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SUMMARY
Four conclusions are drawn from partial collation of 90 witnesses to the Verrines and full collation of a few: that the French family up to II 1.90 has other independent members besides D, that the family of p can be reduced to n, that the most valuable of the deteriores is a manuscript hitherto unreported, and that the agreement of p or this manuscript with the French family gives the oldest text recoverable from the medieval tradition.
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RESUMEN
Se extraen cuatro conclusiones a partir de una colación parcial de 90 manuscritos de las Verrinas y una colación completa de unos pocos: la familia francesa hasta II 1.90 tiene otros representantes además de D, la familia p puede ser reducida a n, el más valioso de los deteriores es un manuscrito desconocido hasta ahora, y la coincidencia con p o la de este manuscrito con la familia francesa proporciona el texto más antiguo recuperable de la tradición medieval.
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After a foray into the transmission of the Verrines over 30 years ago, when together with Richard Rouse I wrote a brief account of it¹, I did not come back to it until 2012, when I belatedly set about reviewing a commentary on II 4². Visits paid since to libraries and the arrival of important manuscripts on line have put me in a position to answer or at least sharpen many of the

questions that I asked in the review3. I have three reasons for not waiting
till I have collated more passages: the need to warn prospective editors, or
anyone interested in the evidence for what Cicero wrote, that the apparatus
of Peterson’s Oxford text is a snare4; the realization that an argument used in
my review does not hold water; and the belief that further collation will not
change my conclusions about which manuscripts editors should use.

Since R. Seider discussed the ancient fragments in 19795, a parchment
scrap of II 5 (s. v) has been discovered6. I shall be concerned, however, with
the medieval tradition. Madvig showed in 1828 that it splits into a French
family, no member of which is complete, and an Italian family, most of
whose members are complete, among them the one that has since turned out
to be the oldest; and he expressed distrust in the Italian family7. Where the
two families agree, editors have seldom felt the need to intervene8; but they
have not studied either family with enough care or thoroughness to identify
their independent or most useful members, a task that I hope this article will
advance.

Though a list of 75 manuscripts has been drawn up by G. Lopez & L.
Piacente9, fewer than 30 have been investigated. When he left Florence for
Rome in 1751, the Jesuit Girolamo Lagomarsini had spent 15 years or more
collating manuscripts of Cicero in libraries at Florence, and nine of these
contained the Verrines10. His collations were used in the 19th century, but

3 Available on line in Gallica are five manuscripts in the fonds latin of the Bibliothèque
Nationale de France: 4588A (k), 7775 (S), 7776 (p), 7822, 7823 (D). All manuscripts in the
plutei at the Laurenziana are available at teca.bmlonline.it.
Verrem, Oxford 1907; reprints number it as volume III of the speeches. Where I add line
numbers to my citations by speech and section, they are those of Peterson’s edition.
5 “Beiträge zur Geschichte und Paläographie der antiken Cicerohandschriften”, Bibliothek
und Wissenschaft 13, 1979, 101-49.
V”, ZPE 54, 1984, 21-6 with plate 1a; B. Bischoff, V. Brown, “Addenda to Codices Latini
antiquiores”, Medieval Studies 47, 1985, 317-66, at pp. 335-6 no. 1839 with plate Xa; Serena
Ammirati, Sul libro latino antico: ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche, Pisa-Rome 2015,
79-80. I thank Maria Chiara Scappaticcio for showing me a discussion of it in draft.
7 J. N. Madvig, Ad virum celeberrimum Io. Casp. Orellium epistola critica, Copenhagen
1828, 7-10.
8 D. H. Berry, “Neglected and unnoticed additions in the text of three speeches of Cicero”,
in R. Hunter, S. P. Oakley, eds., Latin literature and its transmission, Cambridge 2016, 10-
21, at pp. 11-13, argues convincingly for two deletions in II 5.
9 “Inventario dei mss. delle orazioni ciceronianae contro Verre”, Arendia: Academia
Letteraria Italiana, Atti e memorie ser. 3 6.2, 1973, 83-95. Their opening paragraph is more
guarded than the statement in Lopez’s edition of II 2 for Mondadori, 1991, p. II, that they drew
up the list “recognitione apud omnes bibliothecas quale manuscripts Latinos servant peracta”.
10 See J. Ruysschaert, Codices Vaticani latini: codices 11414-11709, Vatican 1989, ix-
xxv; P. L. Schmidt, Die Überlieferung von Ciceros Schrift “De legibus” in Mittelalter und
Renaissance, Munich 1974, 421-3; Dizionario biografico degli italiani 63, 2004, 70-73 (F.
editors have inspected only three of his manuscripts themselves, together with fewer than 20 elsewhere. I add another 15 and also include the editio princeps (Rome 1471). In the full list given below as Appendix 1 I indicate the section or sections of this article where each witness is discussed. A quirk in my numbering of the sections, namely that between 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3 I place one called 2.2.1-2, results from deciding not to cover my tracks; strictly it belongs earlier in 2.2, but I had already done a fair amount of work on 2.2 before I saw the need for it, and I hope that the actual course of my investigation will have more than biographical interest. Unless accompanied by a reference to another section, ‘above’ or ‘below’ refers to the one where it occurs.

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

1.1. THE FRENCH FAMILY (I): THE DESCENDANTS OF S

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

---


"The MSS. of the Verrines", Journal of Philology 30, 1907, 161-207, at pp. 175, 186. I shall have seven more occasions for using the term saut du même au même. In a work inaccessible to me, Alfonso Traina asserted that it was coined by Louis Havet in the form saut de même à même, and the assertion is repeated by Y. Gomez Gane, Dizionario della terminologia filologica, Turin 2013, 297-8, and L. Gamberale, ibid. xii, who suggest that the form saut du même au même was introduced by Alphonse Dain. Can these notions please go no further? In Havet’s Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins, Paris 1911, I find saut du même au même not only three times in the Plan de l’ouvrage, pp. vi, vii, ix (in the titles of §§ 441, 698, 1427), but also in §§ 446, 557, 576, 780, 845, 846; saut de même à même I find nowhere, and Gauthier Liberman kindly tells me that it strikes him as questionable French.
on the branch, R (Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7774A, s. ix\textsuperscript{1}), has kept only II 4–5, but its
descendant S (Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7775, s. xii) has also kept II 1.90–111, and S in
turn has descendants that supply its lost opening up to II 1.90.

That S descends from R is not agreed by everyone but should be, though
whether it is a direct copy has not been established. Evidence was set out
by the last Teubner editor, A. Klotz: S shares misguided corrections with
R\textsuperscript{2}, has many errors against the agreement of R and the Italian family,
and makes enough misguided corrections itself to show that its occasional
avoidance of an error in R can be put down to conjecture\textsuperscript{12}. He did not
mention II 5.174.17, which may appear to support Peterson’s case for the
independence of S. In his article Peterson reports that for the reading of the
Italian family, \textit{extra iudicium quae ad iudicium pertinient}, R has \textit{extra iudicium pertineant} and S \textit{extra quae ad iudicium pertineant}\textsuperscript{13}. He was
right about S and the Budé editor wrong to report that it agrees with R\textsuperscript{14}.
The reading of R, however, so manifestly lacks a subject for \textit{pertineant},
and so manifestly arose by \textit{saut du même au même}, that \textit{quae ad} in S
could easily be a conjectural supplement. If the common source imagined by
Peterson had \textit{extra iudicium quae ad iudicium pertineant}, why should S
omit the first \textit{iudicium}? and if it had the reading of S, why should R omit
\textit{quae ad}?

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

\textsuperscript{12} M. Tulli Ciceronis \textit{scripta quae manserunt omnia} V, Leipzig 1923, viii-xii.
\textsuperscript{13} Peterson, “The MSS. of the \textit{Verrines}” (n. 11), 171, 206.
\textsuperscript{14} H. Borneque, \textit{Cicéron Discours} VI, Paris 1929, 92. The blame lies with Klotz (\textit{M. Tulli Ciceronis
scripta}), who attributes the omission of \textit{quae ad iudicium} to \textit{a} and says in his list
of symbols “\textit{a} = RS”; whether or not he meant something less straightforward than “\textit{a}”, he
should have been more careful.
without labels II 4 is clearly enough the sixth speech and II 5 the seventh, the behaviour of R still needs explanation.

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

\[ G_1 = \text{Wolfenbüttel Extrav. 265.2} \]
\[ G_2 = \text{Wolfenbüttel Weissenburg 41} \]
\[ L = \text{Leiden Periz. F 12} \]
\[ K = \text{B. L. Harl. 4105 (a. 1462)} \]
\[ Z = \text{B. L. Harl. 4852} \]

In his main study of the tradition he associated with \( G_1 \) a manuscript that he rated higher, B. N. F. Lat. 7822, dated March 9th '1470'\(^{15}\), but in his edition he contented himself with mentioning it as a twin of \( G_1 \). In II 1 both originally stopped in mid page at 105.2 \textit{qui erat institutus}; 7822 continues with a change of ink to 106.18 \textit{adversarium [Verrem] futurum} at the end of the page (f. 65v), where a note in the same hand too hopefully says \textit{Quere reliqua in calce libri}, but \( G_1 \) continues in a less formal hand only to 105.7 \textit{Malebat ‘etc.’}, where the same hand adds \textit{Deficit de texto folium} + an abbreviation that I could not make out + a word sliced when the margin was trimmed (f. 70r). In the same article Peterson touched on B. N. F. Lat. 7786, assigned in the old catalogue to the 14th century and used by Zumpt in II 2-3 by way of a collation that Julius Sillig had made in 1824\(^{16}\). Peterson declared it ‘of a composite character’ and limited his reporting of it to eight readings in II 1.17-2.46. Composite it visibly is. It originally consisted of \textit{seniones} but was supplemented with \textit{quaterniones} written by a different hand (f. 48-103); a stub follows f. 46, which ends with II 1.110 \textit{sed P. Annii}, and new hands take over on f. 47r and f. 47v. Presumably the leaf now reduced to a stub originally contained the rest of II 1.110-11 up to \textit{singu-}, after which the other descendants of S leave a gap or add only -\textit{lari} or -\textit{lis}; but why did the passage need to be written out afresh on a new leaf, and why did three hands take part in the supplementation? Whatever the answer, the supplement, which runs to the end of II 3, came from the Italian family (I shall be more specific below, \textsection 2.2.1.3.2), and so did a large number of corrections to the original part, many of them made so neatly in erasure that they set one trap

---


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

Altogether, then, Peterson considered eight descendants of S. Rouse and I mentioned another, Escorial R I 2, which I recently showed to have been written for Clement VI, pope 1342–52\(^\text{17}\). There are at least seven more:

Frauenfeld Kantonsbibliothek Y 227
Oxford Bodl. D’Orville 10
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7777 (dated 1466)
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16226
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16674
Stuttgart Donaueschingen 12 (Caecil. – II 1.111 de istius singulis)\(^\text{18}\)
Vat. Lat. 1751 (dated 1452).

Roughly contemporary with D are B. N. F. Lat. 16226 and 16674, the latter commissioned for the Sorbonne by Andreolo Arisi, Milanese ambassador to Paris in the late 14th century and perhaps the early 15th\(^\text{19}\); 16226 may be even older\(^\text{20}\). The other five are all later than D. Frauenfeld Y 227 and Vat. Lat. 1751 were written in Italy. Vat. Lat. 1751 has a French text unaugmented except that it incorporates a few readings of the Italian family such as Caecil. 65.16–66.23 dubitare ... defendere, but Frauenfeld Y 227, which omits this passage, continues after II 5 with an Italian text of II 2 – II 4.7.9 viderit tot pr., where the scribe must have noticed that he had already copied out II 4. Vienna 156, which has Milanese decoration no later than the mid 15th century, was written in Italy. Vienna 156 is uncoli, Italian. Moreover, Caecil. 111.4 has a Latin text of the same passage. The same passage was written at Vat. Lat. 1751 (dated 1452).


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


\(^{20}\) See my edition of Pro Quinctio, Leipzig 1992, xv-xvi. Both 16226 and 16674 were mentioned by É. Thomas, Discours de Cicéron contre Verrès, Seconde action - Livre V De suppliciis, Paris 1885, 28.
century\textsuperscript{21}, conflates a French text with a recognizable version of the Italian text, but I could not find neat divisions between the two. It shares I 12,5 \textit{vexavit} with Donaueschingen 12, Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, G, B. N. F. Lat. 7822, and Vat. Lat. 1751. More about it below (§ 2.2.2.1) when I analyse the Italian family. Are all the other members of the French family actually French? The subscription of L includes the phrase \textit{et sic est finis}, which I have come to regard as typical of German manuscripts; G, assigned in the latest catalogue to the lower Rhine\textsuperscript{22}, ends with \textit{et sic est finis}; Donaueschingen 12 has a 17th-century provenance of Georgenthal (near Gotha); and I do not see why K or D’Orville 10 need be French.

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

At Caecil. 15.27 Peterson reports the omission of \textit{id} from G, LKZ. One might therefore wonder if they constitute a family to which D does not belong. Unfortunately, the report is inadequate: D too omits \textit{id}. So does Esc. R I 2, as I noted in 1983, and so do all the other manuscripts in Paris except 7822. Here and elsewhere, for instance when they restore Caecil. 65.16-66.23 \textit{dubitare ... defendere}, G, and 7822 draw on the Italian family. Neither Peterson nor Klotz reports that at Caecil. 15, in the very first sentence, D omits consili(i), presumably recovered from the Italian family by the few members of the French family that have it, which include Z as well as G, and 7822; certainly the correctors of Esc. R I 2 and 7786, who restored it, drew on the Italian family.

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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item[21] H. J. Hermann, \textit{Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich}, Leipzig 1930, VIII vi 1, 14-15 no. 7 with plate X I.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
shown that it belonged to the papal library at Avignon and then Peñíscola till 1424, when it was sold to Alfonso of Aragon. S, on the other hand, passed from Richard of Fournival to Gerard of Abbeville and from him to the Sorbonne, where it was recorded in 1338 as ‘Tulius ad Cecilium oratorum, ex legato magistri G. de Abbatisvilla. Incipit in 2° fol. incommodis, in pen. sumus etiam. Precium x sol.’ Actually sumus was a misreading of sed (II 5.155.18), and the instances of incommodis early in Caecil. (8.23, 9.2) are preceded by only about half as many words as occupy any of the surviving leaves. As the title is unlikely to have taken up a whole page, the text may have begun on a verso, or else the layout differed. Be that as it may, S could easily have been used at the Sorbonne not just by the scribe of D, Nicholas of Clamanges, but also by other humanists either contemporary or later. Presumably Esc. R I 2 was written in Paris, though for a papal commission S could perhaps have been taken from the Sorbonne to Avignon. Wherever the copying took place, collation did indeed yield errors of Esc. R I 2 absent from the rest. Up to II 1.26.5 an annotator collated it against an Italian witness, one that at Caecil. 9.3 had boni for idonei; when I come to the Italian witnesses, I shall name some that fit (§ 2.2.1.3.2).

Not surprisingly, the letters of Jean de Montreuil, who shared with Nicholas of Clamanges an interest in Cicero, refer several times to the Verrines; but the references do not add up to a neat story. In a letter probably of 1395, Ep. 108.11, he names the Verrines among works of Cicero’s that he would like to acquire from Italy, as though he had no Verrines at all. In others of 1400-1401, Ep. 110.1-2, 111.17-19, 141.26-27, he quotes from I and II 4, speeches available in either family. In one of 1417, Ep. 214.431, he represents Nicholas of Clamanges as familiar with the Verrines. An
undatable one addressed to an unidentified correspondent, Ep. 128, is worth citing in full (I reproduce the latest editor’s text, punctuation and all)28:

Querenti mihi, ut sit, hoc in Elicone modico alium libellum quemdam meum, nunc, quasi dedita opera, sese ter quaterque Verrine mee, quas accomodati causa hesterno die quesiistis, obtulerunt, ut quasi inntendo [?] dicere viderentur: ‘Mite nos, quas reicis isto modo, ad virum doctissimum illum, qui nos tantopere cupit et qui te magis, ut sentimus, nosbis congratulabitur comiterque suscipiet, non dubitamus, et frequentius alloquetur’. Ego autem, reverende magister, verum perpendens istud esse, et quod forstian numen quoddam molestie ferebat margaritam tantam apud me sistere incognitam aut sopitam sic diitius remanere, et precipe annuere desiderans vestre limam fragrantes, et vobiscum glorientur extitisse, et michi, cui re correcta opus est, utpote ignaro et inscio, eas tunc visendi occasio peramplius ingeratur et delectabile sit.

Val e t e .  S c r i p t a .

The faulty syntax of Ego … accessor and eas … comantur does not affect the sense, but questions arise at two other points. Taking ter quaterque to mean ‘seven’, the editor argues that Jean need not actually have owned all seven Verrines, because even the French family called the last speech liber septimus. True, S after correction, followed by some of its descendants, has incipit liber .vii. at the beginning of II 5; but ter quaterque, an adverbial and not an adjectival expression, must go instead with obtulerunt. I also wonder if the editor’s comma in corruptas in parte et laceras, alias ut vidistis, ingenii vestri clarissimi acu resuantur, ae diseritie corrigantur pectine et comantur, quatinus ad me dum redierint incudis vestre limam fragrantes, et vobiscum glorientur extitisse, et michi, cui re correcta opus est, utpote ignaro et inscio, eas tunc visendi occasio peramplius ingeratur et delectabile sit.

