

*pequaria* of the same inscription for *pecuaria*; *relicium* viii. 2728 (152 A.D.); *ecus* eph. ep. vii. no. 309, an inscription from Thereste in Africa which according to viii. p. 215 did not become a Roman Colony until about the end of the second century.

Taking all the evidence together it seems well nigh certain that *ecus* was the regular pronunciation throughout the first century, and highly probable that this also remained the usual spelling. Of the two fads of the grammarians, *equs* was not in accord with the usual system of orthography, *equus* not in accord with the pronunciation of the time. And so to follow our principles

strictly we ought to write *ecus*. But the fact that at least the spelling *equus* was not unknown in the first century may seem to many a sufficient excuse for retaining it and not introducing in our schoolbooks a set of forms which would perhaps trouble our students as much as they did the Roman grammarians. At all events it is clear that the necessity of reform is not so great as it was in the case of *quum* which was not invented before the fourth century, and then had only a limited vogue, not being recognized by Priscian for example.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

*University of Chicago.*

(*To be continued.*)

#### THE LITERARY DISCOVERIES OF POGGIO.

A GREAT deal of interest has recently been excited by two Madrid MSS. (X. 81, M. 31), which contain Asconius and Valerius Flaccus, Manilius and the *Silvae* of Statius respectively. These are not written in the same hand, but, as is shown by a list of contents on the first page of M. 31, were once bound up together in one volume. The way was led by Professor Ellis, who in 1892 collated the Manilius, and in 1893 published an article in *Hermathena* (No. xix pp. 261-286) demonstrating the value of the MS., and gave a full collation of it in the *Classical Review*. Dr. Moritz Krohn of Zittau, who has for some years been occupied upon the *Silvae* of Statius, was in 1895 fortunate enough to obtain for the period of three months the loan of both MSS., a privilege denied to English scholars. In 1896 I collated, while in Madrid, X. 81 (containing Asconius and Valerius Flaccus), and in the July number of the *Classical Review* published an article upon Asconius, in which I showed that the Madrid MS., which I termed  $\mu$ , is itself the archetype of all MSS. of this author belonging to the Poggian family.<sup>1</sup> I abstained from pronouncing as to whether it was or was not written by Poggio himself, because, although the internal evidence pointed strongly to this conclusion, the hand differs from the published specimens of his writing. I thought, however, that certain notes in the margin

were probably written by him. Shortly after the appearance of this article I received several letters from Dr. Krohn, in which he informed me that he had independently come to the same conclusion, but that he went further than I had done and identified the writing with that of Poggio. He arrived at this conclusion by the aid of a Berlin MS. containing Cicero's Letters to Atticus (Berol. Hamilton 166) written by Poggio in 1408, in which the superscriptions and *marginalia* are written in a hand which differs from that employed for the text, and is in his opinion identical with that in which the text of X. 81 is written. He considered these two hands to represent the *manus bellissima* and *manus velox* of Poggio respectively.

I did not proceed to examine the case of Valerius Flaccus, partly because I had no desire to further anticipate Dr. Krohn, and partly because I was conscious of certain difficulties. The first reason no longer exists, since Dr. Krohn has given up his intention of editing the *Silvae* and handed over his materials to a successor. Quite recently, also, Mr. Souter has published a collation of the *Silvae* made by himself in August 1898, the work being undertaken for the managers of the Craven Fund at Cambridge [*Classical Review*, Nov., Dec. 1898].

I have, therefore, gone through my collation of Valerius Flaccus and now proceed to set forth the results. Before, however, doing this I would briefly dismiss the one MS. of Asconius belonging to the Poggian

<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* of all MSS. except Laur. plut. liv. 5, which represents a copy taken by Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano, and the Pistoia MS. (Forteguerris 37) attributed by Kiessling and Schoell to Sozomenus.

family of which, in my article, I spoke with some reserve, *viz.* the *Leidensis* [L], of which only a few readings are published by Kiessling and Schoell. By the great kindness of Dr. de Vries this was lent to the Bodleian Library for my use. I found that it also is without any possibility of doubt derived from  $\mu$ . It contains in its text various corrections scribbled in  $\mu$  by different hands. In the notable case (p. 78, 6 KS.) the note which is found in the margin of  $\mu$  in somewhat illegible cursive—*Vincis me: itaque puto non defendisse, sed tantum de defendendo cogitasse, quod per epistolam negari non potest*—reappears in the margin of L written in large letters by the rubricator, while *vincis* is corrupted to *antis*. A marginal analysis written in  $\mu$  in a thin and delicate hand from time to time is reproduced in L by the rubricator, while conjectures found in  $\mu$  are continually followed. To give a single instance, p. 76, 27. *male de populo Romano*]  $\mu$  gives *male cie tr.*, and above the line in small letters *c* [*i.e.*, *credimus*] *de re p.* L has *de re p.* To multiply examples would be needless.

Since the appearance of my article I have made some study of Poggio's hand. There are at Florence, in the Laurentian Library, three MSS. written by him [plut. xlviij., 22, l. 31, lxvii., 15], while the Vatican Library possesses one undoubted specimen (Vat. 3245).<sup>1</sup> The hand in these is identical with that of Berol. Hamilton 166 both as to the text and the *marginalia*. The result of the examination is to leave me where I started :

