

MICHAEL D. REEVE

THE DISORDER IN **P** AND **M** OF CICERO'S LETTERS *AD FAMILIARES*,
WITH A LIST OF EXTANT MANUSCRIPTS

The oldest extant manuscript of Cicero's letters *Ad familiares* that contains all 16 books, **M** (Laur. 49, 9, s. IX), came to light at Vercelli towards the end of the 14th century. When Coluccio Salutati, chancellor of Florence, requested from contacts in Milan a copy of a manuscript discovered by Petrarch at Verona that contained the other collection of Cicero's letters, *Ad Brutum*, *Ad Q. fratrem*, and *Ad Atticum*, he received instead **P** of *Ad familiares* (Laur. 49, 7), a copy of **M** made in 1392 quire for quire by a team of scribes. Either **M** was disbound for the purpose or it had never been bound¹.

Today both **M** and **P** have their quires in the right order, but it was not always so. When Politian saw **P** in the 1480s or earlier², he found quire XV out of place after quire XVII, so that a chunk of Book 8 appeared in the middle of Book 9; and he blamed the disorder on the binder of **P**. As all other copies of *Ad familiares* in circulation (*cuncti plane quotquot extant adhuc epistolarum earundem codices*) had the same disordered text but not on disordered quires, he inferred descent from **P**. Over the centuries, the inference has been applauded many times, but in a footnote Mirella Ferrari sounded this warning: «In assenza finora di collazioni di tutti i testimoni del XV secolo, non conviene affermare, come talvolta è stato fatto, che l'intera tradizione umanistica italiana delle *ad fam.* discende da **P**»³. Nevertheless, Politian's inference has been reaffirmed by Giancarlo Reggi in a study of the disorder and various reactions to it among 15th-century hu-

¹ Kirner 1901, 400-401, 405, seems to have favoured «disbound for the purpose», because after saying just that «nel 1392 *M* era disciolto in quaderni» he speaks of «la ricomposizione del libro». That is how he was interpreted by Daneloni 1995, 329-330 n. 6: «quando *M* fu sfasciolato per consentire una rapida trascrizione di *P*». Daneloni 2008, 252, acknowledges that it might still have been unbound.

² Politian 1489, cap. xxv.

³ Ferrari 2016, 630 n. 19. Mendelssohn 1893, xxvi-xxvii, had already cited refractory evidence from Books 9-16, and Reeve 2024, 14-20, adds more.



manists⁴: in his first paragraph one reads of «il codice siglato **P** nelle edizioni critiche, da cui derivano i manoscritti italiani del s. XV».

Politian, however, saw not only **P**, then in the public library of the Medici at San Marco, but also **M**, acquired in 1482 for their private library from the estate of Francesco Filelfo, who had died at Florence in 1481⁵. Together with his blaming the disorder on the binder of **P**, his remarks about **M** imply that its quires were in the right order, and he shows no sign of having detected that quire XV had once stood after quire XVII as in **P**. Besides the evidence of **P**, changes made to the catchwords in **M** put that beyond doubt⁶, but it is not known when between 1392 and 1482 the right order was restored. Apart from the catchwords, the only evidence is the 15th-century note at the end of f. 118v, where *ad finem octavae paginae* fits the present order⁷; but the hand, once thought to be Politian's, has not been identified or more narrowly dated⁸. If, as some investigators suggest⁹, the right order was restored when the quires were reassembled after the copying of **P**, then Politian's inference, which may have rested chiefly on manuscripts and incunables that he had seen in Florence, is nevertheless plausible on the wider map, because there would have been little time for other scribes to reproduce from **M** itself the disorder reproduced in **P**; but when Reggi prefers to suppose that the disorder was not corrected before the late 1450s¹⁰, how does he know that «i manoscritti italiani del s. XV» descend from **P** and not **M**? The same question can be put to those of his predecessors who give no date for the correction.

⁴ Reggi 2024. Since that article and Reeve 2024 appeared, I have exchanged a succession of amicable messages with Giancarlo Reggi, and I thank him for showing me images of several manuscripts as well as discussing matters aired in the present article.

⁵ Speranzi 2016, 67.

⁶ Mendelssohn 1884, 845-846; Kirner 1901, 401-403; Daneloni 1995, 329-330 n. 6; Reggi 2024, 30-31. In the digital version I cannot make out the erasures they report, but certainly the present catchwords in quires XIV XV XVII (ff. 118v, 126v, 142v) are unlike the rest in not being framed by dots.

⁷ Kirner 1901, 402-403; he suggests that the note was written for the benefit of anyone who might be collating **M** on a descendant of **P**.

⁸ Daneloni 1995, 327 n. 2, says «non è assolutamente da ascrivere alla mano dell'Ambrogini». Mendelssohn 1884, 848 n. 6, already doubted the ascription, and it is not clear that his reason was the misapprehension alleged by Kirner (n. 6).

⁹ Kirner 1901, 405-406. Daneloni 1995, 330 n. 6, who does not cite him on the matter, inclines to the same view but only after bewailing the lack of evidence.

¹⁰ Reggi 2024, 46-47. It escapes me why Gionta 2016, 310; 2019, 75, cited with approval by Reggi 2024, 45 with n. 90, regards the date 1453 on f. 174r of **M**, the only part of an informal note to have survived erasure, as the *terminus a quo* for Filelfo's acquisition of **M**.

Reggi immediately jumps to a historical consequence of assuming that the other Italian manuscripts descend from **P**. When he finds some of them adopting un conjecturable readings entered in **P** as corrections by its second owner, Niccolò Niccoli, he argues that they obtained them from the state of **P** to which Niccoli had brought it. Consequently, when any such manuscript has hitherto been assigned to s. XIV^{ex}, s. XIV/XV, or s. XVⁱⁿ, he moves it to the 1420s or later, which he takes to be the date of Niccoli's corrections. A *terminus a quo* previously suggested for them was 1423¹¹, but he pushes it back to 1421, the date of Bologna Univ. 2283¹². Laur. 49, 6, signed in 1420 by Antonio di Mario, takes up no corrections of Niccoli's but does not help, because Antonio copied it from Giovanni Aretino's manuscript of 1410, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1496. It should not be assumed that any Florentine descendant of **P** is a direct copy.

That Reggi adopts a mistaken policy I am not yet in a position to say, but by ignoring its risks he does a disservice to paleographers, art historians, historians in general, and textual critics. Take the very first sentence, where Niccoli restored *ceteris*. **M** opens with a rubricated heading, *M. Cicero salutem dicit Publio Lentulo procons. Ego omni officio ac potius pietate erga te caeteris satis facio*, which is not a title for the collection but the heading of 1, 1 followed by its opening words. Though the heading in **P** is not rubricated, it originally consisted of the same words, and the text opened either with the next word, *Omnibus*, or with a space for the *O* followed by *mnibus*; but someone erased *Ego ... satis facio* and rewrote it as the beginning of the text, adding *omnibus* (unless it was added by someone else: the ink and hand look different), substituting a large *E* for the *O* if it was there, and cancelling *mnibus*. The same person, however, omitted *ceteris*, whether by inadvertence or because the original heading already omitted it. What may be the earliest Florentine copy of **P** that survives complete, Laur. 49, 15 (c. 1406?)¹³, likewise gives the collection no title and after a decorated initial goes straight into the heading of 1, 1, not rubricated; Vat. Pal. Lat. 1496 (dated 1410) invents and rubricates a title, *Epistolarum Marci Tullii Ciceronis ad Lentulum liber primus incipit feliciter*, and then continues in the same way as Laur. 49, 15. Both omit *ceteris*, and the omission can be added to other evidence that they de-

¹¹ Daneloni 1995, 336.

¹² Reggi 2024, 28 n. 10. He has kindly shown me images of the manuscript, a product of northern Italy that has a text at home there.

¹³ For an earlier fragment of 2, 6-7, Florence Ricc. 2317 f. IIIrv, see Cursi 2007 and De Robertis 2016, 67 no. 13, 82 fig. 8.

scend from a state of **P** earlier than Niccoli's corrections. Another manuscript that omits it (and *omnibus* too) is Pistoia Forteguerriana A 7, written by Sozomeno and dated c. 1427 by the latest investigator, who says that most of the notes in the margin correspond to notes in **P**¹⁴. It has another original reading of **P** at 1, 2, 4, *cum enim Cato*, which Laur. 49, 15 and Pal. Lat. 1496 also have but Niccoli corrected to the reading of **M**, *cui cum Cato*. At 1, 2, 4 Niccoli repaired the omission of *ad te*, and it is repaired in Sozomeno's manuscript, but in the margin rather than the text and not necessarily at the time of writing. A correction in **P** taken up by Laur. 49, 15 and Pal. Lat. 1496 but not by Sozomeno is 1, 4, 1 <ab> *adversariis*, but at 1, 5a, 1 none of the three takes up the unattributable transposition of *nihil mihi*, made by superscript strokes. True, Sozomeno was not obliged to adopt all the corrections that he might encounter even if he was making a direct copy of **P**, and so it does not follow that *ceteris* or *cui cum Cato* had not yet been restored; but he did note or incorporate other variants on the five pages that I have seen, among them some added to **P** by hands earlier than Niccoli's: 1, 1, 1 *ut cum* for *ut qui* (*ut quod* edd.), *conquiesti* for *quiescis* (reversing text and variant and writing *quiescis* for *conquiescas*), 1, 1, 2 *Marcellinum* for *Marcellum*, 1, 1, 3 *censet* for *cesset*, 1, 2, 1 *frequentes ierunt* for *frequenter si erunt*¹⁵. Variants absent from **P**, namely 1, 1, 1 *sufficio* for *efficio*, 1, 1, 3 *laborabatur* for *laboratur*, 1, 2, 1 *commovere* for *remove*, *etiam* for *enim* (after *videbatur*), *clam obsisti* for *iam obsisti*, 1, 2, 3 *consularibus* for *consiliariis*, 1, 3, 1 *gratissimum* for *gratosum*, 1, 4, 2 *nequis* (probably not in Sozomeno's hand) for *nequid* before *salvis*, 1, 4, 3 *in hac* for *a vi hac*, could have been added later, because the reading in the text always agrees with **P**. On the other hand, the script of **P** does not account for the misreading of *volcatii* at 1, 2, 1 as *clolcatii* (so too *clolcatius* in the marginal *notabile*), the more surprising because Sozomeno had written *vol-* on the three occurrences of the name at 1, 1, 3¹⁶; and if he did not copy Pistoia A 7 directly from **P**, its date gives only a *terminus ad quem*.

¹⁴ Ceccherini 2016, 267-270 with plate LXXXV.

¹⁵ I thank Alessandra Toschi and her colleagues at the Forteguerriana for sending me images of ff. 1r-3r taken from a microfilm produced before the flood of 1966.

¹⁶ The misreading demands either a form of *v* where the left side curls over at the top not outwards but inwards or else a form where it curls over outwards and descends almost to the line. Gilbert Ouy discussed the first form somewhere and associated it with Nicholas of Clamanges and his circle round about 1400; instances are easy to find in Paris B. N. Lat. 14749 of Cicero's speeches, available on line, or see Ouy 1978, plate 1 (f. 231r), lines 4-8 *videret, veneni, vero, veneno, uno*. The second possibility oc-

So much for Florence or at least Tuscany: what about the rest of Italy? To go no further, *ceteris* is present in all eleven of Vat. Pal. Lat. 1497-1507, some of which have indeed been dated too early for Reggi's comfort and most if not all of which are northern, not Florentine; and there was no compelling reason for Niccoli or anyone else to conjecture it¹⁷. What if they obtained it not from Niccoli but from **M** or a copy of **M** unconnected with **P**? Giuseppe Kirner thought it unlikely that Pasquino de' Cappelli and Antonio Loschi, who arranged the copying of **M** for Salutati, «si lasciassero sfuggire di mano un tesoro, com'era il codice di Vercelli, senza procurarsene anche per sé una copia»¹⁸.

Such a copy may appear to survive. Vat. Lat. 1688 is not available on line but has been described in two catalogues¹⁹. The earlier puts it in s. XIV-XV, the later in s. XIV^{ex} or s. XIV-XV. It does not number the books, and at some time in its history it had the two halves of the collection inverted, as is shown by the continuous numeration of the letters and the quire signatures in one of the two sets; but the two sets do not match, and the numeration, which looks more recent than both, raises further problems irrelevant here²⁰. The first half runs only to 3, 1, 2 *Phaniam valde sim* (f. 22va), and after eight blank leaves the second half begins at 8, 2, 1 *non me hercules* (f. 31r)²¹; but these words open the very passage that had migrated to the middle of 9, 15, 5 in **M** when **P** was copied from it. The misplacement of the passage recurs in Vat. Lat. 1688, which at the end of it (f. 36va) runs on from 8, 9, 3 *sin/sui illam spem* to 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vicii cetera michi probabuntur*; the passage therefore begins on a new quire, as in **M** and **P**, but does not end at the end of a quire. Which of **M** and **P** was the exemplar? Without checking the text of Vat. Lat. 1688, I could not tell from the descriptions, but

curred to me when I saw on line Kraków Jagiell. 929, written at Pavia in 1460 by a northern-European hand.

¹⁷ That is not just my opinion: Ernesti, cited by Benedict 1790, 2, regarded *ceteris* as dispensable.

¹⁸ Kirner 1901, 399.

¹⁹ Nogara 1912, 184-185; Pellegrin 1975-2010, 301-302.

²⁰ The two halves could have been inverted at any time by anyone who noticed *Liber I* in **M** or **P** at the beginning of Book 9, the only book number originally present in either.

²¹ The quiring at the beginning of this second half is strange: ff. 31-40 are two short quires, 31-34⁴ + 35-40⁶, whereas the rest are either *quiniones* (ff. 1-30, 41-60, 69-98, 107-126) or *quaterniones* (ff. 61-68, 99-106); the last is probably a *quaternio* that has lost its outer bifolium, which contained part of Book 16 on its first leaf but will have been blank on the other like the two that follow f. 130 (the text ends at the top of f. 130ra).

when I obtained the information that at 1, 1, 1 it has *ceteris*²², I inferred that its exemplar was **M**.

Not so, as I later found on the spot. Like **P**, Vat. Lat. 1688 has the opening of Book 1 rewritten so as to restore the true separation between the heading of the letter and the body of it. Perhaps the rewriting occurred in connection with the elegant decoration of f. 1r, which uses gold liberally not just in the initial *E* but also in the leafy spangles of the three-quarter border. Similar decoration in manuscripts now at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris has been dated «vers 1390» and assigned to Pavia²³. The page appears to have been designed as the frontispiece of the manuscript, but the second half of the collection may have had its own decorated page, whatever the original order of the two halves. The original version of the opening is not detectable, but the new version, perhaps written by a French hand (the others are certainly Italian), includes *ceteris*. In all other passages that I checked, Vat. Lat. 1688 shares the errors of **P** against **M**, on which more below; but it has none of the readings that *Salutati* or other users of **P** in Florence, or perhaps already correctors of **P** in Lombardy anxious not to disappoint *Salutati* (a possibility I have not seen mentioned anywhere), devised or introduced as improvements to an often unreadable text. In short, it must be the earliest copy of **P** yet known, made before **P** went to *Salutati*. As the words *Phaniam valde sim* at 3, 1, 2 end a quire of both **M** and **P**, quires now lost may have contained the rest, and so it does not follow that no complete manuscript can descend from it; but after omitting at 1, 4, 1 *eo die – bibulum multo iustiore*, which occupies a line in both **M** and **P** and would not have been omitted for any other reason, the scribe restored it with the slip *vetustiore* for *iustiore*, and I have found *vetustiore* nowhere else. These details of quiring and lineation show Vat. Lat. 1688 retaining material features of **M** and **P** lost in other manuscripts hitherto reported. Doubtless the scribes who wrote the opening of 1, 1 in both versions found *ceteris* in the original version of **P** before it was omitted by whoever wrote the new version.