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

28 B. N. F. Lat. 13062 ff. 89v-90r, available in Gallica. I have no quarrel with the transcription. Silvia Rizzo, whom I thank for her comments on the letter, suggests innuendo for innittendo.
-c, and put a line through *qui sunt*, or at *Caecil*. 8.25, where Esc. R I 2 has *vim* in erasure and Frauenfeld Y 227 *itaque*, also retained in Vat. Lat. 1751, G₁, and B. N. F. Lat. 7822, when they restore *vim gravitatemque requirit iudiciorum*. There must have been an intermediary, however, because Esc. R I 2 gives in full *Caecil*. 4.16 *michi* and 7.13 *tempore*, which Frauenfeld Y 227 corrupts to *in* and *turpe*. L and D’Orville 10 are very close, but I doubt whether L, though less accurate than D’Orville 10, can descend from it. Otherwise all the members of the French family up to II 1.90 are independent of one another. Errors of each in my passage of II 4:

Esc.: 64.12 *regressit* (G₁) for *reges* ii (rege sit S', regessit S²) ut vid., D etc.; S also has r in the margin, presumably meant as *require* but easily misunderstood), 65.28 *esses* [et] (G₁), 67.2 *oplerjibus; D: 64.21 *atque* for ac; 7777: 62.18 in for *et*, 64.13-14 *quod ... potuerunt*, 65.27 vendendi for *videndi*; 7786: 62.10 *[et] audierat*, 67.9 [unius]; G₁: 62.24 *<f pergrandicula> pergrandi trulla*, 63.1 [res], 65.28 [et] regio, 1 <vel re> constituerunt, 66.21 [se], 67.4 *esse*t>, 68.21 verra for *vestrum*; 7822: 63.1 *res ipsa ~*, 68.21 vero for *vestrum*; 16226: 62.18 *sic* for *sit*, 63.29 [iste], 65.27 [se]; 16674: 61.1 *propter*, 62.15 abunda[balt, 63.6 [rogatum velle se eam], 65.5 [operum], 68.20 [socium]; G₁: 61.30 [nuper], 1 finem for *sine*, 65.1 clamore for -are, 67.32 [Romano], 4 vim for *iam*; K: 60.27 *<violatum> spoliatum*, 61.4 *postea[quam]*, 63.3 *apud ipsum pulcherrima* for pulcherrima *apud eum*, 6 si for *se*, 64.8 [et], 10 in for ad, 11 e <st>, 65.20-22 *quomodo ... suspicare*-, 27 se after *videndi*, 28 [et] puerili, 6 positis for posset, 9 *illi* d, 10 eo for illos, 66.16 [im]pudentiam, 21 *religionis* for -ne, 22 [impediri], 23 *hominis* for *operis, 24 precibus quam minis for minis quam precibus, 25 *iubet* after *noctem*, 67.32 erat for *esset, 1 suae societatis ~, voluerit* for *esse* *voluisset*, 3 *quaef*, 13 *tempore* for *patre*; Z: 60.26 *existimamus* for -matio, 61.5 a gap for *in Syriam*, 62.18 *[ita], 22 et maxime twice, 25 *[satis credo (D etc.) idoneum], 63.1 *ista* for *ipsa, 5 esset for *nosset*, 64.8 *inde* for *judices, 65.28 *religiosi* for -so (D etc.), 8 *prospexit* for *per-, 66.20 donaret[)], 21 [et] *religione, 67.7 ipsum Iovem ~, 12 *regis* for regio, 15 *provincia<e>> L: 60.24 *huius* for *eius, 62.25 aur[e]jo, 65.10 *sacratum* for *satiatum, 66.23 *isti* for *iste, 67.31 est for e* D’Orville 10: 66.22 *impediret* for -iri, 67.10 possint for -sunt.
Frauenfeld Y 227: 61.1 and 3 regimen for regnum, 3 [et], 5 poterant for potuerunt, 62.19 [sel], 22 [regius] in lac., 26 <et> dicere, 63.26 item for iste, 64.14 atque for ac, 65.5 cum for ea, 66.20 coep<er>it, 67.31 Capitilio for -lium, 68.18 perventurum for -ram, 22 inde for iudices
Vat. Lat. 1751: 61.4 [et], 62.10 ut for et, 19 accep<ta>tum, 21 nam for non, 64.8 iudicium for iudices, 65.23 ac for aut, 24 participarent for periperent, 4 [gemmis]

If the passage is a fair sample, D emerges as the most accurate of the 15, Peterson’s K and Z as the least accurate. K also puts after I 17.6 in manibus two passages that must have occupied a bifolium of its exemplar transposed to the middle of a quire, Caecil. 67.4 defendere ... I 2.19 populo Romano + I 31.16 a nobis dicta erunt ... 38.5 quidem suspicio.

Shared errors reveal these sub-groups or possible sub-groups:

16226, 16674, G₂, K, 7786, L, D’Orville 10: 63.5 <eam> etiam (~ K), 64.13 numquam for nondum;
G₂, K, 7786, L, D’Orville 10: 61.3 <quod> ad, 7 vocatus for -tur, 62.24 eximia for ex una, 64.10 exteras nationes for exteris nationibus, 65.24 [ut] ne, 67.4 ad se for etsi (et se D etc.), 9 huius unius ~; 15 princeps for praecps;
L, D’Orville 10: 63.6 e<ti>am, 13 ostenderent for offenderant, 64.21 ad for ac, 65.30 postea quae for posteaquam, 66.19 servare for -ari, 67.4 ante[a], 68.20 eis tum for iectum;
K, 7786: 60.23 [iam];
Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, 16226, 16674: 66.24 -que for quam, though I suspect that D too originally had que;
G₁, 7822: 61.1 [Syriae], 67.2 [ex] auro (certainly 7822: G₁ not clear), 3 haec for hoc;
16226, 16674: 62.23 er[a]nt.

At 65.1, where S has involutisque with cri written above tis, the original -tisque appears in G₁, Esc. R I 2, 16674, Frauenfeld Y 227, L, and D’Orville 10 (and 7786 may have had it before correction), but 16226 has -ticrisque and Vat. Lat. 1751 -ticrisque; and at 65.11 Esc, R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, G₁, and 7822, have revertuntur ad Antiochum, the reading of S before marks of transposition were added. Similarly, 62.12 haec, at first omitted by S¹, is also omitted by Esc. R I 2, Frauenfeld Y 227, G₁, and 7822.

This is my restatement of Peterson’s laboured account, “The MSS. of the Verrines” (n. 11), 181-2; I ignore some untidiness at the extremities of the passages concerned. The exemplar was not any manuscript that I have seen.
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29 This is my restatement of Peterson’s laboured account, “The MSS. of the Verrines” (n. 11), 181-2; I ignore some untidiness at the extremities of the passages concerned. The exemplar was not any manuscript that I have seen.
As I had made notes on the text of Donaueschingen 12 in I 1.1-16.27, I collated in that passage all the other members of the family. More evidence accrued for the existence of the first two sub-groups: for the first, 2.1 *praedonem*; for the second, 13.19 <a> iudicio, 15.17 mecum ratione ~, 16.26 [ab initio] ab eo res for ab initio res ab eo. L and D’Orville 10 again share errors: 3.3 religioseque for ac religiose, 4 [ref]manere, 4.14 ego rebus ~, 17 exteris<que>, 18 qui<d>, 5.29 primo for -um, 1 tum <demum>, 6.9 privatorum<que>, 8.25 [id], 9.2 fuerit for fieret, 11.25 fuisset [et], induxit for ad-, 13.16 caeactae <sunt>, 23 maximae for optimae, 15.17 aliquam for -cuius, 19 his se ~. As my passage of II 4 yielded only feeble evidence for the independence of L, here are some errors of each:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cicero in Verrinis (rubric).
Abducuntur non numquam a iure homines et ab institutis suis magnitudine pecuniae (4.12)
In rebus venalibus qui modus (nodus ante corr.) est cupiditatis idem est estimationis (4.14).
Plerumque detrahirur honor debitus non homini sed ordini (4.25).
Est boni iudicis parvis etiam ex rebus coniecturam facere (4.34).
Improbi praesentis maior est vis imperio quam in bonorum absentium patrocinio (4.89).
Hominis sepe fallit opinio (4.86).
Procrastinari non debet quod statim fieri potest (4.100).
Rei magnitudo breviter perstringere atrocitatem criminis non permittit (4.105).
Pessimus est qui id facinus ad quod nemo alius ulla pecunia adduci potest gratis efficere conatur (5.11).

30 M. D. Reeve, “A lost manuscript of Cicero’s Verrines”, RHT 12-13, 1982-3, 381-5. In the table at the beginning the “3 frr.” of C should appear under II 2, not II 3.
31 See my review in Gnomon 85, 2013, 30.
33 I consulted it on line at digi.bu.uni-heidelberg.de.
Res magna sine metu ac severitate administrari non potest (5.22).

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

Abhominabile est iura precio non equitate disponi (5.27).

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

Multum inest inter hominum mentes et cogitationes (5.35).

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

Principia amiciciae minori negotio non retinentur quam comparantur (5.175).

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

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

Cicero’s wording is often rearranged or paraphrased, and consultation of Peterson’s apparatus yields only one reading of interest, *perstringere* with pS2 at 4.105 (*praestringere* RS3); but it will not bear much weight, least of all when a late but respectable witness to the *Florilegium Angelicum*, B. L. Add. 25104 (s. xv, Italian), has *praes*-. The restriction to II 4-5 must create a presumption that the source was R in its present state or a descendant other than S, which long after the 12th century still included everything up to II 1.111.

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

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

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

Besides 7786 (Zumpt’s ‘Paris. C’), the collations that Sillig made at Paris in 1824 for II 2-3 covered 7776 (Zumpt’s ‘Paris. B’) and 4588A (Zumpt’s ‘Paris. A’). Assigned in the old catalogue to the 13th century35, 7776 took a long time to assert itself. True, it struck Zumpt as ‘parens fortasse, certe simillimus Lagomarsiniani 29’, namely Laur. 48.29 (s. xv); but Halm said nothing about it and instead singled out Laur. 48.29 as more honest than

34 “Cicero’s *Verrines* and the textual tradition of Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium*”, *Studi sul Boccaccio* 43, 2015, 133-45, at pp. 137-9.
35 *Catalogus* (n. 16), IV, 393.
the other members of the Italian family. The first editor to treat it with respect was Émile Thomas, who gave it the symbol p. In his first volume he kept it in the 13th century, but in his others he mentioned that Chatelain had just pushed it back to the 11th. Chatelain’s dating was reaffirmed by the last paleographers to have looked at it, who tentatively assign it to northern Italy. In the 16th century it belonged to Celso Cittadini of Siena. No editor has yet mentioned a note on f. 17v: In reversione mea de curia ego istud proposui facere et ducere ad effectum et firmavi cum Ren. (?) in dominica .ii. de mense Setembri in signoria. Ingh. ... de Mangaretta (?). 1226. One Inghiramo da Magreta is attested from March 3rd to October 15th 1227 as potestà of Siena.

Alongside p Peterson used not only Laur. 48.29 (s. xv), which he called q, but also B. L. Harl. 2687 (s. xv²), which he called r. In my review I exposed as ‘a complete sham’ Klotz’s case for their independence. Arguing that r descends from q and q from p, I asked whether by any chance II 4.30.16-17 cum iste ... syngraphis and 133.24-25 cum ... arbitramini, omitted by qr for no obvious reason, occupied a line in p. The former does. Furthermore, the scribe of q at first omitted but then restored two other passages that occupy a line in p. Caecil. 44.17-18 quidem cogitas ... futurum and II 4.2.16-17 nihil istum ... me scitote; q must therefore be a direct copy of p. I mentioned in my review that r omits a line of q in II 4 and twice does so in II 2, and I have since noticed that Peterson thanks A. C. Clark for pointing out the omission of II 5.168.28-169.1 crucem ... tum fueris; these words, not in crucem ... tum fueris as Peterson says, are what q has on a line and r omits (the resultant in infestus should have alerted the scribe to the

37 Thomas, Discours de Cicéron (n. 20), 2, 28. There is more to be said for Klotz’s capital P, but as I have worked from Peterson’s text and he retained p, I too retain it.
38 II, 4, 1886 (I have used the reprint of 1887) 2; Caecil., 1892, 12; ed. 2 of all three speeches in one volume, 1894, 52.
40 M. C. Di Franco Lilli, La biblioteca manoscritta di Celso Cittadini, Studi e Testi 259, Vatican 1970, 82-3 no. 91, with plate XVII of f. 1r.
41 Avril, Zaluska, Manuscrits (n. 39), give Otriria for curia and Sagreria for signoria.
43 Peterson, “The MSS. of the Verrines” (n. 11), 191. The omission was mentioned later by Clark himself, The descent of manuscripts, Oxford 1918, 8. What brought it to his attention, I wonder? Peterson also observes that r omits II 2.28.23-24 primum ... ducamus, which occupies a line in p; but as q has it, and not on a line, r must have omitted it by saut du même au même after debemus.
oversight). There are corrections by another hand in q up to the end of its fourth quire (f. 40v, II 2.8.11 Romani) and by yet another hand, no later than the first half of the 15th century, in II 5; I have noticed very few elsewhere. All these corrections passed to r. Below (§ 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.5.1) I shall assign them to the deteriores and those in the first four quires to an identifiable and eliminable family of deteriores. Henceforth, then, qr should be used only for conjectures or lucky slips.

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

Before I leave these three descendants of p and concentrate on p itself, a word about their origin. I have nothing to say about Vat. Lat. 1754 and nothing about r beyond what Rouse and I said over 30 years ago on the authority of Albinia de la Mare, that it was written in Florence or Rome and has Strozzi arms44. More interesting is q, written by the scribe of Laur. 36.23, which contains Ovid’s Fasti and Catullus, and Laur. 50.4 part 1, which contains Cicero’s Orator and Brutus45. The humanistic sections in three volumes of commentary on Dante, Laur. 42.14-16, signed and dated 1432, 1431, 1434, led Albinia de la Mare to identify him as Bartolomeo di Piero Nerucci of S. Gimignano46. Laur. 50.4 part 1 cannot have been written before 1421, when Cicero’s Brutus and a full text of his Orator emerged at Lodi. Albinia de la Mare declared herself reluctantly convinced that the text of Catullus in Laur. 36.23 was written before the death of Salutati in 1406, but at the same time she appears to have convinced the proponent of this view that it was probably written about 142547. A manuscript that Nerucci

---

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

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

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

47 D. F. S. Thomson, Catullus: a critical edition, Chapel Hill 1978, 33–4, 46 no. 23, and Catullus edited with a textual and interpretative commentary, Toronto 1997, 75 no. 23. Gilberto Biondi and Daniel Kiss have kindly told me that his previous arguments for dating it no later than 1406 do not convince them. R. A. B. Mynors in the O. C. T., 1958, p. vii, had even suggested that it might belong to the end of the 14th century. It is not mentioned by M. Zicani, Scritti catulliani, Urbino 1978, or D. S. McKie, The manuscripts of Catullus: recension in a closed tradition, diss. Cambridge 1978. Thomson associates it with his no. 95, Siena Com. IV 41, but I have a note of 1989 or 1990 from David McKie in which he says that
signed and dated 1454, Prato Bibl. Roncioniana Q II 2 (84), does not look close in date to the six just mentioned, and I do not know what kind of script he used in S. Gimignano 62, which he signed and dated 1471-73. Was he already copying out texts in 1419, as recent accounts of him say? Laur. 78.20 has on the verso of the flyleaf at the front a note that in its latest form reads as follows: Iste Boetius scriptus fuit a me Bartolomeo Petri de Sancto Geminiano … in scolis domini Mathie [Mattia Lupi] plebani plebis Aioli Pratensis comitatus die vigesima quinta mensis Aprilis sub annis domini millesimo quadringentesimo decimo nono. Below Petri de Sancto Geminiano, however, is a cancelled name that may itself have been substituted for another. If he did nevertheless write the manuscript, it is further in style than Prato Q II 2 from the other six and conspicuously less humanistic. Perhaps, therefore, Albinia de la Mare’s instinct should be respected and ‘c. 1425’ treated as the likeliest date for q and the other two unsigned manuscripts. Nerucci’s place of origin may account for his access to p, which I take to have been in Siena at the time.

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

---


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

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

52 On Peter the Deacon and the compilation of the manuscript see R. H. Rodgers’s edition of Frontinus De aquaeductu urbis Romae, Cambridge 2004, 37-44.

53 M. Inganez, Codicum Casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus, 1928-34, II, 211, 212.

have forgotten whether I was then aware of previous opinions, which had diverged enough to affect priority: on the one hand ‘s. xii’ narrowed down to ‘s. xii’65, on the other ‘s. x’66. Dated or datable Italian manuscripts are scarce before the 13th century and especially so in the 10th and 11th, and a relative dating might not even be possible if one were to see p and the fragment alongside each other. It is safe to say, however, that neither descends from the other, because the fragment, which covers II 3.120–29, has profugerant for -erunt at 120.9, and p omits 120.6 tot and 121.18 decumano, the former between lines67. For editors, though, the fragment hardly matters, whereas p is unquestionably the oldest member of the Italian family throughout the rest of the work.