<sup>1</sup> Two other Vatican MSS. (Vat. 3330, 3331), containing the 3rd and 4th Decads of Livy, are reputed to have been written by Poggio, on the strength of an entry to that effect on the first page of each of them, signed F. Ursini. These signatures, I am informed by Father Ehrle, are not the work of Orsini himself, since in his will he directs that his name should be put into his books. I reject the ascription of these MSS. to Poggio. The hand is quite different, being larger and coarser. The writer was an ignorant person who misspells common words, writing *e.g.* *Sciiklam* for *Siciklam* (3330, f. 1). Poggio nowhere signs his name, as he does in the MSS. mentioned above. Further, the dates at which the MSS. were written, *viz.* 1453 and 1455 are strongly against the statement. In 1455 Poggio would be 75 years of age. His letters ten years earlier are full of complaints about his bad sight and the trouble of writing. Thus in July 1444, he says—*superiora in librarij manu. Nam et anni suadent scribendi laborem subterfugere et accurate litteras componere est mihi difficillimum tum oculorum tum manus culpa* (MS. Riccard. 759, f. 191 b), and some years earlier, *superiora sunt librariorum manu. Nam raptim cum scripsissem rescribendae litterae fuerunt, quod mihi est difficillimum. Laborem enim in diem libentius declino, scribendi manu mea praesertim* (f. 173).

namely, that, although I am prepared to accept the identification proposed by Dr. Krohn, if it is adopted by experts, I am not willing to make it myself. I regard it as very probable, in view of the internal evidence, but am not convinced on grounds of handwriting. The fact is that the *marginalia* in the various MSS. written by Poggio are themselves for the most part in a formal hand, and, though they often approximate to that in which the text of  $\mu$  is written, are not really specimens of his *manus velox*. Until we have an undoubted specimen of a MS. written by Poggio *manu veloci* the question cannot be finally settled.

Kiessling and Schoell say nothing as to the fate of Poggio's transcript after it was sent to Italy. I find, however, that it was for a long time in the possession of Niccolo Niccoli. In a letter written in 1427 Poggio says, *expecto Valerium Flaccum, Pedianum, et Varronem, quae forsitan transcribam, ni distuleris in huiusmodi* [ed. Tonelli, p. 209]. Two years later he reproaches Niccolo with having kept his Asconius for twelve years, *i.e.* ever since it reached Italy (p. 303). In the same letter he says that, if he gets the Asconius, he will have a copy made and return it to Niccolo. As his complaints cease after this, we may presume that he was successful. At any rate the MS. was for at least thirteen years in the hands of Niccolo.

A curious feature of  $\mu$  is that, before any copies of it were taken, a large number of corrections and annotations were entered in it by more than one writer. This is proved by the fact that all these corrections and annotations are adopted in the later MSS. As Niccolo was a good textual critic, it is probable that many of these proceeded from him during the thirteen years in question. An interesting fact is that in  $\mu$  several

conjectures are introduced by the symbol *c*. This also occurs in the celebrated MS. of the Letters to Atticus (Med. xlix. 18) which passed into the possession of Niccolo from that of Coluccio Salutati. Schmidt holds

that *c* in Med. xlix. 18, stands for Coluccius, and draws important conclusions as to the critical methods of Coluccio.<sup>1</sup> I would suggest that in both MSS. it marks conjectures of Niccolo Niccoli: as elsewhere in  $\mu$  conjectures are introduced by *credo*, *c* probably = *credimus*.

<sup>1</sup> O. E. Schmidt, die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Briefe Ciceros an Atticus, pp. 32-34 (Leipzig, 1887).

I now come to the case of Valerius Flaccus. I started with a full expectation that here also  $\mu$  would appear to be the archetype of the *apographa Sangallensia*. Since, however, I did not wish to assume anything without proof, I proceeded to examine the MSS. Thilo enumerates four of these. Three are in the Vatican library (Vat. 1613, 1614, Ottoboni 1258). The fourth belongs to the library of my own college. The first two contain Valerius Flaccus only, while Ott. and the Queen's College MS., which I term Q, also contain Silius Italicus, an author found at this period by Poggio or, as is more generally believed, by his colleague,<sup>1</sup> Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano. Of the three Italian MSS. Thilo considers Ott. the best, but as its value is much injured by erasures and alterations, he only collated it for Book ii. He collated Vat. 1613 throughout, while he dismisses Vat. 1614, which is a *gemellus*, with a few words. He had no collation of Q.<sup>2</sup> His system of nomenclature is very confusing. In Books i. iii. and iv. he terms Vat. 1613 P, but in ii. calls it  $\pi$ , and transfers the symbol P to Ott. In the following remarks  $\pi^1 =$  Vat. 1613,  $\pi^2 =$  Vat. 1614, Ott. = Ottoboni, Q. = the Queen's College MS. and  $\mu$ , as previously, the Madrid MS. The rarity of MSS. copied from the *Sangallensis* is without doubt due to the fact that the celebrated Vatican MS. (Vat. 3277, ninth century, known as V), which appears to have been shortly afterwards brought to Italy, contains eight books of the *Argonautica*, and so was naturally copied in preference to the apographs of the *Sangallensis*, which ended at iv. 317.

Of these MSS.  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  present no difficulty. That  $\pi^1$  is derived from  $\mu$  is proved by the fact that a large omission in  $\pi^1$  (ii. 324-406) occupies exactly two pages (ff. 78 b, 79 a) in  $\mu$ .<sup>3</sup> No other origin is possible for

<sup>1</sup> F. Barbaro to Poggio (*Epp.* 1. 1), *quia te et Bartholomaeum ad hoc munus obeundum summi Romanae ecclesiae principes delectos publice dimiserunt*: in another passage addressing Poggio he speaks of the ancient authors whom *Bartholomaeo, collega tuo, adiutore... in Latium reduxisti*. For the special connection of Bartholomeo with Silius, v. *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> This MS. was collated for Silius Italicus by Blass in 1870. Blass attaches great value to it for Silius, considering it the best of one of the two groups of uncontaminated MSS. It has not been collated for Valerius Flaccus by any modern scholar.

<sup>3</sup> It must not be thought that this is the only proof. I could fill pages with illustrations of the way in which corrections of the first hand in  $\mu$  are accepted in  $\pi^1$  or *proprii errores* are reproduced. For the sake of brevity I confine myself to this, the most striking, proof.