My argument from *ceteris* therefore collapses, though its absence from other manuscripts does seem likely to indicate descent from the state of **P** remedied by Niccoli; but there is valuable compensation. The text of **P** was

²² Monica Berté kindly checked for me.

²³ Avril-Gousset 2005, 56-57 no. 25 with plate 160, 100-101 no. 36 with plate 168. I find nothing that resembles it in Avril-Gousset 2012.

altered so many times and in so many ways that Vat. Lat. 1688 can be used as evidence of what it originally was. I give one illustration. At 1, 7, 8 modern editors rightly print *iam olim nascenti prope nostrae laudi dignitatie favisti*, of which they owe *favisti* to the *scholia Bobiensia* on *Pro Milone* 39²⁴. In place of *favisti* **M**¹ had a gap of three or four letters at the end of a line, followed at the beginning of the next by *ti* (f. 7r). Well into the 15th century someone expanded *ti* in the gap and the margin to a verb, *praeuisti*, one of many humanistic corrections in **M** that agree with all or some of the manuscripts written in northern Italy (the direction of travel poses a difficult problem not yet investigated), but Mendelssohn in his apparatus says it is written in erasure and took the place of *virtuti* after this was copied into **P**²⁵. In later manuscripts the horrible conjecture *virtuti* prompted various adjustments to the coordination and sometimes the addition after it of either *praeuisti* or *favisti* to account for the run of datives; the only later manuscript I have seen that has either verb in place of *virtuti* is Florence Ricc. 540 (a. 1469), which has *favisti*, but some manuscripts that add *favisti* to *virtuti* or *virtuti-que* are earlier, among them Naples Naz. IV B 42 (a. 1424), which has *laudi dignitati virtutisque favisti*. The original gap in **M** had long been known when *favisti* was championed twice in the 18th century before the *scholia Bobiensia* were brought to notice²⁶. A corrector of **P** different from Niccoli and probably later added *praeuisti* (f. 7r), inferior in sense and rhythm. On the face of it, therefore, *virtuti* despite its faults passed from **P** to the whole of the later tradition with the sole exception of its absence from Ricc. 540, which could easily be due to omission by *saut du même au même* of either *virtuti* after *dignitati* or *virtutisque* after *dignitatis*²⁷. Failing, however, to detect any trace of *virtuti*

²⁴ Stangl 1912, 122.

²⁵ Mendelssohn 1893, 11. That **M** once had *virtutisque* was already surmised by Manutius 1579, 37: «PRAEFUISTI] hoc verbum abest ab omnibus antiquis libris: in Mediceo additum est recenti manu, deleto alio verbo, quod suspicor fuisse *virtutisque*; nam in omnibus meis ita scriptum video: *laudi dignitati virtutisque*. Mendosus igitur locus, cum omnino verbum aliquod sententia desideret».

²⁶ Bengel 1719, 18, approved it, remarking that «congruit mox *invisum*» (an occurrence missing in this active sense, by the way, from *T. L. L.* 198, 78-199, 7, where the only passage cited from the Republic or early Empire is *Aen.* 11, 364), and Benedict 1790, 47-48, put it in his text. Benedict says Graevius anticipated him «in Addendis», but the only pertinent note I can find, which appears on p. 5 of the *Variae lectiones* separately paginated at the end of Graevius 1684, volume I, merely says that the text as he prints it, *laudi dignitati virtutisque praeuisti*, is corrupt.

²⁷ I have found *dignitati virtutisque* in over a dozen manuscripts, *dignitatis virtutisque* in over two dozen.

in the digital version of **M**, I checked **P**, where I concluded that *virtu* might have been imported by Salutati, presumably from a northern manuscript; but saying this in print might have sounded like special pleading, even though the *r* does not match other instances in the vicinity²⁸. Well, the scribe of Vat. Lat. 1688 copied from **P** the reading of **M**¹, *laudi dignitatieque* + a gap + *ti*²⁹. That surely proves that *virtu* did indeed come not from **M** but from a northern descendant of **M**; and if *virtu*, why not the unconjecturable readings present in **M** that enabled Salutati to improve the text of **P**? Furthermore, *virtu* is so far from being an acceptable supplement that it will hardly have been conjectured more than once and therefore suggests that at least in this area of the collection all the northern manuscripts had a single source, neither **M** nor **P** but another copy of **M**.

Now that Vat. Lat. 1688 has exploded my notion that the presence of *ceteris* in a manuscript proves access to **M** by a route independent of **P**, I turn to better evidence: on one side of the coin, uncorrected errors of **P** against **M**; on the other, readings of **M** never available in **P**. As **P** is a direct copy of **M**, errors that other manuscripts share with it against **M** will prove descent from it (subject to the usual reservation that polygenetic errors may wrongly suggest it). Editors ought to have looked for some before deciding that Politian was right about the other Italian manuscripts, but the only editor who has reported any at all seems to be Dante Nardo, who reported some that he found in preparing his edition of Book 12³⁰. Reggi himself in an earlier article, when he compiled an apparatus for five letters from **M**, **P**, and other «codici poziori»³¹, reported some without comment, and he does not use them in the article under discussion: 1, 1, 1 *vitam mihi [esse] acerbam putem* (*esse* omitted between lines, at the expense of the double cretic but not of sense or syntax), 9, 4 *necesse esse[t] evenire* (*necesse esse te venire HDV*, edd.), 9, 22, 2 *quia mul-*

²⁸ The same difference can be seen on f. 22v of **P** at 2, 7, 2 in *visa moris P¹ *vis amoris P² (Salutati).**

²⁹ The Vaticanus that Gebhardus cites for this reading, though without *ti* after the gap, can only be Vat. Lat. 1688, apparently inspected by Andreas Schottus; see Gruterus 1618, III 332b, 59-61 and I *Ad lectorem* f. a4r. «Vatic.» continues to be cited, however, throughout Books 1-8, absent from 1688 after 3, 1, 2, and some of the readings cited from it where 1688 is present do not appear there, for instance 1, 9, 18 *quem ego vehementer auctorem sequor*; perhaps the collation drew on more than one manuscript in the *fondo Vaticanus Latini*.

³⁰ Nardo 1965-1966, 354 n. 40, 355 n. 43. At 12, 15, 3, however, **P**² has the reading of **M**, *in pravitate*.

³¹ Reggi 2022, 54-64. The letters are 1, 1; 9, 4; 9, 22; 12, 1; 16, 18. His apparatus does not give a full report; no mention, for instance, of 1, 1, 1 [*ceteris*] **P**¹ (or the earliest **P**²).

ti<s>, *volu[i]mus convenire*, 12, 1, 1 *pecuniae maximae describuntur* for *p-m- describuntur*³². Of Pal. Lat. 1497-1507 only 1501 omits *esse* with **P** (I have not checked his other passages)³³. The rest, then, flip the coin: they have a reading of **M** never available in **P**. Before seeing his article, I found evidence of my own not vulnerable to the objection of repair by conjecture. At 2, 17, 2, for instance, *rationibus* in **M** was pardonably misread in **P** as *sectionibus*, not obviously corrupt and never corrected; a few manuscripts, almost all plainly written in Florence, have *sectionibus*³⁴, but every one of Pal. Lat. 1497-1507 has *rationibus*. As I was interested in the text of Book 14, I collated **P** and then looked in other manuscripts for errors shared with it against **M**. The distribution is patchy. At 14, 16, for instance, the date *pr. Non. Ian.*, eminently un conjecturable, is omitted by **P** and Pal. Lat. 1497 1498 1500 1505 1506 but present in **M** and Pal. Lat. 1499 1501 1502 1503 1504 1507. Typically, manuscripts that have dates given by **M** but omitted or corrupted by **P** nevertheless share the uncorrected transpositions of **P**: 14, 1, 3 *scribis amicis* ~, 14, 2, 3 *mea vita* ~, 14, 5, 2 *si di nos* for *nos si di*, 14, 7, 1 *mihi deus* ~, 14, 11 *cura diligenter* ~. That suggests descent from **P** tempered by selective collation of **M**. Some manuscripts, however, agree almost everywhere in the book with **M** against **P**: Florence Laur. Conv. Sopp. 490; Leiden B. P. L. 49; B. L. Burn.

³² He also reports from **P** 16, 18, 1 *quod quidem tu* for *cui q- tu*, but in its present state it has *cui*, and so have its early Florentine copies Laur. 49, 15 and Vat. Pal. Lat. 1496.

³³ Reggi 2024, 53, derives Laur. 49, 13, which he puts in the 1420s, from **P** in the state to which Niccoli brought it, but it has *esse*, which neither he nor any other corrector of **P** ever restored. Furthermore, at 1, 9, 18 it has the early and widespread northern conjecture *quem ego vehementer auctorem sequor tantum*, of which *sequor* is absent from **P** + **P**². The truth must therefore be more complicated or quite different. When I told Giovanna Murano that I thought the hand belonged to the generation of Antonio Sinibaldi, she kindly replied as follows: «Il plut. 49.13 è del terzo quarto del sec. XV. La mano potrebbe essere quella di Niccolò Mangona». Reggi also puts in the 1420s Laur. 49, 10, which does omit *esse*, but his evidence, «la decorazione a bianchi girari, ancora priva di putti e figure zoomorfe», takes no account of the script. I have never seen anything like it in the 1420s, and Giovanna Murano confirms Albinia de la Mare's view, «Florentine decoration probably of the late 1440s»; see now Murano 2024, 83. Reggi's article leaves me doubting whether any descendant of **P** that adopts corrections of Niccoli's was written in his lifetime. The best candidate, which he does not mention, seems to be Vat. Lat. 1685, which has three of the fourteen readings listed in Reeve 2024, 21, namely 12, 15, 6 <*provinciam*> (actually it has *-cia*), 13, 53, 2 *pa[t]riana* (actually it has *periana*, and misled by my own handwriting I reported **P** as havng *patriam*), 15, 2, 6 *reticuisent* for *renuntiassent*; but these readings were also available in northern manuscripts, and we are back with the question whether agreement with Niccoli means use of Niccoli.

³⁴ In Laur. 49, 2 Bartolomeo Fonzio glosses it: *Sectiones erant bona omnia et res auctione venditae, quarum pecuniae ad aerarium referuntur*. Laur. 49, 13 (see the previous note) has *rationibus*.

140, Harl. 2505, Harl. 5062, and King's 23; Lugano D 2 E 18; Naples Naz. IV B 42 (Siena 1424); Bodl. Clarke 24 (Bologna 1449); Vat. Barb. Lat. 80 (a. 1447-1448) and Vat. Lat. 3248; Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 154 (second text)³⁵. Would Reggi please explain these findings? As long as direct or indirect access to **M** will account for them, he should not expect to convince his readers that lost manuscripts independent of **M** must have been tapped. In Books 9-16 some Italian manuscripts are wholly or partly independent of **M**, but their source did not include Book 14³⁶.

Belief in access to lost manuscripts independent of **M** goes back to Kirner and Nardo, who preferred to explain in that way not only agreements with **M** against **P**¹ but also a few readings of **P**² that improve on the reading of **M**³⁷. They had two reasons: the absence of external evidence that **M** was used in the 15th century, and the readings of three fragments assigned to the 12th century when they came to light from 1857 to 1867 in Germany. Elsewhere I have shown that the fragments were actually humanistic descendants of **P**³⁸, and the other reason, at best unrealistic, invites a tit-for-tat rejoinder: no external evidence has been produced that anyone in the 15th century used a manuscript independent of **M**³⁹.

I argued above that for his corrections in **P** Salutati used not **M** itself but a descendant independent of **P**, and at least in the earlier books that is what manuscripts written in northern Italy usually are. From a collation of 1, 1-2 kindly sent to me in December 2024 by Giancarlo Reggi I learnt that at 1, 2, 1 *clam* for *iam*, which I mentioned above as a correction in Pistoia A 7, appears in all the manuscripts from northern Italy that he collated, and I too find it in all the earliest, though Leiden B. P. L. 49 and Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499 have *iam* as a variant. The explanation for it must be that in **M** *Iam* begins a line, so written with *i longa*; evidently in 1, 2 this feature of **M**, not reproduced here in **P**, was still misleading to

³⁵ After meeting the pertinent readings in Vat. Lat. 3248, I found it associated for other reasons with King's 23 and Lugano D 2 E 18 by Reggi 2022, 31, 33, 39, 60-64. Burn. 140 and Naples Naz. IV B 42 do not share the main feature by which Reggi defines his group, namely the inclusion of Gellius 3, 8 before rather than after the subscription of *Ad familiares*; Barb. Lat. 80 never included it, and Conv. Sopp. 490 has lost the end after 16, 22, 1. Apart from 1, 1, 1 *esse*, I have not checked in his passages any of the manuscripts listed above in the text.

³⁶ Reeve 2024, 14-16.

³⁷ Kirner 1901, 410-433; Nardo 1965-1966.

³⁸ Reeve 2024, 9-14.

³⁹ See also Reeve 2024, 20-21.

scribes. As more than one might have been misled in the same way, it does not prove that all manuscripts from northern Italy go back to a single copy of **M**, but the possibility should be borne in mind. Likewise, the misreading of **M** discussed above, 2, 17, 2 *sectionibus* in **P** for *rationibus*, does not prove that all witnesses to *sectionibus* descend from **P**, but that possibility too should be borne in mind.

It remains to say what Niccoli used where he must have taken his corrections from a manuscript. But for Kirner and Nardo, would it ever have been doubted that he used **M**? Several of his corrections, especially those that introduce outdated spelling like *traferebant* at 1, 4, 1 (*transferebant* **GR** and **P**¹) and *mercule* at 2, 5, 2 and 2, 8, 1 (*me hercule* **GR**, *mehercule* **P**¹), do not occur outside **M** in any manuscript written before his death in 1437. It is even hard to find among them any readings that must be conjectural, though one such is 1, 9, 11 *accepimus*, absent from **M** but attested in some other 15th-century manuscripts not obviously later than Niccoli's correction: Berlin Lat. fol. 609, Laur. Conv. Sopp. 44, Madrid Nac. 10022, Naples Naz. IV B 24, Pierpont Morgan 981. In connexion with Filelfo's acquisition of **M** at an unknown date, it has gone unmentioned that he spent the years 1429-1434 teaching in Florence⁴⁰: was that by any chance when Niccoli made his corrections? Doubtless it is not the only possibility.

Whether the other Italian manuscripts descend from **M** or from **P** makes no difference to an editor, because no descendant of either has any authority. On the other hand, anyone interested in what the humanists did with the text has a vast amount of scope. Reggi has made a good start by investigating their responses to the disorder in Books 8-9, which disrupts the sense and syntax of four passages, two where the misplaced chunk belongs and two where it finished up; and his attribution of stages in these operations to Salutati, Guarino, Gasparino Barzizza, Gasparino's son Guiniforte, and Niccoli, provides a framework for other scholars to build on or dismantle. It has often been remarked that Cicero's letters and humanistic treatises or collections that draw on them, such as Gasparino Barzizza's *Epistolae ad exercitationem accommodatae*⁴¹, supplemented or even supplanted models of letter-writing offered by medieval

⁴⁰ Viti 1997, 615-616.

⁴¹ This title, absent from the *editio princeps* (Paris <1470>, the first book printed in France), is given by Furietti 1723, 1, 220.