The many corrections in p not made by the scribe, or at all events not made in the process of copying, include the restoration of short sequences omitted through saut du même au même or for no obvious reason. As overwriting is much commoner than erasure, the original reading is seldom in doubt, though it may not always have been a Latin word. Several hands appear to be involved, none, I think, later than the 13th century except that a 16th-century annotator, doubtless Celso Cittadini, jotted a few readings in the margin or in gaps; but the reproduction of p available on line is not good enough to support graphic distinctions68, and I have found no other way of stratifying the medieval corrections if they had more than one source. Did they come from the French family, from the single Italian manuscript known as k, from the Italian sub-family known as δ, or from a source not otherwise attested? I venture an answer below.

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

56 Rouse, Texts and transmission (n. 1), 71 with n. 99, on the authority of Bernhard Bischoff; Bloch, “Der Autor” (n. 54).
57 Maria Chiara Scappaticcio obliged me by checking the text of the fragment on the microfilm held at the Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes. When we were preparing the entry for Texts and transmission (n. 1), Richard Rouse showed me a collation of the two reasonably legible pages against Klotz’s edition (n. 12).
58 It was produced for Gallica from microfilm, whereas 4S88A (k) was digitized from scratch.
59 M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta (n. 12), xxi. R. Sydow, “Beiträge zur Kritik von Ciceros Verrinen”, Hermes 67, 1932, 446–68, argued that Klotz should have accepted more words transmitted in the Italian but not in the French family.
Intermediate in date between $p$ and the *deteriores* is a single Italian manuscript, Zumpt's 'Paris. A', 4588A. Peterson uses it sporadically and calls it $k$. It contains II 2-3 (ff. 76-91, two quires), II 4 from 29.23 *quidem cum esset* or thereabouts (ff. 66r-70r), and II 5 from 30.3 *fuerit siracusus* (ff. 71r-75v, continued by a slip, 75v); after II 3.49.24 *redempturum esse dicebat* space was indeed left at the end of a quire, as I surmised in my review (85v was a slip for 83v), and a different hand used it for adding the end of II 1 from 156.25 *Iam vero*. Though neatly written by various hands in the late 12th or early 13th century, $k$ is tiresome to collate, because its cramped and unarticulated columns of tiny script have suffered badly in places from damp or wear. It has few corrections.

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

II 2.6.18 *romanorum* add. … O’brd’ ($pk$), 8.10 *et post* $p$ … postea $k’$ (*post* $pk$), 17.26 *ei om. b$\delta$’ ($pk$), 18.7 *‘a om. k’* (no), 29.5 *‘uti COP’* (not $p$), 48.12 *‘qui qrk’* ($p$), 52.16 *‘quo om. pq’* (no), 92.14 *‘cum $p’* (no), 120.21 *‘est $p$ in ras.’* (no), 124.19 *‘veterum vulg.’* ($pk$), 149.18 *‘ita eos pb al.’* (eos *ita* $p$), 156.28 *‘obsecurunt $p’* (-arent $p’$ -arent $p’$), 172.6 *‘etiam ille pr’* (not $p$), II 3.10.19 *‘erimus $\delta’* ($pk$), 12.16 *‘ratione cOk’* (not $k$), 28.2 *‘esse aiebat omnes ck’* (not $k$).


\(^{61}\) At least one printing of his first edition, 1907, has *ERRATA ET CORRIGENDA* on p. xix. He there lists 32 passages of II 4-5 where “lectio codicis $p$ erat in adnotationibus diserte enumeranda, ubi facit cum deterioribus ($\delta$) contra $RS$”. These reports were added to the apparatus of his second edition, 1917.
31.19 ‘condemnarent pk’ (no), 41.21 ‘enim est laus p’ (est enim laus), 55.6 ‘pararet p’ (parret), 8 ‘ut Vqr’ (p). 16 ‘magna Prisc. vulg.’ (pk), 64.2 ‘in tanta impud. om. rell.’ (pk omit only in), 68.19 ‘hominim impr. p’ (i.e. hominim in primis improbissimo), 89.11 ‘litterae publicae p’ (no), 112.16 ‘decumarum J. J. Hartman’ (p’k), 199.17 ‘onus aliquod p’ (onus aliquod), 222.22 ‘sortiturus es p’ (no), II 4.30.17 ‘profugientes δ’ (pk), 31.26 ‘minitando δ’ (p and I think k), 35.23 ‘revertamur Sp’ (not p), 73.18 ‘Siculis δ’ (pk), 94.5 ‘ex (ante cohorte) om. δ’ (pk), 113.5 ‘uti de (pk), 118.5 ‘regis Hieronis δ’ (pk), 119.23 ‘theatrwm est’ (pk), 128.24 [num] (pk), 147.10 ‘diligenter et caute δ’ (pk), 150.23 ‘tanta δ’ (pk), II 5 40.3 ‘tu om. δ’ (pk), 46.9 ‘turpe numquam om. p’d: turpe om. qk’ (<postremo> tu tibi hoc numquam [turpe numquam] pk), 58.16 ‘exspoliatosque RS’ (expilatosque p’), 25 ‘de negarent δ’ (pk), 67.12 ‘erat iam δ’ (pk), 68.21 ‘excisum δ’ (pk), 76.7 ‘Acilium add. δ’ (pk), 81.12 ‘libertas etiam k’ (no), 84.1 ‘insula RS’ (pk), 86.19 ‘in speciem kδ’ (in specie k with p), 87.3 ‘luxuria SD’ (pk), 96.13 ‘commosse RSr’ (commovisse pk), 97.5 ‘viderent V’ (pk), 103.11 ‘et tolli et δ’ (pk), 107.27 ‘ita om. V’ (pk), 108.18 ‘catenis aspiciunt Vk’ (not k), 114.11 ‘-em Rδ’ (pk), 129.5 ‘uxores soreoresque δ’ (pk, which omit miserorum), 133.23 ‘in invidiam V’ (k), 3 ‘hoc Herb., hoc Amestr. V’ (pk), 141.19 ‘dicit δ’ (pk), 151.23 ‘mehercules δ’ (pk), 152.3 ‘seu fati SDp’ (not p), 164.16 ‘iam p’ (no), 27 ‘fui’ qrk’ (p), 179.18 ‘ac δ’ (pk), 187.26 ‘Catinae δ’.

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

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

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

From the evidence that I am about to present it emerged very clearly that k is a close relative of p unconnected with δ. Of the readings that pkδ share against the French family I cite only additions, omissions, and transpositions, with the warning that four additions of pkδ accepted by Peterson against the French family do not appear in my list: II 3.1.6 innocentiae <continentiae>,
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II 4.60.24 sed <ad>, 66.26 <ex> eius, II 5.172.16 <vestram severitatem desiderant>.

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

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

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

I have no difficulty in believing that the peculiar readings of pk or δ listed here are all errors, as one would expect if δ is an independent relative of pk. If, however, it conflates the texts of pk and the French family, internal
reasons are needed for treating as errors the readings that pk share against the French family. I will come back to δ, but I do not doubt that most of those readings are indeed errors as editors have thought. I therefore proceed in the conviction that k is a close relative of p.

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

\[\begin{align*}
\text{p2k: II 2.17.5 & accedendo for agendo (acendo p\textsuperscript{1}), 23.6 & qui ... interfuit, 31.12 & <creditorem> petitorem, 50.19 & sub for ubi, 70.12 & molto, 93.27 & si tantulum morae fuisset, 108.24 & ut ... videatur, 110.16 & cius absentis nomen recepisti, 130.5 & habitis for factis, 137.24 & clam, 174.3 & legem, II 3.48 & illo, 63.18 & et, II 4.58.25 & cartula for cretula, 2 & -gula conclavia ... non modo, 81.28 & civitatis sum quam, 87.20 & multitudo atrocitate rei, 88.5 & nostri nomine non, 97.13 & nomen, 101.2 & aut deorum aut, 106.28 & ex Ennae vertice rumpunt, 112.22 & quam tu a iure et a, 118.4 & quae duobus portibus cinctus in, 119.18 & in ea parte for unum fanum, 124.28 & hoc, 129.5 & ferebantur, 132.11 & intellegere possimus, 139.20 & sed in eos (si deos p\textsuperscript{1}, sed eos R), 150.30 & negare non pot(u)erunt (ne tum p\textsuperscript{1}), II 5.63.18 & metum, 70.8 & a navigando ... remotissimos, 72.17 & putem, 73.25 & hominis, 75.19 & tibi, 83.15 & Romano ... denique, 100.29 & urbis, 102.27 & se, 2 & quaerit ... singillatim, 104.25 & apertas <poterone>, 112.10 & solum ut, 13 & in carcere, 125.9 & vetustatis auctoritatis, 127.17 & negligunt pecunias, 136.3-4 & quicum ... amicus est, 156.25 & ut securi ferirentur, 29 & timidiorem \end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{p2k: II 2.50.22 & <in> alteram, 115.25 & [hoc], 127.23 & [erat], 165.16 & restitu for est ita, 171.11 & debemus for possemus, 188.8 & [omnes] ex con[v]enjtu, 192.4 & [neque committebant], II 3.9.4 & ferundus for \textcolor{red}{-}dum putas, 11-12.12 & [ac sustinenum haec causa tri-]pertita, 22.25 & videbantur for vocabantur, 54.28 & [ex Nymphonis arationibus], 56.6 & [non], 62.23-24 & [quid ... taceret], 63.18 & [domestico], 109.17 & expectat[re nolit]e, 157.1 & unitus for totius, 223.15 & [quid possimus] in lac., II 4.39.11 & machior for acrior, 45.26 & confirmavit tam for conferam vitam, 52.7 & [scuta ... privatis], 53.16 & [quam ... solebant], 20 & [puto], 28 & [ fuerat], 59.15 & [hoc denique quod] in lac., 65.5 & [certare videretur] in lac., II 5.33.8 & eruditurus for aere dirutus, 34.14 & [dicere], 36.20 & [ius], 37.25 & [alicui ... opportuerit], 38.5 & [iud], 57.5 & [primum], 174.13 & quid eas (quiescas k\textsuperscript{2}) for videas \end{align*}\]

\[\text{Clark, Descent (n. 43), 252-5, lists passages restored by p\textsuperscript{2} but ignores k.}\]
One pairing seems to predominate in some stretches: p₂k in the first half of II 2, in II 4 from about 60, and in II 5 from about 60; p₁k elsewhere, most noticeably throughout II 3. At II 2.2.17, where p has *debetis* with ea above the second e, k has in the text *debetis vel debeatis* with *vel debeatis* expunged, and in a few passages the same reading appears as a correction in both p and k, for instance these:

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

In default of other evidence, one might infer either that k was copied from p between two campaigns of correction or that k or a relative was used for one of the campaigns. At II 3.63.18, after p₁ had omitted *et domestico*, the two words were visibly added at different times, which makes it understandable that *et* appears in the list for p₂k, [*domestico*] in the list for p₁k; but as I could not find any systematic way of stratifying the corrections in p that did not involve k and so beg the question, I resigned myself to carrying out a full collation of both so far as the present state of k allowed. I began with II 2, jumped to II 5, and then collated II 3-4. I will report first on the disconcerting outcome in II 2 and II 5.

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

*esse* videtur. postremo illo desperatissimo perfugio uti posset. se impru

dentem fecisse. existimasse id licere. quamquam haec perditissima defensio est.

ut aliquid dici videretur. Tollit ex tabulis id quod erat. et facit coram

omnibus *esse*. hic videte in quot laqueos se induerit. quorum ex nullo se

videri expediret. Primum ipse in sicilia saepe et palam de loco superiore

vetierat. et in sermone multis demonstrarit. licere nomen recipere ab

ipso. se exemplo fecisse id quod fecisset. haec eum dictasse pro ore actione

erexit. pompeius chlorus dixit. de cuius virtute antea commemoravi. et

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

I reproduce the passage in question:

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

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

---

63 G. Lopez in his edition (n. 60) wrongly says that pk have coram omnibus esse delatum.
be absent from k, II 4.97.13, he is wrong about p, which does not omit nomen but has it as the last word of f. 130v, added as a correction. I also mentioned above that p omits II 3.120.6 tot between lines, which suggests that it is the manuscript where the omission arose; and k shares the omission. Probably then, I thought, k is nothing more complex than an honest descendant of p unconnected with its other relatives; but where it does not agree with p², it can be used for determining any reading of p² hard to make out.

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

84.23 aequitatis Rk⁶⁴: om. p
123.5 cum Herbitensem Rk: Herbitensem p

In the second passage k could perhaps have restored cum by analogy with what follows, cum Heraciensem, but in the first there was nothing to suggest any omission after dignitatis. In five other passages k agrees with the French family against p⁵:

45.4 te habere nihil licet R: te habere mercari nihil licet k: tibi habere mercari nihil licet p⁵
66.4 ad supplicium duci Rk: ad supplicium adduci p, cett. fere
94.12 excitatur Rk: excitatur exit p⁵
102.3 tabulas Rk: tabellas p⁵
140.28 iudices dico Rk: dico iudices p⁵

Unless these are lucky slips in k or readings imported by contamination, the relationship of pk⁶ is more complex than I have yet found any other reason for supposing. Even in II 5, however, there are signs of descent from p. At 51.26, for instance, k has [ecquem] nautam [ecquem] militem, omissions that would be unaccountable but for the lines under both words in p, surely meant not to delete them but to indicate that they are single words, like the brace under ecquit at II 1.132.28, ecquando at II 2.43.20, ecquod at II 3.131.10, ecquando at II 5.66.24, and ecquem at II 5.67.7; the same thing must have happened at 150.22, where p has the circum of circumretitum at the end of a line and at the beginning of the next underlines retitum, omitted by k; and <et> habetis in k at 60.15, where Habetis opens a new paragraph in p at the top of a verso (f. 152v), may well have resulted from the sign in the margin of p, one of many such (their significance is lost on me) but closer than most to the Tironian 7 for et.

⁶⁴ When I cite R in II 4-5, I am trusting editorial reports, but I have checked S on line. I do not know whether the passage in question is legible in the palimpsest V (Vat. Reg. Lat. 2077).
To put aside δ for the moment, the simplest conclusion to draw from the evidence so far would be that k descends in II 2 entirely from a state of p earlier than its present state but in II 5 not entirely from p. With this difference in mind I set about collating II 3-4.

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

65.3 stuatores (p’) for stipatores
65.8 tu apis (p’) for turpis (p’), 80.15 diseatus (p’) for disertus,
198.27 fuctum (p’) for fructum; presumably a for r is a graphic error caused by rustic capitals
72.16 apronis (p’) for a patronis ab
77.24 legentiam (p’) for licentiam
88.8 rediptio (p) for direptio
97.8 vaxor (p) for uxor
107.9 culea (p’) for culpa
122.1 neglegititis (p’)
122.14 cii er<ti>iores (p)
135.30 refculperatores (p’)
135.6 agi<s> (p’)
136.10 loquido (p’) for liquido
136.18 puperet (p’) for cuperet
142.9 forftujnasque (p’), 198.26 forftujnis (p’)
144.27 L. Metelli <cogn>o cognoverit (p)
159.16 vehemen<ter> (p’)
161.13 imbro (p’) for improbo
169.13 ho<cf> (p)
171.17 atque <atque> (p)
184.17 consula<to>ri (p)
186.5 ftjardiiores (p’)
200.7 pet<end>endum (p)
201.17 minam (p’) for minima
207.4 lu<gent> (p’)
210.16 promanus (p) for populus Romanus
223.10 aliinis (p) for alienis

Some errors in k could again be due to peculiarities of p, especially peculiarities that result from correction. At 76.16, for instance, p has frumentarium corrected to frumentarium, and the result looks like frumentari ai, the
reading of k; similarly, at 137.3 tuam corrected to tuum looks like tuai, the reading of k; at 81.4 the superscript stroke in p that turns depisset into dempsisset is placed somewhat to the right of the e, and k has depressisset; at 114.16 I cannot make out the original reading of p before medimnis, but the correction that turned it into ternis can easily be taken for terri is, the reading of k; at 115.1 the strange reading of k, decudare for decumas dare, is explained by the layout of p, where the scribe wrote decu at the end of a line but continued on the next with dare, forgetting mas; at 152.14, where k has congallius for C. Gallus, the scribe of p at first omitted the initial before gallius but then added it above the line and as usual gave it a superscript stroke; at 153.9 p has metellus at the end of a line and so uses an abbreviation for us, and k has metelli; at 157.22 p uses another abbreviation for us, this time written above the m of dicamus, and k has dicamen; and at 223.5, where p has ida corrected to ita by the addition of a crossbar to the top of the d, k has idea (ida). Apart from trivial slips like putero for potero, auctorit[e] for auctoritae, f[rr]umentum, or sole|lebat, I found only three errors of p not repeated by k: 154.24 <in> inimicis, 220.8 improbitati[s] with δ (‘fort. recte’ Peterson), 222.1 posset for possessit. I therefore have no hesitation in drawing the same conclusion as in II 2: k descends from an earlier state of p than its present state.