$\pi^2$ , which is a *gemellus*. The relation of  $\mu$  to its apographs is curiously different in the case of Asconius and that of Valerius Flaccus. In that of the former most of the criticism represented by notes and corrections in various hands is prior to the time when it was first copied. In that of Valerius Flaccus corrections of the first hand are sometimes not followed, those of later hands but rarely, while the MS. has itself suffered from much posterior criticism in the shape of erasures and alterations. Thus  $\pi^1 \pi^2$  are often of use as containing a reading tampered with or obliterated in  $\mu$ . Thus in i. 303, where  $\pi^1$  has *Hiaonique* (*Hiaonique* V), in  $\mu$  a recent hand has entered *Chaonique*, *in ras.* So i. 389  $\pi^1$  has (with V) *Felevis*, while  $\mu$  has *Et levis Elis*, also by a recent hand, *in ras.* The writer of  $\pi^1$  did his work faithfully, though sometimes he substitutes a word, e.g. ii. 121 *libidine* (*cupidine* V  $\mu$  *cett*). Beside the large omission ii. 324-406, he also omits i. 819-822, iii. 351, and 717.

An interesting point of difference between  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  is that in many cases where  $\pi^1$  adopts a superscription, or marginal reading in  $\mu$ ,  $\pi^2$  exactly produces  $\mu$ , giving both the original reading found in the text of  $\mu$ , and the correction in the margin. I give a few instances—

	inui
1·288	umida $\mu$ .
330	paucos $\mu$ , <i>in mg.</i> oculos.
374	undantem $\mu$ , <i>in mg.</i> sudantem.
713	eductus $\mu$ , <i>in mg.</i> et luctus.

In each of this  $\pi^2$  is a facsimile of  $\mu$ , while  $\pi^1$  adopts the correction, and does not record the original reading.

On the other hand,  $\pi^2$  has been frequently corrected from Q Ott. or V, while in  $\pi^1$  there is no trace of contamination. I give the following instances:—

- i. 527. *flectens*  $\mu\pi^1$  Q, *fientes* V,  $\pi^2$  *in textu*, *in mg.* at. *flectens*.
552. *effusa*  $\mu\pi^1$ , *hiberna* V Q Ott.,  $\pi^2$  *in textu*, *in mg.* at. *effusa*.
- ii. 49. *pergimus*  $\mu\pi$ , *derigimus* V  $\pi^2$ , *dirigimus* Q Ott.

It thus appears that  $\pi^2$  represents a later stage in the development of the Poggian recension than  $\pi^1$ . That both the MSS. were copied not directly from  $\mu$ , but from an apograph of it now lost, appears likely from the following passage:

- i. 28. *pecudum*  $\mu$ , *pecodum*  $\pi^1$ , *pecodum*  $\pi^2$ .

It is hardly likely that two copyists would independently make the same mistake, and put -o- in the wrong place.

There are some very interesting cases in which  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  follow readings of a second hand in  $\mu$ . Two of these are cases where whole lines were originally omitted in  $\mu$ , viz. i. 198. ii. 149. These are added at the foot of the page in a different hand of equal antiquity. In  $\pi^1\pi^2$ , as well as in Q Ott., they occur in the text. The addition must therefore have been made in  $\mu$  before  $\pi^1\pi^2$  were written. The following is a very curious case:—

- ii. 103. *iam tum ea cum reti crinem subnectitur auro.* V.

Here the original reading of  $\mu$  is

*iam tunica cum crinem subnectitur auro.*

A second hand adds *reti* above the line after *cum*: and *reti* is found in the text of  $\pi^1$ .<sup>1</sup> It is, however, omitted by Q O. The insertion by a second hand in  $\mu$  must therefore be due, either to a renewed examination of the *Sangallensis*, or to conjecture, or it must come from V. The last hypothesis at first sight seems most likely, but, if so, it is odd that *tunica* should be left uncorrected.

The large majority, however, of corrections made in  $\mu$  by a second hand have not passed into  $\pi^1\pi^2$ . These are too numerous to mention. I would merely remark that it is the exception to find them followed. A good many alterations which in my collation I have marked as proceeding from the first hand are likewise not adopted in  $\pi^1$ . I instance the following:—

- i. 178. *sede*  $\mu$ , *sede*  $\pi^1\pi^2$  Q.

252. *funduntur ex funguntur*  $\mu$ , *funguntur* V  $\pi^1\pi^2$ , *surguntur* Q.

- iv. 237. *ferans*  $\mu$ , *ferans*  $\pi^1$  Q.

It was natural to expect that Q Ott., the remaining apographs of the *Sangallensis*, would also turn out to be derived from  $\mu$ . These two MSS. are very closely connected. As previously mentioned, they both contain Silius Italicus as well as Valerius Flaccus. Also, whereas  $\pi^1$  and  $\pi^2$  are the work of *docti homines*, Q and Ott. were written by ignorant copyists. This is especially true

<sup>1</sup> My collation of  $\pi^2$  was incomplete; and I have not noted its reading here. This remark applies to other cases where I quote  $\pi^1$  only. For a similar reason I sometimes do not give the reading of Ott., but only of its *gemellus* Q.

of Q. A further point is that Q is, in my judgment, not written in an ordinary Italian hand.

The nature of the agreement between Q and Ott. may be best seen in Book ii., since in this Thilo has published the variants of Ott. I find in his notes, omitting some trivial cases of orthography, some 50 cases in which Ott. disagrees with  $\pi$ . In 36 of these Q agrees with Ott., 13 are *proprii errores* on the part of Ott., and there remains only one real difference.

- ii. 247. *irruerant* Q., *inruerant* Ott. (*inruerant*<sup>a</sup> Vb, *inruerant*  $\mu$ , *inruerant* Va).