*artes dictaminis*⁴², but no contribution that I have seen invokes the astonishing spread of *Ad familiares* after 1392. Reggi underestimates it when he says he has found «162 manoscritti di origine italiana derivati da **MP**»⁴³. As no student of *Ad familiares* to my knowledge has yet published a list of manuscripts⁴⁴, I set about compiling my own, which has reached 356; it includes fragments but not manuscripts that contain only selections or the odd letter⁴⁵. Other Latin works from classical Antiquity that can match or outdo this total are already represented by scores of medieval manuscripts: Terence, *Ad Herennium*, Virgil, Lucan, Persius, Juvenal⁴⁶. **M** apart, however, we have only six manuscripts and a single leaf of *Ad familiares* earlier than 1392, none of them ever in Italy⁴⁷. Par-

⁴² Sabbadini 1885, 13-17; Mercer 1979, 94-98; Kristeller 1979, 93, 249; Pigman 1981, 129-130; Witt 1982; several articles in «Rhetorica» 19, 2, 2001; Burton 2007, 88-89, 92-93. Pigman 1981, 133-135, 146-163, discusses and edits Barzizza's *Vita Marci Tulli Ciceronis*, which he dates between the discoveries of Asconius in 1416 and Cicero's *Brutus* in 1421; on p. 148 Barzizza names some addressees of *Ad familiares*.

⁴³ Reggi 2024, 27 n. 5, where he says he uses 81 in the article. He kindly sent me his list in December 2024, when it included three manuscripts new to me: Lucca Capit. VIII 528, Milan Ambros. L 71 sup., Modena Est. Lat. 306. The last, however, is a set of notes dated 1466; see Peebles 1964, 176-177, 186-190.

⁴⁴ Mendelssohn 1884, 110, says that since 1874 he has seen «mehrere hundert» manuscripts of the letters but does not specify *Ad familiares*. Three Italian web sites and one German each list a few dozen manuscripts: *Manus Online* (which covers only Italian libraries), *Mirabile*, *REMACCLA*, *Handschriftenportal* (which covers only German libraries).

⁴⁵ There is no clear dividing line between complete manuscripts and selections. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1504, for instance, omits many letters in Books 13-16 after 13, 28. Strictly, the decision to omit Book 8 turns the other letters into a selection; manuscripts that omit it tend also to omit 5, 20, 7, 23-25, 9, 4, the second version of 12, 29 and 21 (after 13, 77), and either 15, 4, 4-9 *duo sunt enim aditus – complura incendimus. His* or part of it, 6-9 *Cum autem ad Cybistra – complura incendimus. His*. I list manuscripts that contain whole books or if fragmentary may once have done. Like complete manuscripts, selections are witnesses to the text, and my reason for ignoring them here is mainly practical: reluctance to lengthen a list already longer than most. Also in my mind, though, were the points that I made about excerpts and epitomes in Reeve 2012, 246, 262.

⁴⁶ I am obliged to Rainer Jakobi for suggesting that I should add Horace and Valerius Maximus. On Horace (he was right) see Villa 1992, 95 n. 1; the list given for Valerius Maximus by Lunelli 2022 reaches 350 but includes *volgarizzamenti* and other things that were never complete manuscripts of the Latin text. Add Cicero's *De inventione*, for which Riesenweber 2024, 486, gives a total of over 420.

⁴⁷ In Books 1-8 the manuscripts are **G** (s. xii), **R** (s. xii), and Tours Mun. 688 (s. xii, a copy of **R**); in Books 9-16, **H** (s. x²), **F** (s. xii), and Oxford C. C. C. 283 (s. xiii), which contains excerpts from Books 9, 10, and 13 (Reeve 2024, 15, 17). The single leaf, a relative of **HF** that contains part of 13, 6-7, is Yale Beinecke 1057 (s. xii¹, German), discussed and illustrated by Babcock 2012. The Turin palimpsest a II 2* (uncial, s. v), badly damaged in 1904, included as ff. 73-74 of the upper text (Augustine's *Collatio cum Maximino* and *Contra Maximinum*) a leaf of Book 6 in an abridged version, transcribed by Krüger 1871, 147-149; it was not in the same layout or script as the speeches of Cicero's that the original leaves are better known for including. The discussion of the manuscript in Reeve 1992

ticularly striking, even when allowance is made for the wider range of letters in *Ad familiares*, is the lead over *Ad Atticum*, of which the latest investigator found and discussed only 75 fuller manuscripts⁴⁸; but it must also have made a difference that Cicero's letters to Atticus demand much reading between the lines, because they often come out more elliptical or allusive than they would have seemed if the collection had included letters from Atticus to Cicero.

At my age I have little chance of solving either the problem ignored by Reggi or other problems that further engagement with a tradition of 356 witnesses may throw up, but I hope my observations will put younger minds on guard against starting from a questionable premise.

Beyond that, I offer here only my list of manuscripts⁴⁹. * before an entry indicates that I have seen a complete version on line. I dispense with bibliography except where the source of my information is not an obvious catalogue («cat.»)⁵⁰, and altogether when there is a version on line, because such versions are usually accompanied by an up-to-date description; I have been more concerned to establish that a manuscript belongs on the list than what anyone may have said about it, but I mention a few things that I have noticed. I italicize references to sale catalogues. Dates, especially at the earlier end, are usually those given in catalogues; the «-» in such dates as «1446-» stands for «minus» and indicates a *terminus ad quem*. Works sometimes appended to *Ad familiares* that I mention if aware of their presence are the *Epistula ad Octavianum*, the *Commentariolum petitionis*, Philip's letter to Aristotle about the birth of Alexander (Gellius 9, 3, 5), *Ad Brutum* 1, 17 and 16 ("*Brut.*"), the consular exchange with Pyrrhus recounted in Gellius 3, 8⁵¹, *Att.* 9, 7C (Caesar

did not go into the text of the leaf from *Ad familiares*, and Ammirati 2015 does not discuss the leaf.

⁴⁸ Rota 2018; the 75 include the oldest Italian manuscript, Ambros. E 14 inf. (c. 1375), which he describes as an anthology. Platner 1900, 420, reporting from the Vatican 14 manuscripts of *Ad Atticum*, added that «this number is far exceeded by that of the *Epistulae ad Familiares*, of which there are 57, containing all or part of the letters».

⁴⁹ For urging me to publish it I thank Daniel Hadas, who was inspecting manuscripts of *fam.* in the British Library while I was preparing Reeve 2024 and kindly sent me comments on a draft of it.

⁵⁰ Manuscripts in Spain are listed by Rubio 1984, in the Vatican by Pellegrin 1975-2010, in French libraries A-E by Jeudy-Riou 1989, in the libraries of the U. S. A. and Canada, with a few exceptions, by de Ricci-Wilson 1935-1940 or Faye-Bond 1962. Many Florentine manuscripts are listed by Murano 2024 in her index of authors and works. Incunables, some of them earlier than the latest manuscripts (*ed. princ.* Rome 1467), are listed in *ISTC*; see also Reggi 2024, 73-74.

⁵¹ Some manuscripts have just the letter from the consuls, 3, 8, 8.

to Oppius and Balbus), and the *Significatio breviature quarundam litterarum antiquarum* ascribed in Leiden B. P. L. 49 f. 190r to Gasparino Barzizza, who died in 1430 (autograph?). I also mention, again if aware of it, the absence of Book 8 or 14. I have not numbered the entries, better done when other scholars have had time to fill gaps or remove duplicates.

Amsterdam Univ. 75 (I D 69)	m. xv	cat.
Augsburg 2° 115	ch. xv ^{3/4}	cat.
Augsburg 2° 116	ch. xv ²	cat.
Basel Univ. F III 35	m. xv ^{2/4}	swiss collections
omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 6-9; starts new books at 9, 9 and 13, 53; + Gell. 3, 8		
Bassenge 17.4.24	m. xv ^{3/4}	
fr., 6, 6, 11-6, 7, 4 <i>quo igitur – restituti</i> ; bought by David Ganz		
*Berlin Diez B Sant. 62	m. xv	
*Berlin Diez B Sant. 73	m. xv	
Out of place after 9, 15, 5 <i>aut in tecto vitii caetera mihi probantur</i> is 8, 2, 1-8, 8, 9 <i>non mehercules – Illa praeterea G. Pom-</i> , where the text ends in the middle of f. 122r.		
*Berlin Diez B Sant. 75	m. xv	
like Berlin Magdeb. 87, omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 <i>non me hercules – si nullam spem</i> ; + Gell. 3, 8		
Berlin Ham. 167	m. 1472	cat.
Milanese; has Books 8-9 in the right order		
Berlin Ham. 168	m. xv ²	cat.; Murano 2024, 13
written by Bartolomeo Fonzio; has Books 8-9 in the right order		
*Berlin Lat. fol. 252	s. xii	edd. (F)
It has the end of the collection from 13, 78, preceded by the second version of 12, 29 and 21 from 29, 2 <i>deinde omnia</i> and followed by <i>Oct., Comm.</i> ; but it has suffered losses in other works since Gulielmius saw it, and editors of <i>fam.</i> have not asked what it once had. At 1, 7, 8 Gruterus 1618 cites Gulielmius's report « <i>favisti Erph.</i> » ⁵² , and <i>favisti</i> is absent from the one manuscript held at Erfurt today, Amplon. 2° 4.		
Berlin Lat. fol. 309	m. 1460	Krist. III 474

⁵² Matthew Payne has kindly checked the volume that provided Gruterus with his information, now Leiden 762 B 10, and has confirmed that «*favisti Erph.*» is not in the hand of the main annotator, Gebhardus. Gruterus also reports *Erphord.* on the title of 1, 9 but I think nowhere else, not even where F survives; he has a habit of saying how many of Gulielmius's manuscripts give a reading, and I do not know how Gulielmius expressed himself. On Leiden 762 B 9-10 see Schmidt 1974, 218-223; Berry 1989.

- signed at beginning and end by Ioannes Carpensis, who wrote it in 38 days *Ferrarie in studiolo meo*⁵³; same content as Bologna Univ. 2592
- Berlin Lat. fol. 372 m. xv^{3/4} *Handschriftenportal*; Reggi 2023, 588 n. 29
- Berlin Lat. fol. 609 m. xv¹ *olim* Phill. 8875; Lombardi 1983, 28-32 with plate 1
same content as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 but without Gell. 3, 8 and *Significatio*; 9, 4 added in the margin⁵⁴
- Berlin Lat. quart. 397 m. xv^{med.} cat.
starts at 1, 9, 13 *vis esse potuisset*; leaves missing between 1, 9, 25 *scio libentissime* and 2, 5; disorder in Books 2-4; 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*. *Vale* after 9, 15; + *Att.* 9, 7C to *ut malit mihi esse amicus quam his qui*, which runs to the end of the page
- Berlin Magdeburg 87 ch. xv¹ cat.
omits 5, 20 and 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*
- Berlin Phill. 1801 m. xv^{3/4} cat.
8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*. *Vale* after 9, 15
- Bloomington Ricketts 223 ch. xv²
- Bologna Com. A 40 m. xv Kirner 1901, 415-416; Maz-
zatinti 30, 1924, 30
- Bologna Univ. 467 m./ch. 1436 Kirner 1901, 416-417;
«SIFC» 16, 1908, 217-218
It descends from **P** and has the usual disorder in Books 8-9 but after 9, 15 continues from 8, 3, with the rest of 8, 2 added in the margin by another hand both after 8, 2, 1 *vide modo iniquis* (sic), though only up to 8, 2, 2 *te acriter*, and before 8, 3.
- Bologna Univ. 2229 m. 1467 Kirner 1901, 417; *Manus Online*; Binnebeke 2010-2011, 22 n. 5; Murano 2024, 16
Written for Domenico Dominici, it does not fulfil the expectation of a largely Florentine text.
- Bologna Univ. 2272 m. xv^{2/4} Kirner 1901, 418, who gives
the shelfmark as 2572; *Manus Online*
probably a descendant of Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499, and perhaps owned by the Milanese scribe Antonio Crivelli (the initials *A* and *CR* are reported from an erased shield on f. 1r); 13, 38-39 added at the end

⁵³ Written in red ink that has faded badly, the long subscription is hard to read. It ends with an epigram mentioned by Kristeller but absent from De Robertis 1985.

⁵⁴ I thank Giulio Vannini for sending me a description that includes these details, Alessandra Giuliano for sending me images of other sections.

- Bologna Univ. 2283 m. 29, 1, 1421 Kirner 1901, 417, who gives the shelfmark as 2383; «SIFC» 17, 1909, 23
 Outside Florence, this may be the earliest descendant of **M** that has a complete text, but some undated complete manuscripts may be earlier: Brussels B. R. 9766, Leiden B. P. L. 49, New Haven Yale Marston 59, Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499 (*t. ad quem* 1430). Then come Rome Cors. 43 D 19 (a. 1423), Oxford Magd. 83 (a. 1428), Madrid Pal. II 76 (a. 1433). I have not seen Paris B. N. Lat. 16247 (a. 1428)⁵⁵.
- Bologna Univ. 2475 m. xv^{3/4} Kirner 1901, 417; *Manus Online*
 It starts a new book at 9, 9. After 13, 77 it has 12, 29, with the note *Ista epistola non est collectionata*, but not 12, 21, and on 15, 4, 4 the note *non collationata usque ad istud signum*, a *signum* repeated at 15, 4, 9.
- Bologna Univ. 2517 m. xv^{med.} Kirner 1901, 417-418; *Manus Online*
 Kirner cites a few readings in Books 9-16 that must have come from Dresden Dc 112 or a relative, but fundamentally the text descends throughout from **M**.
- Bologna Univ. 2592 m. 1445 diocese of Ferrara Kirner 1901, 418, who misread the date as 1449; «SIFC» 17, 1909, 70
 After 9, 15 it continues from 8, 3 rather than from the rest of 8, 2, with the addition of 9, 15, 5 *aut – probabuntur. Vale*. It omits 15, 4, 4-9.
- Bourges 311 (257) m. xv^{ex.}
 1-12
- *Brescia Querin. A IV 2 m. xv
 same content in *fam.* as Basel Univ. F III 35; + *Brut.*, *Oct.*, Gell. 3, 8, *Significatio*
- *Brescia Querin. B VI 5 m. xv²
 The omissions in Book 13 alleged by Reeve 2024, 16 n. 31, are actually transpositions, which start after 13, 39 *intelligat* and are more complex than those in Dresden Dc 112.
- Brussels B. R. 530 ch. 1442 Thomas 1896, 1-2
 + Gell. 3, 8; 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *Non me hercule – si nullam spem* after 8, 17 (with a note on f. 80r that names Guiniforte Barzizza, as Michiel Verweij kindly tells me; see below on Wolfenbüttel Aug. 85, 11 2°)
- *Brussels B. R. 9766 m. xv¹

⁵⁵ Alessandra Giuliano has kindly sent me some images, which suggest a relationship with Vat. Ottob. Lat. 2037 and more remotely with Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499. She kindly tells me, however, that 16247 starts a new book at 13, 53, which Ottob. Lat. 2037 and Pal. Lat. 1499 do not. Among the other seven manuscripts this feature is attested only in Madrid Pal. II 76 and a note at 13, 53 in the margin of B. P. L. 49; see on Vat. Chig. H VIII 252.

