicatee of the *Natural history*, Titus, succeeded Vespasian; it has been suggested that work on f. 3r stopped when Fernando

⁹⁴ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 188 no. 18, 192. Lehoux, "Un manuscrit" (n. 37), 232, identified no. 4 with no. 2, but she did not know either no. 3 or no. 6; Walter, "Regius antiquus" (n. 86), 388 n. 11, points out that in *Biblioteca* (n. 31) De Marinis accepts her identification at I, 214 but at II, 184 appears to be suggesting no. 6.

⁹⁵ De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), II, 296 no. 808, 298 no. 828.

⁹⁶ "Manifesto" (n. 52), 45.

⁹⁷ Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 211. For the date of Cola's death see De Marinis, *Biblioteca* (n. 31), I, 149, II, 287 no. 701, 288 no. 723.

died in January 1494⁹⁸. In any event, the illumination was never finished. When Cardinal Georges I d'Amboise bought the manuscript, the bifolia meant for illumination, whether they had received it or not, remained in the Aragonese collection, and they are now *Valencia Univ. 691*; from ten of them the illuminated halves have been cut away, and one other is lost in its entirety.

Other copies attested in 16th-century Spain

I end with some other manuscripts known in the 16th century to scholars or collectors in Spain.

1. Besides *T*, Pintianus used a manuscript at Salamanca that he calls *semivetus*; to his eye, therefore, it was not as old as *T*. It deserted him at the end of Book 15.

2. His correspondence reveals that he tried in vain to consult a manuscript owned by Florián de Ocampo, which contained ‘unos xx libros ... de letra gótica antiquísima’⁹⁹.

3. In December 1544, after his notes had gone to press, Pintianus did receive on loan from Surita a *codex Cesaraugustanus* that included Book 37¹⁰⁰. Sillig reports that he first cites it for 27.20 *melle*¹⁰¹, and I have found no other citation in Books 27-36. Cesaraugusta is Zaragoza.

4-5. When Juan Páez de Castro died in 1570, his library turned out to include some manuscripts that belonged to his friend Surita, among them ‘un Plinio muy grande, escripto todo en pergamino, con unas tablas; item otro Plinio, que aun parece más antiguo, con unos cartones negros’¹⁰². Páez also annotated a

⁹⁸ “*Manifesto*” (n. 52), 40-5; Alexander, *Painted page* (n. 52), 211, and D’Urso.

⁹⁹ Signes, *Biblioteca* (n. 1), 278 no. 8 (20.12.1537?).

¹⁰⁰ Signes, *Biblioteca* (n. 1), 336-7 nos. 46-8, 356-7 no. 65.

¹⁰¹ *C. Plinii Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVII*, Leipzig 1831-36, V, xi.

¹⁰² Antolín, *Catálogo* (n. 27), V, 49-50, 66-7.

copy of Iohannes Parvus's edition (Paris 1532) that Rezzonicus mentions as preserved at the Escorial¹⁰³; it is still there, with the shelfmark 41-I-7¹⁰⁴.

6-8. In the notes on the *Itinerarium Antonini* published by Andreas Schottus from a copy made available at Zaragoza by Surita's son, Surita or Schottus cites *T* and three manuscripts at the Carthusian monastery of Aula Dei, Zaragoza¹⁰⁵.

How many of these can be identified either among themselves or with extant manuscripts ?

To begin with no. 1, there is no reason to identify it with any of nos. 2-8. Among extant manuscripts, the only one known to me that breaks off at the end of Book 15 is *Bodl. Auct. T 1 27* (s. xii), mentioned above. At 13.88, however, it reads *in his* with *igni* written above by Panormita¹⁰⁶, whereas the *Salmanticensis* read *inibi*. I have checked *Le Mans 263* (s. xii), which represents version (2), and *Cambridge U. L. Dd 8 22* (s. xiv/xv), which represents version (3), and they too read *in his*. Other readings of the *Salmanticensis* absent from all three include 11.238 *omnia <loca>*, 14.61 *simile* for *saliva*, 14.120 title *Quibus rebus musta condiantur*, 15.70 *obtinens* for *obtinent*, 15.137 *postea triumphans* for *triumphans postea*. On the other hand, the *Salmanticensis* shared many innovations that passed from version (2) to version (3), and it seems likely to have represented version (3), because it included 3.38-70 and shared with *Cambridge U. L. Dd 8 22* an innovation in a phrase missing from *E* and *Le Mans 263*, 11.219 *citatius aut tardius descriptas* for *citatus aut tardus discriptus*.

¹⁰³ *Disquisitiones* (n. 3), II, 256 n. 1.

¹⁰⁴ Andrés, *Documentos* (n. 76), 31 no. 521.

¹⁰⁵ *Itinerarium Antonini et Burdigalense*, Cologne 1600 (the preface is dated 1585), 180, 194, 335, 371, 566. The references seem to conflict: the first mentions only one manuscript besides *T*, the second mentions three but attributes only one to Aula Dei, the third and fourth attribute all three to Aula Dei, and the fifth, which I am about to cite, mentions three but attributes only two to Aula Dei.

¹⁰⁶ Hunt, "*Coluccio Salutati*" (n. 37), plate 29.

Among nos. 2-8 themselves, the only immediate possibilities of identification are that nos. 6-8 include no. 3 and nos. 4-5. What then can be said about the whereabouts in the 16th century of the manuscripts now at the Escorial?