The ignorance peculiar to Q Ott. may be illustrated from the following errors:—

- i. 498. *siderea tunc arce]* *sidera* Q Ott.  
521. *abnuit* Inoas] *audiunt* Q Ott.  
583. *Acamas]* *amans* Q Ott. [*acamans* V, *adamas*  $\mu$ ].  
597. *proturbat]* *poturbat* Q Ott.  
668. *par regia caelo]* *regio* Q Ott.  
ii. 57. *nullus in ore rubor]* *robur* Q Ott.  
437. *adytisque]* *additusque* Q Ott.

The writer of Q does not appear to have known Latin. I instance the following blunders:—i. 607. *carcabasa* Q (*carbasa* Ott.); 717. *discrimi* Q (*discrimina* Ott.); 768. *ferrigine* Q (*ferrugine* Ott.); 829. *pollo* Q (*polo* Ott.); ii. 56. *gradido* Q (*gravidio* Ott.); 119. *sibi sub* Q (*sub* Ott.); 246. *pallacia* Q (*palatia* Ott.). Other errors are i. 152 *saeviet]* *semet*, 157 *agnam]*, *ammam*, 255 *Chiron]* *duron*, 268 *parvus]* *pervus*, 384 *cothurno]* *conturno*. In both MSS. the spelling is odd, but especially in Q. I note the following:—

- i. 611 *yppotades* Q, *ippo-* Ott., 672 *ymago* Q, *imago* Ott., 552 *Troyam* Q, *Troiam* Ott., ii. 228 *choruscet* Q, *coruscet* Ott. Such spellings as *Grayo*, *Dyane*, *ponthus*, *sompnus* are frequent.

The theory naturally suggests itself that the discrepancies found in Q Ott. are due to the ignorance of the writers, and compatible with descent from  $\mu$ . In support of this, passages may be quoted in which Q Ott. appear to have adopted a correction in  $\mu$ . I made out the following list of passages which might appear to point to this conclusion:—

- i. 43. *Aeetes: & a V: et*  $\mu$  *in textu*, *in mg.* *oeta m. 1: oeta*  $\pi$  Q.  
157. *erigit: vegit* V (*ve-* m. 2. *in ras*):  
*erigit*  $\mu$ , *in mg.* *rapit m. 1: erigit*  
Q: *erigit* Ott.: *rapit*  $\pi^1\pi^2$ .

202. illum ego tu : *illi mi \* \* tu* V :  
*illo metu*  $\mu$  : *ille metu*  $\pi$  Q Ott.  
 205. crinem : *crimen* V ; *crimen*  $\mu$  :  
*crinem*  $\pi^1$  Q.  
 229. comarum : *cumarum* V : *cumarum*  
 $\mu$  : *comarum*  $\pi^1$  Q Ott.  
 553. quot : *quod* V : *quod*  $\mu$  : *quos*  $\pi^1$   
 Q Ott.  
 639. Eurus : *euros* V : *euros*  $\mu$  : *eurus*  
 $\pi^1$  Q.  
 759. sic : *si* V : *si*  $\mu$  : *sic*  $\pi^1$  Q.  
 ii. 94. hinc reduci : *hinc rudici* V : *hinc*  
*rudici*  $\mu$  : *huic reduci*  $\pi^1$  : *hinc*  
*reduci* Q Ott.  
 iii. 158. Protin et : *protin et* V : *protinet*  $\mu$  :  
*protinus*  $\pi^1$  Q.  
 610. vina V : *vina*  $\mu$  : *bina*  $\pi^1$  Q.  
 iv. 58. Teucros V : *teneros*  $\mu$  : *tenedos*  $\pi^1$  Q.

These, however, admit of a simple explanation, viz. that the correction was above the line, or in the margin of the *Sangallensis*, and that, while  $\mu$  reproduces both readings, the correction has been adopted in Q.

On the other hand, Q Ott. continually agree with V, and therefore with the *Sangallensis* (which is known to have been its *gemellus*) as against  $\mu$ . This is so, not only in the case of important readings, which might have been introduced from V, e.g.

- i. 495. *secuntur* V Q. : *loquuntur*  $\mu$ .  
 582. *hiberna* V Q Ott. : *effusa*  $\mu$ .  
 ii. 49. *derigimus* V. : *dirigimus* Q Ott. :  
*pergimus*  $\mu$ .  
 50. *ipsa* V Q Ott. : *iam*  $\mu$ .  
 537. *collibus* V Q Ott. : *montibus*  $\mu$ .  
 563. *piacula* V Q Ott. : *pericula*  $\mu$ .

but also in that of *proprii errores*. The following is a typical case :—

- ii. 9. *pabula magnes* : *pabulā agnes* V (*e coll. mea*) : *pabula agnes* Q Ott. : *pabula magnes*  $\mu$  : *pabula magnos*  $\pi^1$ .

Here correction from V and descent from  $\mu$  are equally impossible. This agreement is most frequent in the case of Q, though this MS. was written by a more ignorant scribe than Ott.; I instance the following cases in which V Q agree *solī* :—

- ii. 185. *verbere* : *urbere* V Q.  
 326. *Graiiis* : *gris* V Q.  
 iii. 294. *fatis id* : *fatisia* V Q.  
 431. *bidentes* : *videntes* V Q.

Of these two MSS. Q represents an earlier stage in the development of the recension than Ott. I instance the following :

- i. 141 *subitae de virgine pugnae*] *subita d. v. pugna* Q : *-ae . . . -ae* Ott. *ex -a . . . -a*.  
 ii. 134 *rapidas* V  $\mu$  : *rabidas ex rapidas* Q : *rabidas* Ott. (*e coll. mea*).