- Book "8" starts after 7, 22 with 7, 26 up to 2 *in honorem et educere. Vale*, but the letter is repeated in full where it belongs with *in honore adducere*; 9, 4 omitted; after 9, 15, 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur* + 8, 2, 1 *non me hercules* – end of 8, 2
- Brussels B. R. IV 219 fr. 1 m. xv Wittek 1976, 445
10, 12, 5-15, 10, 26, 3-28, 2
- Brussels B. R. IV 265 m. xv *olim* Marston 71;
Thomas 1963, 2-3 no. 2; Wittek 1976, 445
- Brussels B. R. IV 347 ch. xv^{med.} Wittek 1976, 446
- Bryn Mawr Gordan 5 ch. 1432-1434 *olim* Phill. 8866
- Butler, S. (*dealer, Old Stratford*), *Autumn 2024 lot 37* ch. xv *olim* Sotheby's 18.6.1981 lot 89
1, 1-2, 12, a quire of ten leaves, sold from the catalogue (information from Stephen Butler, January 2nd 2025)
- Butler, S., *at AbeBooks* s. xv^{med.}, Italian
frr. of Books 8-10
- Butler, S., *at AbeBooks* s. xv, not Italian
frr. of 2, 7-12
- Cambridge Fitzw. Mus. McClean 157 ch. 1471 *olim* Cors. 43 E 33;
cat.; Krist. VI 163
It has Books 8-9 in the order 8, 1-2; 8, 10-17; 9, 1-15; 8, 3-9; 9, 16-26.
- Canberra A. N. U. Classics Dept. Mus. 77-06 m. xv *olim* Phillipps 917;
Manion-Vines 1984, 85
- Canterbury Cath. Lit. C 15 ch. xv^{med.} Ker 1977, 276-77
Despite the French hand, the text descends throughout from **M**, in a version typical of northern Italy, and is unusual only in its handling of the disorder in Books 8-9, which it largely corrects. When it jumps as **M** and **P** once did from 8, 2, 1 *modo inquis* to 8, 9, 3 *mihi literis ostenderis*, it continues to the end of 8, 9 but then leaves blank the rest of the page (f. 93v) and the top of the next, after which it resumes from 8, 2, 1 *Non me hercules* and gives the rest of Books 8-9 in the right order. Like B. L. Arundel 9, Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1230, and Vat. Reg. Lat. 1532, it ends Book 13 with 71 and 72 transposed, 73-76, the second version of 12, 21, and 13, 78-79, omitting 77 and the second version of 12, 29; and those three manuscripts, all north-eastern, have the text of Books 8-9 in the right order⁵⁶.
- Carpentras 434 ch. 1488 Rome
- Carpentras 435 ch. xv

⁵⁶ So Reggi 2024, 58, about Reg. Lat. 1532. In his n. 216 «Reg. lat. 1532» should be Reg. Lat. 1626.

- Carpentras 436 ch. xv^{ex.}
- Catania Ventimiglia 81 m. xv Daneu Lattanzi 1984, 30-31
- *Cava de' Tirreni 59 m. 1461 cat.; Rotili 1978, 177-178
with plate XCVI
- *Cesena S. XVIII 3 m. xv^{med.}
- Chantilly 437 (651) ch. xv
- Christie's 8.12.82 lot 131 m. xv^{2/4} Krist. V 463
- Christie's 11.7.2018 lot 54 m. xv^{3/4} from Feltrinelli; Krist. V
346-347
- Christie's 30.7.2020 lot 13 m. 1442 Florence *olim* Phill. 15727, Cockerell
This may be the earliest humanistic manuscript to have had Books 8-
9 written out in the right order. It has lost the decorated initials of
Books 2-11 on single leaves removed from nine quires and two leaves
removed from another, but the last six quires, ff. 120-179, are intact,
and with them the decorated initials of Books 12-16⁵⁷.
- Christie's 12.12.2022 lot 120 m. xv¹ Colker 500
bifolium, 1, 1, 1-1, 1, 4 *putant ut* + 1, 8, 7 – 1, 9, 4 *si erunt allate – resti-
tutum putabam*; descendant of **P** with no corrections of Niccoli's
- Christie's 13.12.2023 lot 25 ch. xv¹ once owned by Lord Her-
ries at Everingham Hall, Yorkshire (East Riding)⁵⁸
no Book 8 (see plate 2 of the auction catalogue)
- Copenhagen Ny kgl. S. 55 fol. ch. xv cat.
8-16
- *Cremona Stat. 179 ch. 1466
- Dresden Dc 111 m. xv¹ Benedict's *Dresdensis pri-
mus*; cat.
1-14; a descendant of **P** with none of Niccoli's corrections, as emerges
from Benedict 1790, XVII-XVIII, and the variants that he cites in his
notes⁵⁹
- Dresden Dc 112 m. xv^{med.} Benedict's *Dresdensis terti-
us*; cat.
+ a novel version of Gell. 3, 8, 8, probably in a different hand; after
several blank pages, and certainly in a different hand, *Oct.* (in the ver-
sion that travelled with *fam.*), *Epp. ad Brutum* to 1, 18, 2 *maximis co-
niuge* at the end of f. 228r (*olim* 225r); Book 14 after Book 8 (Benedict
1795 on 9 init.)

⁵⁷ By courtesy of Jana Gajdošová and Matthew Reeves I saw the manuscript in Sep-
tember 2024 at the premises of Sam Fogg in London, where Christopher de Hamel had
kindly suggested it might be.

⁵⁸ Schenkl 1905, 42 no. 4726, who cites *First report* 1874, 45.

⁵⁹ Kevin Protze has kindly shown me images of enough pages to establish that it is
probably a direct copy of **P**. No manuscript that I have seen can descend from it.

Dresden Dc 113	ch. xv ^{med.}	Benedict's	<i>Dres-</i> <i>densis quartus</i> ; cat. no Book 8, but 8, 3-5 after 9, 15 as in Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 220
Dresden Dc 114	m. 1473 Cremona	Benedict's	<i>Dres-</i> <i>densis quintus</i> ; cat.
Dresden Dc 115	m. xv	Benedict's	<i>Dres-</i> <i>densis secundus</i> ; cat. like Dc 111, a descendant of P, as emerges from Benedict 1790, XVIII-XVIII, and the variants that he cites in his notes ⁶⁰
Durham NC, Duke Univ. Lat. 19	ch. xv	Krist. V 259	
Durham NC, Duke Univ. Lat. 59	ch. xv	= Ullman 17 Krist. V 259	
			-15, 2, 6; a descendant of Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1709?
Épinal 95 (207)	m. xv		+ <i>Oct., Brut., Philippus Aristoteli</i> ⁶¹
*Erfurt Amplon. 2 ^o 4	ch. xv ^{2/4}		- 9, 15, 5 <i>aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probantur</i> + 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 <i>non me hercules – si illam spem</i> (omitted after 8, 2, 1 <i>modo inquis</i>) + 9, 15, 5 <i>aut in tecto</i> + catchword <i>vitii cetera</i>
Erlangen 624	ch. xv	cat.	- 5, 20, 6 <i>quicquam a meis ra-</i>
*Esc. M I 15	ch. xv		omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9 (this added by the Spanish hand that annotates the manuscript up to 7, 16, f. 52v); "8" consists of 7, 18-22 + 26-33
Esc. M II 14	m./ch. xv		
Esc. T II 21	m. xv		
Esc. T III 16	m. xv		

⁶⁰ Benedict's other manuscripts include one at the Gymnasium in Torgau written two columns to a page, a feature rare in manuscripts of *Ad familiares*; see Benedict 1790, xi. It is not now in Leipzig, Dresden, Gotha, or Halle, as informants in each place have kindly told me; I am also told by the Head of the Gymnasium that no documents survive there about the transfer of its library to Halle after the Second World War, reported by Guth 2004, 182. Rainer Jakobi, however, has done me the favour of obtaining from Dr Isabel Peuker of the Stadtarchiv, Torgau, a scan of a typewritten description made in 1931 by Dr Martin Granzin, which reveals that the material was parchment and the script humanistic; no other manuscript appears in his section «Philologische Handschriften», but the later note at the head of the description, «F» in red for «fehlt», also occurs elsewhere in the catalogue, unfortunately without any indication of date.

⁶¹ I mentioned this manuscript in Reeve 2024, 17, before seeing it on the spot in June 2024. It is neither the source nor a descendant of Paris B. N. Lat. 7783 or Montpelier 359 but may well descend from V (B. N. Lat. 14761), and I doubt whether it is later than mid century.

- Esc. V III 3 ch. xv
 Esc. V III 5 m. xv
 Esc. V III 12 m. xv
 Esc. V III 13 m. xv
 Esc. V III 15 ch. 1468 Venice
 Esc. V III 20 m. 1455 Ferrara
 Fermo Civ. 92 ch. xv^{4/4} Prete 1960, 129-131
 – 11, 17, 2 *Velim igitur*
 Florence Laur. Acq. e doni 298 m. xv *Manus Online*
 on the recto of the leaf before f. 1, *Philippi Strozae et amicorum*; omits
 7, 23-26 (sic), Book 8, and 9, 4, but not 5, 20 or 15, 4, 4-9
 Florence Laur. Conv. Sopp. 16 m. xv^{med.} cat. on line;
 Orsino 2023, 105 no. 6
 Florentine text with frequent contamination *in rasura*; Books 8-9
 without the usual disorder but with 8, 4, 4 *consulem designatum* – end
 of 8, 5 between 8, 3, 1 *-ocium erat* and *tecum id otii* (no explanation for
 this in **P**)
 Florence Laur. Conv. Sopp. 44 m. xv cat. on line;
 Orsino 2023, 108 no. 13
 – 10, 26; the usual disorder in Books 8-9; at 2, 17, 2 neither *sectionibus*
 nor *rationibus* but *omnibus*, which I have met elsewhere only in B. L.
 Arundel 138
 Florence Laur. Conv. Sopp. 490 ch. xv cat. on line
 first leaf missing before 1, 2, 3 *quam numquam antea*; omits 5, 20, 7,
 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, but not 15, 4, 4-9; the outer bifolia of the last quire
 missing, with 15, 15, 1-16, 3, 1 *nostram sententiam* (preserved on f.
 110v as the catchword) – *quod Quintus nos* and the end after 16, 22, 1
 Tertia aderit modo ne.
 Florence Laur. Edili 215 m. 1441 Venice cat.
 same content as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 except that it has nothing beyond
 fam.; on 15, 4, 4-9, mg. *fere tertia pars huius epistolae hic deficit quae*
 in fine codicis est, not true now if it ever was
 Florence Laur. Edili 216 ch. xv cat.
 includes the tables for each book; has the usual disorder in Books 8-9;
 shares many errors with Plut. 90 sup. 73
 Florence Laur. Fies. 186 m. <1463> cat.
 close relative, probably descendant, of Plut. 49, 10
 *Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 1 m. xv^{3/4}
 *Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 2 m. xv^{3/4}
 The scribe also wrote Vat. Lat. 1692, on which see below.
 *Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 3 m. xv^{3/4}
 *Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 4 m. xv^{2/4}

text not Florentine

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 5

m. xv

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 6

m. 1420

Copied from Vat. Pal. Lat. 1496; see above, p. 9.

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 7

ch. <1392>

edd. (**P**)

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 8

m. xv¹

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 9

m. ix

edd. (**M**)

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 10

m. xv

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 11

ch. xv

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 12

m. xv^{2/4}

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 13

m. xv^{3/4}

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 15

m. xv^{1/4}

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 16

m. xv

– 7, 5, 2 *et ego* (end of quire)

*Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 17

ch. 1468

+ Gell. 3, 8, 8

*Florence Laur. Plut. 90 sup. 72

m. xv^{3/4}

*Florence Laur. Plut. 90 sup. 73

m. xv^{med.}

hand or character of hand changes at f. 21r (new quire); shares many errors with Edili 216

*Florence Laur. Plut. 90 sup. 74

ch. xv^{2/4}

Notes and signs in the margin, together with cancellation and numbering, restore the true order in Books 8-9 (f. 86v to the end of 8, 1, f. 202v 8, 2, ff. 99r-104r 8, 3-9, ff. 87v-91v 8, 10-17); also cancelled are letters repeated, as already in **M** and **P**, from Book 2. 16, 14, 13, 16-17, omitted after 16, 15, are restored at the end. Copying from the result would have been a challenge.

*Florence Laur. Plut. 90 inf. 52

ch. xv²

not Florentine

Florence Laur. Stroz. 42

m. xv

cat.; Orsino 2023,

135-136 no. 61

later adjustment of the order, with consequent blank spaces and frequent *hic nihil deest*; 8, 2 entire², followed by 8, 10-17, 9, 1-15, 8, 3-8, 8, 9, 3 *si nullam (ullam²) spem mihi litteris ostenderis me isto missurum alios* with the rest of 8, 9 in the margin; space before 13, 53

Florence Naz. II I 65 (Magl. VI 156)

ch. 1472-

Mazzatinti 8, 1898,

27

Book 3 not numbered; 8, 1-16 (17 omitted) in the right order, but Book "8" starts at 9, 9, Book "13" at 13, 53

Florence Naz. II IX 128

ch. xv²

Mazzatinti

12,

1902, 14

- ends in the same hand with the colophon of *IGI* 2810 (Foligno c. 1471); covered in glossing, especially between the lines
- *Florence Ricc. 501 ch. xv Reeve 2024, 13-14
- Florence Ricc. 502 ch. xv cat.
 German scribe (the first words of each letter in heavy script; f. 174v *et sic est finis* ...)?; 5, 20 omitted; Book 14 after Book 8; 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 missing
- Florence Ricc. 503 m./ch. xv¹ cat.
 a descendant of **P** with the usual disorder in Books 8-9
- *Florence Ricc. 540 m. 1469
- Florence Ricc. 556 ch. 1443 SDBM_143741
 On f. 1r it has the arms of Nicodemo Tranchedino between the letters *N* and *TR*. The misplaced passage of Book 8 is missing between f. 95 and f. 96 and appears at the end of the book with the addition by another hand of 9, 15, 5 *aut – probabuntur*; after 9, 15 another addition (superfluous), 8, 2, 1 *non me hercule* – end of 8, 2
- Florence Ricc. 2317 f. IIIrv m. xiv/xv Cursi 2007, 150, 160-161; De Robertis 2016, 67, 82 fig. 8
- Geneva Bibl. de Genève 103 ch. xiv cat. on line
- Glasgow Hunter 441 m. xv cat.
 related to Laur. 49, 5, but with 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 attached to 9, 15; in quire 14 (ff. 130-139) the second and fourth bifolia are switched
- Göttingen Philol. 115g m. xv^{med.} cat. (*Neuzugänge* 1894-1966)
 three bifolia missing in the middle of the first *quinio*; 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem* between 9, 15, 5 *in parietibus* and *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*; at 13, 53 *XIII* but cancelled
- Hague 73 J 73 m. xv *Medieval manuscripts in Dutch collections*
- Hamburg Staatsbibl. Scrin. 17 fr. 3 + Munich C. L. M. 29220(9) m. xv cat.
 frr. of Books 5 and 10⁶²
- *Harvard Typ. 174 m. xv^{3/4}
 + Gell. 3, 8, 8
- Harvard Typ. 285 see Schøyen
- Holkham 378 m. xv^{2/4} cat.
 -16, 26, 1 *litteris perlatus est. Non*
- *Kraków Jagiell. 929 ch. 1460 Pavia cat.

⁶² On these fragments see Reeve 2024, 9-10. Stephen Oakley obliged me by taking shots of the latter a few days after readers were granted permission to take their own, and unlike Juliane Trede I have no doubt that the two fragments are in the same hand.