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

37.31 homini perditum p: homini perdito Rōk
39.6 facta dicebat optime p: facta optime dicebat p2: optime facta dicebat Rōk
45.24 sint pō: sunt Rk
58.24 Valentius eius interpreti p: Valentio eius interpreti Rōk
58.5 nulla domo … locuples fuit p: nulla domus … locuples fuit Rōk
74.30 veramtamen p: verumtamen Rōk
75.3 flagaret … coepit p: flagrare … coepit Rōk
85.27 senatus Sopatro responsorium nullum dat p: senatus Sopatro responsorium nullum dat Rōk
Over half of these errors, though, are simple breaches of concord, and 103.13 praeponendo and 150.31 potuerunt are not much different. At 45.24, where the divergence is of an everyday kind, the agreement of δ with p suggests that the reading of k, if right, was a lucky slip. At 102.18 I am not sure that est was not expunged in p, though the dots eluded the scribe of q if it was; but the addition or omission of est is another error of an everyday kind. At 39.6, however, there was no reason to adjust the order of p1 or p2 except that optime facta dicebat gives a better clausula, a fact unlikely to have struck a medieval scribe. Just possibly the first pair of superscript strokes in p was meant to cover facta dicebat, not dicebat alone as the scribes of q and Vat. Lat. 1754 assumed centuries before Peterson65; nor can a lucky slip be ruled out, because the many errors of k in this scribe’s portion include several transpositions. Altogether in II 4, then, the evidence for the independence of k seems no better than in II 2-3.

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

I mentioned above that k preserves some readings of p1 obliterated by p2. Two examples: at II 2.106.19, where p2 restored videite in place of a shorter word, k has unde, and at II 3.9.12, where p2 restored qui cum, k has .o. vicum, an error doubtless caused by a pre-medieval script. How far the readings of p1

65 At II 4.96.5 the French family has perparvulum signum ex aere, p apparently ex aere perparvulum (parvulum p2) signum (so too Vat. Lat. 1754), k perparvulum ex aere signum; but in p faint traces of superscript strokes can be made out, and q has the strange misinterpretation ex perparvulum aere signum.
matter to editors, though, largely depends on whether Peterson’s \textit{deteriores} are independent of \(p\). If they \textit{are}, their agreement with the French family will override \(p'\), whatever its historical interest. Time, then, to look at them.

2.2.0. The Italian family (ii): the \textit{deteriores}

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

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

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

In my review I cited two readings of \(\delta\) that I thought might show it to be an independent relative of \(p\), which omits them: II 1.127.1 \textit{ordine}, which it shares with the palimpsest \textit{V} (\textit{Vat. Reg. Lat. 2077}) but puts after \textit{nomine}, and II 5.167.5 \textit{semper}, which it shares with \textit{Gellius}. Both readings occur in passages missing today from the French family, but it is unsafe to assume that either passage was always missing there. The first could have been present in the original state of \textit{R} and \textit{S}, the second in the original state.
of C if C was independent of R as it seems to have been\textsuperscript{66}. The second is open to a further objection, that it could have been imported from Gellius 1.7.2\textsuperscript{67}. Gellius’s work is transmitted in two blocks, Books 1–7 and 9–20, and the first block not only appears in French and English manuscripts of the 12th and 13th century but was also known in Italy to Benzo of Alessandria, Guglielmo da Pastrengo, Petrarch, Salutati, Domenico di Bandino, and Giovanni Dominici\textsuperscript{68}. In 1.7 Gellius is pressing the claims of a reading found in oratione Ciceronis quinta in Verrem in libro spectatae fidei Tironiana cura atque disciplina facto; the reading in question is II 5.167.11 futurum, not semper, but anyone prompted by Gellius’s fanfare to check the text of the passage might have noticed semper. Some of the deteriores, for instance Bologna Univ. 2232 (dated 1419) and Laur. 48.27 (written by 1418; see below, § 2.2.1–2), give the Divinatio in Caecilium a title that includes the phrase de constitutando accusatore, which seems likelier to have come from Gellius 4.9.7 in oratione de accusatore constitutando or 13.25.9 in libro … qui de constitutando accusatore est than to have survived from Antiquity in the tradition of the Verrines, because p has the title M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem lib. I and no member of the French family differentiate the speeches by anything more than their place in the set\textsuperscript{69}. Doubtless Gellius was echoing

\textsuperscript{66} Reynolds, Texts and transmission (n. 1), 68; Reeve, “A lost manuscript” (n. 30), 385.

\textsuperscript{67} Stephen Oakley points out to me that A. C. Clark, The Vetus Cluniacensis of Poggio, Oxford 1905, xlviii, traced to Gellius 20.10.4 the correction pellitur at Pro Murena 30.11 in Laur. 90 sup. 69.1, a Florentine manuscript written by the “Puccini” scribe, on whom see n. 101 below.

\textsuperscript{68} P. K. Marshall in Texts and transmission (n. 1), 176–80; R. Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne’ secoli XIV e XV, Florence 1905–14, reprinted with an introduction by E. Garin and additions and corrections from an annotated copy of the author’s, 1967, II, 225–6; S. Scipioni, I codici umanistici di Gellio, Rome 2003, 30. Sabbadini and Scipioni mention that in 1375 Salutati had got wind of a complete manuscript in the estate of Giovanni Calderini, but the inventory published by M. Cocchetti, “La biblioteca di Giovanni Calderini”, Studi medievali III 19, 1978, 951–852, includes only De floratio exerpta ex libro Agelli Nocium activarum, no. 63 II on p. 974 (the widespread misconception that A. Gellius was Agellius survived into the age of print). Nothing of I.2 appears in any of the medieval florilegia described by F. Cavazza, “L’elenco finora conosciuto dei florilegia medioevali che comprendono anche excerpta gelliana o solo excerpta gelliana” (I omit three misleading commas, Maia 52, 2000, 99–126, and Leofranc Holford-Strevens kindly tells me that he has met no florilegium that includes it.

\textsuperscript{69} “Septem … Verrinarum libros numerant codices PQH [= pqr]” says Klotz (n. 12) iv, but in fact p has at the end of the first speech M. Tulli Ciceronis de accusatore liber I explic. incip. lib. II (f. 9r), at the end of the second M. Tulli Ciceronis in C. Verrem lib. III (later II?) explic. incip. lib. III (later III?) explicit. (f. 38v), and thereafter (f. 69v, 112r, 144v, 173v) no rubric at all. The only original title in O (Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79) is Liber Verrinarum at the beginning of II 2; the others were added much later (by Lagomarsini?). L. Piacente, “Numerazione e titoli delle Verrine”, Bol. dei Class. III 1, 1980, 134–44, does not mention either the titles in any of the manuscripts or Gellius’s way of referring to the Divinatio in Caecilium. I shall return below (§ 2.2.2.4) to this title and the
what Cicero himself says in 10, *dicendum necessario est de contentione nostra, ut in constituendo accusatore quid sequi possitis habeatis*. At II 5.167, however, it may be thought to tell against use of Gellius that none of the earlier *deteriores* adopt *futurum*, though it does appear for instance in the text of Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1, Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 (‘A. Gellius’ in the margin, written by the scribe), Budapest Univ. 2, and the *editio princeps* (Rome 1471), and in the margin of Laur. 48.14 (‘sic legit A. Gellius’ or ‘sic legit Agellius’, probably written in the 16th century). About Gellius, therefore, *non liquet*.

At the moment I have no other evidence for or against either position that δ may occupy in the stemma. In his apparatus Peterson does not mention that at II 3.228.30, where he prints *etiamne frumentum pro empto gratis dare? etiamne in cellam cum cupiant gratis dare ultro pecuniam addere?*, only δ has the whole of it: Opδk omit *etiamne in cellam cum cupiant gratis dare*, and in p a corrector expunged *frumento pro empto* and wrote above it *in cellam cum cupiant*, with the result that p + p2 omits *etiamne frumentum pro empto gratis dare*; but here too it is unsafe to assume that the French family in its entirety omitted what O omits. In general, though, I would rather not postulate contamination when an unobjectionable stemma can be drawn up without it. I therefore issue a challenge to devotees of contamination: produce evidence.

If δ is independent of p, one source of corrections in p must have been δ or a relative, with which p2 shares these readings not accepted by editors:

| II 2.35.8 | venisse relictam pδk2: venisse δ: relictam pδkO |
| II 2.177.12 | condicio p2δ: contentio pδkO |
| II 3.83.4 | eripiet pδ: non eripiet pδkO |
| II 3.121.20 | minore (-res δ) remansisse p2δ: remansisse pδkO |
| II 3.163.21 | ita ut p2δ: ita in pδkO |
| II 3.213.3 | voluntatem p2δ: utilitatem pδkO |
| II 4.59.9 | neque/nec vulgo p2δ: nea et vulso pδk: neti lyso R |
| II 5.38.2 | creditam p2δ: sibi creditam pδk: tibi creditam R |
| II 5.45.28 | responsio p2δ: res p. pδkR |
| II 5.46.14 | naviculariam <te> p2δ |
| II 5.51.18 | imperaretur p2δ: imponeretur pδk: imponebatur R |

Already at *Caecil. 8.25* p2 restores *vim ... iudiciorum*, missing by *saut du même au même* from the descendants of S as well as from pδ; but δ may not have been alone in preserving it, because the omission in S need not have occurred in any ancestor of S. Presumably, though, when p2 restores words present both in δ and in the French family, they came from the same source others that go with it.
as the readings just listed. In fact I have met few passages like Caecil. 27.21, where ipse, added by p\textsuperscript{2}, is present in the French family but absent from δ; and in such passages p\textsuperscript{2} could be following a less corrupt relative of δ rather than a member of the French family.

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

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

\textsuperscript{70} The fullest summary that I have met is C. Griggio’s in “Due lettere inedite del Bruni al Salutati e a Francesco Barbaro”, Rinascimento II 26, 1986, 27-50, at p. 39 n. 20.
\textsuperscript{71} “Cicero’s Verrines” (n. 34).
\textsuperscript{73} Rizzo, La tradizione, 30 n. 20, 37 n. 47.
\textsuperscript{75} Sabbadini, Scoperte (n. 68), II, 123, put the start of his service in 1391 and composition in 1395, but on p. 278 these dates are corrected to 1398 and 1399. The entry in the Diz. biog. degli italiani 66, 2006, 154-60 (P. Viti) ignores not only Sabbadini’s corrections but also D. Gigensohn, “Antonio Loschi e Baldassarre Cossa vor dem Pisaner Konzil von 1409”, IMU 30, 1987, 1-93, at pp. 15-30, who says that the earliest document signed by Loschi bears the date June 26th 1398, though he mentions a previous tenure, undated. The terminus ante quem appears to be early 1404.
Had p emerged first, it would probably have built up a larger family regardless of who found it or where. Above (§ 2.1) I gave a reason for thinking that it was not just owned in the 16th century by Celso Cittadini of Siena but already there in the 13th; I do not know, however, where q or V at. Lat. 1754 was written. Curiously, it was from Siena that Bruni wrote two letters in October 1407, one on the 8th to Niccoli about a copy in the possession of Bartolomeo Capra, ‘volumen … preclare scripturam orationum Ciceronis contra Verrem et quarundam aliarum invectivarum’, which he asks Niccoli to have furnished with decorated initials, and one on the 7th to Nicola de’ Medici about a copy that he describes as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

79 Griggio, “Due lettere” (n. 70), opposite p. 42, and J. Hankins in *Autografi dei letterati italiani*, Rome 2013, 2 I, 97, give a plate. In *Manuscripts and methods* (n. 17), 266, I quoted the note in translation; see also *R. F. I. C.* 114, 1986, 170 n. 1. Griggio, “Due lettere”, 57 n. 18, gives the fullest available description of Strozzi 44. Peterson, “The MSS. of the Verrines” (n. II), viii n. 1, misattributes Bruni’s note to Conv. Soppr. 79, probably because Zumpt (n. 16), I, xxxii, had misidentified Strozzi 44, from which he quoted it, as Lag. 42, which was actually Conv. Soppr. 79. On Lagomarsini and his numbers see n. 10 above.

80 Griggio, “Due lettere” (n. 70), 29, 36-39, 47. I do not understand why he describes the letter as roughly three years earlier than the one sent on October 7th 1407 and Strozzi 44 as
that he wrote to Niccoli about must have been different, because Strozzi 44 contains only the *Verrines*, apparently belonged already to Bruni himself, and is decently enough written at the beginning but not throughout; nor could the same manuscript have been sent on the 7th of October to Nicola de’ Medici and on the 8th to Niccoli. Though bishop of Cremona at the time, Capra was attached to the curia, which happened to be in Siena, and it is hard to say how or where he might have acquired his copy. It could even have belonged to the French family, two Italian members of which do include other invectives: Vat. Lat. 1751 continues with the *Catilinarians* and the spurious exchange of insults with Sallust (*Graviter et iniquo animo …* and *Ea demum magna voluptas …*), and Frauenfeld Y 227 begins with the *Philippics*, the *Catilinarians*, and the spurious exchange. On his death in 1433, however, a “liber Marci Ciceronis de denominatione” was found among the books at his house in Milan, and I shall reveal below (§ 2.2.2.4) that there is an alternative to the suggestion made by the scholar who published the inventory in question that *De divinatione* was meant. Later, when he became archbishop of Milan, he may have put his manuscript at the disposal of Lombardy or further afield in the north. Certainly many of the extant *deteriores*, especially the earlier ones, seem to be northern. Is even Strozzi 44 Florentine?

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

---

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


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

84 R. Sabbadini, *Biografia documentata di Giovanni Aurispa*, Noto 1890, 159 no. 27 “Item Verinam Ciceronis copertam de rubeo preci ducatorum quinque”; A. Franceschini, *Giovanni Aurispa e la sua biblioteca*, Padua 1976, 121 no. 360 “Item Verius Ciceronis, in cartis membranis deauratis, cum albis cohopterdis brasill”. Franceschini reports several other manuscripts of *orationes*, but with the possible exception of 120 no. 352, “Item omnes orationes Ciceros, perpulcre, in membranis deauratis, cum albis cohopterd brasilli”, it can probably be assumed that they did not include the *Verrines*. 
operibus in pergamenō in mediocrī volumine; incipit Quam multe res et finīt accusare necesse sit [the end of II 5]. Copertus de rubec

Unless it was dismembered, it has not survived; but the cataloguer’s transformation of Verres into Venus must be one of the strangest incidents in the transmission of classical texts.

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

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

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

---


87 Griggio, “Due lettere” (n. 70), 37 n. 18.
9.15 *is*, which *F* corrupts to *sibi, voluntates rerum, hoc, ipse*. I will call it *M*. When I collated *M* in my passage of II 5, more instances emerged:

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

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

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

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

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

Readings of *M*² adopted in the text of *F* include these:

*Caecil.* 55.20 *nomenque* (*nomine* *pD*: *nomen* *M*¹), II 1.42.6 *ad aliquam* (*aut ad quam* *pD*: *aut aliquam* *M*¹), 157.7 *aude* (*audeam* *p*: *tandum* *M*), II 2.57.15 [*facere cum*] (*facere* *cum* *M*¹), 71.11 *alter iuri* (*alter iuri* for *alterutri* *M*¹), II 3.77.10 *exhausti* (*adflicti* *pO*: om. *M*¹), 202.15 *tum* (*iam* *pO*: *tam* *M*¹), II 4.29.30 *minus* <*invidiae*>, 41.26 <*praesentes*> *reos*, 57.23 *incredibile*<*m rem* ... *claram*, 93.6 [*quidem*], 95.18 *tandum mali* for *tam mali*, 101.5 *or[n]andi*, 127.9 *Haec*, II 5.7.4 *illum* <*se*>, 39.14 <*non*> *ut*, 53.19 *omnes* <*praetores*>, 67.7 et quem audisti (*equem scis* *pR*: et *questis* *M*¹), 69.26 *coniecerat* <*contradi*>, 75.25 *esse potuit* (*esse* *p*: *esse* *M*¹), 78.1 *non* for *nunc* [*quiaquam*], 95.7 *cum* for [*qui*], 105.5 <*potius*> *suscipiam* (*pMF* have *totius* for *potius* shortly before), 161.11 *comperisse* <*ait*>, 164.23 *secundum* (*ad* *pR*: om. *M*¹).
Like F, M has in the margin at II 5.33.3, 6, 8, the same glosses as p on *aera, abduci, aere dirutus*.

Two obstacles seem to present themselves, but they occur on leaves written in a different hand from the adjacent leaves. The passage from II 2.127.16 *familiaris* to 135.5 *quadriplatorum*, which occupies f. 43, has not only gaps for missing words but also a number of startling errors absent from pF, some of them plainly guesswork: 127.29 *e duabus* for *eduici*, 1 *solum* for *scriptum*, 2 *indigensis* for *indignum*, 128.9 *iam neque* for *ille atque*, 129.29 *solummodo* for *hoc modo*, 30 *adverteret* for *opreatoret*, 132.25 *addidit* for *ostendit*, 134.25 *furandi* for *fuisse*. Presumably the original leaf suffered damage after the copying of F and was replaced with the present leaf, a not very successful copy of the damaged one; like the rest of M, the present leaf has readings shared with p but corrupted by F, such as 128.12 *et* (ac F), 134.15 *habuerit* (habuit F). At II 1.127.18–21 M but not F omits *Verres utrum ... quid est before Verres quod planum;* but the bifolium ff. 24–5, which runs from II 1.118.30 *-nibus non* to 138.26 *loquitur Mustius*, is again in a different hand, probably the one that wrote f. 43. A stain in the margin, fainter on the other side of the leaf and not repeated on the adjacent leaves, might suggest it is hard to believe that the passage was ever restored. Why a new bifolium should have become necessary I have no idea, but the omission is not the only error here against pF: add 126.5 *ipsum* for *ipse*, 129.21 *querimonia [que]*, 132.26 *testamenta* for *-to*. Agreements of pF against M elsewhere, few in number, can be put down to conjecture or lucky accident: I 13.14 *eo* (eis M or perhaps M1), II 1.152.27 *te tam (~ M)*, II 2.178.20 *quidem tibi (~ M)*, II 3.6.19 *ullas inimicitias (~ M)*.