Also, the fact that in the margin of Ott. there are a quantity of variants entered by the first hand shows that when it was written there were a number of MSS. in circulation. Thus it has, 1.103 *armorum*, in mg. *arvorum*, 109 *gaudentibus*, in mg. *at. candentibus*, 121 *ad undas*, in mg. *in oras*, 123 *gracili*, in mg. *grandi*. In Q there are no such variants.

Not only is Q nearer to the archetype than Ott., but it has rarely been corrected, whereas Ott. has been tampered with to such an extent that its value is greatly diminished. When Q has been corrected, the correction was first entered in minute letters in the margin, and the alteration was then made, apparently by the original scribe. The reading of the *prima manus* is, however, always legible. It follows that Ott. should disappear from critical notes to Valerius Flaccus, and its place should be taken by Q. I do not assert that Ott. was copied from Q, but I do not find anything inconsistent with such a hypothesis.

The conclusion at which I am forced to arrive is, that Q Ott. are not derived from  $\mu$ , but represent another apograph made from the *Sangallensis*. If we ask by whom, or for whom, this was made, the name which must suggest itself is that of Poggio's colleague in the work of discovery, Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano. We know that Bartolomeo himself made a copy of Asconius (which was found together with Valerius Flaccus at St. Gallen) since a MS. descended from his copy and possessing a *subscriptio* in which his authorship is attested is in existence.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laur. plut. liv. 5. I cannot agree with Kiessling and Schoell who consider that this was written by Bartolomeo himself. It is in a formal hand, quite different from that employed in another MS. (Laur. plut. lxxx. sup. 42) which contains various works written by him at Constance with *subscriptio*es to that effect, which have greater claims to authenticity. The *subscriptio* in liv. 5 occurs on fol. 73b after Asconius, but there are no similar *subscriptio*es to the other works contained in the MS., viz. Ant.

What could be more natural than that he too should have a copy of Valerius? This conjecture is supported by the fact that Bartolomeo is specially connected with Silius Italicus, an author bound up in precisely these two MSS. with Valerius Flaccus, and is, I think, verified by the *provenance* of Ott. This MS. bears in it the name of Joannes Angelus Altaemps. He, as I am informed by Father Ehrle, obtained his books from Marcello Cervini (afterwards Pope Marcello II.) who, like Bartolomeo, was a native of Montepulciano.

Q, then, I would connect with Bartolomeo. That it was written by him is not possible, since he could not make such mistakes as are found in it (and Ott.). I suggest that he had a copy made for him by a local scribe. This would account for the blunders of Q Ott., and also for the fact that there is no *subscriptio* in either of them bearing witness to their connection with him as is the case with the Asconius previously mentioned (Laur. plut. liv. 5). This suggestion derives probability from the fact that his copy of Silius (an author found with Valerius in Q Ott.), is said by Philelfo to have been *manu Germani librarii exscriptus*. It will be recollected that, as previously stated, Q is not written in an ordinary Italian hand. This may mean that the writer was influenced by the style of the 'German scribe,' or it may possibly be the transcript in question.

The result thus arrived at is not without importance, since it follows that  $\mu$  and Q are independent sources of evidence for the readings of the lost *Sangallensis*, which for convenience I call  $\varsigma$ . Where  $\mu$  Q agree we may be satisfied that their reading is that of the archetype. In cases of disagreement the reading which approximates most closely to that of V must be original, in view of the fact that  $\varsigma$  was undoubtedly a *gemellus* of V. The net result is chiefly negative, but it enables us to clear the critical notes to Valerius of much rubbish, which is in itself a gain.

It is the well-known theory of Thilo, arrived at without the help of  $\mu$  and Q, that  $\varsigma$  was itself directly copied from V. It had occurred to me as an objection that V omits iii. 146-185, a passage which occurs in the

Lusci, *Inquisitio Artis in Orationes IV. Ciceronis*, and various speeches of Cicero. Further, the text of this MS. is largely affected by conjectures made in the margin of  $\mu$ . I conclude, therefore, that the *subscriptio* of Bartolomeo was copied, just as that of Poggio has been reproduced in so many of the copies of works discovered by him.

apographs of  $\varsigma$ . I found, however, on examining V, that a page (the second page of the fifth quaternion) has been torn out. As V generally contains 20 lines on a page and the missing passage consists of 40 lines, it is obvious that a folio has been torn out. Father Ehrle pointed out to me that the leaf must have been cut out in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, before the folios were numbered. Thilo's position is greatly strengthened by the results of my collations. Out of eleven instances which he gives to illustrate divergences between V and  $\varsigma$ , three are *proprii errores* of V (1.710, ii. 81, 114), and do not count; in six the first hand of  $\mu$  agrees with V (i. 205, 219, \*232, ii. 67, 80, \*94), as does Q except in the two asterisked cases. In the remaining two cases (ii. 32, 49), the evidence of Q shows that  $\mu$  misrepresents  $\varsigma$ . I cannot, however, regard Thilo's contention as proved. Some of the omissions of  $\varsigma$  are hard to explain if it was copied from V. Thus ii. 236, the omission of *frigore cursus* can only have been due to some obscurity in the archetype. In V, however, *frone cursus* is perfectly legible. Thilo's *certissimum argumentum*, viz. that in ii. 213-263, a passage written twice in V, the *apographa Sangallensia* agree with the first transcript (Va), as against the second (Vb), from which he infers that the writer copied Va and did not go on to compare his text with Vb, is not convincing since the repetition may have been in the common archetype. The number of new readings, however, to be gleaned from the *Sangallensis* is extremely small. This is a subject which I will reserve for another occasion.

