



NILDE

Network Inter-Library Document Exchange

Il presente documento viene fornito attraverso il servizio NILDE dalla Biblioteca fornitrice, nel rispetto della vigente normativa sul Diritto d'Autore (Legge n.633 del 22/4/1941 e successive modifiche e integrazioni) e delle clausole contrattuali in essere con il titolare dei diritti di proprietà intellettuale.

La Biblioteca fornitrice garantisce di aver effettuato copia del presente documento assolvendo direttamente ogni e qualsiasi onere correlato alla realizzazione di detta copia.

La Biblioteca richiedente garantisce che il documento richiesto è destinato ad un suo utente, che ne farà uso esclusivamente personale per scopi di studio o di ricerca, ed è tenuta ad informare adeguatamente i propri utenti circa i limiti di utilizzazione dei documenti forniti mediante il servizio NILDE.

La Biblioteca richiedente è tenuta al rispetto della vigente normativa sul Diritto d'Autore e in particolare, ma non solo, a consegnare al richiedente un'unica copia cartacea del presente documento, distruggendo ogni eventuale copia digitale ricevuta.

Biblioteca richiedente: Biblioteca del Dipartimento di Scienze dell'antichità
Data richiesta: 28/11/2022 12:33:52
Biblioteca fornitrice: Biblioteca. Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità. Università degli Studi di Bari
Data evasione: 28/11/2022 13:05:45

Titolo rivista/libro: Philologia antiqua
Titolo articolo/sezione: Studies in the manuscript transmission of Aulus Gellius
Autore/i: Holford- Strevens, L.
ISSN: 1971-9078
DOI:
Anno: 2016
Volume: 9
Fascicolo:
Editore:
Pag. iniziale: 33
Pag. finale: 57+front.

Editors:

Eugenio Amato (*Université de Nantes & Institut Universitaire de France*)
Giampiero Scafoglio (*Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis*)

Editorial Board:

Elisabetta Berardi (*Università di Torino*), Frédéric Le Blay (*Université de Nantes*),
Emanuele Lelli (*Università di Roma La Sapienza*), Ángel Narro (*Universitat de València*),
Sophia Papaioannou (*National and Kapodistrian University of Athens*),
Gianluca Ventrella (*Université de Nantes*), Hélène Vial (*Université de Clermont-Ferrand*),
Arnaud Zucker (*Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis*)

Editorial Staff:

Pasqua De Cicco (*Université de Nantes*), Matteo Deroma (*Université de Nantes*),
Rita Gianfelice (*Editorial Manager, Fabrizio Serra editore*),
Valentina Zanusso (*Università di Roma La Sapienza*)

Advisory Board:

Markus Asper (*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*), Silvio Friedrich Bär (*University of Oslo*),
Pierre Chiron (*Université Paris Est Créteil*), Federica Ciccolella (*Texas A&M University*),
Jean-François Cottier (*Université Paris Diderot*),
Pedro Pablo Fuentes González (*Universidad de Granada*),
Rafael J. Gallé Cejudo (*Universidad de Cádiz*), Alessandro Garcea (*Université Paris Sorbonne*),
Thomas Gärtner (*Köln Universität*), Charles Guérin (*Université Paris Est Créteil*),
Charles Guittard (*Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense*), Leofranc Holford-Strevens (*Oxford*),
Martin Korenjak (*Universität Innsbruck*), Enrico V. Maltese (*Università di Torino*),
Gesine Manuwald (*University College London*), Antonino M. Milazzo (*Università di Catania*),
Étienne Wolff (*Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense*), Vincent Zarini (*Université Paris Sorbonne*)

«Philologia Antiqua» is an International Peer-Reviewed Journal.
The eContent is Archived with Clockss and Portico.

PHILOLOGIA ANTIQUA



AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CLASSICS

9 · 2016



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI BARI ALDO MORO
DIPARTIMENTO DI STUDI UMANISTICI
(DISUM)

INV. Nr. 616 9006415

PISA · ROMA

FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE

MMXVII

STUDIES IN THE MANUSCRIPT TRANSMISSION OF AULUS GELLIUS

LEOFRANC HOLFORD-STREVENS

IN the course of preparing a new Oxford Classical Text of Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* I have reconsidered his manuscript tradition, well studied as it has been,¹ in the light of my own researches; I set out here the results of that reconsideration, including an attempt at an *Überlieferungsgeschichte* more detailed and I hope more accurate than any known to me for this author. That is not to say that all questions have been answered: in particular, it remains unclear whether knowledge of Gellius in the Irishman Virgilius Maro Grammaticus and more speculatively in the Englishman Aldhelm, if accepted,² would indicate an Insular stage in the tradition (some corruptions in which seem to result from misreading of Insular script and abbreviations) or reveal a dead end in the history of his manuscripts.

Apparently between the death of Herodes Atticus in AD 177 and the burning-down of the *Templum Pacis* in 192,³ Aulus Gellius published the twenty book-rolls of his miscellany, prefixing to them another that contained the preface and a list of chapter-summaries.⁴ A trace of this arrangement survives in the earliest manuscript, the fragmentary codex A, written by one Cotta in rustic capitals no later than the Severan age,⁵ which survives as the main underwriting in the Old Testament palimpsest *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Pal. lat. 24.⁶ It presents a few chapter-summaries from books 17 and 18, and fragments of books 1-4, including a passage (1. 2. 13-1. 3. 7 *molestiam quod*) absent from all other extant manuscripts (but see below on the *Codex Buslidianus*); its readings are often but by no means always better than theirs.

Nevertheless, the making of this early codex did not mark a once-for-all abandonment of book-rolls. That book 8, known to Nonius, Macrobius, and Priscian, is missing from all our manuscripts can hardly be due to anything but the loss of a roll; moreover, since Priscian (the only ancient author to cite Gellius by book-number) counts 5 and 8 as respectively sixth and ninth, one must suppose that the *Noctes Atticae* had come to Constantinople, perhaps even at the time of foundation, in the original format of twenty-one rolls.⁷ Nor was this simply a matter of conservatism: it must have been in a codex that the end of 1. 2 and beginning of 1. 3, and the beginning of 18. 9, were lost as leaves, but in a set of rolls copied from that codex that books 6 and 7 were transposed (see below).⁸ Evidently there were fastidious persons then who regarded codices as unfit for their libraries, even as there were those in the Quattrocento who scorned printed books and

¹ Besides the accounts given by previous editors, and studies on individual manuscripts cited below, see Gamberale (1975) and Fioretti (2016) 19-29, to which latter I was kindly referred by the anonymous referees for *Philologia Antiqua*.

² Holford-Strevens (2015); for Aldhelm see pp. 402-403 n. 44.

³ Holford-Strevens (2005) 18-20.

⁴ Rocchi and Holford-Strevens (in c.d.s.). The same conclusion was reached independently by Fioretti (2016) 27.

⁵ Cavallo (1996), 68-69; the previous dating was to s. iv.

⁶ Studied in detail by Fohlen (1979); see too Fioretti (2016) 19-27. Old Testament scholars know the overwriting as L.

⁷ *Inst.* 6. 73 (*GL* II. 259. 23-260. 2), 6. 61 (II. 246. 6-8); see Holford-Strevens and Rocchi (in c.d.s.).

⁸ The unbound fascicles posited by Fioretti (2016) 29 for early Gellian codices would make the loss of leaves even easier, but not account for the interchange (which he does not discuss).

are now who scorn paperbacks. This disdain seems unlikely to have lasted long into the fourth century, when the codex became the norm.

Not only book 8, but the chapter-summaries for book 19 and the end of book 20 are absent from our extant manuscripts, which are derived from a two-volume codex divided before book 9, in which the chapter-summaries preceded the individual books.¹ The two halves went their separate ways, as did those of a codex divided after book 10 from whose first volume came the excerpts in the *Florilegium Gallicum* (see below), and another divided after book 9, to whose second volume was prefixed an epigram (*AL* 904; s. iv?) transferred to our tradition before the chapter-summaries for book 10:

C. Aurelii Romuli
Cecropias noctes, doctorum exempla uirorum,
donat habere mihi nobilis Eustochius.
Viuat et aeternum laetus bona tempora ducat,
qui sic dilecto tanta docenda dedit.

Since Romulus bore the traditional *tria nomina* without a *signum* ('qui et . . .'), he is likely to have lived before the Theodosian age, although one Q. Aurelius Symmachus was consul in 391 and another in 446; from *tanta docenda* he is evidently a schoolmaster. The first Eustochius we know of is the friend of Plotinus' old age (Porph. *Vita Plotini* 7), hence shortly before 270; there were several men of this name in the fourth century, amongst them Eustochius V.C. *consularis aquarum* in 365 (*ILS* 5791) and perhaps the Salvii Eustochii VV.CC. commemorated in Africa (*CIL* VIII. 16292), unless they belong to the fifth; Romulus' friend, being called *nobilis*, should have been a senator (Amm. Marc. 16. 10. 13) of senatorial birth.² The tone of the epigram fits the grateful recipient of a superior's kindness.³

A part, the extant manuscripts fall into two main classes, medieval and *recentiores* (ϵ). The former contain either the preface and books 1-7, or books 9-20, ending at 20. 10. 6 *manum conserere*; the latter, collectively known as ϵ, recombine the two portions, continue the second to 20. 11. 5 *nolite uos atque*, and place the preface after this.⁴ In addition most but not all preserve the chapter-headings for book 8, which are absent from the medieval copies. Although their text overall is inferior to that of the older manuscripts, not all their better readings seem explicable as conjectures.

Antiquity also furnishes an indirect tradition, whose chief representative, Macrobius, is also the most problematic, since he often rewrites his material; nevertheless, he sometimes presents better readings, and also reproduces the contents of 8. 1 and 8. 15.⁵ He never acknowledges Gellius by name; neither does Nonius (citing only a source *auctoritatis/nobilitatis obscurae* or the like), who contributes occasional improvements (mainly to the text of quotations from early writers) and what seem to be two fragments of book 8; Priscian too offers a fragment of that book, unless it is rather a chapter-summary. Servius and Deutero-Servius merit occasional mention in the apparatus.

¹ Fioretti (2016) 28 doubts the existence of such a codex, preferring to suppose that a volume originally containing books 1-9 had lost both 8 and 9, but that a reader who had somehow come across the latter prefixed it to the companion volume containing books 10-20. This seems to require too much of chance.

² Arnheim (1972) 8.

³ On the relations between great men and grammarians in the later Empire see Kaster (1988), esp. 209-215.

⁴ For a complete list see Cavazza (1999a), (2004).

⁵ See Gamberale (1975) 37-43.

MEDIEVAL MANUSCRIPTS

The First Part

Although the first part was known from Carolingian times onwards,¹ no extant manuscript is older than the twelfth century. The oldest of all may be Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Gronovius 21, foll. 25^{ra}-40^{vb}, s. XII, siglum R,² probably originating in northern France, which contains the text down to 6. 20. 6 *amarioris* without the chapter-summaries, following Cicero, *De finibus* (foll. 1^{ra}-22^{vb}) and his translation of Plato's *Timaeus* (foll. 23^{ra}-24^{vb}). Oldest, however, does not mean best: very often Gellius' words are repeated, omitted, transposed, corrupted, or exchanged for synonyms. It appears that the scribe, responsible for both Cicero and Gellius, was working from a faulty exemplar, for though he seems barely to have known Latin,³ he very often corrects his mistakes;⁴ sometimes he deletes a letter by underdotting and repeats it above. He mostly omits Greek, substituting *gr.*, but occasionally preserves it with or without errors in its own script or in transliteration. Yet for all the manuscript's defects it sometimes alone preserves the true reading, e.g. 1. 1. 2 *sescentos*, 1. 3. 11 *aspteofrasto*, 1. 5. 2 *hinc eita*, 1. 13. 9 *atque*, 1. 16. 13 *passum*, 1. 22. 5 *potius uideatur*, 2. 22. 30 *an*, 3. 14. 1 *existumat*, 4. 1. 16 *ueteres*, 4. 16. 3 *I littera*, 5. 10. 7 *tum*, 5. 17. 2 *tum*¹. The Insular abbreviation for *enim*, H with a point or stroke, is frequent; the ancient digraph *cx* for *x* is found (1. 12. 12 *dumtaxat*, 2. 5 *detraxeris*),⁵ but so is the French interchange of *c* and *qu* (e.g. *cateret* 1. 13. 11^{ac}, *scamarum* 2. 6. 20); at 2. 6. 16, 2. 26. 5 it shares *V*'s *linga*. It makes great use of abbreviations, and often continues the first line of a chapter into space left after the last words of that preceding, marked off by a conventional sign (known by the Irish name *ceann faoi eite*, 'head under wing').