- + Gell. 3, 8; in Book 4, switches 4-11 and 12-15; Books 5-6 at the end (ff. 143r-166v); ff. 58+61 and 59+60 switched, as contemporary notes point out; 10, 35 omitted; like Bologna Univ. 2272, probably a descendant of Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499
- *Leiden B. P. L. 49 ch. xv¹
+ Gell. 3, 8 + *Significatio*
- Leiden Voss. Lat. F 49 m. xv² cat.
+ Gell. 3, 8, 8
- Leiden Voss. Lat. Q 4 m. xv¹ cat.
Probably copied from the manuscript of which Christie's 12.12.2022 lot 120 is the first bifolium.
- Leiden Voss. Lat. Q 27 m. xv^{3/4} cat.
- Leiden Voss. Lat. Q 58 m. xv cat.
same content in *fam.* as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 apart from also omitting 9, 3, Book 16, and various other passages; Book 15 starts with *Incipit quartus decimus* but ends with *Explicit liber .xv.*; + Gell. 3, 8
- Leipzig Rep. I 18a m. xv^{med.} cat.
descends from **P** at least up to 2, 10, 1; heavily annotated up to 5, 16; then omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4¹, 15, 4; starts new books at 9, 9 and 13, 53; + *Brut.* to 1, 16, 8 *in integrum potest* at the end of the last page
- London B. L. Add. 11928 m. 1444 cat.
Probably not a direct copy of **P**, because some of its errors are shared by Vat. Lat. 1684 and Ottob. Lat. 1295, neither of which can descend from it; but only in this manuscript and one other, Wrocław Rehd. 68, have I found at 2, 5, 2 and 2, 8, 1 Niccoli's *mercule*, the reading of **M** (see above, p. 17).
- London B. L. Add. 11929 m. 1455 cat.
between 9, 15, 5 *parietibus* and *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*, 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*; after Book 16, 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nihil spei* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur. Finis*
- London B. L. Add. 16620 m. xv cat.
omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8; as in Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500, Book "8" begins with 9, 9
- London B. L. Add. 19251 m. xv cat.
8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – singrapham misi* follows 8, 17 (the last letter in the book); Reggi 2024, 68-71, links such manuscripts with Guiniforte Barzizza
- London B. L. Arundel 9 ch. 1446 Bologna cat.
+ a list of abbreviations that resembles *Significatio*; Books 8-9 in the right order

- London B. L. Arundel 138 ch. xv cat.
-7, 14, 2 *Cesari familiarem*, 10 in a different hand; omits 5, 20
- London B. L. Burn. 139 m. xv cat.
after 9, 15, 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*
- London B. L. Burn. 140 m. xv cat.
omits 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4; like Vat. Chig. H VIII 252 and Pal. Lat. 1504, on which see Reggi 2024, 64, and also Naples Naz. IV B 42 and Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 211, creates Book “8” out of 7, 26-33 + 9, 1-14 and starts Book “9” with 9, 15
- London B. L. Burn. 141 ch. xv cat.
like Berlin Magdeb. 87, omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*
- London B. L. Burn. 142 m. xv cat.
- London B. L. Burn. 143 m. xv cat.
omits 5, 20 and 7, 23-25; quire lost after f. 89 (9, 4, 1-8, 8, 6 *-turus es scito – in aede Apollinis*)
- London B. L. Burn. 144 m. xv cat.⁶³
- London B. L. Burn. 145 m. xv cat.
3, 11, 1-15, 10, 2 *-lgi sermo – per te qua hornatissimum* with many leaves missing or transposed
- London B. L. Harl. 2470 ch. xv cat.
- London B. L. Harl. 2505 ch. xv Venice? (Iohannes de Westphalia) cat.
+ Gell. 3, 8; serious disorder in Book 3 is embedded in the text, but notes in the margin, not much later, give directions for correcting it
- London B. L. Harl. 2509 ch. xv cat.
f. 1 should precede f. 45, and several leaves are missing, probably because decorated initials or leaves that had them were cut out; omits 7, 23-25, Book 8, and 9, 4, and “8” begins at 9, 9
- London B. L. Harl. 2512 m. xv^{med.} cat.
Book “8” starts with 9, 2-12; then follow 9, 15, 8, 10-11, 8, 1-8, 2, 1 *modo inquis*, 8, 9, 3 *mihi litteris ostendis* – 8, 9 end, 8, 12-14, 7, 23-25 (omitted in Book 7), 9, 13-14, 8, 15-9, 1, 8, 3, 1 – 8, 9, 3 *sin illam spem*, 9, 15, 5 *aut in certo vitii certa mihi probabuntur*, 9, 16 and so on; 9, 4 and 15, 4, 6-9 are omitted but not 5, 20.

⁶³ When I wrote Reeve 2024 n. 31, I had not seen this manuscript, which puts Book 14 after Book 8. It is free from any disorder at the end of Book 13, where after 77 it has 12, 29 as far as 2 *ad scribendum* and in the margin the note «Vacat quia supra precedentibus locis exscripta est»; the rest of 12, 29 and the whole of the letter that usually follows, 12, 21, are absent. At the end, ff. 124v-126v, it repeats 14, 1-4 in a different version that more obviously goes back to P.

- London B. L. Harl. 2591 m. xv^{1/4} s. xi cat.; corr.
Mendelssohn 1893, xvii n. 1; De Robertis 2016, 74, dates it 1401-1410⁶⁴
-16, 4, 1 *quare nunc*; like Berlin Magdeb. 87, omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*
- London B. L. Harl. 2625 m. xv cat.
-16, 23, 2 *Ego tamen*; like its close relative Berlin Magdeb. 87, omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*
- London B. L. Harl. 2682 s. xi² cat., edd. (H)
9-16, *Oct., Comm.*
- London B. L. Harl. 2707 m./ch. xv cat.
-12, 16, 3 *cum has litteras darem* f. 227v, then in another hand to the end of 12, 18 ff. 228-29
- London B. L. Harl. 2743 m. xv¹ cat.
-16, 21, 8 *multum enim mihi eripitur opere* in end of *quinio* 21
- London B. L. Harl. 2749 m. xv^{med.} cat.
8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* after 8, 17; + Gell. 3, 8
- London B. L. Harl. 2773 s. xii¹ cat., edd. (G)
-8, 9, 3 *si ullam spem*⁶⁵
- London B. L. Harl. 4920 ch. xv cat.
The first quire has lost its outer bifolium, of which the first leaf may have been blank but the other contained the rest of Book 1 after 1, 9, 22 *essem usus eisdem*. Though Books 8-9 are in the right order, 9, 15 is followed on f. 76v by 8, 2, 1-2 *Non mehercule – nuncium nostrorum comiciorum* framed by *va – cat.* Under the coat of arms is *Petrus de Fuxo*; the elder died in 1464, the younger in 1490.
- London B. L. Harl. 5062 m. 1469- cat.
from 2, 11 *terve ad summum*; + Gell. 3, 8 (ff. 274v + 280r; the last quire should be read in the order 278-279, 273, 270-272, 275-277, 274, 280-<281>)
- London B. L. King's 23 m. xv^{2/4} cat.
+ Gell. 3, 8

⁶⁴ On the strength of Byzantine *M* (like a broad *H* with a descender from the middle of the crossbar), which occurs in both text and rubrics, I would put it after Guarino's return from Constantinople in the latter part of 1408, though his use of Byzantine *M* is documented from 1406; see Barile 1994, 87-90. A further reason for connecting it with Guarino is the absence of 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3, on which see Reggi 2024, 59-63 (though his list of manuscripts includes several that omit 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 because in Books 9-16 they do not descend from *M*; had Guarino seen any of these?). A galling thought is that it may have had a subscription either dated or informative in other ways, but even without one it sets Reggi a stiff challenge. It may be the earliest manuscript to put 8, 10 after 8, 1; others that do so are Bologna Univ. 2283 (a. 1421), Cesena S. XVIII 3, B. L. Burney 141 (which likewise omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3) and Harl. 2743, Modena Est. Lat. 928, Bodl. D'Orville 11, Prague Nat. VIII D 16, Udine Civ. 1, Vat. Barb. Lat. 80.

⁶⁵ This falls in mid page, but Mendelssohn 1884², 845 n. 1, pointed out that it ends quire 15 of *M*.

- Lucca Capit. VIII 528 ch. 1456 *Mirabile*
 Lucca Capit. VIII 538 ch. 1457 «SIFC» 14, 1906, 370
 528 is a selection filled out by 538; see Bandini 2021, 88-92. Rather than exclude both as selections, I include them but count them as one manuscript, even though it seems unlikely that they had the same source.
- Lucca Capit. VIII 551 ch. 1469 «SIFC» 14, 1906, 371
 Like 528 and 538, this was written by Lodovico Vannuccori, but Bandini 2021 does not say how it is related to them.
- *Lugano D 2 E 18 m. xv^{2/4}
 + Gell. 3, 8
- *Madrid Nac. 10022 m. xv¹
 omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25; 7, 33 + 9, 1, then Book 8; + Gell. 3, 8, 8 + Att. 9., 7C
- *Madrid Pal. II 76 ch. 1433 Lucca
 from 1, 2, 3 *apud Pompeium*; starts a new book at 13, 53
- Manchester Rylands 60 m. xv¹ cat.
 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 not in place but split into the rest of 8, 2, which follows 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera [mihi] probantur*, and 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur*, which follows 8, 17; large initial at 13, 53; letters omitted here and there
- Manchester Rylands 62 ch. xv^{med.} cat.
 has 5, 20 but omits 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9, and as in Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 Book “8” begins at 9, 9, “13” at 13, 53
- Manchester Rylands 63 ch. 1466 cat.
- Manchester Rylands 64 ch. xv^{med.} cat.
 from 6, 22, 3 *tanto studio esse facturum*; + *Brut.*, *Oct.*; omits 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9, and as in Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 Book “8” begins at 9, 9, “13” at 13, 53
- Marston 5 m./ch. xv^{med.} Thomas 1963, 3-4 no. 5
- Marston 71 see Brussels IV 265
- Messina Mus. Com. XIII C 14 ch. xv *olim* II E 11; Pirrone 1903;
 Costanza-Foti 1974, 21-22 with plates III-IV
- Milan Ambros. A 234 inf. ch. xv cat.
- *Milan Ambros. A 235 inf. ch. xv^{2/4}
 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *Non me hercules – si nullam spem* after 8, 17; + Gell. 3, 8, 8, Att. 9, 7C
- *Milan Ambros. C 220 inf. m. xv^{2/4} cat.
 same content in *fam.* as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500; 13, 61-64 and 65-66 switched
- *Milan Ambros. D 67 inf. m. xv^{med.}

- two quires missing after f. 16 (2, 7, 3-3, 10, 9 -*rus domesticos* – *cuiquam ex col-*); 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *Non me hercules* – *si nullam spem* after 8, 17; + Gell. 3, 8, 8, *Att.* 9, 7C
- Milan Ambros. H 118 inf. m. xv cat.; Sabbadini
1995, 190-196
originally had the same omissions as Basel Univ. F III 35; all except that of 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 repaired by a later hand from a manuscript of Guarino's
- Milan Ambros. H 98 sup. m. xv cat.
+ *Significatio*
- Milan Ambros. H 100 sup. m. xv² cat.
- Milan Ambros. L 71 sup. m. xv cat.
- Milan Capit. C/17/295 m. xv^{1/3} Ferrari 2016, 628-630
frr. of 8, 12, 3-14, 3, 15, 2, 4-5
- Milan Trivulz. 808 m. 1450 cat.; *Manus Online*
The last word before the subscription, *κηπενωσ*, stands for *καὶ ἔπαινος*.
- *Modena Est. Lat. 178 (α O 6 14)⁶⁶ m. xv^{2/4} cat.
same content as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500
- Modena Est. Lat. 226 (α P 6 18) m. 1448- *Manus Online*
same content as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500
- Modena Est. Lat. 258 (α Q 8 2) m. xv
omits Book 8, 9, 4 (this added later), and 15, 4, 4-9, and starts new books at 9, 9 and 13, 53; + *Brut.*, *Oct.*, *Att.* 9, 7C (+ 9, 13A, 1, 9, 16, 2, 10, 8B)
- Modena Est. Lat. 279 (α Q 8 18) m. 1452
omits 5, 20, starts a new book at 7, 26, omits Book 8 and 9, 4; folds the last quire, ff. 91-94, inside out, with the result that the dated subscription appears on f. 92r
- Modena Est. Lat. 285 (α P 8 19) m. xv
It has Book 14 after Book 8 and more traces of the original disorder between 13, 59 and 77 than Est. Lat. 928, though with a heavily contaminated text where I checked (13, 1); between 9, 15 and 16 it includes 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut* – *probantur* + 8, 2, 1 *non me hercule* – end.
- Modena Est. Lat. 926 (α U 5 5) m. xv^{2/4} *Manus Online*;
Reggi 2024, 60-61

⁶⁶ In 2017 I checked Campori App. 101 (γ W 2 18, m. xv¹) for letters *Ad Atticum* but found that it appears to be a selection from *fam.* (f. 1r *M. Cicero s. d. p. Lentulo procons.* – f. 91v *explicunt epistole M. T. Ciceronis ex volumine assumpte*; ff. 134r-145v *fam.* 14).

Book 8 not labelled, and *Incipit .viii.* at 9, 1, *Incipit nonus.* 9^{us} at 9, 9; omits 9, 4 and like Berlin Magdeb. 87 omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*

- Modena Est. Lat. 928 (α U 5 8) m. 1456 *Manus Online*
 It puts Book 14 after Book 9 and in Book 13 has much the same disorder as Dresden Dc 112 and Vat. Reg. Lat. 1626 and 1696: 59, 68-71, 65-67, 60-64, 72-76, 71, 77.
- Modena Est. Lat. 930 (α R 6 16) ch. xv^{1/4} *Manus Online*
 It descends from P. After Book 7, where a new book starts at 23 (*Incipiunt ad Balbum*), it continues with 9, 2-15 (perhaps without 13-14; see below and on B. L. Harl. 2512) up to f. 80v (the end of a quire) and then from f. 81r with 8, 2, 1 *non me hercule* – end + 8, 1-8, 2, 1 *vide modo inquis* + 9, 1 and 13-14, 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *sui illam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut – probabuntur*. On a flyleaf at the end, written by another hand, it has *Significatio*.
- *Montpellier 359 m. xv^{3/4}
 + *Philippus Aristoteli, Oct.*
- Monza Capit. d-12/168 ch. xv^{med.} *Manus Online*
- Moscow Univ. 8510 m. xv Völkel 1877, 852;
 Rühl 1883, 750-752 no. 34; Mendelssohn 1884, 109-110
 no Book 8
- Munich C. L. M. 762 ch. xv Rimini cat.
 Transpositions in Books 1-3 and 7-9 are embedded in the text, and parts of Books 1 and 2 are missing.
- Munich C. L. M. 6718 ch. 1444-1449 *Manuscripta mediaevalia*
 + *Significatio*
- Munich C. L. M. 10713 ch. xv^{2/4} *Manuscripta mediaevalia*
 + *Oct.*
- Munich C. L. M. 29220(9) see Hamburg
- Naples Naz. IV B 24 m./ch. xv *Manus Online*⁶⁷
 omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9, as notes in the margin point out; + *Brut.*, *Oct.*
- Naples Naz. IV B 24bis m. 1434 *Manus Online*
 1, 1 lost; same content as Bologna Univ. 2592, + Gell. 3, 8, 8 in another hand
- Naples Naz. IV B 25 m. xv *Manus Online*
- Naples Naz. IV B 26 ch. xv cat.
- Naples Naz. IV B 27 m. xv cat.