I now proceed to discuss some further discoveries made by Poggio, or by Bartolomeo, at this period. Much light is thrown upon these by a letter of Poggio written from Constance at the end of 1417 or early in 1418. I found a copy of this in a Bodleian MS. (Canonici, Misc. 484 ff. 35, 36 b): another mutilated copy exists in a MS. now at Venice (Marciana CL. xii. no 80 f. 130) which is printed by Mittarelli (Bibl. S. Mich. p. 924). As the letter does not appear in any of the edition of Poggio's letters, and the most important parts of it are omitted in the mutilated copy used by Mittarelli, I give it in full. The mutilation may possibly be due to the imprudence with which Poggio expresses himself regarding the new Pope, Martin V. Mr. Horatio Brown has kindly examined the Venetian MS. for me and verified its readings.

V = reading of the Venice MS. Mitt. = readings of Mittarelli, which are not always

accurate. I have to acknowledge several suggestions made to me by Professor Remigio Sabbadini.

Poggius P. S. D. Francisco Barbaro. Si vales, bene est, ego quidem valeo. Matthaëus <Barucius> noster reddidit mihi tuas litteras admodum suavissimas, quibus ego mirifice sum delectatus, tum quia optimi viri officium continebant, tum quia plenae amoris erant atque humanitatis. Nam de gratulatione pontificis quod erat in primo capite epistolae non admodum laboro. Iucunda est mihi quidem propter rem publicam nam si privata<sup>1</sup> respicio, malo vivat<sup>2</sup> ut inquit ille Augusto. Illud paulo molestum fuit quod me de Guarino<sup>3</sup> nostro admones. Credam mihi velim mi Francisce, cupio illum ornari pro meritis suis, id tum requirit amicitia nostra tum virtus sua. Sed quid ego homuncio possum in tanta confusione rerum, ubi non ratio, non virtus sibi locum vindicat, sed fortuna dominatur? Antea pecuniis, nunc ambitione certatur, tantaque est suffragiorum ac tribuum varietas, ut nedum Cato, sed Paulus repulsam ferret. Obiit ille qui doctorum omnium erat asyllum.<sup>4</sup> De reliquis quid dicam nescio: melius est tacere quam pauca loqui, <verum haec ipsa plura quam tempus ferat>. Multa non immutata sunt, sed novata. Gasparinus noster ista tecum melius disputabit, qui vidit, qui a nobis audivit plurima. Ab eo igitur percunctator. Ego <enim si facile esset in eos scribere qui possunt proscribere, ipsemet tibi explicarem quae spes esset habenda doctis, sed forsitan, si vivero, non inultum ferent. Aliquando vindicabo me in libertatem ut ne Iovem<sup>5</sup> quidem tonantem aut fulminantem pertinescam. Nunc et mussanda et ferenda sunt omnia. O sub quam lentis maxillis<sup>6</sup> sed tempore acuentur, et utinam non fiat cena Thyestes (sic). Vide quid aliis sperare queas: ego, qui tam diu in hac tam morata vici patria, quique>, ni forsitan fallor, neque sum in postremis, neque in sordidis,

<lingue crudeles terras et litus avarum  
quaerogue patriam

atque sub sole iacentem  
et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos>

Grave est mihi, sed illud multo gravius,<sup>7</sup> videri indignos quousque <promoveri> deprimi bonos. <praeterea ubi non sis, qui esse soleas, non esse cur esse velis>. Sed de me alias pluribus et, ut opinor, coram. Haec scripsi ut perspicias, <ut> quasi qui oculis vident, Guarino nostro non esse valde laborandum hoc tempore, ut hic aliquid se dignum reperiat. Quantum quisque sua nummorum tenet in arca,

<sup>1</sup> privatam V.

<sup>2</sup> vivat *Mitt.* (-at V). The reference, as Prof. Sabbadini points out to me, is to the saying of Tiberius about Galba (Suet. Galba iv.), *vivat sane, ait, quando id ad nos nihil pertinet*. Poggio is purposely using guarded language, which would be intelligible to his correspondent.

<sup>3</sup> Guarino left Venice when it was visited by the plague in 1416. Prof. Sabbadini suggests that he may have wished to gain a post in the service of the new Pope. At the end of 1418 he settled at Verona.

<sup>4</sup> *i.e.* Cardinal Zabarella, Archbishop of Florence, who died on Sept. 17, 1417. Poggio in his funeral oration says of him *is unus erat maxime ad quem docti homines et Musarum amici sine fastidioso stomacho possent adire*.

<sup>5</sup> This appears to refer to the Pope.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Suet. Tib. ch. xxi., *miserum populum Romanum qui sub tam lentis maxillis erit*, said by Augustus of Tiberius.

<sup>7</sup> honorari indignos quosque V.