The MS comprises four fascicles:

(i), the earliest, Cicero and Gellius.

(ii) Gerbert of Aurillac, *Theoria geometriae*,⁶ without its last sentence but with a few scholia (foll. 41^{ra}-45^{vb}); Hugh of Saint-Victor, *Practica geometriae*, down to *et sit [recte erit] figura talis* (foll. 46^{ra}-52^{vb});⁷ anonymous excerpts relating to astronomy natural and judicial (what is now called astrology) and to popular medicine (foll. 52^{vb}-54^{ra}), including the first lines of the spurious continuation of Hyginus' *Poetica astronomia* and Isidore, *Etymologiae* 13. 11. 3-14 (foll. 53^{vb}-54^{ra}); tables of mean solar motion for 1169-1249 in twenty-year blocks 'composite secundum clyma pisanum [sc. by Abraham Ben Ezra] et translate secundum clyma parysiense' (fol. 54^{ra});⁸ Hyginus, *Poetica astronomia* 3. 1. 1 *igitur incipiemus*-4. 8. 1 *perueniant ad occasum* (foll. 55^{ra}-58^{vb}), Gerbert, letter *De sphaera* to Constantine of Orlé-

¹ Holford-Strevens (2014) 277-278.

² The siglum stands for Rottendorffianus after the learned physician Bernhard Rottendorff of Münster in Westfalen, who on 3 June 1651 sent Johannes Fredericus Gronovius a list of recently acquired texts including this (misdescribed as 'Auli Gellii noctium Atticarum lib. II'), but not another seen but not bought the previous year 'ad Rhenum', since 'illo potiri nequeo nisi fuero praesens': Lehmann (1938) 174-176 = (1941-62) IV. 115-119.

³ Magnaldi (1986) 147-148, basing herself on the Ciceronian texts. At the end of a line he will freely divide a word after a consonant, or in mid-diphthong; other scribes do likewise, but not nearly so often.

⁴ Cf. J. F. Gronovius in the *Annotationes* appended to his edition of 1687 (p. 102): 'Quod addo, ut agnoscat fides librarii, quod non intelligebat, corrigere religioni habentis, et ut literas adsequi poterat, reddentis, quamquam discerptis vocibus.'

⁵ Ancient too may be 2. 16. 7 *caussam*, but 1. 15. 7 *possuit* before correction is Insular.

⁶ Ed. Bubnov (1899), 46-97.

⁷ Baron (1966) 15-57.

⁸ For comparable canons in Copenhagen, Det kongelige Bibliotek, GkS 277, 2°, fos. 183^v and 192^v see Pedersen (2007); I owe the reference to Philipp Nothaft.

ans without its final sentence (foll. 58^{vb}-59^{rb});¹ Hyginus, *Poet. astron.* 2. 1. 1 *hanc autem*-2.3.1 *ut Erat(h)osthenes demonstrat* (fol. 59^{rb}-^{vb}). At the foot of fol. 41^r, in an all but obliterated inscription, J. P. Gumbert (pers. comm.) made out the words *sancti . . . seburgh*, suggesting that this fascicle once belonged to St. Peter zu Syburg.

(iii) Incomplete commentary on Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* (foll. 60^r-75^v), inc. '[B]oetius romanæ urbis ciuis fuit: in cuius tempore theodoricus rex gothorum rem inuasit romanorum et cepit et cotidie oppressit'.

(iv) Notes on the *ars dictandi* closely resembling those in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14175, foll. 18^r-21^v, inc. '[H]uius operis auctor .i. ligator unicus fuit' (fol. 76^r);² fragment of a commentary on Cicero, *De inuentione* (fol. 77^r-^v), inc. 'pleno de corpore manat [cf. Horace, *AP* 338]. Inter attributa negocio' [cf. *De inu.* 1. 44].

From the late twelfth century comes Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 5765, containing Caesar and Hirtius on the Gallic War (foll. 1^r-61^v)³ followed by Gellius down to 7. 4. 3 *solis ictus* (foll. 61^v-111^v), siglum P, but with a blank half-column at fol. 63^{va} in place of text between 1. 19. cap. and 1. 2. 11. It preserves the Greek down to 2. 22, but draws the line at the long quotations from Menander in 2. 23, from which point it mostly either omits Greek passages or else transmits only their first few letters. *Quod* appears for *quid*, at 4. 6. 8 even *inquod* for *inquit*. The manuscript often differs from the rest, sometimes for better, e.g. 1. 3. 8 *hic autem* (om. rell.), 1. 5. 3 (ΑΠΡΟΧΑΥΟΝΥΟΟC (recto ἀπροσδιόλουσος; ΑΠΡΟC rell.), 1. 25. 5 *mensum* (in *mensum*, *immensum*, in *immensum*), oftener for worse, e.g. 1. 3. 23 *portarum* (partarum), 1. 9. 3 *paruum* (parum), 1. 11. 15 *creatis* (citat), 17 *mortem* (morem), 1. 12. 14 <*sicut*> *scriptum*. On the seven places where *huc usque* is intruded into the text see below on the φ florilegium.

Also from late-twelfth-century France comes Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3452, foll. 1^r-54^r, siglum V, the best manuscript in the sense of least bad, but also as preserving the Greek more fully than the other medieval manuscripts and the only one of them to contain the whole of book 7; but having lost the preface it begins with the chapter-summaries of book 1. The scribe commonly writes *linga* for *lingua* in accordance with vernacular pronunciation, and likewise 2. 6. 4, 19, 25 *scalentem*, *scalor* for *squalentem*, *squalor* and conversely 2. 23. cap. *loquorum* for *locorum*. Both he and a colleague corrected the manuscript; their hands are not always easy to distinguish, but sometimes one can catch a correction in the making as at 1. 18. 2, where, having copied the first three letters of the older manuscripts' *inlustriam*, the scribe took a knife to the *l* and completed the word as the correct *industriam*. There are also Renaissance interventions for good (e.g. 1. 2. 4 *gri post* > *grippos*) and ill (e.g. 1. 3. 23 *lacuna* > *lasciua*).

An English manuscript written in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, perhaps at St Albans, now Cambridge, Clare College 26, comprises texts, rendered incomplete by loss of quires and leaves, of the Pseudo-Quintilianic *Declamationes maiores* (5. 10 *contraxi pro duobus*-17. 9 *fauore dimittitur*; foll. 1^r-31^v) and portions of the real Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (32^r-57^v), followed by Gellius (foll. 58^v-92^v), siglum C.⁴ Although closer to V than to other manuscripts, it exhibits book 7 before book 6 (ending at 6. 14. 6 *sunt ferme*) in the manner of ζ, with which, or some of which, it shares numerous readings, good and bad. They have been regarded as made in a *gemellus* of V, designated θ, from which

C was copied by an ignorant scribe, and from which they descended into ζ;¹ but while C may indeed contain conjectures (e.g. 6. 3. 16 *nos priuatim*, where the other medieval manuscripts read *nostruatim* and ζ *nostru natiui*), and the scribe does not seem intelligent enough to collate other copies, the interchange of book 6 and 7, which as we have seen must have taken place in the book-roll period, indicates a far older origin for readings shared with ζ, derived no doubt from θ but not originating there. In addition, C exhibits several errors in common with P alone, e.g.

2. 16. lemma *supplicio* for *Sulpicio*
2. 28. 6 *iubet* for *libet*
4. 13. 1 *tibicem* for *tibicen*
4. 17. 6 *compertus* for *copertus*
5. 4. 2 *inquit uis* for *in quoduis*
5. 9. lemma *orodoti* for *Herodoti*
6. 3. 52 *expectantur* for *expetantur*
6. 5. 3 *quem* for *quoniam*.²

It also shares some with R:

2. 7. 13 *ea* om.
3. 1. 2 *neesse* for *necessum*
3. 9. 3 *internectionem* for *internecionem* (niti-)
3. 9. 7 *eadem* <*quoque*>
5. 4. 5 *annos* om.
5. 6. 23 *coronarentur* for *-retur*
6. 6. 3 om. (not merely the Greek)
6. 12. 3 *quod genus Graeci dicunt* ἐξωμίδας om.

There are also two fifteenth-century manuscripts that contain both parts, but despite heavy influence from ζ also exhibit older readings and have books 6 and 7 in the same order as VPR. Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek philol. 162, siglum D, written by one Petrus Chappella, MA (Paris),³ despite omitting words, sentences, and even the whole of 10. 15, and time and again reading *ubi* for *ut* and *qui* for *quod*, is not entirely without interest. In the first part it often agrees with some or all of the older manuscripts; it also shares corruptions with P, e.g.

1. 26. 11 *senior* for *saeuior*
2. 17. 1 *portendi* for *protendi*
3. 3. 13 *istae* for *istaec*
5. 11. 3 *hic* for *sic*
5. 21. 14 *cuius* for *huius*
6. 5. 7 *e* om.,

with R, e.g.

1. 18. 3 *primo* for *primore*
2. 17. 3 *tamen hanc* for *hanc tamen*
2. 18. 11 *memoria est* for *est memoria*
2. 20. 6 *medias uineas* for *uineas medias*
2. 25. 2. *quidem* for *quidam*
3. 9. 4 *interfectumque* for *atque interfectum*,

¹ So Marshall-Martin-Rouse (1980) 357.

² Itself probably a corruption of *quando*.
³ Possibly the Petrus dominus de Capella for whom, according to a fifteenth-century note in Leiden, UB Voss. Lat. F. 112, fol. 84^v, Solinus was copied.

¹ Ed. Bubnov (1899) 24-28.

² See Turcan-Verkerk (2008) 173.

³ See Brown (1979) 1.118, 128-129.

⁴ Made known by James (1905) 42-43, but not used by Marshall (1968); for a full study see Marshall-Martin-Rouse (1980).

or with C, e.g.

1. 5. 1 *probra* for *probro*
1. 7. 20 *compositius* for *compositum*
1. 9. 1 *commiserationem* for *comisationem*
1. 11. 4 *preceptione* for *praecentione*
1. 18. 2 *hellen* for *Hellena*
1. 19. 7 *excussit* for *excussit*.

Agreements in error between these two manuscripts are particularly frequent; by contrast, with V (misspellings apart) I have found only 5. 10. 12 *o tu* for *potui*, for at 7. 16. 1, where VD read *amuolaremus* for *ambularemus*, neither P nor R is present (C conjectures *iam uolaremus*).

More importantly, D in several places anticipates later corrections,¹ e.g.

1. 22. 19 *epistula* for *epistula M.*
2. 23. 7 *arma* for *amerca*
3. 14. 12 *dimidia* for *dimidiām*
4. 15. 1 *findendi* for *findi*
5. 6. 27 *uehentem*
6. 3. 10 *Axium*
6. 3. 14 *edomant*
6. 3. 19 *ad eos uel*
6. 3. 55 *autem rectius*
6. 8. 4 *refert*
6. 11. 2 *uilitatem*
7. 6. 10 *praepes*
7. 9. 1 *huc*
7. 16. 10 question-mark
7. 16. 12 *consimiliter*.

In these books it shows no sign of Gellius' chapter-summaries, though it sometimes offers its own, e.g. 1. 2 'De herode athico qualiter iuuenem stoicum de diuersis se disciplinis scientiisque in deambulatoriis iactantem ex dis<s>ertationibus epictet<t>i stoicorum maximi refutauit'.

Less important is Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1532, s. xv^{3/4}, siglum W, written for Niccolò da Cattaro bishop of Modruš by the soldier, physician, and copyist Giovanni di Nardo Fusco da Itri (Johannes Nardi Fusci de Itri), the Greek being supplied by Andronicus Callistus (Ἀνδρόνικος Κάλλιστος);² highly corrupt, it combines with ζ readings others taken in the first part from V and in the second from v (see below),³ but sometimes superior readings shared with C, e.g.