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

---

88 None is mentioned in the brief description available on line in *Manus*.
margin added by someone whose interests were lexical and rhetorical; a few rhetorical terms are capably written in Greek (ff. 4r, 12r, 56r, 58r, 65r, 66r, 66v). An earlier annotator, or at most two, picked out a few *notabilia*. What then of the scribe or scribes? I have already mentioned that ff. 24–25 and f. 43 are later replacements. Elsewhere in a few places, though not at the end of any quire, there seems at first sight to be a change of hand, pen, or ink: after f. 12, f. 30, f. 32, and f. 104va. In all probability, however, there is only one change of hand, after f. 12. After that point r invariably has a foot (a hook to the right at the base of the first stroke), which it seldom has before that point. The scribe of ff. 24–5 and f. 43, who gives it a foot, differs from the second scribe chiefly in greater regularity and in not sharing the slight lean to the right seen in the rest of M; a lapse of time may account for these differences. The first two hands suggest the influence of Salutati rather than of anyone active in the Veneto, but short of speculating about Niccoli’s cursive hand in the undocumented period of his scribal career, say from 1385 to 1405 (he was born in 1364/65), I have no candidate to offer for either.\(^90\)

2.2.1.2. Descendants of M but not of F

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

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

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

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

\(^91\) I thank Consuelo Dutschke for the information about Plimpton 101, and Gareth Williams for channelling my inquiry.
43.21 [etiam], 44.2 et for ut. Up to that point they descend from M but not by way of F, as is shown by their having 42.7 vendideris, which F omits; by the passages that occupy ff. 24–5 and f. 43 of M, where they differ from M chiefly in ignoring the gaps that M leaves; and by their omission of II 1.68.14–15 si ... essent, which M omits between the recto and verso of f. 18 (other things omitted by M occur at similar points: II 2.13.8 traditos between the recto and verso of f. 29, II 5.6.15 locorum between the columns of f. 99r). Furthermore, after II 3.45.18, where the other two break off, Canon. Class. Lat. 233 shares omissions and transpositions with F against M: 57.15 [Aetnae], 67.12 minis ac vi for vi ac minis, 85.1 [fin], 119.6 plus sibi ~, 121.22 [eos], 137.29 [esse], 140.12 [ut], 146.21 virorum bonorum ~, 147.5 verbo decimas ~, 152.16 [per], 176.9 [quidem], 178.11 [illa], 191.7 [potius], 212.17 [ne], 214.14 [non modo], 222.24 [recte]. It must therefore descend from a manuscript that originally stopped at the same point as the other two but was then supplemented. I will come back to the character of the supplement (§ 2.2.2.1). As Canon. Class. Lat. 254 was written at Sibenik in Croatia, it seems likely that the common source of the three manuscripts was copied from M in the territory of Venice, obviously no later than 1449.

2.2.1–2. The two families of deteriores

Before I had identified M as the exemplar of F, I collated F throughout and checked in Laur. 48.27 every passage where F has an error absent from p. I chose Laur. 48.27 partly because it is available on line, partly because I had already noticed that it did not share all the errors of F, and partly for its date. 'Liber Cosme Iohannis de Medicis' (f. 107r, at the end of II 4), it must surely be the ‘Verrine di Tulio di lettera antica’ listed in an inventory of 141892, and Albinea de la Mare at first thought it might well have been written by Poggio as early as 1403–8, but later she said ‘I am now less certain that the scribe is Poggio himself’ and put it ‘?’ before 141093. Surprising for that date, and even more surprising if Poggio did indeed write it, is its large number of errors:

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

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

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

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

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

94 On Lagomarsini’s numbers see n. 10.
95 Peterson reports that D also had this transposition, and B. N. F. Lat. 16226 and 16674 have it too, which suggests that ista tua corrected by superscript strokes already appeared in S. Esc. R I 2 has tua ista with pMF.
II 1.30.1-3 Interposuistis accusatorem qui, cum ego mihi c et x dies solos in Siciliam postulassem, c et viii sibi in Achaiam postularet.

in achaiaim pD: nala F¹(nalam M¹ ut vid.): hic alter F²(M³): in achaia F³

I shall not use again the symbol F³, which I have used here because F has more than one correction and it is clear which came first. By F² I shall mean any corrector of F, not a particular corrector that I feel able to recognize. Here F², probably the scribe, inserted hic alter above the line (a poor conjecture, because postularet already has qui as its subject), but later it was erased, presumably by whoever put in achaia in the margin. This later correction appears in the text of many calligraphic manuscripts largely written in Florence, to which I devote the next section.

2.2.1.3.1. Descendants of F that have in achaia at II 1.30.1-3

Many of the calligraphic manuscripts in the following list have been assigned to particular Florentine scribes by Albinia de la Mare⁹⁶:

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

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

In these largely Florentine manuscripts I have found no innovations that they all share against F but several more besides II 1.30.3 in Achaia that they share with F² against F³ and the other family, such as Caecil. 4.9 adductum for adduci (pMF³D), II 1.141.14 tectum for verum (pMF³), II 2.122.25 fde

censu] (why did F2 make this change?), II 4.62.15 -que triclinium (so pR, rightly) for quatriclinium (MF3), II 5.26.5 non modo extra <cubiculum sed ne> lectum quidem (non modo extra [tectum sed ne extra] lectum quidem pMF1, cett. dett.: recte R). Made in the margin, this last correction has been attributed to Bruni97. At II 4.62.15 F2 erased the original reading of F before substituting -que triclinium, but quatriclinium can still be made out. In view of the credulity shown by the many witnesses to exornat ample PDJQL½FH TXDWULFOLQLXP, the agreement of all these largely Florentine manuscripts on -que triclinium can hardly be dismissed as polygenetic (the result of independent correction by various scribes). Though in theory F could have been corrected from one of the others, it cannot be an accident that they share corrections made in F but among themselves only such errors as appear in F. That they descend from F would therefore be likely even without the near certainty that the errors of F against M arose in F.

Surely a copy of F itself is Conv. Soppr. J IX 8, which agrees with F in omitting non ad avaritiam non ad cupiditatem at II 4.60.23-24 and in reading fecit at I 5.28 with pM and the French family against patefecit in F2 and most other deteriores that I have checked; did the scribe take Bruni’s admonition to heart? Several of the rest cannot have been copied directly from F + F2, not least because four descend from others. Bologna Univ. 2234 descends from Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. I; they share II 3.1.7 ut<i>, 2.12 hominibus for omnibus, 4.17 licentia for laetitia, 5.7 in iudicium for indicium, [non], 9 in for mihi, 8.28 and 29 viri for vestri, 9.12 [cum], and the former adds II 3.2.12 [eiusmodi], 4.16 ceteros<que>, 21 semper erit ~, 10.18 alio dicentur loco 1 alio loco dicentur 2, II 4.65.28 [et] puerili, 7-8 [quod cum … referrent] (a line of S. Croce 23 sin. 1, the last of a page, begins with this, and only punctuation and iste ait follow). Budapest Univ. 2 descends from Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IX 8, written by Giovanfrancesco Marzi and owned by Giorgio Antonio Vespucci; they share II 3.2.15 [voluntate], 4.20 aliquem for alterum, 6.19 esse, 7.15 possint for -sunt, II 4.62.19 arbit[raretur], 20 iste for ipse, 22 [quaer], 25 aurea for -eo, 64.10 [est], 15 nondum [etiam], 65.25 a<b>, 67.11 foculos], and the former adds II 3.6.16 descendere for -erim, 7.17 ac for atque, II 4.63.28 [fillud], 66.16 impudentiam<que>, 67.3 [sel], 9 huius unius ~, 15 e<x>. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1487 (s. xv2), from the Veneto and written in a distinctive cursive98, descends from Venice Marc. Lat. XI 36 (4518), which if Florentine must already have been in the Veneto; they share II 3.4.23 asperior in re for in re asperior, II 4.65.30 obtulerunt for att-, and the former incorporates

97 At least, I presume it is one of the notes that Hankins, Autografi (n. 79), 87, has in mind when he says that notes in Bruni’s hand occur on both columns of f. 88v.
corrections made in the latter, for instance II 3.2.13 <a> re publica, 3.17 ita<que>, II 4.61.3 quod for ad et. In turn, San Daniele 58 descends from Pal. Lat. 1487; at II 5.171.6 they share the conjecture silvestria animalia, and at II 5.163.1, where Marc. Lat. XI 36 has deligatur for -atus, Pal. Lat. 1487 has -atur in its text but corrects it to -aretur, which appears in the text of San Daniele 58. Battista da Cingoli had written San Daniele 58 by 1461, which becomes the terminus ante quem for the other two. Then three manuscripts in my list do share errors absent from F and the rest: II 5.166.21 suspicabare is omitted by the two Marciani and Urb. Lat. 321, and at II 4.62.18 for et, unambiguously written in F, Marc. Lat. Z 430 and the first hand of Marc. Lat. XI 36 have è and Urb. Lat. 321 est. Marc. Lat. Z 430, signed by the Florentine scribe Petrus Stroza but owned by Bessarion, has a few slips absent from the other two and either not worth correcting or not correctable without recourse to another manuscript, such as II 3.2.10 a/b), 3.11 accusarunt for -arint, 4.22 quendam for quempiam, II 4.68.22 ceteris for exteris, II 5.168.15 [quod velit], 174.22 longe for longius. For suspicabare at II 5.166.21 Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 has speculabare, but this slip, caused by speculatorum two words before, is hard to connect with the omission of suspicabare in the manuscripts just discussed if Conv. Soppr. J IX 8 was copied directly from F. Behind those that omit suspicabare must have been a lost copy of F, perhaps a “Puccini” manuscript (one written, that is, by the scribe of many that have the 16th-century ex libris of Bernardus de Puccinis). As the other speeches are all represented by a “Puccini” copy probably written in the 1430s, and so too most of Cicero’s other works, it would be astonishing if the “Puccini” scribe did not copy the Verrines, though no such copy has come to light. The hypothesis would also account for any disagreement among these manuscripts where the readings of both F1 and F2 are still available, because the “Puccini” scribe equipped his copies with variants in the margin.

300 For a plate see (with a magnifying glass) S. Marcon, “La miniatura nei manoscritti latini commissionati dal cardinal Bessarione”, in G. Fiaccadori, ed., Bessarione e l’umanesimo, Naples 1994, 171-95, at p. 174 fig. 42; on p. 173 she discusses the illuminator and the date of acquisition.
101 The point was made to me very forcefully by Stephen Oakley, who has identified Laur. 48.33 as the “Puccini” copy of the Philippics and found that Urb. Lat. 321 and Marc. Lat. Z 430 descend from it; see now his article “The ‘Puccini’ scribe and the transmission of Latin texts in fifteenth-century Florence”, in R. Black, J. Kraye, L. Nuvoloni, eds., Palaeography, manuscript illumination and humanism in Renaissance Italy: studies in memory of A. C. de la Mare, London 2016, 345-64, at pp. 347-8. For the other speeches see Rizzo, Catalogo (n. 81), 52-53 no. 32, and M. D. R., “Before and after Poggio: some manuscripts of Cicero’s speeches”, RFIC 112, 1984, 266-84, at pp. 280-82.
2.2.1.3.2. Descendants of F that have hic alter at II 1.30.1-3

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

Reims II10 (a. 1417) Brussels 10007-11

Reims II10, the earliest dated manuscript of the Verrines, has this note on f. 1v: ‘Scriptum Constancie in concilio generali anno domini millesimo CCCCmo decimo septimo et dicti concilii tercio’, and then in an informal hand ‘Ego Guillelmus cardinalis sancti Marci olim decanus Remensis hunc librum dono librarie ecclesie Remensis scriptum manu propria Constancie in concilio generali die primo Octobris anno suprascripto. G. cardinalis sancti Marci’. The donor, then, was Guillaume Fillastre, and the absence of punctuation before scriptum in the informal note may suggest, as it did to the cataloguer102, that he was also the scribe; but quite apart from the superhuman effort that would have been needed for copying out the seven Verrines and five other speeches in a day, similar notes in other manuscripts show that scriptum … Marci just certifies Ego … ecclesie Remensis103. Brussels 10007-11 I have not seen and shall not go out of my way to see, because it has the same unusual content (the Verrines followed by five other speeches) and on f. 273r the note ‘Hunc librum feci conscribi in libraria ecclesie Remensis’104. These are the errors of Reims II10 in my passages of II 3-5:

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

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

103 Loriquet, Catalogue général, 469 (1320), 471 (1321); Ch. Samaran, R. Marichal, Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste V, Paris 1965, 297 (1110), 301 (1320, 1321).
104 P. Thomas, Catalogue des manuscrits de classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles, Ghent 1896, 50-51.
far as I am aware, Bruni is attested at Konstanz only at the end of 1414, but Poggio was there for the duration of the council. In any event, Reims II provides a terminus ante quem for some readings of F2, for instance three that appear in all the largely Florentine manuscripts discussed above (§ 2.2.1.3.1): Caecil. 4.9 adductum for adduci, II 2.122.25 (de censu) (unless the scribe jumped du même au même), II 5.185.27 pergame for perge.

Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7786, accurately written, supplements and corrects its French text from an Italian source, and the main result is that it has an Italian text, albeit in a French hand, from II 1.111.24 to the end of II 3. Readings such as II 2.54.12 amicorum suorum ~., 141.1 improba (F2; improbata pMF), and II 3.5.9 [mihi], show that it descends from F + F2, but it originally omitted for no obvious reason several passages of the same length, namely II 2.33.4 et Siculis ... cum cive, 73.23 gravius ... invidiamque, 114.15 testimonis ... absolutus, 152.2 qui tibi ... dicet et, which must each have occupied a line of an exemplar written not in two columns like F here but across the page like Reims II, where the lines are slightly longer. At II 2.151.19 it shares with pMF and Reims II the true reading maximam, for which the second family has max eximiam.

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

Above I cited three readings that F2 must have introduced by 1417, the date of Reims II. The first, Caecil. 4.9 addu(c)tum, appears in Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IV 4, which also shares with MF Caecil. 2.16 [saepus] ostendisse and I 5.28 fecit (patefecit F2, cett. fere). It never included II 3-5. Reported sporadically by Peterson as b and more fully in G. Lopez’s edition of II 2 as B, it is very corrupt, so much so that it may descend from F at several removes; but in view of hic alter it must descend from an early state of F. Outside the Verrines, or at least in most of the other speeches that it contains, it belongs to a family at home in northern Italy. No surprise, then, that in the Verrines it has a much earlier relative probably written in

---

35 Luiso (n. 78) 81-82.
37 See n. 60.
38 See my edition of Pro Quinctio, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1992, xv. Rizzo (n. 89), 57-9 no. 37, reports the view of Albina de la Mare that it has “Florentine decoration of c. 1450-60”. Wide of the mark was Peterson’s date in his edition (n. 4) xiii: “Videtur circa annum 1420 esse exaratus”.
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the Veneto, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1476. This large collection of Cicero’s speeches and some of his rhetorical and philosophical works is usually dated s. xiv or s. xiv/xv, but its three forms of capital \( M \) include the Byzantine form (like an \( H \) with a descender from the middle of the crossbar), occasionally found in Latin manuscripts from about 1410 to about 1460; in some of the speeches it has marginalia that go back to Petrarch\(^{109}\). Shared errors in \( Caecil. \) and the next two speeches include these:

\[
\text{Caecil. 2.10 nominis[que], 3.6 hoc uno ~, 5.28 [mihi], 6.5 <necessitatis> necessitudinis, 10.10 reprehendis for repetundis, 11.15 tacet si for tametsi, 1 2.1 [atque], 3.9 <feci> factae, 3.10 in ea for mea, 4.17 [populo Romano], 5.25 [quod], 6.6 in eo for meo, 10.5 non for vero, 11 [fore], II 1.6.7 mendet (Pal.) or mendati (Conv. Soppr.) for respondet, 71.23 cui ipse for audisse (blotted in F), 80.13 [causam], 119.10 [ita], 149.15 istam diem ~, 19 factus est ~}
\]

In my passages of II 4 and II 5, however, Pal. Lat. 1476 belongs to the second family. The simplest explanation for this change of allegiance would be that like Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 its first exemplar did not go beyond II 2, but in fact the agreement between the two does not continue to the end of II 2; at 151.19 Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 has \( \text{mox eximiam} \) with the second family against \( \text{maximam} \) in MF and Pal. Lat. 1476. I cannot say where before II 2.151.19 Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 changes its allegiance; at II 2.122.25 it has \( \text{de censu} \), which Pal. Lat. 1476 omits with F2 and Reims III10, but as omission by \( \text{saut du même au même} \) is a possibility anywhere in the tradition, the passage cannot safely be used as evidence that the change occurred before that point. I mention for completeness, not because it sheds any light on the matter, that Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 omits II 2.184.5 \( \text{vobis} – 190.20 \text{haec omnia} \). Similarly, I cannot say where after II 2.151.19 Pal. Lat. 1476 changes its allegiance. In my passages of II 3 and II 4 it has these errors:

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

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

\(^{109}\) Rizzo, \textit{Catalogo} (n. 89), 139-41 no. 129. It has just become available online at digi. bu.uni-heidelberg.de.