⁶⁷ Of the twelve manuscripts in this library I did not see 25, 26, 28, 30, 32.

closely related to Oxford Balliol 248C but with the usual disorder in Books 8-9		
Naples Naz. IV B 28	ch. xv	cat.
Naples Naz. IV B 29	m. xv ^{2/4}	<i>Manus Online</i>
+ <i>Brut.</i> , <i>Oct.</i> , and in a different hand <i>Att.</i> 9, 7C		
Naples Naz. IV B 30	m. 1462	cat.
Naples Naz. IV B 31	m. 1464	cat.
+ Gell. 3, 8		
Naples Naz. IV B 32	m. xv	cat.
Naples Naz. IV B 33	m. xv ¹	<i>Manus Online</i>
same content as Basel Univ. F III 35		
Naples Naz. IV B 42	m./ch. 1424 «perfectum Senis»	<i>Manus Online</i>
same content as Vat. Chig. H VIII 252 but without the notes on 9, 9 and 13, 53; space nevertheless for an initial at 13, 53		
*New Haven Yale 1057	m. xii ¹	Babcock 2012
a single leaf, German; part of 13, 6-7		
*New Haven Marston 59	m. xv ¹	<i>olim</i> Phill. 24346
10, 34, 1-11, 1, 4 <i>milia quinque</i> – <i>nunc aliquid</i> missing between f. 115 and f. 117, 14, 11-15, 1, 2 <i>amicissimusque</i> between f. 164 and f. 167; + Gell. 3, 8		
New York Columbia X87.C48	m. 1444-	<i>olim</i> Phill. 11913
+ Gell. 3, 8		
New York Pierpont Morgan 981	m. xv ¹	Krist. V 336
at the beginning related to Siena H VI 16 but with an infusion of northern readings; omits (with notes by the scribe) 5, 20, 7, 23-25, 15, 4, 4-9; also omits Book 8 and starts Book 9 at 9, 9; new book at 13, 53, none at 14, 1; + <i>Brut.</i> , <i>Oct.</i>		
New York Public Library 140	m. 1447?	<i>olim</i> Phill. 2879
Niort 91 (9070)	m. xv	<i>Départements</i> 31, 1898, 631
*Oxford Balliol 248C	m. 1446-	
closely related to Naples Naz. IV B 27 but with Books 8-9 in the right order; after 9, 15 it repeats 2, 11, repeated by M and P after 8, 8 ⁶⁸		
Oxford Bodl. Add. C 155	ch. xv	cat.
Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 210	m. xv ^{1/3}	cat.

⁶⁸ A note in **P** on f. 121v says *Est item scripta supra in secundo libro ad m. caelium haec epistola*, with *ae* in both places. Ullman 1960, 70-73, discussed Niccoli's addiction to diphthongs. Salutati, on the other hand, «preserved the mediaeval *e* for *ae*», says Ullman 1963, 110, and for his use of *e* with a tail see De Robertis 2008, 349-350, where no instance of *ae* is mentioned. She kindly tells me, however, that she would assign the note to Salutati, and she refers me to instances of *ae* in his addition to S. Marco 284 of Pliny's letters, which she dates late in his life. Certainly the note does not seem to be written in any version of Niccoli's hand.

- 9-16, *Oct., Comm.*; everything between 13, 76, 1 *coniunctius* and 15, 13, 2 *dig-
nitas et meus magnus honos* omitted between the recto and verso of f. 53⁶⁹
- Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 211 ch. 1450 cat.
same content as Vat. Chig. H VIII 252 but without the notes on 9, 9 and
13, 53
- Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 220 m. xv cat.
It omits 5, 20, 7, 25-26, 29, 32, 8, 17, and 9, 4, and has the usual jump at
8, 2, 1 but with 8, 3-5 between 9, 15 and 16 as in Dresden Dc 113. The
passage of Book 2 that I collated is full of transpositions.
- Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 223 m. xv cat.; Pächt-Ale-
xander, 83 no. 810
It puts 9, 22-23 after 24-26 and has 21 at the end as the third of five let-
ters omitted in the body of the text; the others are 2, 12, 9, 4, and 12, 29
and 21.
- Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 225 m. 1462 Ferrara cat.; Pächt-Ale-
xander, 40 no. 392
8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi
probabuntur. Vale* after 9, 15
- Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 236 m. xv cat.; Pächt-Ale-
xander, 52 no. 520
Wherever decorated, it has a Florentine text with Books 8-9 in the right
order.
- Oxford Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 244 m. xv cat.; Pächt-Ale-
xander, 83 no. 811
starts Book 13 at 13, 53; + *Brut.* to 1, 16, 6 *oportet praestet adhuc*; Reeve
2024, 16 n. 31
- Oxford Bodl. D'Orville 11 ch. xv cat.; Pächt-Ale-
xander, 62-63 no. 617
"8" begins at 7, 26; after 9, 15, 8, 3, 1-8, 8, 8 *mitti oporteret etc.* + 2, 11
- Oxford Bodl. D'Orville 75 m. xv cat.; Pächt-Ale-
xander, 42 no. 417
begins with a table of addressees and opening words, followed by Gell. 3,
8 and *Significatio*; in *fam.* has the same content as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500
- Oxford Bodl. E. D. Clarke 24 ch. 1449 Bologna cat.; Pächt-
Alexander, 67 no. 660
Books 8-9 in the right order
- Oxford Bodl. Eng. Misc. d 239 ff.1a-b m. xv cat.
frr., 10, 4, 4-7, 1 *Certe tibi – iussi ex quo*, 10, 24, 5-26, 2 *-cio substitutum –
ad laudem impe-*
- Oxford Bodl. Lat. class. e 4 ch. 1442 Brescia cat.

⁶⁹ Kirner 1901, 391; Reeve 2024, 15-18.

- omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 6-9, and "8" begins at 9, 9, "13" at 13, 53; + Gell. 3, 8, *Significatio*
- Oxford Linc. Lat. 41 m. 1446- cat.
omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4; space before 9, 9
- Oxford Magd. 83 m. 1428 cat.; Watson 1984, I no. 826, II plate 334
- Padua Capit. B 32 m. xv^{3/4} cat.
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 6347 ch. 1423? Basel?
On ff. 57r-191v it has continuous text from 1, 2, 4 *retinebimus* to the end of Book 16 but serious disorder between 3, 5, 1 and 5, 9, 1, inadequately remedied by supplements on ff. 191v-196v, and then omits 5, 10a, 3-5, 13, 3 *iustissimi triumphi – aut commemorare* and Book 6 from 6, 8, 3 *familiari meo* (unless these two chunks are misplaced and eluded me). Like Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 it omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9, but "8" starts at 10, 1, 10, 21a *tu videris* – end is omitted, and "9" starts at 10, 22, "13" at 13, 53. I shall discuss it on another occasion.
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 7783 m. xv^{med.}
9-16, *Oct., Comm., Philippus Aristoteli*
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 7788 ch. xv
1, 1-2, 6 (ff. 215r-226v)
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8522 m. xv cat.
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 8523 m. 1457 Milan
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 8524 m. xv^{2/4}
begins with a table of addressees and opening words; + Gell. 3, 8, *Significatio*
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8525 m. xv cat.
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8526 ch. xv cat.
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8527 m. xv cat.
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 8528 m. xv^{2/4}
after 8, 17 a gap and then 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*; + Gell. 3, 8, *Att.* 9, 7C; Reggi 2024, 47 n. 97, 70-74, implausibly derives its closest relatives from it.
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8529 ch. xv cat.
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8530 ch. xv cat.
- Paris B. N. Lat. 8531 ch. xv cat.
- *Paris B. N. Lat. 8532 m. xv
1, 1-3, 9⁷⁰

⁷⁰ This manuscript, French, breaks off at the end of 3, 9 four lines down f. 47r. To judge from 2, 17, 2 *conferendis* for *referendis*, it is a relative of V and the other French manuscripts discussed in Reeve 2024, 17; I have found *conferendis* in Bologna Univ. 2283 and Leiden B. P. L. 49 as the original reading, in Bologna Univ. 2475, in Bodl. Clarke 24, and in the *ed. princ.* (Rome 1467), but they are firmly Italian.

*Paris B. N. Lat. 8533	m. xv ²	cat.	
Paris B. N. Lat. 8612	ch. xv	cat.	
Paris B. N. Lat. 8613	ch. xv	cat.	
Paris B. N. Lat. 8658	ch. xv	cat.	
Paris B. N. Lat. 10336	m. 1450	cat.;	Samaran-
Marichal 1974, 167 and plate CLVI			
Paris B. N. Lat. 10337	m. 1458 Genoa and Arquà	cat.;	Samaran-
Marichal 1974, 169 and plate CLXVI			
Paris B. N. Lat. 10338	ch. 1468 Cittanova	cat.;	Samaran-
Marichal 1974, 169 and plate CLXXXV			
*Paris B. N. Lat. 14761	m. xv ^{med.}	V in edd.	
1-8, other works, 9-16, <i>Oct.</i> , <i>Comm.</i> , <i>Philippus Aristoteli</i>			
Paris B. N. Lat. 16247	m. 1428 Parma	cat.;	Samaran-
Marichal 1974, 519 and plate CXLV			
*Paris B. N. Lat. 17812	s. xii	R in edd.	
-8, 8, 6 <i>moram</i>			
*Paris B. N. N.A.L. 1112	ch. xv		
like Berlin Magdeb. 87, omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 <i>non me hercules – si nullam spem</i> ; + <i>Att.</i> 9, 7c			
Paris B. N. N.A.L. 1561	ch. xv	cat.	
*Pavia Ald. 238	m. xv		
Perugia D 54 (236)	ch. xv		Mazzatinti 5, 1895, 104
*Philadelphia Lewis E 66	m. 1468 Ferrara		
Piacenza Land. 191	m. xv	«SIFC» 9, 1901, 492	
Pistoia Fort. 7 (A 7)	m./ch. c. 1427	Ceccherini 2016,	
267-270 with plate LXXXV			
*Prague Nat. VIII D 16 (1511)	ch. 1470	cat.	
has 8, 10 after 8, 1; omits 13, 77, 2-14, 1, 3			
Rome Angel. 590	ch. xv		<i>Manus Online</i>
-5, 20, 4 <i>a me non insipienter</i>			
Rome Casanat. 324	ch. xv ^{med.}	cat.	
+ Gell. 3, 8; no Book 8			
Rome Cors. 43 D 19	m. 1423	cat.	
Book 9, so labelled because Book 8 is present, starts with 9, 15; but see above on B. L. Burn. 140.			
Rome Cors. 43 E 1	ch. xv ¹	cat.	
omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 6-9; starts new books at 9, 9, 13, 53; + Gell. 3, 8, 8			
Rome Naz. S. Pant. 48	m. xv ¹	cat.	
-5, 2, 8 <i>civem egregium</i> + catchword <i>qui qua pena</i>			
Rome Naz. Vitt. Em. 198	ch. xv ²	cat.	

Rome Naz. Vitt. Em. 1493	ch. xv	cat.
1, 2, 3-6, 3, 4 <i>et ego eo die – dum vivam erunt</i>		
Rome Vallicell. C 77	ch. xv	<i>Manus Online</i>
+ <i>Significatio?</i>		
Rome Vallicell. R 43	ch. 1453 Massa	cat.
Rouen 1110	m. 1442 Milan	cat.
Salamanca Univ. 2071	ch. xv	
San Daniele 64	m. xv	cat.
San Francisco State Univ. de Bellis La. 01	m. xv ^{1/4}	
San Marino (California) Huntington SM 1028	m. xv ²	
Schlägl 50	ch. xv ^{3/4} Bologna	cat.
Schøyen 612	m. xv ^{2/4}	
description and a few images on line; formerly Harvard Typ. 285, on which see Krist. V 236 and Clough 1962 ⁷¹		
Siena Com. H VI 16	m. xv ¹	«SIFC» 11, 1903, 414
1-7		
The text, very corrupt, descends from P . As the same hand wrote the letters of 1416 that follow these books, the date gives only a <i>terminus a quo</i> , but I doubt whether the manuscript is later than the 1420s.		
Siena Com. H VII 6	ch. xv ¹	«SIFC» 11, 1903, 418-419
It omits 5, 20 ⁷² , 7, 23-26 (sic), Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9; “8” starts at 9, 9, “13” at 13, 53; the last quire that survives ends at 15, 10, 2 with the catchword <i>-plicatione decernenda</i> (f. 184vb). The scribe who takes over at the beginning of Book 4 (f. 115r) writes the pages in two columns.		
Siena, raccolta Maffei, fr. 46	m. xv	Mecacci 2006, 821-822
fragments of Books 2-4		
<i>Sotheby's 18.6.91 lot 89</i>		see <i>Butler</i>
<i>Sotheby's 1.12.98 lot 91</i>	m. 1454	Comites latentes
1988-1998; SDBM_44		
Toledo 100-26	m. xv	
-10, 20, 3 <i>belli oppresserit</i>		
Tours Mun. 688	s. xii	cat., edd.
Trento Com. 1579	ch. xv ^{3/4}	Mazzatinti 74, 1942, 45-46
+ Gell. 3, 8, <i>Significatio</i>		
Trento Com. 1802	ch. xv ²	Mazzatinti 74, 1942, 77
Treviso Com. 1571	ch. xv ^{2/4}	<i>NBM</i>
*Troyes 847	ch. xv	cat.

⁷¹I thank Sara Powell of the Houghton Library for telling me the recent history of this manuscript. Martin Schøyen's web site does not mention that it was on deposit there until the sale by Sotheby's in 1988 but does add «De-accessioned April 2014 to Jörn Günther».

⁷² So Dr Rossella De Pierro kindly tells me. I had forgotten to check.

- *Udine Civ. 1⁷³ ch. xv¹ Mazzatinti 46, 1930, 10
8, 10 after 8, 1⁷⁴; 9, 4 omitted; 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur. Vale* after 9, 16
- Uppsala C 932, *olim* Phill. 16288 m. xv cat.
1-7 + excc.
- *Vat. Barb. Lat. 80 m. 1447-1448 cat.
8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur. Vale* after 9, 15 as in Berlin Lat. fol. 309, Lat. quart. 397, Phill. 1801, Bologna Univ. 2592, Udine Civ. 1, and the manuscripts listed by Reggi 2024, 71-73
- Vat. Barb. Lat. 141 ch. 1460- cat.
Vat. Chig. H VI 182 m. xv^{med.} cat.
copied from Vat. Ross. 602, where 15, 8 *erga me – meo vel* occupies a line omitted and then restored by the scribe of this manuscript; it antedates the corrections in Ross. 602, notably the restoration of 1, 9, 1-4 *levius – quoniam tibi* (presumably a page or opening of the exemplar)
- Vat. Chig. H VI 189 xv cat.
fr., front pastedown, 1, 1, 3-1, 2, 2 *auget suspicionem – erat enim iniqua et nova*
- Vat. Chig. H VII 220 ch. xv cat.
The scribe at first wrote 8, 2, 1 *Non me hercules nihil enim unquam tam* between 9, 15, 5 *cetera mihi* and *probantur. Vale* but cancelled it and made a separate letter of *Non me hercules* – end of 8, 2.
- Vat. Chig. H VIII 251 m. 1464 Siena cat.
+ Gell. 3, 8
- Vat. Chig. H VIII 252 ch. 1421 Rocca di Pieve (Bol.) cat.
omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25; Book “8” = 7, 26-33 + 9, 1-14; 9, 9 mg. *Aliqui tenent hic principium libri octavi*; 13, 53 mg. *In alio libro hic ponitur principium libri tercii decimi. Ita liber Emanuelis Risolai habebat* (the same note about Chrysoloras, with a different misspelling of his name, in the margin of Leiden B. P. L. 49; he died in 1415)⁷⁵
- *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1036 m. xv¹ cat.
– 8, 14 *parabit. Vale* + c’word *Et quando tu*
- Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1176 ch. 1469 cat.
+ Gell. 3, 8; no Book 8
- *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1230 m. xv^{med.} cat.
written and decorated in northern Italy; Books 8-9 in the right order

⁷³ I thank Giorgio Ziffer for ascertaining that this manuscript is available on line and sending me a link.

⁷⁴ See n. 64.

⁷⁵ The earliest dated manuscript with this division is Naples Naz. IV B 42 (a. 1424), though Berlin Lat. fol. 609 and Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500, either or both, could be earlier.