1. 2. 1 *terra grecia* for *terras grecia/e*
1. 9. 7 *tum* for *tunc*
3. 2. lemma *quae a* for *qui a* or *quia*

¹ As was pointed out by Meyer (1893-4) I. 35-36, a description far beyond the duties of a cataloguer.

² Cherubini (1980): 42-48; Rollo (2006): 367-374. In places Callistus tried to emend the Greek; in 5. 11. 2-3 he knows, as Gellius does not, that the Greek for *in matrimonium ducō* is not ἀγω but ἀγομαι.

³ Hertz (1883-5) II: xcvi n. **: 'Cum V magis quam reliqui ex ζ conspirat Vat. 1532 (w), qui ex utraque recensione ita conflatus est, ut non dubitem, quin ipse V ad mixturam hanc procreandam adhibitus sit ...'. More optimistically Hertz (1847) 416-417: 'der eine freilich sehr entstellte und mit dem Gewinne aus neueren Hss. vermehrte Copie eines direkt aus zwei alten Mss. der ersten und letzten Bücher geflossenen Cod. scheint'.

or even unique to it and no doubt conjectural, e.g.

1. 3. 31 *φιλιαις* <τὰς>
1. 15. 3 *quod* for *quo* or *quos*
2. 26. 11 *sic Q.* for *sicque*
5. 18. lemma *an quid* for *inquit* or *inquit*.

Numerous readings are shared with Giovanni Andrea Bussi's *editio princeps*:¹

2. 23. 22 *assequi* <nequi>*ret*
3. 7. lemma *de Q.* for *deque*
3. 14. 10 *eadem* for *eandem*
3. 18. 5 *sententiae ius* for *sententia eius*
4. 14. 3 *quod* for *et quod*
4. 18. 8 *Asiatico* for *asia cum* (in the older manuscripts *asiaco*)
4. 20. 3 *agebat* for *aiebat* (in the older manuscripts *acebat*)
5. 19. 16 *se natum* for *senatum*²
6. 3. 15 *recte* for *recto*
6. 3. 16 *adiuuere* for *adiuuare*
6. 9. 17 <*descendiderant*>

Since both scribe and collaborator were still at Rome in 1469, one might suppose that these readings were taken from the edition; on the other hand *Asiatico* and *agebat* might have been prompted by V, and at 4. 15. lemma, where both w and Bussi read *reprehenderunt* for the vulgate manuscripts' *reprehenderint*, V too has *reprehenderunt*, albeit with a dot of deletion under the left-hand vertical of the u. Moreover, a few readings from the edition were inserted as corrections by someone other than Giovanni da Itri.

The Second Part

The second part is known from more manuscripts, most of which seem to fall into two main families γ and δ ; however, as we shall see the transmission is more complex.

The γ family

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 597, foll. 79^r-200^v, s. ixⁱⁿ, siglum O, bound together with a manuscript of Freulf, *Chronica* (foll. 1^r-4^v), and Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 6. 58 [*s*]uo *proastio*-end (foll. 5^r-78^v), owned in 1564 by Pierre Daniel,³ who also made corrections in Gellius, and subsequently by Paul Petau. The text begins at 9. 14. 2 *grammaticam facie dicitur* and ends in a torn page at 20. 11(10). 5 [*litteri*]s; written by three scribes and corrected (as it often needed) from another (lost) manuscript by Servatus Lupus, who occasionally made emendations of his own.⁴

The next oldest manuscript in this family is Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus F 112, s. x, siglum X, French, perhaps from Chartres. Of book 9 there survive only two discontinuous bifolia inserted in 17. 2. 7 at the break between *scripsit* (fol. 56^v) and *illi* (fol. 61^r), containing 9. 2. 10 *Harmodii*-9. 8. 1 *indigentiam* (foll. 57^r-58^v), 9. 12. 10 *non*

¹ These places must be distinguished from those few in which a later hand has entered a reading from the edition as a correction: 1. 2. 2 *refrigeranti*^{bus}, 7. 2. 15 *explicita*^t, 7. 7. 1 *accalarentia*^f.

² In principle both might have been using a manuscript like London, British Library Harley 4859, in which *senatum* was divided between lines after *se*.

³ See Hagen (1875) p. xi f.

⁴ See in great detail Meagher (1936).

ut uulgo-9. 16. 6 sibi reddi (foll. 59^r-60^v); the damage had been done before the fourteenth-century transcription in Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria di Torino 1360 (I. II. 6).¹ It is very carelessly written, though often enough the scribe corrects his errors; sometimes the text agrees with Lupus' corrections, sometimes with δ .

The Sainte-Colombe subfamily

Amongst the companions in exile of Archbishop Thomas Becket, who from 1166 till his fatal return to England in 1170 resided in the abbey of Sainte-Colombe de Saint-Denis-lès-Sens, was Peter Lombard's pupil, the learned theologian Herbert of Bosham. Consulted by Henry the Liberal, count of Champagne,² concerning the three marriages of St Anne and the name Salome at Mark 15: 40, he responded in a long letter that ended: 'Sciatis quod liber qui agellii noctium atticarum inscribitur quem a me multociens requisistis. non meus sed sancte columbe sit.'³ It is natural to suppose that Henry prevailed upon the brethren to let a copy be taken; that copy appears to survive as Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1646, siglum Π , which ends on fol. 131^v with the colophon 'Willelmus scripsit anno incarnati uerbi .m^o.c^o. lxx Indictione .ii^o.i^o Concurrente .ii^o.i^o epacta i';⁴ the same elegant hand had written Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 9688 (Valerius Maximus and Auctor de praenominibus), signed on fol. 149^r: 'feliciter emendauit descriptum pruuini iussu illustris comitis henrici: Willelmus Anglicus. anno incarnati uerbi .m^o.c^o lxxv^{mo}.ij^o Indictione .x^{ma}.v'.⁵ Since in Champagne the civil year was counted from the Easter following 1 January and the indiction from the previous 24 September, Π was completed between 5 April and 23 September 1170 (and Valerius between 9 April and 23 September 1167). In several places it shows interventions by William, who for example emends *historia* to *historiae* at 10. 16. 8 and supplies a rudimentary chapter-summary for 13. 4, which lacks one in the other manuscripts; he also has a penchant for transliterating Greek script into Latin surmounted by a horizontal bar. However, he is particularly prone to *saut du même au même*.

Very similar in text to Π , and also from the late twelfth century, is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 13038 (*olim* Saint-Germain 643), fos. 72^r-154^v, siglum G, extending as far as 20. 9. 2 *columbulatim labra*;⁶ This manuscript has been regarded as a

¹ Given in 1566 by Jacques Cujas to the Savoyard nobleman Emanuel-Philibert de Pingon.

² Son of Thibaut the Great, count of Blois; nephew of Stephen, king of England; son-in-law of Louis VII, king of France; brother of Guillaume aux Blanches Mains, archbishop successively of Sens and Reims; father of Henry I, king of Jerusalem; father-in-law of Baldwin, Latin emperor of Constantinople. See Evergates (2016), especially for his love of learning 91-96, 105-106, 119-123; for his relations with Herbert 117-119.

³ Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 123, foll. 1^{ra}-4^{va}, edited with his usual carelessness by Giles (1845-6) ii. 207-217, the source for de la Mare-Marshall-Rouse (1976) 223 n. 22. The beginning of the Corpus MS is lost, but the addressee is identified as Henry by British Library, Royal MS 6 E III, fol. 251^{ra}.

⁴ The concurrent (no longer in use, having been displaced by the Sunday Letter) was the day of the week (here Tuesday) on which 24 March fell; the epact was, before the Gregorian reform, the lunar age (according to the Church's calculation) of the 22nd; Easter was, and still is, the first Sunday after the first lunar age 14 not to precede 21 March. In all cases the year is counted from 1 January, not from the beginning of the local civil year.

⁵ Ultimately derived from Bern, Burgerbibliothek Cod. 366 (Lupus of Ferrière's copy); cf. Stirnemann (1999) 64, no. 30, (2008) 86 n. 11 (who supposes direct use). In the early fourteenth century Π appears to have been at Saint-Étienne: Charles Lalore, *Inventaires des principales églises de Troyes*, 2 vols. (Troyes: Société académique de l'Aube, 1893), II. 271, no. 2302. On William see Evergates (2016) 93, 241 n. 64, cf. Stirnemann (1984) 21-29, (1999), 37, 39-40.

⁶ The medieval manuscript was afforded in the fifteenth century by Pietro da Montagnana of Padua (m. 1478), who prefixed a complete set of lemmata (foll. 5^r-14^r), a copy of books 1-7, not all in the same hand, with lemmata as headings to individual chapters (foll. 14^r-71^r), inserted the Greek in the blank spaces left for it, and appended the remainder of book 20 and the preface (foll. 155^r-157^r). Thus augmented, the MS belonged to Claudius Puteanus, Pierre Séguier chancellor of France, and his great-grandson Henri Charles de Coislin, bishop of Metz (d. 1732), who left his books to the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés.

gemellus of Π ,¹ and identified with Becket's own copy,² which was recorded among the *Libri sancti thome* in a catalogue compiled at Canterbury during the priorate of Henry de Eastray (1284-1331);³ however, it is even closer to a contemporary manuscript, subsequently bound together with V, Vat. lat. 3452, fos. 57^r-132^v,⁴ siglum v, which shares with it such errors as

- 9. 1. 1 *fundit ore* two words
- 9. 1. 8 *idem que* for *idem Q*.
- 9. 2. 10 *seruirⁱ* for *seruili*
- 9. 10. 3 *autem* om.
- 9. 13. 7 *torque* om.
- 9. 14. 12 *in* om.
- 9. 16. 4 *declamantis* for *declamandis*.

Neither G nor v, however, was copied from the other: G occasionally either corrects or corrupts the text of Π v, e.g.

- 9. 1. 3 *conprobato* Π v, *cum probato* G
- 9. 8. 3 *nequid* G, *nequit* Π v
- 13. 26. cap. *valeri* G, *valeri* Π v
- 17. 14 cap. *Publili* v, *publili* Π , *publii* G
- 18. 12. 2 *splendeat* G, *splende an* Π v,

but v abounds in errors of its own, e.g.

- 9. 1. 5 *superna* for *prona*
- 9. 2. 3 *ei* GR for $\epsilon\lambda\zeta$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$
- 9. 2. 10 *hispiam* for *Hippiam*
- 9. 3. 3 *eius* – *plenarum* om.
- 9. 4. 5 *has* for *his*
- 9. 6. 5 *appellauit* om.

Evidently, then, G and v were copied from a common exemplar (I call it κ), which it is reasonable to identify with Becket's manuscript, but which in any case was the *gemellus* of Π and copied from the manuscript at Sainte-Colombe, which I call π .⁵ It follows that when either Π G or (far less frequently) Π v agree, theirs was the reading of π .

As already observed, w takes some of its readings from v, e.g. at 9. 1. 5, 9. 2. 3, 10, 9. 6. 5. After the medieval ending *manum conserere* 20. 10. 6 comes the preface from § 2 onwards, followed by the words 'improbis iste librarius qui opus hoc perscripsit inter cetera leuandi sui laboris gratia que omisit in fine capituli quod ultimum posuit etiam hoc scribere neglexit. Nam ubi sic finit', the rest of book 20, and (running on from it as in

¹ de la Mare-Marshall-Rouse (1976).

² de la Mare-Marshall-Rouse (1976) 223-224; they also suggest (p. 222) that Π should be discarded in favour of G, even though the discrepancies listed prove that sometimes Π is superior.

³ British Library, Cotton MS Galba E. IV, fol. CLXV^r (139^r); see James (1903) 83, no. 817, cf. p. XLII.

⁴ In the fifteenth century the remainder of book 20 and the preface were added, foll. 132^v-134^r, but not the lemmata of book 8.