\(^{110}\) So my note says, but Lopez in his edition (n. 60) reports that the omission starts three words later.
The reading of F2 at Caecil. 4.9 obliterated *adduci*, but *adduci* appears in a large sub-family that descends from F. This sub-family must therefore descend from a state of F earlier than 1417, the date of Reims 1110, which has *adductum*. Nine manuscripts belong to it:

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

They share these errors:

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

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

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

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

---

112 See n. 78.
II 3.2.16 qua<e>dam, 3.5 invitus for munitus, 7.15 <esse> animum, II 4.61.6 primum for patrium, 64.18 pervenire<n>, 65.27-28 [esse facturum ... improbitate], 1 involucris eiectis for involucrisque reiectis, 7 qui cum for quod cum, 66.19 maximoque for maximo quod.

In my passages of II 3 and II 4 some of the few differences that I find in my collations may be due to carelessness on my part, but I can vouch for II 4.63.2 [ext]spoliatatum in Vat. Lat. 8509, an innovation with respect to the reading of F, Vad. 314, and Montecassino 340, even though right (pMR have it). Vat. Lat. 8509 may therefore be a copy of Montecassino 340. Leiden B. P. L. 16D and Turin D IV 2 share the subscription Ut gaudere solet ... (a quatrain, Schaller-Kössgen 16856) and also a few errors: II 3.6.20 [dis] similitudines, 7.10 [contra], II 4.63.27 gaudere <coepit>, 65.9 ait se -. The former, which has more errors and originally omitted Caecil. 4.10-11 spes ... petissent, descends from the latter, which has spes ... petissent on a line and omits II 3.7.10 contra between lines; indeed, it must be a direct copy, because it was the scribe who restored spes ... petissent. As Vat. Lat. 11421 at first omitted II 2.138.12-14 sic census ... posset ad- (f. 51r), which the scribe restored (sic census ... posset in the margin, ad- by overwriting in the text), it must be a direct copy of Vad. 314, which has the sequence on a line (f. 51v).113 In my passage of II 3 a relative and probably descendant of Vat. Lat. 11421 is Vat. Chig. H VIII 249, which in its original text shares with it 2.10 reprehenda<n>t, 16 etiam ut -, 4.18 <h>ae, 24 iudicare for videare, 5.10 <in> omnibus, 9.6 [beneficia], 12 [ornet]; but in my passages of II 4 and II 5 Chig. H VIII 249 belongs with the largely Florentine manuscripts discussed above (§ 2.2.1.3.1)114. A member of this sub-family provided q2 with Caecil. 28.5 cum (Vad.1) for quod (pqM: om. F, Vad.1), 1.35.7 periculos<issim>, 41.18 <et> iudicibus, II 1.42.5 <de> hoc, 62.10 fastigia for ves-, 81.28 aut <ab>, 83.28 <te> teste, 88.17 causas for -am, 151.18 concitaret (Vad.1) for commoverem (pq: concitarem MF), 153.11 cuiuslibet for cuiusque115; another, used in II 2-3, provided a corrector of O (Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79) with II 3.4.22 quendam for quempiam, 8.22 [ita], 9.4 cuiquam ferendum -; and another was used up to II 1.26.5 by the corrector of Esc. R I 2, whose

---

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

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

115 The corrections in II 5 also came from a deterior but are few in number and less distinctive, unless the reading of Vad. 314 at II 5.24.4, et species (ac species MF), is peculiar to this sub-family. Apart from corrections made by the scribe, all apparently from the exemplar, I find none that could not have come from a deterior.
boni for idonei at Caecil. 9.3 appears in Montecassino 340, Vat. Lat. 8509, and Leiden B. P. L. 16D (Vad. 314 has idonei, but I have not checked all the other members of the sub-family). Burney 158 has been assigned to Rome116, and both it and E. D. Clarke 21 were owned by the Maffei of Volterra, who kept a library in Rome117; but E. D. Clarke 21 was previously owned by a Sacratii of Ferrara, and its decoration has been assigned to Florence118. After istius et at II 2.156.9 E. D. Clarke 21 originally omitted varias ... dixerunt, which occupies a line in Vad. 314; a hand different from the scribe’s restored it (after istius and with <et> before it, so that an unwanted et follows dixerunt). In Caecil, up to at least 48.9 Burney 158 steps out of line by sharing with Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577, on which see below, 1.3 sum for sim, 4.16 <idem> id (the reading of the French family, unlikely to be polygenetic), 5.24 quo<rum>, 1 nec for et, 8.29 <et>iam, 11.15 utriusque for utrumque, 14.25 committata for communicata, 38.27 paratarit (patarit Burn.2) for peccarit, 45.29 [sit], 47.17 mihi hodie ~, 48.9 gregis for Graecis; but the agreement probably stops short of 49.17, where it has detracturus ... denique se with MF and Vad. 314 against detractaturus ... se denique in Ottob. Lat. 1577, and certainly of 51.6, where it has illo with Vad. 314 against isto in MF and Ottob. Lat. 1577. In my passages of II 3-5 some errors of Burney 158 are shared by Paris B. N. F. Lat. 17154: II 3.4.18 [ego], 6.20 ac (et MF, Vad.), 29 omnia for omnes, 3 explicatione for expilacione, II 5.165.4 [cum], 5 numquam for inquam (corrected in Burney 158), 15 nemini for ne tantum, 166.28 profu<g>isset (corrected in Burney 158). There will be more to say about Vad. 314 when I tackle contamination between the first and the second family (§ 2.2.5.1).

Two Florentine manuscripts written in the 1440s, Balliol 248B and Vienna 139, belong in part to this sub-family and in part to the wave of calligraphic manuscripts that have II 1.30.3 in Achaia (§ 2.2.1.3.1). In Caecil, they share errors that I have not found in other deteriores: 8.27 vindicandas for iudic-, 29 asperius [antea] (restored in Vienna 139 before asperius), 10.8 mea for nostra (restored in Vienna 139), 31.31-32 faudebis ... possis after fecisti, probably because in Vad. 314 the question mark after possis comes immediately below the one after fecisti119. At II 1.30.3, however, Vienna 139 has hic alter, and of the readings I listed above that appear in the same manuscripts as in Achaia (§ 2.2.1.3.1) it has only II 4.62.15 -que triclinium. On the other hand, it shares with the two Marciani and Urb. Lat. 321 the omission of II 5.166.21 suspicabare. It was sold by Vespasiano and owned

---

116 See the Catalogue of illuminated manuscripts that the British Library has put on line.
119 I thank Dániel Kiss for checking Vienna 139 at this point.
and annotated by Filippo Podocataro\textsuperscript{120}, who probably made the corrections to be seen on the first few pages. At \textit{Caecil.} 3.1 Balliol 248B shares with Montecassino 340 and Vat. Lat. 8509 \textit{Ex se}, a corruption hard to account for until one notices how \textit{Sese} is written in Vat. 314. It deserts Vat. 314 between I 10.5, where they share \textit{non} for \textit{vero}, and 20.19, where it has \textit{non} with F, not \textit{num} with Vat. 314 and the second family; perhaps it used just the first quire of Vat. 314, which ends at 11.18 \textit{consulem} (f. 8v), or used Vat. 314 just up to 12.4, where a quire of its own ends (f. 82v).

Two further manuscripts, Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750, share three of the four omissions by which I defined the first family (not \textit{Caecil.} 13.10 \textit{[meae]} and also have \textit{fecit} with pMF\textsuperscript{121} at I 5.28 against \textit{patefecit} in the second family (imported into Vat. Lat. 1750 by a corrector) and \textit{maximam} with pMF at II 2.151.19 against \textit{mox exitianam} in the second family. That they descend from F is shown by \textit{[haec]} at I 54.7 and \textit{ad} (F\textsuperscript{2}) for \textit{ante} (M: om. F\textsuperscript{0}) at II 1.61.27, and \textit{adduci} at \textit{Caecil.} 4.9 shows that like the family just discussed they must descend from a state of F earlier than 1417. Vat. Lat. 1750, which has an unidentified coat of arms\textsuperscript{121}, originally omitted two passages that form a line in Ottob. Lat. 1577, II 2.146.16-17 \textit{ut statuas … pollicerentur} and II 3.76.20-21 \textit{civitates … praebeat}; as they were restored in different ink, and probably by the hand that restored a passage missing from Ottob. Lat. 1577, II 2.45.13 \textit{primum … necesse est}, it may not be a direct copy. In any event, it cannot descend entirely from Ottob. Lat. 1577. At least up to \textit{Caecil.} 11.19 Ottob. Lat. 1577 has errors absent from it: I.3 \textit{sum} for \textit{sim}, 4.16 \textit{idem} \textit{id} (the reading of the French family, unlikely to be polygenetic), 5.24 \textit{quo} \textit{rum}, 1 \textit{nec} for \textit{et}, 8.29 \textit{et} \textit{iem}, II.15 \textit{utriusque} for \textit{utrumque} (I listed these above in connexion with Burney 158, which shares them). Between \textit{Caecil.} 11.19 and II 2.45.13 I have checked both only in the four places mentioned above, and so I cannot say whether the differences came about through contamination in an intermediary or through a change of exemplar. In my passage of II 3 they share these errors:

\begin{itemize}
    \item 3.10 \textit{vita sit }\sim\textit{, 14 }\textit{[nobis]} \textit{(restored in Vat. Lat. 1750 by a corrector),}
    \item 4.25 \textit{quid} for \textit{quod}, 5.7 \textit{libidinis iudicium} for \textit{indicium libidinis},
    \item 7.9 \textit{[ei]} \textit{, 9.4 putas esse }\sim\textit{ }
\end{itemize}

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

\textsuperscript{120} Hermann, \textit{Beschreibendes Verzeichnis}, VIII vi 3, Leipzig 1932, 47-48 no. 41; de la Mare, “New research” (n. 96), p. 546, 86 no. 17, and p. 567 no. 16.

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane}, Paris 1991, III, 1, plate 13c.
they are back together, and Vat. Lat. 1750 shares errors not only with the original text of Ottob. Lat. 1577 but also with a corrector:

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

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

2.2.1.4. The first family: a telltale reading

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

\textsuperscript{122} Vat. Lat. 1750 originally omitted on f. 127r II 3.201.25 magnum – 209.3 placeat, restored by a corrector on two leaves inserted for the purpose, ff. 125-6. The passage must have formed a unit of layout in an ancestor.
and unless I collated without due care, mihi appears in Berlin Ham. 172, Besançon 531, Conv. Suppr. J IX 8 and its copy Budapest Univ. Lat. 2, and Vat. Lat. 1749. Such variation is just what one expects if all these calligraphic manuscripts descend from F but not through a common intermediary, and similar variation occurs in the other descendants of F.

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

2.2.2.1. Bologna Univ. 2232 and its relatives
This sub-family had come into existence by 1419:

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

It has these errors:

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

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

II 3.3.6 <ab> ineunte, 5.7 vitium (a correction in Vat. Lat. 1753) for indicium/indiciun, 6.25 aeque for aequo, 7.11 sum for sim, 8.26 [tum], 9.15 quam <quod>, 16 [vobis], II 4.62.21 [omnes], 63.29 discessus for -um, 64.8 quo<e>, 14 non ... non for neque ... neque, 18 et for ut, 65.27 non for neque, 66.26 <per>venturos, 67.28 me after crinie (before forte the others), II <conventu> comitatu, 68.16 [hoc], II 5.159.7 non for neque, 163.10 tum before egomet, 166.2 etiam for esset, 167.5 non noti for neque noti,
168.26 non for neque, 169.2 at for ac, 172.16 quem for quoniam, 173.26 haec ratio me for in hoc me ratio, causam suam ~, 176.12 esse for est.

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

\(\text{\textsuperscript{123}}\) Rizzo, \textit{Catalogo} (n. 89), 64 no. 42, describes it, but on its origin see my review, \textit{CR} 98, 1984, 40-43, at p. 42. At the foot of f. 1r an \textit{ex libris} of Petrus Francius († 1704) can be made out despite erasure, and the manuscript can be identified as lot 479 in the \textit{Catalogus selectissimorum librorum celeberrimi viri Petri Francii}, Amsterdam 1704, p. 119, “M. T. Ciceronis orationes omnes \textit{mss. in membrana bonae notae}”. On returning to the description in the \textit{Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum bibliothecae Universitatis Rhenodialis Trajectinae} I, Utrecht-The Hague 1987, 206-7, I find the information that it was acquired (by whom?) from the Emtinck sale at Amsterdam in 1753; see \textit{Bibliotheca Emtinckiana}, \textit{sive catalogus librorum … quos … collegit et reliquit … M. Simon Emtineck Toparcha in Noordwykerhout Part 4, ‘Libri in folio’}, p. 17 lot 157, “Orationes M. T. Ciceronis omnes integrae. \textit{MS. in pergamenon}”. C. D. Beck, on whose edition see n. 128 below, used a collation of a manuscript owned by Balthazar Huydecoper († 1778) that had readings characteristic of the \textit{deteriores} and also included the \textit{Philippics} and other speeches; it seems likely to have been lot 157 = 479. Lot 480 in the Francius sale, “eiusdem Oratones XII. \textit{eleganter scriptae in charta}”, must be lot 158 in \textit{Bibliotheca Emtinckiana}, “Ciceronis orationes duodecim, \textit{eleganter scriptae in charta. Liber olim D. Franc. Barbari, et Dni Daniellis}”, and this fuller description enables it to be identified as Deventer 101 G II, which I described in “Before and after Poggio” (n. 101), 271 n. 3. Zumpt (n. 16), I p. xxii, noticed that J. G. Graevius in \textit{M. Tullii Ciceronis orationes} I 1, Amsterdam 1699, cites more than one Francianus on II 1.42.7 and 93.15, and the other must have been lot 481, “Orationes XV. aliae, \textit{item} Sallustii bellum Catil. et Jugurthinum \textit{partim in membrana partim in charta mss.}”, now Leiden Periz. F 12, on which see § 11.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{124}}\) In Bologna 2232 the two central bifolia of the third quire were folded the wrong way, and the right order is 21-3, 26-7, 24-5, 28-30.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{125}}\) So I learn from Albina de la Mare’s files, which I consulted at the Bodleian, Hermann, \textit{Beschreibendes Verzeichnis}, VIII vi 1, Leipzig 1930, 48-49 no. 32 with plate XXVI 1, assigned the decoration to Mantua or Verona.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{126}}\) S. Krämer, \textit{Latin manuscript books before 1600}, Munich 1993, 585; “1945” says the web site of Meiningen “wurde die Herzogliche öffentliche Bibliothek Opfer der Kriegswirren und ist bis auf wenige Bände verschollen”. Manuscripts from Meiningen were put up for
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manuscript of the *Verrines*\textsuperscript{27}, and C. D. Beck drew on an older collation for his edition (Leipzig 1795)\textsuperscript{28}. A contemporary description reveals that the manuscript was laid out in two columns, had 30 parchment leaves, broke off at II 2.113.20 *quod propter*, and was bound with three texts about Jerome written across the page by a different hand\textsuperscript{125}; the date ventured by Facius and in the description, s. xii/xiii, can be taken with a pinch of salt, because in *Caecil.* I have checked against Esc. N II 16 the readings that Facius reports\textsuperscript{129}, and they share 3.2 *cum* for *quod*, 31.29 *alteri*<us>, 44.20 *ego*, 47.22 *feceris* for *fuere*, 71.7 *hoc*. Omissions in *Caecil.* that may reveal a closer relationship with other members of the sub-family are 19.31 [id], 21.13 [tuam], 27.16 [omnium], 37.28 [et] oratione, 40.16 [haec], 46.13 [fore], 47.25 [hoc], 27 [et paratissimus], 53.23 [iniurias], 27 [illud], 63.14 [fita]. All these manuscripts, I suspect, descend from Naples IV B 15, written on paper about 1400 or not long after and annotated by Gasparino Barzizza († 1430), who from 1407 to 1421 worked at Padua and before and after that at Pavia\textsuperscript{131}; but various hands corrected it so heavily, often in erasure, that its sale, however, by Reiss & Sohn in their Auktion 80, October 23rd-26th 2001, nos. 318-69. Christopher de Hamel kindly told me that Messrs Quaritch might have a copy of the catalogue, and indeed they have; I saw it by courtesy of Anke Timmermann. The manuscripts were almost entirely modern, though, and I looked through them in vain.

\textsuperscript{27} “De codice IV. Verrinarum Ciceronis in Bibliotheca Ducali Meiningensi asservato, eiusque lectionibus variantibus”, in two *Programmschriften* entitled *Anniversaria gymnasii Casimiriani sacra* and published at Coburg; they are available on line from Munich. Old collations tend to pass over variants helpful for affilating witnesses but not for improving the text, such as transpositions that do not affect the sense or omissions that damage sense or syntax. Facius, however, does report enough omissions to reveal the affiliation of the manuscript if it has close relatives.