- *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1295 ch. xv^{med.} cat.
not decorated but probably written in Florence; Books 8-9 in the right order
- Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1512 m. xv^{med.} cat.
Books 8-9 in the right order; -15, 4, 11 *ornasti qui* + catchword *oratione*; copied from 1230 and written at least in part, certainly up to f. 131r, by the same scribe⁷⁶
- Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1709 ch. xv cat.
-15, 2, 6 *summa pietate* + c'word *predictum*
- *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1756 m. xv^{2/4} cat.,
which gives a full account of the leaves disordered after f. 43. The text runs to the end of 12, 1 and is then missing except for 13, 1, 6-11, 2 *rogo fore mihi gratissimum – ipsosque quorum nomina scri-* and 13, 21, 2-24, 2 *maiores modum domum suam – sine tua summa*; Books 8 and 9 were both missing until the hand of 13, 21, 2-24, 2 (f. 102) wrote the end of Book 7 from 7, 25, 2 *aliquantum* and the whole of Book 9 (ff. 71-80) as a replacement for the bifolium that contained 7, 25, 2-7, 33, 2 *aliquantum – ut ipse intellegis in*; the original end of 7, 33 precedes Book 10 = “9” on f. 81r.
- *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1851 m. xv^{3/4}
2, 6, 3-2, 19, 2 *et gratiosorum – et de nostra*, 5, 2, 6 *plenam humanitatis –* 16 + Gell. 3, 8, *Att.* 9, 7C
- Vat. Ottob. Lat. 2037 ch. xv¹ cat.
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 598 ch. 1480-
9-16 (in disorder), *Oct.*, *Comm.*
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1496 m. 1410
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1497 m. xv^{2/4}
9, 15 + 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 8, 2, 1 *non me hercules* – end of 8, 2
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1498 m./ch. xv¹
+ *Brut.*, *Oct.*, *Comm.* (change of hand after f. 145v *vitia versantur*), *Philippus Aristoteli*; Reeve 2024, 19
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1498 xv
f. a, 1, 2, 3-1, 5a, 3 *ducta senatus dimissus – possum existimare sed si*; apparently a copy of the same section in the main text
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499 m. 1430-
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500 m. xv^{2/4}
omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9; “8” begins at 9, 9, “13” at 13, 53; + *Brut.*, *Oct.* (in the version transmitted with *Att.*, not *fam.*), Gell. 3, 8, *Significatio*; for relatives see Reggi 2024, 65-67; from 4, 14, 2 *per-timescebam*, which begins a new quire in **P** (f. 59r), descent from **P** seems likely

⁷⁶ I saw 1512 on the spot in September 2024 but 1230 not until I found in December 2024 that it had come on line, whereupon their nearly identical text and my notes on the script of 1512 led me to this surmise. Claudia Montuschi obligingly confirms it.

- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1501 m. xv^{med.}
Annotated by Pietro da Montagnana; after the subscription, where a strip has been cut off, it probably contained a note of ownership or of bequest to S. Giovanni di Verdara, Padua.
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1502 m. xv^{2/4}
+ Gell. 3, 8 + *Significatio* (with other things in between)
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1503 m. xv^{med.}
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1504 m. xv^{2/4}
same content as Vat. Chig. H VIII 252 but without the notes on 9, 9 and 13, 53; see Reggi 2024, 64
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1505 m. xv^{med.}
same content as Basel Univ. F III 35 but without Gell. 3, 8
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1506 m. xv^{3/4}
-16, 12, 3 *traditurum* + c'word *ad con-*; omits 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 4-9
- *Vat. Pal. Lat. 1507 ch. xv^{med.}
omits 7, 23-25, Book 8¹ (8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *Non me hercule – si nulam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut – probabuntur* follows the rest of the book, added at the end), 9, 4; starts new books at 9, 9 and 13, 53
- *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1532 m. xv
- *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1626 m. xv
+ *Oct.* (in the version that travelled with *fam.*), *Epp. ad Brutum* 1, 1-1, 3a, *Philippus Aristoteli*, *Att.* 9, 16, 2, *Virgilius Augusto Caesari*, Gell. 3, 8, 8, *Plutarcus Traiano*; 13, 60-71 in disorder; 14 after 8; Reeve 2024, 16
- *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1657 m. xv^{2/4}
In Reeve 2024, 16 n. 31, I should have mentioned that on f. 137r a new hand starts on a new quire with 13, 29, 1 *modo causis*, which may indicate a change of exemplar; and at least in Books 9-10, if not up to the change of hand, I overestimated its agreements with **M** against Dresden Dc 112.
- *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1696 m. xv
as 1626
- *Vat. Reg. Lat. 1876 m. xv
from 1, 9, 9 *Nam hoc senatus consulto*; same content as Vat. Pal. Lat. 1500, but 15, 4, 4-9 added in s. xvi with erasure of 4, 9-10 *rebus ita gestis – et Parthorum*
- *Vat. Ross. 416 m. xv
f. 1, fragment in two hands, 1, 2, 3-1, 5a, 4 *-dinum video perspicio – et agendi et cogitandi*
- *Vat. Ross. 441 m. xv^{med.}
omits 7, 23-25, Book 8, 9, 4, 15, 4, 6-9; “8” starts at 9, 9
- *Vat. Ross. 602 m. xv¹
See above on Chig. H VI 182.

*Vat. Urb. Lat. 313	m. xv	
*Vat. Urb. Lat. 316	m. 1453	
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1684	m. 1448	
+ <i>Significatio</i>		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1685	m. xv	
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1686	m. xv ²	
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1687	ch. xv ^{med.}	
Vat. Vat. Lat. 1688	m. <1392>	
See pp. 14-15 above.		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1689	m. xv	
-16, 18, 1 <i>gaudio profu-</i> ; quire lost after f. 10 (1, 9, 16-2, 13, 2 <i>modo invidorum – post hoc nego-</i>)		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1690	ch. 1462	
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 1692	m. xv ^{3/4} Florence	
copied from Laur. 49, 5, not 49, 2		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 3247	m. xv ^{2/4}	
+ <i>Brut., Oct.</i>		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 3248	ch. xv	
+ Gell. 3, 8 ⁷⁷		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 4610	m. xv ^{med.}	
same content as Paris Lat. 8528 except that 8, 2, 1 <i>non me hercules</i> – end of 8, 2 follows 8, 9, 3 <i>si nullam spem</i>		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 7577	m. xv ¹	
Vat. Vat. Lat. 9367	ch. xv	cat.
-5, 2, 7 <i>verissimum pulcherrimum</i> τελος		
*Vat. Vat. Lat. 9891	ch. xv ^{med.}	
Vat. Vat. Lat. 11492	m. xv	cat.
Like Berlin Magdeb. 87, omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 <i>non me hercules – si nullam spem</i>		
Venice Marc. Lat. Z. 426 (2022)	ch. 1467	cat.
Venice Marc. Lat. XI 157 (4119)	m. xv	cat.
Vienna 78	m. xv	cat.
Vienna 136	m. xv	cat.
-16, 25 <i>et de sua in me voluntate</i>		
Vienna 161	m. xv	cat.
Vienna 230	m. xv	cat.
Vienna 3087 ff. 35-78	ch. xv	cat.
1-3		

⁷⁷ The *DA* that should have been cited in the bibliography of the entry in Pellegrin 1975-2010, III, 2, 152, was not *Deutsches Archiv* but *Dissertation abstracts*. When the issue proved inaccessible to me in any form, Judy Geczi, Reference Librarian of St Louis University Library, kindly sent me a copy of the abstract in question: Koncen 1984.

- Vienna 3136 ch. xv cat.
 Warminster, Longleat House 284^a m. 1431- Binnebeke 2010-2011, 33 n.
 2; 2020, 838 (his no. 33); Fiocco 1964, 306 no. 2
- Wolfenbüttel Aug. 4, 2, 1 2^o ch. 1457 Ebert 1827, no. 225, cat.
 omits 5, 20; 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *etiam si nullam* after 9, 15 *proba[bu]ntur*, then
 the part of 8, 2 missing in Book 8; text but not leaves missing between
 15, 19, 3 *Itaque anno* (corrected to *Itaque Silla*) and 16, 10, 1 *ad tercium*
kl. (*anno* must correspond to the *-ano* of 16, 10, 1 *Formiano*); + Gell. 3, 8
- Wolfenbüttel Aug. 85, 11 2^o ch. xv¹ Ebert 1827, no. 224, cat.
 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *Non me hercule – si nullam spem* after 8, 17 (as in Paris Lat.
 8528, notes at beginning and end that name Guiniforte Barzizza, here f.
 98v and f. 104v, comment on the placing, and a shorter note follows at
 the end of 9, 15); leaves missing between 15, 4, 8 *distributisque cohori-* (+
 catchword *-tibus et auxiliis*) and 16, 14, 1 *tuis litteris*; + Gell. 3, 8
- Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 87 m. xv^{2/4} Ebert 1827, no. 226; cat.
 much disorder in Books 3-4; leaves missing between 7, 13, 1 *arbi-*
trarere (+ catchword *litteras ad te*) and 9, 5 (did they include Book 8
 or 14?), again between 9, 16, 2 *summo studio me conse-* and 9, 20, 2
cenam dedi sine pavone; 9, 21 omitted (or lost before 9, 20), 22-23 af-
 ter 24-26; pp. 133-164 a jumble of leaves from Books 10, 11, 13; pp.
 151-154 and 163-164, which have 13, 29-31, 47-49, 2, 14, 13, 50-52, 60
facit in illum – end, 68-71 to *socius neque hoc*, in a different hand⁷⁸;
 Books 14-16 missing
- Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 126 m. 1457 Ebert 1827, no. 227; cat.;
 Toniolo 2016, 241-247 with 529 plate 10
 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – etiam nullam spem* between 9, 15, 5 *in*
parietibus and *aut in tecto vitii cetera mihi probabuntur. Vale* (these
 words repeated after 9, 15, 5 *in parietibus* by a corrector with *cetera mi-*
hi transposed); two bifolia missing between 13, 29, 7 *potui ad te* and 47
mihi gratissimum fuerit
- Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 135 m. 1454- Ebert 1827, no. 229; cat.
 central bifolium of second *quaternio* reversed (ff. 12-13); 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3
non me hercules – si nullam spem both after 8, 17 and after 9, 15 (with
sui illam spem); in the latter place an extended quire (ff. 73-85, stub
 after 76)
- Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 154 ch. xv Ebert 1827, no. 228; cat.

⁷⁸ Mendelssohn 1893, xxvii n. 1, grouped this manuscript with Dresden Dc 112, perhaps because it has nothing of Book 8 at the end of 9, 15 (if so, an inadequate reason) and omits 13, 61-67 (if so, an inadequate reason again; see Reeve 2024, 16 n. 31). I did not carry out enough collation in what it has of Books 9-13 to decide whether his view can nevertheless stand.

omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 *non me hercules – si nullam spem*; Book 14 after Book 8 and in the right place; no omission or dislocation towards the end of Book 13⁷⁹

- Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 206 m. xv¹ Ebert 1827, no. 230; cat.
 Books 1-2 lost; omits 5, 20, 7, 23-25, Book 8, like Vat. Chig. H VIII 252,
 but does not indicate where Book 9 starts
- *Wrocław Univ. Mil. IV 7 ch. xv^{med.}
 descendant of **P**
- *Wrocław Univ. Rehd. 66 m. xv^{3/4} cat.
 8, 3, 1-8, 9, 3 *si nullam spem* + 9, 15, 5 *aut – probabuntur. Vale* after 8, 17
- *Wrocław Univ. Rehd. 68 ch. xv^{2/4} cat.
 related to B. L. Arundel 9 and Bodl. Clarke 24 early in the text, but with
 the usual transposition in Book 8; omits 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3

⁷⁹ I mention this because Mendelssohn 1893, xxvii n. 1, groups the manuscript with Dresden Dc 112. Either he was wrong (perhaps misled by the repetition of Book 14) or I did not carry out enough collation. The omission of 8, 2, 1-8, 9, 3 proves nothing if Books 9-16 do not descend from **M**; see n. 64.

Dated or datable manuscripts

- 1392 Laur. 49, 7
 1392 Vat. Lat. 1688
 1410 Vat. Pal. Lat. 1496
 1420 Florence Laur. 49, 6
 1421 Bologna Univ. 2283
 1421 Vat. Chig. H VIII 252
 1423 Rome Cors. 43 D 19
 1423(?) Paris B. N. Lat. 6347
 1424 Naples Naz. IV B 42
 1427± Pistoia A 7
 1428 Oxford Magd. 83
 1428 Paris B. N. Lat. 16247
 1430- Vat. Pal. Lat. 1499
 1431- Longleat 284^a
 1432-1434 Bryn Mawr Gordan 5
 1433 Madrid Pal. II 76
 1434 Naples Naz. IV B 24bis
 1436 Bologna Univ. 467
 1441 Florence Laur. Edili 215
 1442 Brussels B. R. 530
 1442 Christie's 30.7.2020 lot 13
 1442 Oxford Bodl. Lat. class. e 4
 1442 Rouen 1110
 1443 Florence Ricc. 556
 1444- New York Columbia X87.C48
 1444 London B. L. Add. 11928
 1444-1449 Munich C. L. M. 6718
 1445 Bologna Univ. 2592
 1446- Oxford Linc. Lat. 41
 1446 London B. L. Arund. 9
 1447? New York Public Library 140
 1447-1448- Vat. Barb. Lat. 80
 1448- Modena Est. Lat. 226
 1448 Vat. Vat. Lat. 1684
 1449 Bodl. E. D. Clarke 24
 1450 Milan Trivulz. 808
 1450 Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 211
 1452 Modena Est. Lat. 279
 1453 Rome Vallicell. R 43
 1453 Vat. Urb. Lat. 316
 1454- Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 135
 1454 Sotheby's 1.12.98 lot 91
 1455 Esc. V III 20
 1455 London B. L. Add. 11929
 1456 Lucca Capit. VIII 528
 1456 Modena Est. Lat. 928
 1457 Paris B. N. Lat. 8523
 1457 Wolfenbüttel Aug. 4, 2, 1 2^o
 1457 Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 126
 1458 Paris B. N. Lat. 10337
 1460- Vat. Barb. Lat. 141
 1460 Berlin lat. fol. 309
 1460 Kraków Jagiell. 929
 1461 Cava dei Tirreni 59
 1462 Naples Naz. IV B 30
 1462 Canon. Class. Lat. 225
 1462 Vat. Vat. Lat. 1690
 1463 Laur. Fies. 186
 1464 Naples Naz. IV B 31
 1464 Vat. Chig. H VIII 251
 1466 Cremona Stat. 179
 1466 Rylands 63
 1467 Bologna Univ. 2229
 1467 Lucca Capit. VIII 538
 1467 Venice Marc. Lat. Z. 426
 1468 Esc. V III 15
 1468 Florence Laur. Plut. 49, 17
 1468 Paris B. N. Lat. 10338
 1468 Philadelphia Lewis E 66
 1469- B. L. Harl. 5062
 1469 Florence Ricc. 540
 1469 Lucca Capit. VIII 551
 1469 Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1176
 1470 Prague Univ. VIII D 16 (1511)
 1471 Cambridge Fitzw. Mus. McClean 152
 1472- Florence Naz. II I 65
 1472 Berlin Ham. 167
 1473 Dresden Dc 114
 1480- Vat. Pal. Lat. 598
 1488 Carpentras 434



Bibliography

- Ammirati 2015: S. Ammirati, *Sul libro latino antico: ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche*, Roma 2015.
- Avril-Gousset 2005: F. Avril, M.-Th. Gousset, *Manuscripts illuminés d'origine italienne 3: XIV^e siècle I. Lombardie-Ligurie*, Paris 2005.
- Avril-Gousset 2012: F. Avril, M.-Th. Gousset, *Manuscripts illuminés d'origine italienne 3: XIV^e siècle II. Émilie-Vénétie*, Paris 2012.
- Babcock 2012: R. G. Babcock, *A new fragment of Cicero's Epistulae ad familiares (Book 13, epistles 6 and 7)*, «Codices manuscripti» 84, 2012, 1-5.
- Bandini 2021: M. Bandini, *Preliminari a una ricerca sull'umanista lucchese Lodovico Vannuccori (ca. 1440-1510/13)*, «Codex studies» 5, 2021, 75-92.
- Barile 1994: E. Barile, *Littera antiqua e scritture alla greca: notai e cancellieri copisti a Venezia nei primi decenni del Quattrocento*, Venezia 1994.
- Benedict 1790: T. F. Benedict, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistolarum octo priores libri*, Leipzig 1790.
- Benedict 1795: T. F. Benedict, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistolarum octo posteriores libri*, Leipzig 1795.
- Berry 1989: D. H. Berry, *Gulielmus and the Erfurtensis of Cicero: new readings for Pro Sulla*, «CQ» 39, 1989, 400-407.
- Binnebeke 2010-2011: X. van Binnebeke, *Payne & Foss, Sir Thomas Phillipps and the manuscripts of San Marco*, «SMU» 8-9, 2010-2011, 9-38.
- Binnebeke 2020: X. van Binnebeke, *Manuscript production in Florence*, in F. T. Coulson, R. G. Babcock (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Latin palaeography*, Oxford 2020, 832-849.
- Burton 2007: G. Burton, *From ars dictaminis to ars conscribendi epistolis [sic]: Renaissance letter-writing manuals in the context of humanism*, in C. Poster, L. C. Mitchell (eds.), *Letter-writing manuals and instruction from Antiquity to the present: historical and bibliographical studies*, Columbia (SC) 2007, 88-101.
- Ceccherini 2016: I. Ceccherini, *Sozomeno da Pistoia (1387-1458): scrittura e libri di un umanista*, Firenze 2016.
- Clough 1962: C. H. Clough, *More light on Pandolfo and Ludovico Ariosto*, «Italia» 39, 1962, 195-196.
- Costanza-Foti 1974: S. Costanza, M. B. Foti, *I codici manoscritti del Museo Nazionale di Messina*, Messina 1974.
- Cursi 2007: M. Cursi, *Boccaccio: autografie vere o presunte. Novità su tradizione e trasmissione delle sue opere*, «Studi romanzi» 3, 2007, 135-163.
- Daneloni 1995: A. Daneloni, *Niccolò Niccoli, Angelo Poliziano ed il Laur. Plut. 49, 7*, «Rinascimento» 35, 1995, 327-342.