⁵ It is therefore to κ , not to G, that statements by de la Mare-Marshall-Rouse (1976) 224 pertain; Holford-Strevens (2004) 274, 276 should be corrected accordingly. Evergates (2016) 122 supposes that William the Englishman took two copies from π ; this may seem the more plausible now that another stage of copying has intervened before G, which is not in William's hand, but only if he did not make in the copy for the archbishop the interventions and omissions he made in that for the count. He also infers from William's failure to mention Provins in Π that he copied it at Sainte-Colombe, but neither does he call himself *Anglicus* nor state who gave him his commission; conversely he does not record the concurrent and epact in Valerius.

many ζ manuscripts) § 1 of the preface. The 'scoundrel copyist' must be the scribe of v, who deserves no such reproach for not copying what was not in his exemplar; but were that not the case, how *perscripsit* may be said of one who did not complete his task is as hard to understand as the words *ubi sic finit*, unless *ubi sic* be a mistranscription of *ut hic* in an intermediate manuscript.

A fifteenth-century *Codex Vetustior*

One manuscript, despite its date, counts as medieval: Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, conventi soppressi J IV. 26, *olim* San Marco 329, was copied in 1431 by Niccolò Niccoli (hence its siglum N) 'ex uetustissimo exemplari fideliter pro suo more' according to Politian,¹ but not so faithfully as to exclude the occasional intervention, such as spelling with one *i* genitives that in the other manuscripts have double e.g. *Claudi* 9. 1. 7; 9. 13. 6; 9. 14. 1, or writing *hac* at 9. 15. 9 for the other copies' *haec*. The Greek is in his own hand, despite Ambrogio Traversari's offer to insert it,² which suggests that it was present in his original; unlike Traversari, he had not enough Greek to correct such obvious errors as 10. 19. 3 ΕΓΡΑΦΑ ΣΟΥΤΩΣ ΣΑΝ for ἔγραψας οὕτως ἔάν. He also made use of one or more *re-centiores*, from which he added the long ending of book 20, but not the preface (foll. 123^v, l. 9-135), appended some thirty years later by Giorgio Antonio Vespucci.³

The exemplar was so old that *quoniam*, as sometimes in O and F, was abbreviated *quō*, which Niccoli misread as *quom*. It may have been the 'A. Gellii liber cum Graeco' listed in a letter to him from one Candidus,⁴ writing soon after Leonardo Bruni's marriage in February(?) 1412, amongst the 'ex antiquis libris vetustissimi' in the library of Johannes Aretinus, with an offer to have copied 'si quid tibi placuerit'; but the nineteen-year interval suggests that Niccoli worked not from a transcript but from the ancient manuscript.⁵ Johannes Aretinus was identified by Sabbadini (1886) 85-88 = (1914) 426-431 as Filippo Maria Visconti's counsellor Giovanni Corvini (d. 1438), who however was notorious for not lending his books, and, having refused to oblige Guarino with his Gellius,⁶ was even less likely to have done such a favour for Niccoli when Milan and Florence were in the throes of a bitter war. A rival candidate has been proposed,⁷ ser Giovanni di Cenni d'Arezzo, notary and copyist, who together with Niccoli and Poggio wrote Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo de El Escorial N. III. 7 (s. xv^{1/4}), containing Leonardo Bruni's translation of Plato's *Gorgias*, dedicated to the antipope John XXIII (r. 1410-15);⁸ one might wonder why it took him so long to make his manuscript available to his fellow Tuscan, but Niccoli's quarrelsome nature may have played a part.

¹ Politian (1489), sig. [g6f].

² In a letter to Niccoli of 8 July 1431 (Martène-Durand [1724-33] III. 491-494 at 492). Traversari (1759) II. 352) but see de la Mare (1973) 56, no. 6, who also, like Rizzo (1972) 161 n. 1, corrected the longstanding error of calling the manuscript 'Magliabechi 329' after the library's pre-unification name of Biblioteca Magliabechiana.

³ de la Mare (1973) 137 no. 133. His source may have been the same as Niccoli's for the end of book 20; in his own copy (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Edili 188) he took books 9-20 and the preface from N (so de la Mare rightly), in the chapter-summaries and books 1-7 he used Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Conventi soppressi 188 or an apograph, but not in the preface. Vespucci's MS may be the source of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 8667.

⁴ See Sabbadini (1886) 81-83 ~ (1914) 421-423; his notion (1886) 84-85 that Candidus was Pier Candido Decembrio was rightly retracted at (1914) 425-426 (the fellow's Latinity is appalling).

⁵ Politian's assertion is not of itself decisive; see Rizzo (1973) 161.

⁶ Sabbadini (1886) 90-91 = (1914) 435-536.

⁷ Marshall (1968) I, p. xvi n. 2 (by implication).

⁸ Cf. Davies (1988) 1-11, 22-27.

The δ family

A partial copy, siglum B, exists in a twelfth-century manuscript long since divided into two parts, of which one, formerly owned by François Daniel, running from 9. 1. cap. to 12. 10. 3 *satis hoc esse potuit*, is now Bern, Burgerbibliothek 404, foll. 22^v-48^v, the other, containing 13. 5 followed by the rest of book 12, is now Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, B.P.L. 1925, formerly owned by Paul Petau and Pieter Burman the younger, and until 1908 Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Gr. 26, foll. 111^r-117^v.

In the Bern MS Gellius is enmeshed in book 7 of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* (foll. 1^r-8^v, 49^v-53^v), headed 'Scena filorum' (*sic*), and al-Fargānī's *Jawāmi' 'ilm al-nujūm wa'l-ḥarakāt al-samāwiyya* in John of Seville's translation, dated in the Hispanic manner *era* 1173 = AD 1135 (foll. 49^r, 53^v-56^v, 9^r-22^v);¹ there follow twenty-letters by Gilo, prior of Saint-Père-en-Vallée (foll. 57^r-61^v), a prayer to the Virgin (fol. 62^r-v), and one to Jesus Christ (fol. 63^r). The Leiden MS, which has lost several leaves, consists of six fascicles, all from the twelfth century except the fourth:

(i) *Ilias Latina*, vv. 59-664 (foll. 1^r-10^v).

(ii) Letters of Ivo of Chartres (foll. 11^r-94^v), followed by the canon 'Episcopus missam celebrare debet' falsely ascribed to Gregory the Great and excerpts on the priesthood of monks from the *Decretum Gratiani* (foll. 94^v-96^v).

(iii) Persius (foll. 97^r-104^r).

(iv) The end of a French poem on the art of love in imitation of Ovid (foll. 105^r-109^r),² copied c.1300, followed in English hands by instructions in Latin and French on sailing from England to France (fol. 109^v; fol. 110^r is blank) and two poems, one in French octosyllabic couplets inc. 'O cors plesaunt e de graunt pris', the other in Latin Goliardic quatrains inc. 'Pandam uobis famina posse mihi dato' (fol. 110^v).

(v) Gellius, followed by a distich from Emmerich of Mainz's *Historia de Mahumete* (formerly attributed to Hildebert of Lavardin), vv. 339-340 = canto 3, vv. 29-30:³

Ast oculus quintus uitulum si uiderit intus
quintum post oculum scire putes populum,

which in its conspiratorial context means: 'if anyone besides you and me sees even with one eye the calf hidden in the pit, be sure that he will tell everyone about it'; Isidore, *Etymologiae* 5. 1. 1-3, 5-6 absol'e uerunt (*sic*) (fol. 117^v); verses on the so-called Egyptian or dismal days (fol. 118^v);⁴ the description of an incomplete Gellian manuscript now lost (fol. 119^r),⁵ and various notes ending 'anno ab incarnatione domini m^o c^o lx^ox vi^oiii ii^oi Kal'. octobris Guilelmus philosophus fuit annorum xxxi^orum dierum xī dc lxxx viii 11688 festo Sancti Michaelis archangeli' (foll. 119^v-120^v).

(vi) Boethius' translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge* (foll. 121^r-128^v) and Aristotle's *De interpretatione* (foll. 128^r-138^v) and *Categories* (foll. 138^r-153^r) with his own *De differentiis topicis* (foll. 153^r-175^r) and the beginning of *De diuisione* (foll. 175^r-v).

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus F. 7, written probably at Chartres by a single hand in the last years of the twelfth century, contains the end of Guillau-

¹ The date refers to the translation, not the copy: Holford-Strevens (1979).

² See Talsma (1925), pp. v-vi, 99-113.

³ PL 171. 13518; downloadable from <http://www.mlat.uzh.ch/MLS/index.php?lang=0> (consulted 16 February 2017).

⁴ See Schmitz (1877); Blackburn and Holford-Strevens (1999) 590-592.

⁵ See Holford-Strevens (2004) 280; for '1178' read '1179' and for 'viii' read 'vi'.

me de Conches's *Dragmaticon* (i.e. *dramaticon*, dialogue) from *desiccetur* 6. 18. 2 onwards (foll. 1^{ra}-5^{ra}), the second part of Gellius (foll. 5^{rb}-63^{vb}), siglum Z, and Walter Map's classic of misogynistic humour (widely circulated by itself and also incorporated in his *De nugis curialium*, dist. 4, chs. 3-5) *Dissuasio Valerii ad Ruffinum philosophum ne uxorem ducat* (foll. 63^{vb}-66^{ra}). It often agrees with B in truth and error; it is also given to writing *pluraque* for *plerique* and, when Gellius joins Greek words cited individually with $\chi\alpha\iota$, undoing the code-switch by substituting *et*.¹

From the early thirteenth century comes Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 8664, siglum Q; its origin is firmly located at the monastery of Saint-Évroult-sur-Ouche by a prayer in the scribe's hand on fo. 53^v:

Virgo parens duc euurigenas · o ianua celi
Tolle tua pressis tantos pietate labores
Atque preces pia funde tuas · natumque perora
Virgineo quem uentre tuo benedicta tulisti.

The first two verses were also appended at Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 5506 (II), fol. 199^v, in a hand very much like that of Q, to the autograph copy by Orderic Vitalis (d. c.1142), monk of Saint-Évroult, of his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, books 5-6. It is clear that *euurigenas* means *Eberulfi filios*, nor can one well see why anyone other than a monk of Saint-Évroult should pray for them.

Editors from the seventeenth century onwards assigned undue merit to this manuscript, as offering good unique readings, until it was unmasked by Peter Marshall in his OCT; ² Bentley, as usual, showed better judgement when in his own copy of Gellius (now British Library 683. c. 4) he described P as the oldest and best of the manuscripts available, and Q as far inferior. Many of the readings in question are in fact not good or not unique; others are conjectural. However, doubt remains whether even a brilliant medieval emender (who besides would have had a lot else to do in this manuscript) could have hit on 9. 13. 7 *linguam exertare* for *lingua exerrare*, 14. 7. 4 *ait* for *addit*, 20. 8. 7 *augmenta* for *aucta*, or indeed at 16. 5. 3, where the corruption *Caecilius* had already entered the text when Macrobius purloined the passage at *Sat.* 6. 3. 16, restored not indeed the correct *C. Aelius* but at any rate *celius*. Yet since Q shares readings with γ and with the ϕ florilegium to be discussed below, ³ it was clearly not copied, with however pervasive a blend of carelessness and ingenuity, from a single exemplar.

The fourth manuscript of this family is D, already mentioned under the first part, which extends as far as 14. 1. 22 *impari(litas)*, and includes the chapter-headings for books 9-14; its unique readings are less valuable than in the first part, but note 9. 13. 14 *ilico*.

Family breakdown

Since as many medieval Gellian manuscripts have been lost as preserved, ⁴ it is dangerous to be dogmatic about a stemma; moreover, cross-family agreements, especially but not only $X\delta$ (e.g. 9. 13. 4, 6, 9. 14. 1 *que* for Q.) and γQ (e.g. 10. 26. 6 *freti*), suggest a more complicated transmission, as does the appearance of readings from both families in Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, Tresoar 55 hs (F; formerly Provinsjale Biblioteek fan Fryslân 55), copied at Fulda by ten hands (two Anglo-Saxon, eight Caroline), apparently in 836 from a text lent by Einhard six years earlier to Servatus Lupus, but seized by Hrabanus Maurus for

¹ Holford-Strevens (1992) 285.

² See Marshall (1968) I, p. xvii.

³ Cf. Martin (1977) 10.