\textsuperscript{28} As the digital copy available on line from Munich is puzzlingly selective, Dominic Berry kindly checked for me the printed copy at the National Library of Scotland, the only one in Britain. He reports that the first five speeches appear in volume I, II 4-5 in volume II, 1800, which on pp. 400-490 includes a list of readings from a Leidensis, the Huydecoperanus, and the Meiningensis. On the Huydecoperanus, also cited, he tells me, in the notes under the text, see n. 123 above.


\textsuperscript{129} I owe most of my information about the text of Esc. N II 16 in *Caecil.* to Ben Watson. See n. 26.

\textsuperscript{130} The correct order of leaves in the first quire is 1-2, 8, 7, 5-6, 4, 3, 9-10. Giliola Barbero, who prepared the entry on Gasparino for a volume on Italian literary autographs, happened to be at the Biblioteca Nazionale when I was studying the manuscript; she had not previously seen it but confirmed that many of the notes in the margin are his. Two notes on f. 79r refer to his son Guiniforte (1406-63). Notes on ff. 15r, 32r, 38r, cite Asconius (on the *Verrines* Pseudo-Asconius), discovered in 1416 by Poggio and his friends on an excursion from the Council of Konstanz; see *Texts and transmission* (n. 1), 24-5. On Gasparino see the *Diz. biog. degli italiani* 7, 1965, 34-9 (G. Martellotti) but on the date of his death R. G. G. Mercer, *The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza*, London 1979, 135-6. Mercer several times mentions
descendants, especially Bologna Univ. 2232, Marc. Lat. XI 99, and Vienna 64, give a clearer picture of its original text. Its subscription, M. T. Ciceronis Verrinarum .viï. et ultima explicit, recurs in Marc. Lat. XI 99; though the wording does not look distinctive, no other manuscript has it. Vienna 156, which I mentioned above in my discussion of the French family (§ 1.1), has the text of this sub-family in my passages of II 3 and II 4 but conflates it with a French text at the beginning of Caecil, and in my passage of II 5. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1476, which I discussed among the descendants of F, may be related to the sub-family in my passage of II 5: 165.3 <et> eo, 170.24 non[nel], 171.6 [et], 176.9 [hoc]. If it is, the same may be true throughout II 3-5. Another probable relative is Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 233. I argued above (§ 2.2.1.2) that like its two close relatives it descends from M independently of F up to II 3.45.18 necessarios but that beyond that point it descends from F. In II 5 it has 156.1 noto for notus, 162.23 inquam <inquam>, 165.3 <et> eo, 171.6 [et], 176.9 [hoc], errors amply even if not unanimously attested in the sub-family under discussion. Quite heavily corrected, it is also the only Italian manuscript to have in its original text at II 5.160.25 consciam with the French family against sociam in pM.

2.2.2.2. The family of Ricc. 499

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

- Cesena S. 18.2
- Laur. Edili 208
- Naples Naz. IV B 10
- Toledo Capit. 100-17
- Vat. Reg. Lat. 1525
- Vat. Lat. 1752

They have these errors:

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

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

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

132 Ullman, The origin (n. 92), 37-40; A. C. de la Mare, The handwriting of Italian humanists, Oxford 1973, 1, 70, 82-4.
Florence by Ormannus de Erfordia\textsuperscript{133}. Of the rest, Naples Naz. IV B 10, no less accurately written on paper in an accomplished and regular cursive, stands alone; it must descend from Ricc. 499, because the scribe omitted, but someone else restored, II 1.39.14-15 \textit{prospicere ... ad exercitum}, which occupies a line in Ricc. 499. Watermarks that resemble Briquet 6641 ‘fleur’, 11652 ‘monts’, 5955 ‘enclume’, point to the second quarter of the century. The other four have II 3.1.6 \textit{virtutum[que]}, 4.22 \textit{avaritiae suspicio ~}, 23 \textit{erit semper ~}, 3 \textit{audiendus for ferendus, 5.12 fuisse videar ~}, 6.28 \textit{of[b]itis vel sim.}, 7 \textit{[fixas], 7.9 ei inimicum ~}, 9.7 \textit{teneamus for tueamur. Reg. Lat. 1525 and Cesena S. 18.2 share many errors: II 3.3.9 \textit{[quam], 10 quam for quanto, 6.16 [ad]ductus, 28 obiecit before ex tensarum, 7.19 ac for et, 8.2 hoc for quo, 9.4 non for nos, II 4.60.27 atque for ac, 61.30 [filios], 1 [id], 62.21 copias omnes ~}, 26 [Q.], 64.12 \textit{[re]ges ... attulissent], 20 <maximum> extimum, 67.4 est for esse. Cesena S. 18.2 was probably written at Ferrara in the early 1450s\textsuperscript{134}. Toledo 100-17 was bought a Petropaulo librario Romae die xxv Februarii 1450 ducato uno (f. 183r) and has later notes by customs officers. Vat. Lat. 1752 was written by Giovanni da Itri in the 1460s, if not at Rome, then presumably at one of the papal establishments near Rome\textsuperscript{135}. Perhaps the four manuscripts that share errors descend from a copy of Ricc. 499 made during Poggio’s time in Rome, whereas Edili 208 was copied from it after his return to Florence in 1453. Another descendant of Ricc. 499 at least in the first three speeches is the \textit{editio princeps} (Rome 1471), in which Giovanni Andrea Bussi assembled all the speeches known at the time. The following list of errors that it shares with Ricc. 499 includes two that appear there as corrections:

\begin{itemize}
\item 8.29 \textit{idque for id iam, 24.15 <per>ferre, 33.15 solum non ~ (Ricc\textsuperscript{1}), 51.5 \textit{[e]munties (Ricc\textsuperscript{2}), 56.26 Veneri<<> (Ricc\textsuperscript{3}), 2 <hac, 60.9 statuere (Ricc\textsuperscript{1}) for statuent, 61.21-22 te before hanc, 63.17 prout for quod ut, 19 super (Ricc\textsuperscript{1}) for semper, 71.12 hoc for nihil, 1.5.1 cum for tum, 29.16 eximia (Ricc\textsuperscript{1}) for ex vestra, 46.28 tenuissime for -mum, II 1.35.5 reiectionem for relictionem, 60.4 sese for saepe (MF, Laur. 48.27: se p and the French family), 90.30 <de> illo, 111.23 ita iam (iam M, F in the margin, p, the French family: itaque F in the text, Laur. 48.27, Bologna Univ. 2232),
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{133} De la Mare, “New research” (n. 96), p. 524, 56 no. 10.
\textsuperscript{134} A. C. de la Mare, “Lo scriptorium di Malatesta Novello”, in F. Lollini, P. Lucchi, eds., \textit{Libraria domini. I manoscritti della Biblioteca Malatestiana: testi e decorazioni}, Bologna 1995, 85-93, at pp. 48-51, 84. Another manuscript at Cesena that must have some connexion with Poggio is S. 20.4 of Lucretius, on which see my article “The Italian tradition of Lucretius revisited”. \textit{Aevum} 79, 2005, 115-64, at pp. 140-141, 150.
Further collation might establish a closer link with a descendant of Ricc. 499 than with Ricc. 499 itself. In other speeches it has been established that Vienna 4 descends from the ed. Rom., and the same holds for the Verrines\textsuperscript{38}. I shall therefore ignore it when I come to the text of the ed. Rom. after II 1 (§ 2.2.3).

2.2.2.3. Other members of the second family
Two individual manuscripts earlier than most seem to be equipollent with the two sub-families just defined:

Florence Laur. 48.27

Milan Ambros. B 121 sup.

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

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

In every quire the text ends short, clear evidence that the quires of the exemplar were copied simultaneously. A strange thing happens, though: f. 12r runs to II 1.20.13 \textit{vestra mihi \ldots} embedded in the text:

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

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

\textsuperscript{38} Stephen Oakley kindly lent me a microfilm; on the other speeches see Rizzo, \textit{Catalogo} (n. 89), 170-71 no. 160. See also \textit{Manuscripts and methods} (n. 17) 175-83 “Manuscripts copied from printed books”. 185-207 “A proposal about Modestus, \textit{scriptor rei militaris}”, especially pp. 195-8; on p. 196 I disgraced myself as a scribe by miscopying two words from the original article (in all three quotations read \textit{potuit for posuit}, caused by the next word, \textit{pusilla}, and in the third \textit{disciplino for discipulo}).
have met that begins in a copy at the beginning of a verso. Is that just a coincidence, or can some physical explanation be devised?

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

2.2.2.4. The titles in the second family

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

---

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

138 Klotz, M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta (n. 12), vii, n. 2, asked “an fuit ab initio de re frumentaria?”, but Piacente, “Numerazione” (n. 60), 141, n. 23, drew attention to causam frumentarum at II 3.10.25 and frumentaria causa at 11.1. On Boccaccio’s mention of De re frumentaria, which he mistakes for a philosophical work, see “Cicero’s Verrines” (n. 34), 135-6.
no explanation to offer of De damnatione or De iudiciis except that the latter phrase does appear at II 2.118.4. Whatever the truth, the full set of titles appears in Bologna Univ. 2232, Esc. N II 16, Harl. 5428, Naples IV B 15 (with De damnatione misguidedly corrected to De divinatione; the speeches are also listed by title and incipit in a marginal note at the top left corner of the first page, with De damnatione), Vat. Lat. 1753, and Vienna 64; the title of I stops short at De in Laur. 48.27, but it has the others; Marc. Lat. XI 99 lacks only De constitutendo accusatore; Ambros. B 121 sup. has the first three (with De divinacione for the second); and Pal. Lat. 1490, which contains only II 4, duly has De signis. Ricc. 499 just numbers the seven books of what it calls accusationes, and those of its descendants that have titles do the same; doubtless, therefore, Ricc. 499 was the Liber accusationum qui vocatur Verrine in pergamo copertum coreo rubeo that belonged to Poggio when he died in 1459. Outside this family I have met a full set of titles that indicate content only in Vienna 139 and Besançon 531. The simplest explanation for their presence in Vienna 139 would be contamination from this family. Besançon 531, a calligraphic descendant of F, calls I De testibus and II 2 De iure dicendo; the latter may well have come from Pseudo-Asconius, discovered in 1416, and the former is not hard to make up, whether from the speech itself or from Pseudo-Asconius's introduction to it. Three relatives and probably descendants of Vad. 314 have just De constitutendo accusatore: Leiden B. P. L. I 6D, Turin D IV 2, and Vat. Lat. 8509. If Vat. Lat. 8509 is a copy of Montecassino 340 as I suggested above (§ 2.2.3.2), the absence of titles from the latter will account for the importation from elsewhere in the former; and as Leiden B. P. L. 16D and Turin D IV 2 are contaminated, for instance in having saepe ostendisse at Caecil. 2.16 against [saepe] ostendisse in F, Vat. Lat. 314, Montecassino 340, and Vat. Lat. 8509, they may descend from Vat. Lat. 8509, with which they share exspoliatum at II 4.63.2. There is a snag, though: Vat. Lat. 8509 alone of the three has the transposition De accusatore constitutendo. I mentioned above (§ 2.2.0) that a “liber Marci Ciceronis de denominatione” was registered in Bartolomeo Capra’s estate at his death in 1433, and I wonder if de denominatione was another misreading of de damnatione, the first title, as it happens, in Marc. Lat. XI 99.

139 Hermann, Beschreibendes Verzeichnis (n. 125), mistakenly reports De dominatione from Vienna 64.

140 Walser, Poggius (n. 106), 418 no. 3.

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

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

Two of them make up a fuzzy sub-family:

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

B. L. King’s 22

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

*Caecil*. 12.30 eos for hos, 17.10 petisse <id>, 18.18 nunc minus aliquanto for minus aliquanto nunc, 19.26 eis for meis, 36.14 quod [est]; 38.3 senserint for senserunt, 47.19 codicibus for orationibus, 57.14 atque [adj], 60.6 illas for eas, 8 in illius vita nullum for nullum illius in vita, 62.7 fere umquam ~, 65.15 <suorum> sociorum, I 15.21 inania mihi ~, 41.18 *praetori*<bus>, II 1.4.16 pernicies potest ~ (ula om. M, cett. dett.), 9.16 sententia sua ~, 10.21 ineptus for victus, 11.1 [aj], II 4.63.3 [ea], 64.12 Romam cum ~, 19 Iovi maximo for Iovis maximus, 65.7 satis iam ~, II 1unc for tum, II 5.157.18 cognomen for tugae nomen, 164.17 [est], 165.4 [ipse], 14 illum <se>, 166.22 forratione, 168.14 alium quemlibet ~, 171.6 animalia with no gap before it, 176.4 tanta for tacita.

\(^{142}\) M. D. Reeve, “A lost manuscript” (n. 30); “Recovering annotations by Petrarch” (n. 76), 342-3. A microfilm of the whole manuscript passed to the Bodleian in the *Nachlass* of Albinia de la Mare.

\(^{143}\) On Corbinelli see the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 28, 1983, 745-7 (A. Molho). For descriptions of Conv. Soppr. 79 see Griggio, “Due lettere” (n. 70), 38, who puts it in the late 14th or early 15th century, and G. Tanturli in T. De Robertis, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (ed.), *Coluccio Salutati e l’invenzione dell’umanesimo*, Firenze 2008, pp. 185-86 no. 48. Both misstate the contents of ff. 44v-63v: Griggio says that they contain II 4-5, Tanturli that ff. 5-63 contain II on ff. 5r-58v, 54r-63v, and *Caecil*. on ff. 51r-53v. Tanturli argues that ff. 5-64 probably came from Salutati and dates the whole volume as Griggio does without considering the possibility that the tiresome hand is decades later than O. In his account of the quiring he overlooks the jumbled order, but the original quiring has so far baffled me; as *Caecil*. and I – II 1 share no leaf, either could have been written first unless f. 52 has always come next after f. 51.

\(^{144}\) G. F. Warner, J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of western manuscripts in the old Royal and King’s collections in the British Museum*, London 1921, III, 8. See also the *Catalogue of illuminated manuscripts* on line.
Of the errors by which I defined the second family (§ 2.2.1-2) Conv. Soppr. 79 and King's 22 have Caecil. 15.29 mihi obiciatur ~, 27.20 accusat for -et, 31.32 tua ista ~, 33.17 crimen for crimini, 48.10 vidimus for -emus (restored by Conv. Soppr. 79 in the margin), 51.6 illo for isto, 65.7 quem actorem <idoneum>, 67.1 atque for ac, 72.17-19 hunc ... hanc for habet ... habet ... habet (HI ... FF ... FF F), I 21.26 <con>gratulatio, II 1.73.21 ut for et, II 4.66.17 ab for ex, II 5.157.10 spe<cie>s, 159.7 assumpserim for con-, 169.9 qui for quoniam; Conv. Soppr. 79 also omits Caecil. 27.18 quoniam in the text but restores it in the margin. Somewhere in its ancestry, however, King's 22 acquired by contamination II 197.21-22 istum ... putavit, omitted by Conv. Soppr. 79 and the other deteriores. The scribe at first wrote before istum the word that belongs after putavit, namely quo – a sure sign that istum ... putavit was being incorporated from the margin of the exemplar. At first sight, its reading protulit produxit betrays contamination from the French family, because it was the original reading of S and survives in some of its descendants; but it could have appeared in the archetype of the Italian family and been deliberately or accidentally corrected by p to produxit. Nevertheless, I suspect that it did come from the French family, which by 1460 certainly had Italian members. A reading of the French family, I 14.1 depopulatus, appears in King's 22 as a variant on depeculatus (so pMF, Conv. Soppr. 79, cett.). At I 22.8 it alone with the French family has meorum (om. pMF, Conv. Soppr. 79, cett.). It also gives as a variant II 2.67.23 ostendisset for possedisset (pMF), but as the only extant witness to the French text at that point is the section of Conv. Soppr. 79 known as O, the variant can hardly have appeared in an Italian ancestor of the two manuscripts.

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

Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1577 ed. Rom. 1471
Vat. Lat. 1750

Up to II 3.139 I have already assigned Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750 to the first family (§ 2.2.1.3.2), and in at least the first three speeches I have already assigned the ed. Rom. to the family of Ricc. 499 (§ 2.2.2.2). In my passage of II 5, however, the ed. Rom. shares innovations with Ottob. Lat. 1577 and Vat. Lat. 1750: 162.22 usurparet<que>, 23 crux <crux>, 170.18 tolli for tollere, 176.7 excusationibus for accus-, of which the second is plainly a conjecture (a good one145), the third another (the previous three infinitives are in the passive, an error that goes back to M), and the other two either conjectures or imports from elsewhere. It also shares errors with Vat. Lat. 1750 in my passage

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

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

2.2.4. Two unplaced manuscripts

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

Siracusa Archivio di Stato (fragments of II 2-3)
Phillipps 16070 = Sotheby’s 9.7.69 lot 35, 13.7.77 lot 55

Seven of the eight leaves at Siracusa have been transcribed and one illustrated146; they belong to the mid 15th century and contain II 2.48-53, II 3.65-9, 73-7, 135-40, 182-7, 199-214. Though these fragments and those in Berlin (§ 2.2.2.3) nowhere overlap, script and layout show that they come from different manuscripts: these have at least nine lines fewer to a page, and the scribe uses only the upright s, whereas the other scribe uses the modern s at the end of a word.