Like *Esc. VI 14*, *Esc. RI 5* has the *ex libris* of Surita. It also has the shelfmark 15.7, which confirms that it passed to the Conde-Duque de Olivares¹⁰⁷; doubtless *Esc. VI 14* too would have his shelfmark if its frontispiece had survived. Both have a few variants entered by a small and neat hand that cites other copies of Pliny and a *vetustissimus codex* of Bede's work *De temporum ratione*. Whether this hand belongs to Surita himself I cannot say, but I have no hesitation in assigning it to the 16th century and therefore disagreeing with Rezzonicus, who considered it 350 years old¹⁰⁸. The copies of Pliny are referred to as *T(ol.)*, *P*, which I can vouch for in *RI 5*, and *F*, which I can vouch for in *VI 14*; I did not pay the variants enough attention to determine whether *P* occurs in *VI 14* or *F* in *RI 5*, but if not, each letter may stand for the other manuscript. Surita himself certainly took an interest in Pliny. In 1547-49 *T* comes up in his correspondence¹⁰⁹, and nos. 6-8 are the three manuscripts at Aula Dei cited in his notes on the *Itineraria*. For identifying these manuscripts the most useful note is probably the one that gives the reading of each in the list of *oppida Hispalensis conventus* at 3.11:

In Plinii manuscripto exemplari Toletano ...
Celtiarana, Caniama acua Ilipa cognomine illa Italica, alterum ex Caesaraugustanis exemplaribus
 vetustis ... *Celtiaria exatim Vacamaria Acira Ilipa cognomine Ilpa Italica*, in altero vero pervetusto
 ... *Celtiara Vacaniana aeria Ilipa cognomine Ilpa Italica*, et in alio manuscripto *Celtiara exatim Vaccamaria aeria Illipa cognomine Ilpa Italica*.

¹⁰⁷ Andrés, "Conde-Duque de Olivares" (n. 29), 60 no. 1031.

¹⁰⁸ *Disquisitiones* (n. 3), II, 255-6, 257. Antolín, *Catálogo* (n. 27), IV, 171, says that notes by Surita appear in *VI 14*, and these may be what he had in mind, even though at III, 451-2 he does not mention the notes by the same hand in *RI 5*.

¹⁰⁹ Signes, *Biblioteca* (n. 1), 309 n. 190, 420.

As it seems likely that *Esc. R I 5* and *VI 14* are two of them, I am sorry not to have seen the note before visiting the Escorial in December 2005; but I always look forward to going back. Any help in identifying nos. 2-5 would be welcome.

* * *

I wrote the section above on *Valencia Univ. 691* without having seen *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1593-94*. When I visited the Vatican Library in May 2006, who should be there but Carmen? I took that as a good omen for my inspection of *Ottob.*, and so it proved when I checked the two passages that I selected above for checking, 5.73-85 *aliorum vitae poenitentia est ... fractum expellit in meridiem* and 25.60-73 *medetur ita morbis comitialibus ... dea arthemisiam cogno-*, which occupy ff. 11 and 40 of *Val.* (in my reconstruction, ff. 82 and 388 of the original manuscript). Both occupy leaves of *Ottob.* supplied for Cardinal Georges I d'Amboise: the former f. 76 of 1593, the latter f. 133 of 1594, except that it actually begins on f. 132v with a line added by the later scribe, *Medetur ita morbis comitialibus ut diximus vertigini melancho-*. Further checks of the same kind seemed unnecessary. The discrepancy between my reconstruction of the original manuscript, in which the last bifolium of *Val.* was ff. 553 + 558 of a regular *quinio*, and the published description of *Ottob.*, from which it appeared that the quire concerned must have been a *quaternio*, resolved itself as follows: the quire was indeed a *quaternio*, namely ff. 289-95 with one leaf cut out after f. 289, and that leaf and its partner, f. 294, were a replacement for the last bifolium of *Val.*, which must therefore have been ff. 552 + 557 of the original manuscript. The last quire of *Ottob.*, however, seems to be a *senio* with a leaf missing: ff. 296 + <306> (now a pastedown), ff. 297 + 305, f. 298 loose, ff. 299-304 three bifolia. Like *Val.*, *Ottob.* has a few variants in the margin. Finally, as regards the proposed identification, which I rejected, of *Ottob.* with the manuscript illustrated by Gasparo Romano, the objection that had already been raised about the initials in *Ottob.* was entirely justified¹¹⁰.

¹¹⁰ Haffner, *Bibliothek* (n. 63), 99 n. 21, cited above in n. 67.

My conclusion therefore stands: *Val.* and *Ottob.* are *membra disiecta* of a single manuscript, and not the one illustrated by Gasparo Romano. It remains only to determine which of the duplicates at the front of *Val.* are contemporary with the main body of the manuscript.

A month later, at the Bodleian, I came across a recent volume that illustrates at last the frontispiece of *Madrid Nac. Res.* 5¹¹¹. As the crown in the arms is plainly original, the manuscript turns out to have been produced for Fernando I; and I believe that the scribe can indeed be identified as Antonio Sinibaldi and the illuminator as Gioacchino de Gigantibus. Suzanne Reynolds had mentioned to me that besides parrots Gioacchino had a liking for putti with coral necklaces, and the border includes several.

MICHAEL D. REEVE
Pembroke College, Cambridge
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

¹¹¹ *La real biblioteca pública 1711-1760 de Felipe IV a Fernando VI*, Madrid 2004, 218 plate B51. See also pp. 217, 494.