⁴ Holford-Strevens (2004) 272-281.

copying; ¹ the multiplicity of scribes may be due to Abbot Hrabanus' impatience. Marshall, without ever arguing his case, treated it as an independent line of descent, yet did not (and could not) always accept its agreement with either γ or δ as establishing the paradox; other editors have regarded it as a contamination of the two, ² yet continued to cite it, even though *ex hypothesi* its only function would be to prove δ 's reading as old as γ 's. Besides agreement in truth and error with one or other of the families (though more often γ), it offers peculiar readings; most of these are wrong (a fact concealed in silence by Marshall's apparatus), ³ e.g.

- 9. 1. 1 *anna^{hium}* for *annali*
- 9. 4. 3 *isogonus* for *Isigonus*
- 9. 4. 14 *pros^{pecta}* for *profecto*
- 9. 9. 12 *prosperere* for *inprosperere*
- 9. 9. 17 *nascetur* for *nosceretur*
- 9. 12. 11 *Liberius* for *Laberius*
- 9. 14. 26 *ergo* for *ego*
- 10. 1. 1 *misit* for *misi*
- 10. 3. 11 *implorantis om.* ⁴
- 10. 5. 1 *et* for *non*
- 10. 7. 2 *Vorro* for *Varro*
- 10. 12. 5 *eodem* <modo>
- 10. 16. 9 *diuinas apud se* for *diuinasse apud*
- 10. 16. 13 *se* for *si*
- 10. 18. 4 *septimum* for *septem*
- 10. 19. 2 *inuenit mentem* for *in mentem uenit*
- 10. 24. 3 *farias* for *ferias*
- 10. 25. 3 *mortem* for *morem*
- 10. 26. 1 *blancum* for *Plancum*
- 10. 27. 3 *ad (aut s.l.)* for *et*

But at 20. 8. 6, where γ has *aeluorum* and δ (by this stage reduced to ZQ) *elulorum*, F has the correct *aelurorum*, long since restored by conjecture; at 20. 1. 50 it reads *reapse* where γ trivializes to *re ipsa*, but δ is in mid-lacuna. It also contains numerous corrections of varying date and quality.

There are also readings from both families, besides numerous corruptions, in Brussels, Royal Library (abbrev. KBR) IV 625/60 (E), ⁵ a bifolium containing 14. 2. 19 *eodemque*-14. 3. 2 *sectatorum*, 14. 8. 2 *cclviii*-15. 14. cap. *metellus* from the same MS as Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Lipsius 30 (Cicero, *Tusculans* down to 3. 36 *nequiter facere*), made for Abbot Steven of Sint-Adelbert, Egmond (d. 1105). ⁶ Its best moment is at 14. 3. 1 *coniectatoria*, where it agrees in truth with the Valerio-Gellian florilegium (see below) against

¹ Lieftinck (1955) (but against his notion that the exemplar was the source of Lupus' corrections in O see Marshall (1968) xii f.); Servatus Lupus, *Epistulae* 1. 7, 5. 8 Marshall. The manuscript must have left Fulda quite early, since 'Aulus Gellius steht in keinem der Fuldaer Bücherverzeichnisse' (Gugel (1995-1996) i. 45). By 1592 it had reached Geneva, where the Huguenot exile Jean de Tourmes II used it for his edition; it was bought there on 11 November 1628 by Robert Koenigsmann of Strasburg (1606-1663; note at foot of fol. 1^r), and subsequently owned by Johann Melchior Steinberg (1625-70), professor at Franeker/Frjentsjer, after whose death it was presumably bought at the auction of 20 March 1671 OS by the local Academy. See too Hermans-Pastoor (2002) 9, 51-53, 69-70, 87-97.

² As cogently argued by Gamberale (1975) 51-55.

³ One of Marshall's few false reports also concerns F, which at 9. 3. 2 reads not *mera* but *mesa*. Evidently his eye had not yet accustomed itself to the Insular script.

⁴ Added in the margin by a very late hand.

⁵ Holford-Strevens (2004) 265-269.

⁶ Gumbert (2006) 219-220. On the erroneous date of 1083 for Steven's death see Holford-Strevens (2004) 266 n. 44.

coniectatori(a)e F, coniectaria δ; its worst at 14. 1. 21, where instead of *suadeo* it reads *uadio*, a Latinized Germanic legal term roughly meaning *spondeo* (cf. English 'I wed' and Dutch *ik wed*, German *ich wette* 'I bet').

A Lost Manuscript of Both Parts: The Codex Buslidianus

Several sixteenth-century scholars cite readings of the most uneven quality from a manuscript in the Collegium Trilingue at Leuven and called Buslidianus after the college's patron, the Luxemburg-born humanist Jérôme vu Bauschelt (Hieronymus Buslidius, in Dutch Jeroen van Busleyden), councillor of Mechelen and canon of Sint-Rombouts (d. 1517). It was first mentioned by Willem Canter in 1564, who quoted from it two passages, 1. 2. 13-1. 3. 8 et and 18. 9. 1-8 *sequo*, absent from our extant copies (but see above on A);¹ our chief source of information is Ludovicus Carrio (known in Paris as Louis Carrion, but born to a Spanish father in Antwerp as Luis Carrión), whose good faith was suspect even in his own day but who cannot be shown to have invented readings either in Gellius or (as also been alleged) in Valerius Flaccus.² He claimed that the manuscript was about four hundred years old,³ which Marshall strangely supposed not to be far wrong since it could be said only of a manuscript written in minuscule,⁴ like all other extant manuscripts of Gellius from the ninth century onwards; but Carrio may have been no better a judge of a manuscript's age than his contemporary Fulvio Orsini, who stated that Vat. lat. 3452 (V + v) was over seven hundred years old (Vat. lat. 7205, fol. 27^v). The abnormal sequence in which the books were presented, our book 1 being the fourteenth and our book 18 the first,⁵ would indicate descent from a disordered set of rolls from a very high point on the stemma,⁶ yet alongside readings that are clearly or possibly right we find corruptions shared with the *recentiores*. It included both halves, but evidently not book 8, the chapter-summaries of book 19, or the end of book 20, since not a word of them is quoted from it. In all probability it did not survive the Orange siege, and more destructive Spanish defence, of 1572.

The Buslidianus needs to be distinguished from Carrio's *optimae membranae*,⁷ the manuscript of books 1-4 bought cheaply for him at Orléans in 1580 by Maximilien Micault of Invelde (who died on 25 August of that year), prebendary of Sainte-Waudru de Mons,⁸ and which may or may not be the *membranae, membranae meliores*, or *libri meliores* cited without further specification.

THE RECENTIORES

Some individuals and institutions had the good fortune to possess manuscripts of both parts: not only are both exploited in florilegia (see below), both are quoted or used in the twelfth century by Radulfus de Diceto, in the thirteenth century by the annotator of

¹ See Canter (1564) 76-78.

² Carrio 1585: 9 = 1885-1886: I. 7.

³ Carrio 1585: 9 = 1885-1886: I. 6.

⁴ The evidence of A seems to stand in the way of any suggestion that it is our extant manuscripts that descend from disordered rolls (the case of books 6 and 7 apart).

⁵ Carrio 1585: 83-84 = 1885-1886: III. 6-7.

⁶ Grandson of Jean Micault, receiver-general of the Low Countries under Charles V, and Livine Cats van Welle, who are portrayed with their children (including Maximilien's father Nicolas) in the side-panels of Jan Cornelisz. Vermeyen's triptych *The Raising of Lazarus* now in the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium in Brussels.

² See Zissos (2008) pp. LXVIII-LXX.

⁴ Marshall (1968) I, p. vi n. 4.

Bern, Burgerbibliothek 276,¹ by John of Wales,² and in the *Gesta Romanorum*, in the fourteenth by Thomas of Ireland³ and John Ridevall;⁴ the Durham Cathedral catalogues of 2 February 1391/2 and 15 January 1416/17 record copies of both halves.⁵ If such separated manuscripts were bound together like V and v, or copied into a single codex such as the source of w (or even in intention D), the result might be called *totus Agellius*, such as the heirs of the canonist Giovanni Calderini (d. 1365) were said to possess at Bologna.⁶

A similar process lies at the origin of the hundred-odd ζ manuscripts,⁷ whose inter-relationships remain to be studied; the earliest datable specimens come from the 1410s (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottoboni lat. 2019, after 22 November 1410;⁸ Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka R. 80, 23 September 1418). Most are of the fifteenth century, but for some a date before 1401 or after 1500 is not to be excluded. They are highly corrupt, but alone preserve 20. 10. 7-11. 5, to which they add the preface. Some three-quarters of them contain the chapter-summaries of book 8,⁹ since manuscripts otherwise closely related may disagree on the summaries' inclusion,¹⁰ omission may ultimately be due to a decision that in the absence of their chapters they were useless.¹¹ (It is noteworthy that they are least likely to appear in manuscripts in which each summary stands above its own chapter, rather than in a single list or before the respective books, which matter too was subject to scribal initiative). In the absence of authentic chapter-summaries for book 19, spurious substitutes are sometimes inserted; this is already the case in Ottoboni lat. 2019, though the summaries there do not conform to either of the two alternative sets found in most manuscripts that contain such a supplement, one (the more frequent) beginning 'Quod in re terribili et repentina pallor in philosopho uituperari non debet et inibi pulchra quedam circa primos animi motus quos esse in potestate nostra philosophi negauerunt',¹² the other 'Responsio cuiusdam philosophi interrogati quam ob rem maris tempestate palluerit.'

The least problematic hypothesis to explain the existence and nature of this class is as follows. As we have seen, there must have been a set of rolls in which books 6 and 7 were in the opposite order to that in modern editions, less of book 20 had been lost, and the chapter-summaries of book 8 had been added at the end. This text too was copied into a two-volume codex divided after book 7, which seemed a reasonable place for division given the loss of book 8; in the fourteenth century at the latest a scribe evidently acquired descendants of both volumes together with a γ manuscript and produced a combinative

¹ Marshall-Martin-Rouse (1980) 382, 389-391.

² See Swanson (1989) 24-29. The distorted quotation from 13. 8 at *Communiloquium* 5. 1. 1 comes from φ (see MS L, foll. 156^b-157^{ra}) through John of Salisbury, *Policraticus* 4. 6.

³ Marshall-Martin-Rose (1980) 391-392.

⁴ See Liebeschütz (1926) 92; Palmer (2005) 223, 224-225, 230; the passage from the *Lectura in Apocalypsim* at Smalley (1960) 312-313 is adapted from the φ quotation cited above.

⁵ Raine (1838), 31, 109; Marshall-Martin-Rouse (1980) 383-385 observe that that of the first part (which began with the preface) may well have belonged to Richard de Bury (who also cites our book 6 as 7) and been related to C.

⁶ Coluccio Salutati to Benvenuto da Imola, 22 May 1375; Salutati (1891-1911) I, 201. His own incomplete inventory, compiled before his wife's death in 1352, includes only 'Defloratio excerpta ex l. Agelij nocium Acticarum' (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense MS 4412, fo. 6^v); cf. Cochetti (1978) 974 n. 63 (reference owed to Michael Reeve).

⁷ I do not include in the count manuscripts copied from printed editions (see below).

⁸ Holford-Strevens (2004) 270-271.

⁹ Occasionally they follow the preface, but this seems to be the result of scribal initiative, not conservatism.

¹⁰ Thus, despite textual resemblances, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chigi H. VII. 219 includes them, Chigi H. VIII. 262 and Vat. lat. 1536 do not.

¹¹ Cf. Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 679, fol. 32 (33)^v: 'Octauus liber ut quidam putant non inuenitur sed solum inueniuntur quedam ipsius Rubricę / quas non pono. Sequuntur Rubricę Noni.' Since this MS belongs to the epitome ε (see below), which otherwise shows no sign of them, this note must have been copied from an earlier manuscript.

¹² This summary, though not the rest, is found in B.

text, full of variants, in which the chapter-summaries of book 8 were transferred to precede book 9 and the preface was moved to the end, so that what had been last written should also be last read. This seems more economical than supposing that more than one scribe not only acquired three such manuscripts as suggested, but moved chapter-summaries of book 8 and (without necessity) the preface.

Although individual manuscripts or groups of manuscripts often present conjectures, from time to time the ζ class exhibits good readings that do not seem conjectural,¹ e.g.