The conclusions hitherto drawn about the allegiance of the manuscript at Siracusa rest partly on omissions and inaccuracies in the editions available147. At II 2.49.25, for instance, where Peterson attributes suorum to the French and comitum to the Italian family, suorum comitum is the reading not just of this one manuscript but of the whole Italian family; and at II 2.49.27

146 C. Nicolosi, F. Carpenteri, “Un codice inedito delle ‘Verrine’ di Cicerone”, Siecolorum Gymnasium 16, 1963, 65-83. I am much obliged to Vincenzo Ortoleva for sending me a copy of the article. Concetta Corridore of the Archivio di Stato kindly tells me that leaf VII has come to light since the article was written.
147 For these conclusions see Nicolosi in Nicolosi & Carpenteri, “Un codice inedito”, 68-72.
non ita multum tecum fuit, which the deteriores and not just the ed. Rom. share with O, is surely right against non ita tecum multum fuit, the perverse order that Peterson accepts from p. In fact the manuscript shares all the errors of F against M, namely II 2.52.9 \( \text{ut} \), II 3.67.12\( \text{vi ac vi} \) for\( \text{vi ac minis} \), 137.29\( \text{esse} \), 183.12\( \text{valent} \) for\( \text{velint} \), 212.7\( \text{ne} \), but I have not done enough collation of other manuscripts in the passages that survive to say whether it belongs to the first family or the second. The published transcription is also unreliable\(^{148}\).

Phillipps 16070, of which Sotheby’s illustrated the first page in the earlier of their two catalogues, was written at Padua by Johannes Nydenna de Confluentia as a companion volume for Abbey J. A. 276 of the Philippics, which he dated 1476\(^{149}\). The plate shows errors characteristic of the deteriores.

2.2.5.0. Contamination in the deteriores

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

2.2.5.1. Contamination in the second family of deteriores

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

Caecil. 27.12 specimen ceteris (M\(^{1}\)), 43.11 \( \text{aratione} \), 64.25 causa honestior (M\(^{1}\)), I 4.18 cona\(\text{<ba\text{>tur}} \), II 1.44.25 iste (est M), 71.30 eius filium (~M), 86.13\( \text{[a]} \), 21 rabio (fabio M), 87.1 \( \text{<ex> cogitabas} \), 99.19\( \text{[e]} \), 109.28 complecteris (am- M), II 2.15.6\( \text{sit sicul} \) (~M), 22.22\( \text{[ei]} \), 34.27 gess\(\text{[e]rit} \), 37.11 es\(\text{[e]} \), 46.1\( \text{[aliquant]o} \), 52.9 \( \text{[ut]} \), 57.19\( \text{fortunam} \) (~M), 74.15 sua (samma Harl.: eius M), 81.6\( \text{[te]} \), 90.23 urbem (~M), 91.1 atque (ac M), 96.30\( \text{[omnes]} \), 5\( \text{forte} \) (fortasse Harl.: fere M), 109.9\( \text{et} \) (atque M), III.1\( \text{isto tuo} \) (~M), 123.12 agrigenti (~M), 142.17 consumpta adhuc (~M).

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

149 J. J. G. Alexander, A. C. de la Mare, The Italian manuscripts in the library of Major J. R. Abbey, London 1969, 121-4, no. 43.
The appearance of M accounts for some of these errors in F. Furthermore, some of the errors that I have used for defining the second family occur in St Gallen Vad. 314, an early descendant of F:

\textit{Caecil.} 15.29 mihi obiciatur \text{~} (with very faint strokes above), 27.18 [quoniam] (restored by a corrector), 31.32 tua ista \text{~}, 32.12 Verris for vere, 33.17 crimen for criminii (restored by a corrector), 38.29 huius for eius, 51.6 illo (abbreviated) for isto, 64.4 adoptant \text{~} (restored by a corrector), 65.7 actorem <doneum>, 67.1 atque for ac, I 21.26 <con>gratulatio, II 1.73.21 al ut for et

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

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

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

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

On the other hand, as late as II 1.68.14–15 the second family unanimously has \textit{si istius nefarium scelus Lampsaceni (in)}ulti \textit{in manuque essent}, omitted by MF, and no member, to the best of my knowledge, shows any trace of its incorporation from elsewhere. It does appear, however, in the margin of Vad. 314, which also has other corrections early enough to pass into the text of its descendant Montecassino 340, among them the restoration of \textit{Caecil.} 13.10 meae and II 1.42.7 Carbonem sortem in Cn., likewise present in the second family\textsuperscript{50}. Yet the second family does not share the errors of

\textsuperscript{50}Vad. 314 also has conjectures introduced by c with a squiggle above (= corrigere), some of which happen to restore true readings transmitted elsewhere, for instance II 1.6.1 \textit{discriminii} (pMD) for \textit{discrimine} (F), II 3.127.2 \textit{posterioratem} (pO) for \textit{potestatem} (MF), or to anticipate conjectures that editors attribute to later scholars, for instance II 1.104.20 \textit{P. Annius} (Naugerius)
Vad. 314 in my passages of II 3-5, and I have also found some in the earlier speeches that it does not share (from I and II 1, where there are more than in Caecil., I cite only transpositions):

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

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

Besides II 1.30.3 hic alter, F₂ shares with the second family not just other conjectures already present as corrections in M, such as II 5.23.25 multo[s], 45.1 nave <opus fuit>, 124.18 non erramus for noveramur (M₁, F₁: numeramur pR), but also conjectures absent from M, such as Caecil. 16.7-8 mallent ... malle ... mallem (mallem ... mallem pMD), 22.29 <Q. > Caecili, I 3.3 atque (ac pMD), 7 iudicis (<ibus pMD), 5.28 <pate>fecit, II 1.61.27 ad for ante (pMD: om. F²), II 2.141.1 improba[tal], II 5.185.27 perg<am>e.

Curiously, F appears to stand in exactly the same relationship as Vad. 314 to the second family, which shares errors with their original texts, has in its text others that they present as corrections, but is free from some of their errors. The same question therefore arises about the corrections in both: did they come from the second family (or an intermediary) or pass to it? Even if I were to carry out more collation, especially in II 1-2, I doubt whether I could decide. The most puzzling correction that I have met occurs at II 2.151.19, where for the reading of pMF, maximam, Vad. 314 has in the text magnam but in the margin, probably by a different hand or the same hand at a later date, the variant max eximiam, the reading of the second family. There is nothing obviously wrong with magnam, and no scribe who checked F would have miscopied from it a second time; but if max eximiam was imported from the second family or an intermediary between F and the second family, two different corruptions of the unproblematical and perfectly legible maximam would have come about, which seems unlikely.

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

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

King’s 22 has maximam, probably by contamination from the first family or the French family.

I mentioned above (§ 2.2.3) that meorum appears in King’s 22. In II 1 Peterson and
five are repaired by the second family: the four that I used for defining the first (§ 2.2.1-2) together with Caecil. 2.16 [saepe] ostendisse. This already rare contamination dwindles to nothing as the speeches roll on – or does it perhaps run to II 1.111? If a change of behaviour could be shown to take place at II 1.111, one might go on to look for agreements with the French family up to that point against pM. In order to help editors, however, the source of the contamination would need to be independent of S and p as well as M, and most forms of independence would be hard to detect. The contamination might have come, say, from the exemplar of M; but how would one be able to tell? Another possibility is suggested by the many corrections from a deterior in q (§ 2.1) up to II 2.8.11 Romani: perhaps corrections from q entered the deterior at the same time. If I was right, however, to date q round about 1425, it cannot antedate every member of the second family, which includes a manuscript dated 1419 and others unlikely to be so late.

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

Though I have cited errors that these two manuscripts share with the second family (§ 2.2.3), I had a reason for not immediately assigning them to it. Conv. Soppr. 79 was reported as Lag. 42 by Zumpt and in Halm’s apparatus and Supplementum apparatus critici ad quattuor priores orationum Verrinarum, where I found it sometimes agreeing with p and the French family against all the other deteriores, for instance in having Caecil. 21.15 in after et, 24.23 diutius, II 1.3.9 omnia. King's 22 shares these three readings and others, such as Caecil. 8.30 et (pD: atque MF, cett.), 39.14 expromere (pD: exponere MF, cett.), 50.20 est (pD: om. MF, cett.), 58.18 denique (pD: deinde MF, cett.), 8.24 in pecunia tantum (pD: in pecunia tantum MF, cett.), 18.24 et (pD: om. MF, cett.), II 1.8 convictus (pD: evictus MF, cett.), 10.17 hoc (pD: om. MF, cett.), 20.13 dignitas mihi (pD: ~ MF, cett.). Conv. Soppr. 79 and King’s 22 also have I 49.20 constituta, 53.30 universos, omitted by M and the second family. At Caecil. 56.16 Conv. Soppr. 79 but not King’s 22 has as a variant a reading otherwise confined to the French family, intrat for mittit. Altogether, one or both of them up to II 1.111 repair 18 of the 60-odd omissions in M, a much better record than the second family achieves. Later, however, someone who was plainly collating another deterior (§ 2.2.1.3.2) put a line under diutius in Conv. Soppr. 79 and dots under constituta and universos. One does not expect omissions to

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

Orelli-Baiter-Halm, Zürich 1854, II 1, 103–461, where the edition was largely prepared by K. A. Jordan. It wrongly says that at I 23.14 Lag. 42 has continuo.
travel by contamination, but here are some that did. The possibility must therefore be entertained that Conv. Soppr. 79 was independent of M but after correction from a descendant of M gave rise to the second family. Further contamination would have to be allowed for, though, because Conv. Soppr. 79 has errors absent from the second family, such as Caecil. 1.7 [mihi], II.27 causae totius ~, 28.26 [omnes], 32.12 socios vere ~ (verre Conv. Soppr. 79: verris the second family), 54.1 [esse], I 7.19 -que for etiam, 15.21 inania mihi ~, 20.21 quidem tibi ~, 23.13 [etiam], 41.18 praetori<bus>; one would also have to suppose that after II 1.152.1 not just the rest of II 1 is missing after f. 58 but also the whole of II 2-3. In my passages of II 4-5, however, Conv. Soppr. 79 behaves like a descendant of F.

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

2.2.6. A verdict on the deteriores

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

| St Gallen Vad. 314 | Florence Laur. 48.27 |
| Bologna Univ. 2232 | Milan Ambros. B 121 sup. |
| Florence Ricc. 499 | Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79 |

Conclusions

I set out in the hope and indeed expectation of being able to eliminate most 15th-century members of the French family, all the relatives of p, and most of the deteriores. In the first hope I have not succeeded; in the second I probably have, except that k retains some utility for recovering p1; in the third I may have, and at the very least I have not only made a case for taking the deteriores seriously but also found an important manuscript and reduced the task of collating the rest to a manageable size. As for the discovery of δ and the diffusion of its text, I have brought northern Italy into the picture but made no progress beyond that.

Nevertheless, if I am right about where δ belongs in the stemma, editors can ignore p or δ where the other agrees with the French family. They can also spare themselves agonies over the corrections in p, because I have found evidence that some of them came from δ or a relative and none that any of
them came from outside the Italian family. On the other hand, the Italian family will need to be reported in full and not as selectively or inaccurately as in Peterson's apparatus.

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

*        *        *

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

POSTSCRIPT

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

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

*Bamberg IX A 1 + Einsiedeln 1099 (44) fr. 1 + fr. in private hands: § 1.2
Berlin Ham 172: § 2.2.1.3.1
Berlin Lat. 2o 252 (E): § 1.2
*Budapest Univ. Lat. 2: § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
Besançon 531: § 2.2.1.3.1
Bologna Univ. 2232: § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1, § 2.2.6
Bologna Univ. 2234: § 2.2.1.3.1
Brussels 10007-II: § 2.2.1.3.2
Besançon S. 18: § 2.2.2.2
Cesena N II 16: § 2.2.2.1
Escorial R I 2: § 1.1, n. 95, § 2.2.1.3.2
Florence Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79: n. 10, § 1.2, n. 69, § 2.2.1-2, § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.3, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.5.2, § 2.2.6
Florence Laur. Edili 208: § 2.2.2.2
Florence Laur. Fies. 187: n. 10, § 2.2.1.3.1
Florence Laur. Plut. 48.14: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
Florence Laur. Plut. 48.27: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1-2, § 2.2.2.3, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6
Florence Laur. Plut. 48.29 (q): n. 10, § 2.1, § 2.2.1.3.2, § 2.2.5.1
Florence Laur. S. Croce 23 sin. 1: n. 10, § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1.3.1
Florence Laur. Strozzi 44 (F): § 2.2.0, § 2.2.1 passim, § 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6
Florence Naz. Conv. Soppr. J IV 4 (b): n. 10, § 2.2.1.3.2
*London B. L. King’s 22: § 2.2.3, § 2.2.5.2
Meiningen (untraced): § 2.2.2.1
Milan Ambros. B 121 sup.: §§ 2.2.2.3, § 2.2.6
*Modena Est. Lat. 328 (M): §§ 2.2.1.1, §§ 2.2.1.2, §§ 2.2.5.1, § 2.2.6
Montecassino 340: §§ 2.2.1.3.2, §§ 2.2.5.1
Montecassino 361: § 2.1
*Naples Naz. IV B 10: § 2.2.2.2
Naples Naz. IV B 15: § 2.2.2.1
New York Columbia Plimpton 10: § 2.2.1.2
Oxford Balliol 248B: §§ 2.2.1.3.1, §§ 2.2.1.3.2
Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 233: §§ 2.2.1.2, §§ 2.2.2.1
*Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 254: §§ 2.2.1.2
Oxford Bodl. D’Orville 10: § 1.1
Oxford Bodl. E. D. Clarke 21: §§ 2.2.1.3.2
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 4588A (k): § 2.1
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7774A (R): § 1.1
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7775 (S): § 1.1
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7776 (p): § 2.1, n. 69
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7777: § 1.1
*Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7786: §§ 1.1, §§ 2.2.1.3.2
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7822: § 1.1
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 7823 (D): §§ 1.1, n. 95
*Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16226: §§ 1.1, n. 95
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 16674: §§ 1.1, n. 95
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 17154: §§ 2.2.1.3.2
*Phillipps I6070: § 2.2.4
Reims 1110: §§ 2.2.1.3.2
San Daniele del Friuli 58: §§ 2.2.1.3.1
St Gallen Vad. 314: §§ 2.2.1.3.2, §§ 2.2.5.1, §§ 2.2.6
*Siracusa Archivio di Stato frr.: § 2.2.4
*Stuttgart Donaueschingen 12: § 1.1
Toledo Capit. 100-17: §§ 2.2.2.2
Turin Naz. D IV 2: §§ 2.2.1.3.2
Vatican Chig. H VIII 249: §§ 2.2.1.3.1, §§ 2.2.1.3.2
Vatican Ottob. Lat. 1577: §§ 2.2.1.3.2, §§ 2.2.3
Vatican Ottob. Lat. 2842: §§ 2.2.3
Vatican Pal. Lat. 1476: §§ 2.2.1.3.2
Vatican Pal. Lat. 1487: §§ 2.2.1.3.1
Vatican Pal. Lat. 1490: §§ 2.2.2.1
Vatican Reg. Lat. 1525: §§ 2.2.2.2
Vatican Urb. Lat. 321: §§ 2.2.1.3.1
Vatican Vat. Lat. 1749: §§ 2.2.1.3.1
Vatican Vat. Lat. 1750: §§ 2.2.1.3.2, §§ 2.2.3
Vatican Vat. Lat. 1751: §§ 1.1, §§ 2.2.0
Vatican Vat. Lat. 1752: §§ 2.2.2.2
Vatican Vat. Lat. 1753: § 2.2.2.1
Vatican Vat. Lat. 1754: § 2.1
Vatican Vat. Lat. 8509: § 2.2.1.3.2
Vatican Vat. Lat. 11421: § 2.2.1.3.2
*Venice Marc. Lat. Z 430 (1833): § 2.2.1.3.1
*Venice Marc. Lat. XI 36 (4518): § 2.2.1.3.1
*Venice Marc. Lat. XI 99 (3830): § 2.2.2.1
Vienna 4: § 2.2.2.2
Vienna 64: § 2.2.2.1
Vienna 139: § 2.2.1.3.1, § 2.2.1.3.2
Vienna 156: § 1.1
Wolfenbüttel Extrav. 265.2 (G1): § 1.1
Wolfenbüttel Weissenburg 41 (G1): § 1.1
*ed. Rom. 1471 (ISTC ic00541000; the abbreviation stands for the Incunabula Short Title Catalogue, on line from the British Library): § 2.2.0, § 2.2.2.2, § 2.2.3

I also mention two ancient fragments:

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

APPENDIX 2: OTHER MANUSCRIPTS CITED

Abbey J. A. 276: § 2.2.4
Deventer 101 G 11: n. 123
Florence Laur. Plut. 33.13: n. 47
Florence Laur. Plut. 36.23: § 2.1
Florence Laur. Plut. 42.14–16: § 2.1
Florence Laur. Plut. 48.33: n. 101
Florence Laur. Plut. 50.4: § 2.1
Florence Laur. Plut. 78.20: § 2.1
London B. L. Add. 25104: § 1.2
London B. L. Burney 160: n. 46
Paris B. N. F. Lat. 13062: n. 28
Prato Roncioniana Q II 2 (84): § 2.1
Reims 1320: n. 103
Reims 1321: n. 103
Rome Angel. 1895: § 1.2
S. Gimignano 62: § 2.1
Siena Com. H V 41: n. 47
Vatican Pal. Lat. 957: § 1.2
Venice Marc. Lat. XI 39 (3929): § 2.2.1.1