tantum habet et fidei. Consulo ut studeat et vacet virtuti, quae si reliqua desint, contenta erit<sup>8</sup> conscientia sua. Quamvis spero aliquando tempus futurum quo suam obtineat dignitatem, nam vel inter malos elucebit. Dixi de Guarino: idem conicere potes de Francisco Braccho<sup>9</sup> quem ego propter virtutem et humanitatem suam tota mente complexus sum. Locutus sum <cum> Cincio<sup>10</sup> nostro de utroque. Is, pro sua in doctos homines benevolentia, omnia respondit se facturum quae ad eorum augendam dignitatem pertineant. Sed quid haec prosunt? Qui nequeunt, vellent bonis bene facere, qui possunt, nolunt. Multi miserantur, nemo succurrit. O quam vellem totam hanc familiam dari mihi obviam, ut in eos iram hanc evomam<sup>11</sup> omnem, dum aegritudo haec est recens. Ego Francisco nihil rescribo ad praesens, nescio enim quomodo me ab eo exsolvam aut pollicendum est ei studium et operam<sup>12</sup> meam, quae cum nullum fructum consequi possint,<sup>13</sup> non est hominis verbis polliceri quod nequeas re ipsa persolvere, aut culpanda tempora et mores, quod non est satis tutum, neque cuique omnia credenda, tuque ipse, si sapias, nescis quae scis. Tu ei pro me respondeo, quae tibi in rem cadere videbuntur. Verum haec hactenus: verbosior fui quam putaram sed traxit me abundans materia et quae nequeat paucis absolvi. Ago tibi gratias pro xx florenis, quos dedisti Matthaëo: liberatus enim sum aere alieno, <utque aliquid incipiam referre, mitto ad te per Presbyterum Brandinum Pisanum, qui est ex familia<sup>14</sup> Cardinalis Pisani. Silium Italicum, libros V Statii Silvarum, item M. Manilium Astronomicum. Is><sup>15</sup> qui libros transcripsit ignorantissimus omnium viventium fuit, divinare oportet<sup>16</sup> non legere, ideoque opus est ut transcribantur per hominem doctum. <Ego legi usque ad xviii librum Silii, multa emendavi, ita ut recte scribenti facile sit similes errores deprehendere eosque corrigere in reliquis libris, itaque da operam ut transcribantur, postea mittas illos Florentiam ad Nicolaum>. Orationum<sup>17</sup> volo<sup>18</sup> hic exemplar remanere, post modum vel ego ipse deferam vel per alium ad te mittam, idque quam primum. Lucretius mihi nondum reddidit<sup>19</sup> est, cum sit scriptus: locus est satis longinquus, neque unde aliqui veniant: itaque expectabo quoad aliqui accedant qui illum deferant: sin autem nulli venient, non praeponomam publica privatis.<sup>20</sup> <Nam de Ammiano Marcellino non reperio, qui symbolum conferat.><sup>21</sup> Hi quidem sacerdotes opus commendant, remque sedentes collaudant et cotidie a me postulant copiam orationum. Ceterum de exclusione<sup>22</sup> verbum nullum. O portenta et varia monstra ferarum>.

<sup>8</sup> comestiva sua V, om. *Mitt.*

<sup>9</sup> Francesco Bracco of Cremona, a scholar frequently mentioned in the letters of Poggio.

<sup>10</sup> Cincio Romano, <sup>11</sup> evomerem V.

<sup>12</sup> opera mea V. <sup>13</sup> possent V.

<sup>14</sup> Alamano Adimano, Archbishop of Pisa and Cardinal of St. Eusebius. He is said to have discovered Pompeius Trogus in Spain.

<sup>15</sup> Presbyter qui tibi V: qui Presbyter tibi *Mitt.*

<sup>16</sup> Opus V.

<sup>17</sup> *i.e.* Cicero. Poggio refers to his *orationes Cluniacenses*.

<sup>18</sup> nolo hic V, hic nolo *Mitt.*

<sup>19</sup> *i.e.* 'delivered.'

<sup>20</sup> *i.e.* 'he will go and fetch the copy himself.'

<sup>21</sup> *i.e.* 'aid in the decipherment or interpretation.'

<sup>22</sup> *i.e.* curiae. Prof. Sabbadini has very kindly given me a copy of an unedited letter of Poggio, written to F. Barbaro immediately afterwards, in which he says *cognovi vos commotos propter novum consilium meum, verentes ne desperatione mei curiam relinquam*. (Bertoliana di Vicenza cod. 492, f. 80).

The date of this letter is fixed by the reference to the death of Cardinal Zabarella (Sept. 17, 1417), the election of Martin V. (Nov. 11, 1417), and his projected journey to Britain. As it would take some time for the news of the latter event to reach Italy, and for F. Barbaro's reply to get to Poggio, the letter cannot have been written before the end of Dec. 1417 or the beginning of Jan. 1418. Poggio did not go from Constance to England, whither he had been invited by Cardinal Beaufort, but, after the dissolution of the Council, on May 16, 1418 accompanied Martin V. as far as Mantua, reaching that town at the end of September. At Mantua he became desperate and suddenly went off to England without even taking leave of his friends. This letter must have been written before Poggio started for Italy, since, if he were returning, he would have brought his MSS. himself instead of entrusting them to a messenger. Also, the references to the *suffragiorum ac tribuum varietas*, and to the *sacerdotes* who *rem sedentes collaudant* are specially appropriate to the time of the Council. The letter, therefore, was probably written between Jan. and May 1418.

It will be noticed that Poggio expresses his wish to keep with him at Constance his MS. containing those speeches of Cicero which he first discovered.<sup>1</sup> Ambrosio Traversari, the friend and correspondent of Poggio, in a letter to F. Barbaro, generally assigned to the year 1417, says *orationes illas omnes a Poggio missas tam credo acceperis. Misit enim illas Nicolaus noster* (Martène, vol. iii. p. 559). As at the beginning of 1418 the MS. was still at Constance, this letter must be somewhat later than has been supposed.<sup>2</sup> The fate of this MS. is curious and instructive. As early as Nov. 6, 1423 Poggio wrote to Niccolo begging him to use his influence with F. Barbaro to procure its return (Tonelli, vol. i, p. 100). Barbaro, however, kept it, just as Niccolo did that of Asconius and Valerius Flaccus. In spite of frequent complaints he did not succeed in recovering his MS. until 1436, when F. Barbaro returned it with the following note :<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Poggio says that he obtained them *ex monasterio Cluniacensi*, and calls them his *Cluniacenses* (Tonelli, vol. i., pp. 100, 153). In a *scriptio* to a MS. Abbat. Flor. S. Maria they are said to have been found *in silvis Lingonum*. Reifferscheid (Rhein. Mus. xxiii., p. 146) conjectures that they were found at Langres.

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Sabbadini would now assign it to July or Aug. 1418.

<sup>3</sup> Centotrenta Lettere inedite di Francesco Barbaro, Salerno, 1884, ed. Remigio Sabbadini.