1. 21. lemma *amaror*
1. 4. 8 *enodabat diiudicabatque*
2. 25. 9 *Inde M. Varro*
4. 2. 1 *seruorum*
4. 11. 14 *Pyrrandrum*
6. 20. 6 *acino*
7. 2. 13 *et*¹
7. 16. 1 *ambularem*
7. 16. 9 *significat abigo*
14. 1. 2 *exercendine aut*
16. 3. 8 *ἡ κοιλία*
16. 4. 1 *hominibusque Hermundulis*
17. 2. 15 *complusculi*.

Moreover, at 1. 6. 4 both A and ζ read *hominum animos* against *animos hominum* in VPRCDw with a rhythm *ād mōuēndōs hōmīnānīmōs*, cretic and doubly resolved dispondeee, more characteristic of Gellius than the hemiepes (*mouen*)*dōs ānīmōs hōmīnūm*, and at 2. 25. 10 they agree that the verb is perfect (*scripsit/scripsit*), not present (*scribit*), which in Gellius accompanies either direct quotations or (even in 17. 18. lemma) more circumstantial reports.

An abridgement (ϵ) showing some signs of independence is preserved in three manuscripts, one of which (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. lat. 307) may well be from the late fourteenth century but already contains the commoner set of chapter-summaries for book 19; the other two are Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 679 (which has neither) and New Haven, Conn., Yale University, Marston 83 (which ends with 12. 12).² As in D, the shortening is particularly evident in the early books; in books 1-2 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 13039 also reproduces this text, but then abandons it. The epitome lacks the chapter-summaries for book 8, but sometimes agrees with the medieval manuscripts against the bulk of ζ for good (1. 13. 11 *curaret* for *curarent*) or ill (2. 29. 8 *<et> discescit*), or even improves on both (1. 15. 9 *bibendi* for *uiuendi*, 2. 13. lemma *filiamue* for *filiam*, 2. 16. 13 *permulsi* as in A and the Valerio-Gellian florilegium for *permulsis*, 4. 14. 2 *propterea* for *praeterea*); these corrections may be ascribed to the compiler along with ingenious but erroneous conjectures such as 1. 3. 30 *fini amaueris* for *finiam et* (correct is *fini ames*), 1. 11. 9 *<at> quid* (a connective seems necessary, perhaps *quid <igitur>*), 2. 26. 1 *uisendi causa iret* for *uisere* (correct is *uisum iret*).

There are also manuscripts copied from printed editions, most blatantly Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 169 (owned by Ferrante I king of Naples), which includes Bussi's epistle dedicatory complete with his explanation that the Latin glosses of the

¹ Marshall (1968) I, p. xviii is too sweeping; his indiscriminate use of ζ for readings in the *recentiores* as a class, in individual manuscripts, and in the *editio princeps* is misleading and has misled.

² There are other abridgements in individual manuscripts: Bryn Mawr College Gordan 107; Pesaro, Biblioteca Oliveriana 36; Yale Marston 167, made by Giovanni Antonio Pandoni, known as Il Porcello for his habits.

Greek passages have been included in the text because the printers could not set them in the margin; others are Valencia, Biblioteca Universitària 389 (*olim* 817), from the Aragonese court; Perugia, Biblioteca comunale Augusta 577 (H. 62), foll. 175^r-259^r; Tournai, Bibliothèque communale 96, foll. 184-399 (14 July 1501; destroyed in Second World War); Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek 61. 12 Aug. 12^{mo} (12 January 1503), commissioned by Andrea Matteo Acquaviva, marchese di Bitonto e duca d'Atri (1458-1529); and Manchester, Chetham's Library 27900 (Mun. E. 8. 23), Florentine, c. 1472 (owned by Francesco Sasseti and King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary), but with use of a manuscript. In addition, individual readings from a printed edition have been transferred to manuscripts in copying in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 8666; Lyon, Bibliothèque municipale 168 (91), or subsequently, in British Library Additional 16981; Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale V B 6; Oxford, Bodleian Library E. D. Clarke 20. The same is shown by the readings cited to have been true of the Palatinus housed at Heidelberg before its destruction in the Thirty Years' War.¹

Florilegia

Extracts (mostly whole chapters) from Valerius Maximus 1-7 and from Gellius 1-3, 13, 16, 19 appear in a manuscript of c. 1100 from Salisbury Cathedral: Cambridge, Trinity College R. 16. 34,² foll. 1^r-22(16)^v (siglum S), interrupted on fol. 12(6)^v by *Anthologia Latina* 667 (the so-called *Epitaphium Senecae*) and followed by fol. 23(17)^r Vitalis, *De libidine et uino* (*Anthologia Latina* 633); foll. 23(17)^r-26(20)^v extracts from Sen. *De ben.*; foll. 26(20)^v-27(21)^r provisions of Council of Lisieux 1064; foll. 28(22)^r-44^r Cic. *Off.* 1-2. 9 'quam tibi'; and on foll. 44^v-45^r a late-thirteenth-century copy of a verse invective from the 1250s.³ The manuscript is cited by Bentley in British Library 683. c. 4 as 'codex Iacobaeus', that is to say belonging to the royal library in St James's Palace, of which he was librarian; he need not, however, have been guilty of robbing his king,⁴ for if Bentley, a staunch Whig, had shown William III the manuscript, not a thing of beauty (as Salisbury manuscripts of its date were not) and riddled with wormholes, asking as a special favour if he could possibly take it, William, a soldier but not a scholar, would have been only too glad to reward his loyal servant with an unprepossessing object for which he himself had no use.

Not much later than S is Bremen, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek msc 0041 (western Germany, siglum W) with the same material from Valerius and Gellius, after which on pp. 68-70 come excerpts from Jerome, *Adu. Rufinum* 3. 39, Augustine, *Conf.* 11. 20. 25 'Praesens de preteritis - non uideo', and Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 2. 7. 10-11, followed by some chapters from *Noctes Atticae* book 9, ending on p. 80. A few chapters from the two authors were added, not without adaptation, in the twelfth century at Laach (now Maria Laach) to an eleventh-century miscellaneous manuscript from Sankt Maximin in Trier, on foll. 25^r and 41^v (Bonn, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek S 218, siglum J).

The same Valerian and Gellian material as in S is followed in two twelfth-century French manuscripts by an extensive selection of chapters from the second part (those from book 9 are not entirely the same as in W); since they were discovered before S resurfaced, their content is commonly called the Valerio-Gellian florilegium,⁵ even though the second part is purely Gellian:

¹ See Gebhard (1618) 14-16, 22-23, 30-31, 38-41, 68-70, 81-82, 96-97, 100-101, 104-105.

² James (1900-1904) II. 396-398, no. 982; Webber (1992) 64-65, 158.

³ See Binkley (1991).

⁴ The insinuation of Marshall (1968) I, p. xix: 'nescio quo modo ... in suos libros transtulit.'

⁵ Discussed from the Valerian point of view by Schullian (1937).

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 4952, foll. 136^v-203^r, siglum T, from St-Arnoul de Crépy-en-Valois (the 'Liber Sancti Arnulfi'), in which the text is preceded by fol. 1^r prayer 'Ex omni tribulatione eripuisti me', fol. 2^r blank, foll. 2^v-126^r Justin, foll. 126^v-128^r Bishop Arnulf of Halberstadt to Bishop Heinrich I of Würzburg on creating the bishopric of Bamberg, foll. 128^v-130^r *Epistula Walonis ad Widonem episcopum*, and foll. 130^v-136^r, Priscian, *Praexercitationes*; formerly owned by Jacques-Auguste de Thou, the brothers Jacques and Pierre Dupuy, and Colbert.

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3307, siglum Y. A palimpsest of liturgical texts from the ninth to eleventh centuries, some with Messine neumes, and breviary with notation of c.1000,¹ formerly owned by Fulvio Orsini.

Over the centuries, Y has suffered some damage, ending now at fol. 87^v foot '... ciuitate donatum aut in latinam' (19. 13. 3); more significant is the earlier loss between foll. 80 and 81, resulting in a textual lacuna between 16. 8. 15 *sed ubi* (catchword *aliquantum*) and 17. 21. 42 *consulibus claudio*.

Where TY differ, it is Y's text that one expects to find in two later manuscripts that omit all Valerian matter after the preface:

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouvelles acquisitions latines 1777, foll. 1^r-25^v, siglum H, written in 1382 at Arquà (now Arquà Petrarca) by Petrarch's pupil, continuator, and literary executor Lombardo Della Seta of Padua (d. 1390); a florilegium of the florilegium, followed by (foll. 26^r-47^r) historical *exempla* of self-inflicted misfortunes from Cyrus the Great to Alexius V, (foll. 47^v-48^r) genealogies of Porcii Catones and Cornelii Scipiones. Amongst the many chapters omitted are all those between 16. 4 and 18. 1.

Florence, Biblioteca Marucelliana C. 220, foll. 26^r-75^v, siglum M, with the lacuna already noticed for Y; preceded by Leonardo Bruni's translations of Plutarch's *Cato minor* and Xenophon's *Hiero*; followed by that of Plutarch's *Antony*. The text is spectacularly corrupt: e.g.

1. 8. 3 *loco* for *Graecia*

1. 8. 3-4 *quate tum hinc illud frequens adagorum* for *quantum hinc ait natum esse illud frequens apud Graecos adagium*

10. 14. 1 *in moderno* for *in medio*

14. 6. 3 *nomina inscriptum* for *illud etiam scriptum*.

However, at 10. 27. 5 it anticipates Marshall's correction *caducei* for *caduceum*.

It is obvious from their readings that HM share a common hyparchetype: after 15. 16 both add passages from Solinus 1. 76 and Cicero, *De senectute* 27, 33, after 15. 20 from Solinus 9. 15. This hyparchetype was further related to Y.² In 9. 2, T and before correction Y omit § 8 and reduce § 9 *Sed hoc potius (inquit) dolori* to *hoc inuit musonius dolori*; Y after correction and HM read *et tunc ille aspiciens nos ait quod philosophum se ostentanti mussonius [sic] iussit dari mille nummos et cum plerique dicerent nebulonem esse et hominem malum et nulla re dignum aiunt tunc illum dixisse dolori mihi inquit est et aegritudini*. But after 14. 1 only H adds *Vnde trogus siue iustinus [12. 13. 5] recitat de alexandro magno quod ab anaxarcho philosopho compulsus sit magorum predicta contempnere ut falsa et incerta et si fatis constant tamen ignota mortalibus et {t} si nature debeantur immutabilia*.

Another manuscript said to contain this florilegium has nothing at all to do with it. Vat. lat. 4808 (saec. xv)³ contains two items, both in Italian,⁴ divided by a blank page

at fol. 117^v: on foll. 1^r-117^r the Italian translation of Livy's fourth decade by Boccaccio;¹ on foll. 118^r-179^r part of the translation, by an anonymous thirteenth-century Florentine,² of the much-copied history *Li fet des Romains, compilé ensemble de Saluste et de Suetoine et de Lucan*,³ written between the Emperor Otto IV's alliance with King John of England in 1213 and his defeat by the French king Philip Augustus at Bouvines on 27 July 1214.⁴ The reference may be a slip for Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 4808, which, however, contains 'Fragmenta e libro nono et decimo *Valerii Maximi*, saeculo decimo quinto exarata', in other words (as I thank Professor Mark Everist for confirming) the end of Valerius (9. 15. 1 *amplis]sima*-ext. 2) followed by the *Auctor de praenominibus*.

Although the earliest witnesses to this florilegium are older than any direct witness to Gellius' text, it is not in general superior. In the early books of Gellius it displays some resemblance to P:

2. 6. 2 *commodi* for *incommodi*

2. 7. 1 *patris* for *patri*

2. 29. 9 *animo otioso* for *otioso animo A, amotu ociosos* (VR).