Daneloni 2008: A. Daneloni in De Robertis 2008.

Daneu Lattanzi 1984: A. Daneu Lattanzi, *I manoscritti ed incunaboli miniati della Sicilia*, Palermo 1984.

De Robertis 1985: D. De Robertis, *Iohannes Carpensius / Giovanni da Carpi*, in *Tradizione classica e letteratura umanistica. Per Alessandro Perosa*, Roma 1985, I, 255-296.

De Robertis et al. 2008: T. De Robertis, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi, *Coluccio Salutati e l'invenzione dell'umanesimo*, Firenze 2008.

De Robertis 2016: T. De Robertis, *I primi anni della scrittura umanistica. Materiali per un aggiornamento*, in R. Black, J. Kraye, L. Nuvoloni (eds.), *Palaeography, manuscript illumination and humanism in Renaissance Italy: studies in memory of A. C. de la Mare*, London 2016, 55-95.

Ebert 1827: F. A. Ebert, *Zur Handschriftenkunde* II, Leipzig 1827.

Faye-Bond 1962: *Supplement* of C. U. Faye and W. H. Bond, New York 1962, to de Ricci-Wilson.

Ferrari 2016: M. Ferrari, *Archeologia del libro: frammenti di Cicerone nella biblioteca del Capitolo Metropolitano di Milano*, in S. Lusuwardi Siena, C. Perassi, F. Sacchi, M. Sannazaro (a cura di), *Archeologia classica e post-classica tra Italia e Mediterraneo: scritti in ricordo di M. P. Rossignani*, Milano 2016, 627-633.

Fiocco 1964: G. Fiocco, *La biblioteca di Palla Strozzi*, in *Studi di bibliografia e di storia in onore di T. De Marinis*, Verona 1964, II 289-310.

First report 1874: *First report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, London 1874.

Furietti 1723: G. A. Furietti, *Gasparini Barzizii Bergomatis et Guiniforti filii opera*, Roma 1723.

Gionta 2016: D. Gionta, *Graeca umanistici in codici antichi di Cicerone e Columella*, «SMU» 14, 2016, 297-335.

Gionta 2019: D. Gionta, *Fortune umanistiche del più antico manoscritto delle Familiari ciceroniane*, in P. De Paolis (a cura di), *L'esegesi ciceroniana fra Tardo Antico e Umanesimo*, Cassino 2019, 65-90.

Graevius 1684: J. G. Graevius, *M. Tullii Ciceronis epistolarum libri XVI ad familiares ut vulgo vocantur*, Amstelodami 1684.

Gruterus 1618: J. Gruterus, *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia quae exstant*, Hamburgi 1618.

Guth 2004: W. Guth, *Bibliotheksgeschichte des Landes Sachsen-Anhalt*, Halle (Saale) 2004.

IGI: *Indice generale degli incunaboli delle biblioteche d'Italia*, Roma 1943-1981.

ISTC: *Incunabula short title catalogue*, on line from the British Library.

- Jeudy-Riou 1989: C. Jeudy, Y.-F. Riou, *Les manuscrits classiques latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Paris 1989.
- Ker 1977: N. R. Ker, *Medieval manuscripts in British libraries II*, Oxford 1977.
- Kirner 1901: G. Kirner, *Contributo alla critica del testo delle epistole Ad familiares di Cicerone (l. IX-XVI)*, «SIFC» 9, 1901, 369-433.
- Koncen 1984: J. G. Koncen, *A collation and study of Cicero's Epistulae ad familiares as contained in Codex Vaticanus Latinus 3248*, diss., St Louis Univ. 1984, «DA» 45, 1984, 1742A.
- Krist.: P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, London-Leiden 1963-1997.
- Kristeller 1979: P. O. Kristeller, *Renaissance thought and its sources*, New York 1979.
- Krüger 1871: P. Krüger, *Ciceroniana*, «Hermes» 5, 1871, 146-149.
- Lombardi 1983: G. Lombardi, *Note su Cencio dei Rustici*, in *Scrittura, biblioteche e stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento*, Roma 1983, 23-35.
- Lunelli 2022: E. A. Lunelli, *I Facta et dicta memorabilia di Valerio Massimo in Italia fra Tre e Quattrocento. Catalogo e rassegna dei principali aspetti codicologici e paleografici*, diss. Firenze 2022 (on line).
- Manion 1984: M. M. Manion, V. F. Vines, *Medieval and Renaissance illuminated manuscripts in Australian collections*, Melbourne 1984.
- Manutius 1579: P. Manutius, *In epistolas M. Tullii Ciceronis quae familiares vocantur Paulli Manutii commentarius*, Venetiis 1579.
- Mazzatinti: G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, Firenze 1890-1997.
- Mecacci 2006: E. Mecacci, *Alcune notizie sul fondo manoscritti della raccolta Maffei*, in M. Ascheri, G. Colli (a cura di), *Manoscritti, editoria e biblioteche dal Medioevo all'età contemporanea: studi offerti a D. Maffei per il suo ottantesimo compleanno*, Roma 2006, II, 731-834.
- Mendelssohn 1884¹: L. Mendelssohn, *Zur überlieferung von Ciceros briefen*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 30, 1884, 108-110.
- Mendelssohn 1884²: L. Mendelssohn, *Weiteres zur überlieferung von Ciceros briefen*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 30, 1884, 845-855.
- Mendelssohn 1893: L. Mendelssohn, *M. Tulli Ciceronis epistularum libri sedecim*, Leipzig 1893.
- Mercer 1969: R. G. G. Mercer, *The teaching of Gasparino Barzizza with special reference to his place in Paduan humanism*, London 1979.
- Murano 2024: G. Murano, *Florentine humanistic manuscripts: revised and enlarged list from Albinia de la Mare*, New research (1985), Firenze 2024.
- Nardo 1965-1966: D. Nardo, *Le correzioni nei due codici medicei 49,7 e 49,9 delle Familiars di Cicerone (una terza tradizione diretta?)*, «AIV» 124, 1965-1966, 337-397.

- NBM: *Nuova biblioteca manoscritta* (of manuscripts in the Veneto) on line.
- Nogara 1912: B. Nogara, *Codices Vaticani Latini, tomus III: Codices 1461-2059*, Roma 1912.
- Orsino 2023: S. Orsino, *La biblioteca della Badia fiorentina*, Firenze 2023.
- Ouy 1978: G. Ouy, *In search of the earliest traces of French humanism: the evidence from codicology*, «The Library Chronicle» 43, 1978, 3-38.
- Pächt-Alexander: O. Pächt, J. J. G. Alexander, *Illuminated manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford 2: Italian school*, Oxford 1970.
- Peebles 1964: B. M. Peebles, *The Ad Maronis mausoleum: Petrarch's Virgil and two fifteenth-century manuscripts*, in C. Henderson Jr (ed.), *Classical mediaeval and Renaissance studies in honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, Roma 1964, II 169-198.
- Pellegrin 1975-2010: É. Pellegrin and others, *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, Paris 1975-2010.
- Pigman 1981: G. W. Pigman III, *Barzizza's studies of Cicero*, «Rinascimento» 2, 21, 1981, 123-163.
- Pirrone 1903: N. Pirrone, *Un codice delle Epistolae ad familiares di Cicerone nel Museo Com. di Messina*, «SIFC» 11, 1903, 447-454.
- Platner 1900: S. B. Platner, *The manuscripts of the letters of Cicero to Atticus in the Vatican Library*, «AJP» 21, 1900, 420-432.
- Politian 1489: A. Politianus, *Miscellaneorum centuria prima*, Florentiae 1489.
- Prete 1960: Serafino Prete, *I codici della Biblioteca Comunale di Fermo*, Firenze 1960.
- Reeve 1992: M. D. Reeve, *The Turin palimpsest of Cicero*, «Aevum» 66, 1992, 87-94.
- Reeve 2012: M. D. Reeve, *Excerpts from Pliny's Natural history*, in P. F. Alberto, D. Paniagua (eds.), *Ways of approaching knowledge in late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages: Schools and scholarship*, Nordhausen 2012, 245-263.
- Reeve 2024: M. D. Reeve, [Five fragments of Cicero's letters Ad familiares](#), «COL» 8, 1, 2024, 9-25.
- Reggi 2022: G. Reggi, *Tradizione milanese delle Ad familiares di Cicerone: le due mani del codice di Lugano, fra conservatorismo e restauri testuali antecedenti il Poliziano*, «Fogli» 43, 2022, 26-66.
- Reggi 2023: G. Reggi, [Review of Cicero, Opera omnia](#), ed. Andreas Cratander, Basel 1528, with an introductory essay by C. Scheidegger Lämmle and G. Manuwald, «COL» 7, 1, 2023, 581-590.
- Reggi 2024: G. Reggi, [Tradizione delle Ad familiares e cultura umanistica: Coluccio Salutati, Niccolò Niccoli, Guarino, i Barzizza](#), «COL» 8, 1, 2024, 27-84.
- de Ricci-Wilson 1935-1940: S. de Ricci, W. J. Wilson, *Census of medieval and Renaissance manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, New York 1935-1940.

- Riesenweber 2024: Th. Riesenweber, [*Die Geschichte des De inventione-Textes im Altertum*](#), «COL» 8, 2, 2024, 483-533.
- Rota 2018: G. Rota, *The textual tradition of Cicero's Epistulae ad Brutum, ad Quintum fratrem and ad Atticum*, diss., Cambridge 2018.
- Rotili 1978: M. Rotili, *La miniatura nella badia di Cava 2*, Cava dei Tirreni 1978.
- Rubio 1984: L. Rubio, *Catálogo de los manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España*, Madrid 1984.
- Rühl 1883: F. Rühl, *Vermischte bemerkungen (fortsetzung)*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 29, 1883, 735-752.
- Sabbadini 1885: R. Sabbadini, *Storia del ciceronianismo e di altre questioni letterarie nell'età della rinascenza*, Torino 1885.
- Sabbadini 1995: R. Sabbadini, *Opere minori I: Classici e umanisti da codici latini inesplorati*, Padova 1995, I: *Spogli ambrosiani latini*, 1-233, a revised version of «SIFC» 11, 1903, 165-388.
- Samaran-Marichal 1974: C. Samaran, R. Marichal, *Manuscripts datés III*, Paris 1974.
- Schenkl: H. Schenkl, *Bibliotheca patrum Latinorum Britannica III*, 3, Wien 1905.
- Schmidt 1974: P. L. Schmidt, *Die Überlieferung von Ciceros Schrift De legibus in Mittelalter und Renaissance*, München 1974.
- SDBM: Schoenberg database of manuscripts (run by the University of Pennsylvania).
- Speranzi 2016: D. Speranzi, *Poliziano, i codici di Filelfo, la Medicea privata. Tre schede*, in P. Viti (a cura di), *Cultura e filologia di Angelo Poliziano*, Firenze 2016, 51-68.
- Stangl 1912: Th. Stangl, *Ciceronis orationum scholiastae II*, Vindobonae-Lipsiae 1912.
- Thomas 1896: P. Thomas, *Catalogue des manuscrits de classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles*, Gand 1896.
- Thomas 1963: A. G. Thomas, *Fine books*, Catalogue 12, London 1963.
- Toniolo 2016: F. Toniolo, *Word and image: Italian illuminations in the manuscripts of the [sic] Marquard Gude's collection at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel* in P. Carmassi (hrsg.), *Retter der Antike: Marquard Gude (1635-1689) auf der Suche nach den Klassikern*, Wiesbaden 2016, 217-261.
- Ullman 1960: B. L. Ullman, *The origin and development of humanistic script*, Roma 1960.
- Ullman 1963: B. L. Ullman, *The humanism of Coluccio Salutati*, Padova 1963.
- Villa 1992: C. Villa, *I manoscritti di Orazio. I*, «Aevum» 66, 1992, 95-135.
- Viti 1997: P. Viti, *Filelfo, Francesco*, *DBI* 47, 1997, 613-626.

- Völkel 1877: J. Völkel, *Zu Livius*, «Jahrbücher für classische Philologie» 23, 1877, 851-857.
- Watson 1984: A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of dated and datable manuscripts c. 435-1600 in Oxford libraries*, Oxford 1984.
- Witt 1982: R. G. Witt, *Medieval ars dictaminis and the beginnings of humanism: a new construction of the problem*, «Renaissance Quarterly» 35, 1982, 1-35.
- Wittek 1976: M. Wittek, *Manuscripts classiques latins à la Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}. Acquisitions récentes (1961-1975)*, in G. Cambier (éd.), *Hommages à A. Boutemy*, Bruxelles 1976, 444-448.

Postscript

Just published (May 2025): A. Giuliano, *Per la storia umanistica del Laur. 49, 9. Cencio de' Rustici e i graeca delle Familiars di Cicerone*, «S. M. U.» 21, 2023, 129-188. From a draft that she had kindly sent me I learnt of two manuscripts absent from my list: *Vat. Lat. 1495, ff. 17r-67v, which has only 1, 1, 1 – 3, 8, 9 *de rebus urbanis quod* (end of page) but was plainly meant to continue, because ff. 68-140 are blank, and London B. L. Add. 11927, which must have dropped out by a *saut du même au même* at an early stage of my work. The latter has 8, 10 before the whole of 8, 2, omits 8, 3-9, and has 8, 17 before 16; on looking again at its close relative *Prague Nat. VIII D 16, I see that it too omits 8, 3-9 and has 8, 17 before 16 but also embeds disorder in its text between 8, 11, 2 *nam furnius et* and the beginning of 9, 4.