In the later books it has no definite affinity. Its most notable feature is that in some, but not all, manuscripts the name of Theophrastus' rival, which Gellius twice wrongly gave as Menedemus (13. 5. 3), appears correctly as Eudemus or the like at first mention (SY) or even in both places (WJ, T after correction); in the direct tradition this happens at first mention in D and nowhere else.⁵

Another florilegium, containing Gellius only but both parts (books 1-3, 5, 9-16), known as ϕ , was probably made by William of Malmesbury (d. c.1143) but in any case used by him in his *Polyhistor* and also by John of Salisbury.⁶ It is divided between two manuscripts:

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawl. G. 139, foll. 152^v-154^v, siglum K, written in England for William before 1125, and also containing (foll. 1^{ra}-10^{ra}) Cicero, *Partitiones oratoriae* (foll. 10^{ra}-46^{ra}), Cicero, *De officiis*, (foll. 46^{ra}-152^{rb}), and pseudo-Quintilian, *Decl. Mai.*⁷ From this manuscript Cicero and the florilegium, but not pseudo-Quintilian, were copied later in the century into Poppi, Biblioteca Comunale Rilliana 39 (Italian hand with West Midlands English initials).⁸

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. class. d. 39 (*olim* London, Sion College, Arc. L. 40. 2/ 21), c.1175, foll. 153^{rb}-159^{ra}, siglum L, preceded by (foll. 1-125^{rb}) Suetonius, *Caesares* (foll. 125^{rb}-153^{rb}), texts relating to the Franks (notably Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni*, 137^{ra}-150^{va}),⁹ and followed (fol. 159^{rb}) by the Emperor Henry III's epitaph *Cesar tantus eras*. Although the manuscript was written well after William's death, the material appears to derive from a collection made by or for him.¹⁰

In the second part this florilegium too has no definite affinity,¹¹ but in the first it is more closely related than the other to P:

¹ Boccaccio's authorship seems secure for this decade, though not for the others; see Dell'Oso (2013) 12-13.

² Partially ed. Marroni (2004).

³ See Flutre-Sneyders de Vogel (1935-1938) I. 347.2-714.26.

⁴ For the date see Flutre (1932) 5-8.

⁵ The likeliest source for an eleventh-century restoration of the true name is the logical writings of Boethius; see Holford-Strevens (2005) 317 n. 38.

⁶ Thomson (2003) 189-198.

⁷ The manuscript is described at length by Thomson (2003) 85-86.

⁸ Thomson (2003) 195 n. 31. At *Off.* 2. 43, where the words *Ti. enim Gracchus P. f. tam diu laudabitur dum memoria rerum Romanarum manebit* have been omitted, William's marginal supplement *T. Gracchus in primis uir bonus et magnus ita uixit ut et tunc ciuitati profuerit et adhuc eius nomen laudabile sit* is incorporated in the text of the Poppi manuscript.

⁹ See Cavazza (1998), (1999b).

¹⁰ Thomson (2003) 138-153.

¹¹ But see Martin (1977) 10 on possible input from ϕ .

¹ Bannister (1913) 1. 90, no. 258.

² The omission of 1. 20. 9 $\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$ - *altitudine* in Y^cM is coincidental, being due to *saut du même au même* after *altitudine* § 8.

³ Marshall-Martin-Rouse (1970) 370; Marshall (1983) 178; but see Cavazza (1999a) 77, (2000) 102.

⁴ Vatican MSS are classified by script, not by language.

1. 13. 11 *qua* for *qui*
 3. 7. 8 *aeque* for *atque*
 3. 7. 12 *in om.*¹
 5. 10. 6 *disciplina* for *disciplinam*

At seven places in P the words *huc usque* appear uncalled-for in the text, having evidently been inserted in the margin of an ancestor as an instruction to an excerptor: 'down to here'. Five of these places correspond to the end of excerpts in φ (1. 8. 6 *emo*; 1. 26. 9 *age*; 3. 7. 19 *seruauit*; 3. 9. 9 *dicimus* P, *diximus* K, which lacks the rest of the chapter (*Graeci-dicitur*); 5. 9. 3 *inceptit*); at 2. 2. 10 *prius* the insertion is made eight words too soon, no doubt because its place was inadequately marked in the exemplar; but 4. 5. 6 *dignarum* is not the end of an excerpt, nor indeed does anything from this book appear in the florilegium.

Two important collections of classical excerpts must be considered here. Although the Florilegium Gallicum is chiefly notable for its poetical texts, some manuscripts also include prose authors, including Gellius;² the excerpts from books 1-10 are not particularly faithful, but uniquely preserve the truth at 10. 23. 1 *deprehendendi* for *reprehendendi* (though Q had *deprehendi*).³ The quotations from books 9-20 in the Florilegium Angelicum have been too much rewritten and corrupted to serve an editor of Gellius.⁴ More significant are the extracts from both parts in the *Abbreuiationes chronicorum* of Radulfus de Diceto (?Ralph of Diss), High Dean of St Paul's, London, compiled at the end of the twelfth century and preserved in two recensions, Lambeth Palace MS 8 (Radulfus' own copy) and British Library Cotton Claudius E. III, written in the same scriptorium by 1198.⁵ At 1. 9. 3 his paraphrase anticipates the conjecture *iubebatur* for *iubebat*, which has not found favour but makes for a smoother construction (admittedly not a decisive argument in Gellius) and is palaeographically unproblematic.

Furthermore, as early as the ninth century, and again in the twelfth, chapter 3. 6 was incorporated along with Christian texts in florilegia;⁶ other chapters were also excerpted in e.g. Brussels, KBR 10615-10729 (c.1130, Saint-Riquier?), fol. 239^{vb} (14. 5. 15. 2. 7 *expers ... compulerit*, 15. 4. 3 *concurrere ... factus est*; miserably corrupt);⁷ Cambridge, St John's College D.16 (s. XII, MS J of Quintilian), fol. 72^v (6. 13. 3. 6. 1. 15. 1-3); Trinity College Dublin 602 (s. XIII¹), fol. 131^v (9. 1); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 633 (*Florilegium morale Oxoniense*), fol. 67^v (12. 12. 1; ascribed to Solon). In humanistic times such excerpts are not infrequent; in particular 3. 8. 8 and 15. 24 were frequently added to texts of Cicero, *Ad familiares* and Plautus respectively.

SIGLA

- A Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 24
 B Bern, Burgerbibliothek 404 + Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, B.P.L. 1925

¹ I discount 3. 9. 2 *scribam*, which is probably correct.

² The florilegium is studied in depth by Fernández de la Cuesta González (2008).

³ I have used Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez B Santen 60, foll. 69^{vb}-70^{rb}; Arras, Médiathèque municipale 64, foll. 120^v-122^r and 171, foll. 58^v-60^v; Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 47903, foll. 135^{vb}-137^{rb}; Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria 2306, foll. 83^{vb}-85^{ra}; El Escorial Q I 14, foll. 185^v-187^r. The excerpts are themselves excerpted at Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 70 E 9, foll. 184^{ra}-184^r.

⁴ Following Rouse and Rouse (1975) 66-70 = (1991) 101-104 I have used Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Strozzi 75, foll. 54^v-57^r; Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1895, foll. 77^r-79^v, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 957, foll. 166^v-171^r, Reg. lat. 1575 foll. 91^{ra}-92^{vb}, Vat. lat. 3087, foll. 60^r-63^r.

⁵ The reference edition, Stubbs (1876), is unexpectedly inaccurate.

⁶ Holford-Strevens (2004) 250-252, 253-254; but on Trier, Stadtbibliothek 2500 see Contreni (2002) 132 (s. ix²), Declercq (2005) 697 n. 63 (Saint-Amand not Reims; reference owed to David Ganz).

⁷ Holford-Strevens (2004) 269-270, where at p. 269 l. 2 up delete 'I'.

- C Cambridge, Clare College 26
 D Göttingen, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek philol. 162
 E Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique/Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België iv 625/60
 F Leeuwarden/Ljouwert, Tresoar 55 hs
 G Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 13038
 H Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, nouvelle acquisition latine 1777
 K Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson G 139
 L Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lat. class. d. 39
 M Florence, Biblioteca Marucelliana C. 220
 N Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, conventi soppressi J iv. 26
 O Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 597
 P Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 5765
 Π Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1646
 Q Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8664
 R Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Gronovius 21
 S Cambridge, Trinity College R. 16. 34
 T Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 4952
 V/ v Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3452
 W Bremen, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek msc 0041
 w Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1532
 X Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus F 112
 Y Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3307
 Z Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus F. 7
 γ family OXII GvN
 δ family BZQD
 ς *codices recentiores*

REFERENCES

- ARNHEIM, MICHAEL THOMAS WALTER (1972), *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, Clarendon.
 BANNISTER, ENRICO [= HENRY] MARRIOTT (1913), *Monumenti vaticani di paleografia musicale latina*, 2 vols., Leipzig, Harrassowitz.
 BARON, ROGER (1966), *Hugonis de Sancto Victore opera propaedeutica*, Notre Dame, Ind., University of Notre Dame Press.
 BINKLEY, PETER (1991), *The Date and Setting of Michael of Cornwall's Versus Contra Henricum Abrincensem*, «Medium Aevum», 60, 76-84.
 BLACKBURN, BONNIE, HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (1999), *The Oxford Companion to the Year: An Exploration of Calendar Customs and Time-Reckoning*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
 BROWN, VIRGINIA (1979), *Latin Manuscripts of Caesar's Gallic War*, in *Palaeographica, Diplomatica et Archivistica: Studi in onore di Giulio Battelli*, Rome, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 105-157.
 BUBNOV, N. M. (1899), *Gerberti postea Silvestri papae II opera mathematica (972-1003)*, Berlin, R. Friedländer & Sohn (repr. Hildesheim, G. Olms, 1963).
 CANTER, WILLEM (Gulielmus Canterus) (1564), *Nouarum lectionum libri quatuor*, Basel, Oporinus.
 CARRIO, LUDOVICUS (1585), *In A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum libros commentarios qui exstant castigationes et notae*, Paris, Henricus Stephanus, bound with some copies of his edition; repr. by M. J. Hertz before the Index Scholarum of Breslau university for summer 1885 and summer and winter 1886.
 CAVALLO, GUGLIELMO (1996), *Per la datazione del frammento Rylands delle Historiae di Sallustio*, in Carlo Bo (ed.), *Studi latini in ricordo di Rita Cappelletto*, Urbino, Quattro Venti, 63-69 = *Il calamo e il papiro: la scrittura greca dall'età ellenistica ai primi secoli di Bisanzio*, Florence, Gonnelli, 2005, 203-208.
 CAVAZZA, FRANCO (1998), *Le genealogie dei re Franchi e gli excerpta degli Annales Mettenses priores nel codex Oxoniensis*, *Bodleian Library Ms. Lat. class. d. 39 (L)*, «Sileno», 24, 45-92.

- CAVAZZA, FRANCO (1999a), *Un "nuovo Gellio": il problema di una nuova edizione e la questione dei codices recentiores (e dei florilegi)*, «Maia», 51, 47-88.
- CAVAZZA, FRANCO (1999b), *La Visio Karoli (Crassi), gli excerpta historica (pertinenti ai carolingi) e il poemetto "Cesar tantus eras" nel Codex Oxoniensis, Bodleian Library, Ms. Lat. class. d. 39 (L)*, «Sileno», 25, 21-50.
- CAVAZZA, FRANCO (2000), *L'elenco, finora conosciuto, dei florilegia medioevali, che comprendono anche excerpta gelliana o solo excerpta gelliana*, «Maia», 52, 99-126.
- CAVAZZA, FRANCO (2004), *Addendum all'elenco dei codices recentiores gelliani pubblicato in «Maia»: 51 (1999)*, «Maia», 56, 105-110.
- CHERUBINI, PAOLO (1980), *Giovanni da Itri: armigero, fisico e copista*, in *Scrittura, biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento: aspetti e problemi. Atti del seminario 1-2 giugno 1979*, eds. Concetta Bianca et al., Vatican City, Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia, Diplomatica e Archivistica, 1, 33-63.
- COCHETTI, MARIA, *La biblioteca di Giovanni Calderini*, «Studi medievali»³, 19 (1978), 951-1032.
- CONTRENI, JOHN J. (2002), *John Scottus and Bede*, in *History and Eschatology in John Scottus Eriugena and his Time: Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference of the Society for the Promotion of Eriugenian Studies, Maynooth and Dublin, August 16-20, 2002*, eds. Michael Dunne and James McEvoy, Leuven, Leuven University Press, 91-140.
- DAVIES, M. C. (1988), *An Enigma and a Phantom: Giovanni Aretino and Giacomo Languschi*, «Humanistica Lovaniensia», 37, 1-29.
- DECLERCQ, GEORGES (2005), *La Vita prima Bavonis et le culte de saint Bavon à l'époque carolingienne*, in *'Scribere sanctorum gesta': recueil d'études d'hagiographie médiévale offert à Guy Philippart*, eds. Paul Bertrand, Xavier Hermand, Étienne Renard, and Michel Trigalet, Turnhout, Brepols, 595-626.
- DELL'OSO, LORENZO (2013), *Reopening a Question of Attribution: Programmatic Notes on Boccaccio and the Translation of Livy*, «Heliotropia», 10/1-2, 1-16.
- EVERGATES, THEODORE (2016), *Henry the Liberal, Count of Champagne, 1127-81*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- FERNÁNDEZ DE LA CUESTA GONZÁLEZ, BEATRIZ (2008), *En la senda del Florilegium Gallicum: Edición y estudio del florilegio del manuscrito Córdoba, Archivo Capitular 150*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, Textes et études du Moyen Âge, 45.
- FIORETTI, PAOLO (2016), *Percorsi di autori latini tra libro e testo. Contesti di produzione e di ricezione in epoca antica*, «Segno e testo», 14, 1-38.
- FLUTRE, LOUIS-FERNAND, *Les Manuscrits des "Faits des Romains"*, Paris, Hachette.
- FLUTRE, LOUIS-FERNAND, SNEYDERS DE VOGEL, KORNELIS (1935-1938), *Li Fet des Romains. Compilé ensemble de Saluste et de Suetone et de Lucan*, 2 vols., Paris-Groningen, Droz-Wolters.
- FOHLEN, JEANNINE (1979), *Recherches sur le manuscrit palimpseste Vatican, Pal. lat. 24*, «Scrittura e civiltà», 3, 195-222.
- GAMBERALE, LEOPOLDO (1975), *Note sulla tradizione di Gellio (In margine alla più recente edizione delle «Noctes Atticae»*, «Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica», 103, 35-55.
- GEHARD, JACOB (JANUS GEBHARDUS) (1618), *Antiquarum lectionum libri duo*, Herborn, Christophorus Corvinus.
- GILES, J. A. (1845-1846), *Herberti de Boseham S. Thomae Cantuarensis socius a secretis opera quae extant omnia*, 2 vols., I. Oxford, Parker; II. London, Whittaker.
- GUGEL, KLAUS (1995-1996), *Welche erhaltenen mittelalterlichen Handschriften dürfen der Bibliothek des Klosters Fulda zugerechnet werden?*, 2 vols. (Fuldaer Hochschulschriften, 23a-b; Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht).
- GUMBERT, J. P. (2006), *Cicerones Leidenses*, in *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics*, eds. Claudine A. Chavannes-Mazel and Margaret M. Smith, Los Altos Hills-London, Anderson-Lovelace-The Red Gull Press, 208-244.
- HAGEN, HERMANN (1875), *Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana)*, Bern, B. F. Haller.
- HEMANS, JOS. M. M., PASTOOR, ALINE (eds.) (2002), *De Oudheid in handen: Klassieke handschriften in de Provinsjale & Buma Biblioteek fan Fryslân*, Leeuwarden, Provinsjale en Buma Biblioteek fan Fryslân.

- HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (1979), *A Misdated Manuscript of Gellius*, «Classical Quarterly», 29, 226-227.
- HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (1992), *Kai for et*, «Classical Quarterly», new series, 42, 284-287.
- HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (2004), *Recht as een Palmen-Bohm and Other Facets of Gellius Medieval and Humanistic Reception*, in *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, eds. Leofranc Holford-Streuvens and Amiel Vardi, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 249-281.
- HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (2005), *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (2014), *Aulus Gellius*, in *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*, ed. Greti Dinkova-Bruun, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies x, 253-329.
- HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (2015), *The Harp that Once through Aulus' Halls*, in *Early Medieval Ireland and Europe: Chronology, Contacts, Scholarship. A Festschrift for Dáibhí Ó Cróinín*, eds. Pádraic Moran and Immo Warntjes, Turnhout, Brepols, 395-404.
- JAMES, MONTAGUE RHODES (1900-1904), *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, 4 vols., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- JAMES, MONTAGUE RHODES, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- JAMES, MONTAGUE RHODES (1905), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Library of Clare College, Cambridge*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- KASTER, ROBERT A. (1988), *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press.
- LEHMANN, PAUL (1938), *Aus dem Leben, dem Briefwechsel und der Büchersammlung eines Helfers der Philologen*, «Archiv für Kulturgeschichte», 28, 163-190 = *Erforschung des Mittelalters: Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5 vols., Leipzig-Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1941-62, IV, 107-127.
- LIEBESCHÜTZ, HANS (1926), *Fulgentius metaforalis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Mythologie im Mittelalter*, Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner.
- LIEFTINCK, G. I. (1955), *Le manuscrit d'Aulu-Gelle à Leeuwarden exécuté à Fulda en 836*, «Bullettino dell'Archivio Paleografico Italiano», n.s., 1, 11-17.
- LUTZ, CORA E. (1944), *Dunchad: Glossae in Martianum*, Lancaster, Penn., American Philological Association.
- MAGNALDI, GIUSEPPINA (1986), *Il codex Rottendorffianus Gronovianus (R) del "De finibus bonorum et malorum" di Cicerone*, «AAST», 120, 133-160.
- MARE, A. C. DE LA (1973), *The Handwriting of Italian Humanists*, Oxford, Association Internationale de Bibliophilie, vol. 1, fasc. 1 (no more published).
- MARE, A. C. DE LA, MARSHALL, P. K., ROUSE, RICHARD H. (1976), *Pietro da Montagnana and the Text of Aulus Gellius in Paris B.N. lat. 13038*, «Scriptorium», 30, 219-225.
- MARRONI, SERGIO (2004), *I fatti dei Romani. Saggio di edizione critica di un volgarizzamento fiorentino del Duecento*, Rome, Viella.
- MARSHALL, P. K. (1968), *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*, 2 vols., Oxford, E typographeo Clarendoniano; lightly revised reprint 1990.
- MARSHALL, P. K. (1983), *Aulus Gellius*, in *Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 176-180.
- MARSHALL, P. K., MARTIN, JANET, ROUSE, RICHARD H. (1980), *Clare College MS. 26 and the Circulation of Aulus Gellius 1-7 in Medieval England and France*, «Mediaeval Studies», 42, 353-394.
- MARTÈNE, EDMOND, DURAND, URSIN (1724-1733), *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio*, 9 vols., Paris, Montalant.
- MARTIN, JANET (1977), *John of Salisbury's Manuscripts of Frontinus and of Gellius*, «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes», 40, 1-26.
- MEAGHER, SISTER LUANNE, OSB (1936), *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières* (diss. University of Chicago).
- MEYER, WILHELM (1893-1894), *Verzeichniss der Handschriften im Preussischen Staate. I. Hannover. 1-3. Göttingen*, Berlin.

- PALMER, NIGEL F. (2005), *Bacchus und Venus: Mythographische Bilder in der Welt des späten Mittelalters. Mit einem Textanhang*, in *Literatur und Wandmalerei II: Konventionalität und Konversation. Burgdorfer Colloquium 2001*, eds. Eckart Conrad Lutz, Johanna Thali, and René Wetzel, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 189-235.
- PEDERSEN, FRITZ S. (2007), *Astronomical Tables for Pisa in MS. København, K.B., GkS 277, fol.*, «Renaissanceforum» (e-journal).
- POLITIAN (ANGELUS POLITIANUS, AGNOLO DEGLI AMBROGINI DA MONTEPULCIANO), *Miscellaneorum centuria prima*, Florence, Antonius Miscominus, 19 September 1489.
- RAINE, JAMES (1838), *Catalogi veteres librorum cathedralis Dunelm*, London, Surtees Society.
- RIZZO, SILVIA (1973), *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti*, Rome, Edizioni de Storia e Letteratura.
- ROCCHI, STEFANO, HOLFORD-STREUVENS, LEOFRANC (in c.d.s.), *The Twenty-One Books of Aulus Gellius' Attic Nights: A Prehistory of the Text and Ancient Textual Arrangements*, in *Storie di libri in memoria di Alessandro Daneloni*, eds. Stefano Rocchi, Cecilia Mussini, and Giovanni Cascio, Munich, Herbert Utz).
- ROLLO, ANTONIO (2006), *Interventi di Andronico Callisto in codici latini*, «Studi medievali e umanistici», 4, 367-380.
- ROUSE, RICHARD H., ROUSE, MARY A. (1975), *The Florilegium Angelicum: Its Origin, Content, and Influence*, in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R. W. Hunt*, eds. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson, Oxford, 66-114; repr. in MARY A., RICHARD H. ROUSE, *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts*, Notre Dame, Ind., 1991, 101-152.
- SABBADINI, REMIGIO (1886), *Della biblioteca di Giovanni Corvini e d'una ignota commedia latina*, «Museo italiano di antichità classica», 2, 81-92; heavily revised in Sabbadini (1914), 421-444.
- SABBADINI, REMIGIO (1914), *Storia e critica di testi latini*, Catania, Francesco Battiato.
- SALUTATI, COLUCCIO (1891-1911), *Epistolario*, ed. Francesco Novati, 4 vols., Rome, Istituto Storico Italiano.
- SCHMITZ, WILHELM (1877), *Zu den Verzeichnissen der sog. Aegyptischen Tage und Stunden*, in Id., *Beiträge zur lateinischen Sprach- und Literaturkunde*, Leipzig, Teubner, 307-320.
- SCHULLIAN, DOROTHY M. (1937), *The Anthology of Valerius Maximus and A. Gellius*, «CPh», 32, 70-72.
- SMALLEY, BERYL (1960), *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- STIRNEMANN, PATRICIA (1984), *Quelques bibliothèques princières et la production hors scriptorium au XII^e siècle*, «Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques», n.s. 17-18 (1981-1982), Fascicule A: Antiquités nationales, 7-38.
- STIRNEMANN, PATRICIA (1999), *Une bibliothèque princière au XII^e siècle*, in *Splendeurs de la cour de Champagne au temps de Chrétien de Troyes (Troyes, Association Champagne historique, 1999)*, 36-42 and descriptions in following catalogue, ed. Thierry Delcourt.
- STIRNEMANN, PATRICIA (2008), *Where Can We Go from Here? The Study of French Twelfth-Century Manuscripts*, in *Romanesque Art and Thought in the Twelfth Century: Essays in Honor of Walter Cahn*, Princeton, Institute of Christian Art, Princeton University, 82-94.
- STUBBS, WILLIAM (1876), *Radulfi de Diceto decani Londonensis opera historica/The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London*, 2 vols., London, Longman and others; repr. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- SWANSON, JENNY (1989), *John of Wales: A Study of the Works and Ideas of a Thirteenth-Century Friar*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- TALSMA, DEEUWES (1925), *L'Art d'amours van Jakes d'Amiens (XIII^e eeuw): critische textuitgave met inleiding en aantekeningen*, diss. Leiden; Almelo, N. V. Drukkerij W. Hilarius Wzn.
- TEEUWEN, MARIKEN (2011), *Writing between the Lines: Reflections of Scholarly Debate in a Carolingian Commentary Tradition*, in *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella: Ninth-Century Commentary Traditions on 'De nuptiis' in Context*, eds. Mariken Teeuwen and Sinéad O'Sullivan, Turnholt, Brepols, 11-34.
- THOMSON, RODNEY M. (2003), *William of Malmesbury*, revised edition, Woodbridge, The Boydell Press.
- TRAVERSARI, AMBROGIO (1759), *Ambrosii Trauersarii generalis Camaldulensium aliorumque ad ipsum*,

- et ad alios de eodem Ambrosio Latinae epistolae*, eds. Pietro Canneti and Lorenzo Mehus, 2 vols., Florence, Ex typographeo Caesareo.
- TURCAN-VERKERK, ANNE-MARIE (2008), *La théorie des quatre styles; une invention de Jean de Garlande*, «Bulletin Du Cange (Archivum latinitatis medii aevi)», 66, 167-187.
- WEBBER, TERESA (1992), *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral, c.1075-c.1125*, Oxford, Clarendon.
- ZISSOS, ANDREW (2008), *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica, Book 1*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.