*Orationes illas Ciceronis quas a Germania in Italiam longo, ut aiunt, postliminio reduxisti, ab illis mensariis, de quibus fecisti mentionem, accipies. Quae etsi tardius ad te reverterentur quam voluisses, sibi facile ignoscas : nam cum mecum peregrinari non crederent, sic in aula Camenarum ut aiunt, apud me se receperant, quasi haec sua hospitalitas illius tuae Germanicae legationis monumentum quoddam in perpetuum esse debuisset. Vale. Venetiis, 1436.*

F. Barbaro appears to have amply compensated himself for the 20 florins with which he relieved the difficulties of Poggio at Constance. The statements made in this letter of Poggio concerning Silius Italicus and the *Silvae* are of great importance. We now know that Poggio—as well as Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano—possessed a MS. of Silius, and also have direct evidence that the *Silvae* are to be included among his discoveries. Dr. Krohn in his preface to Vollmer's edition (1898) points out the want of testimony to this effect. The only evidence which he is able to give is that of Vespasiano, a bookseller, who states (*Messer Poggio*) *trouvó le selve di Stazio in versi*. The addition to the *scriptio* of a Florence MS. of Asconius (Soc. Columb. Flor.), in which they are mentioned, is a later and ungrammatical addition. On the other hand they do not appear in the list of Poggio's discoveries given by F. Barbaro, nor, except in one passage curiously overlooked by Dr. Krohn and previous writers, in published letters of Poggio.<sup>4</sup>

The view might be advanced that Poggio when speaking of the person *qui libros transcripsit* was referring, not to a copyist employed by himself, but to the original writer of the MS. discovered by him, and that he was sending this MS. itself to F. Barbaro. This, however, would not agree with his use of the word, which he always uses of a contemporary writer. Thus in the case of Asconius, Valerius Flaccus, and Quintilian he says *haec mea manu transcripsi et quidem velociter*, or again of the *Orationes*, *decrevissem orationes Tullii per scriptorem meum transcribi*. Of a *vetustus codex* he uses such expressions as that it is *novis et barbaris litteris, parumque emendatus*. For a combination of these terms *cf.* his description of his *vetus codex* of Ammianus Marcellinus, *Cardinalis de Columnis habet eum codicem quod portavi, litteris antiquis, sed ita mendosum ut nil corruptius esse possit. Nicolaus Nicolaus illum manu sua transcripsit*. Also,

<sup>4</sup> In a letter to Niccolo Niccolò alluded to above, Poggio says, *Lucretium tenuisti per annos quatuordecim, eodem modo Asconium Pedianum, sic et Petronium Arbitrum et Statium Silvarum*. (Tonelli i., p. 303.)



it is not likely that Manilius and the *Silvae* were found in one MS. together with Silius Italicus, or that, if the MS. itself had come to Italy, all trace of it would have been lost. It follows then that Poggio had a copy made for him on the spot, and in all probability by a local scribe. It is not clear from his words whether he himself read and corrected Manilius and the *Silvae* as well as Silius i-xiii, or whether he is only referring to Silius.

This new evidence throws much light upon debated questions in connexion with the MSS. of Silius Italicus. The chief authority on this subject is H. Blass, whose conclusions are to be found in a long and careful paper in the *Jahrbücher f. class. Philologie, Suppl. Band*, 1875-1876, pp. 162-250. He considers that all our MSS. are descended from a single copy now lost, brought to Italy by Bartolomeo de Montepoliciano. This is based upon statements of Philelfo, a scholar now chiefly known on account of his famous quarrel with Poggio. He says *advectus enim tum primum fuerat (i.e. codex Sili) ex urbe Constantia in Italiam per Bartholomaeum Pulicianum* (Epp. xxiv. p. 163, ed Ven. 1502). It was bought after the death of Bartolomeo in 1429 by the father of Antonio Barbadori,<sup>1</sup> and Philelfo wished to ascertain its whereabouts, remarking, *Nam codices omnes, quotquot illo exemplari exscripti sunt, depravatos corruptosque invenio* (Epp. xvi. 116). This he says was *solus per id temporis in Italia* (xxiv. l.c.), and adds that it was *manu Germani librarii exscriptus*.

Blass enumerates twenty-five MSS. of Silius, of which twenty are contaminated, and of little value. There remain two groups which consist (1) of three MSS., Q (the Queen's College MS.),<sup>2</sup> V (Vatic. 1652), and G (Gaddiana plut. lxxxxi. sup. 35), which are free from attempts at emendation. (2) of two MSS., F (Bibl. Aedil. Flor. Eccl. cxvii.), and L<sup>3</sup> (Laur. plut. xxxvii. 16). These differ from the first group in that they frequently contain readings found in none of the other *apographa Sangallensia* and known only from the lost *Coloniensis* used by Carrion and Modius. These readings are more frequent in F than in L<sup>3</sup>. The latter is a beautifully written MS. copied in 1457 for Cosmo dei Medici by a Florentine notary,

<sup>1</sup> Philelfo says of A. Barbadori *quem nunc audio istic agere relegatum ab eis qui Florentiae principatum tenent*. In the printed book *istic agere* is given as one word. Blass proposes to read *isto carere*, a very unfortunate emendation.

<sup>2</sup> This is termed O by Blass. He places Ottob. 1258 among the interpolated MSS., so that here, as for Valerius Flaccus, it appears to be inferior to Q.

Gherardus Johannes del Ciriagio. The former was previously supposed to have been written by Ambrogio Traversari, the friend and correspondent of Poggio. Blass has no difficulty in showing that this is impossible, since the writer was a man of extraordinary ignorance. The errors which he makes are worse even than those which I noticed as occurring in Q (in the case of Valerius Flaccus), while the spelling is still more eccentric. There are a number of *lacunae*, while the alterations and erasures of later hands, coupled with the blunders of the original scribe, make it impossible to use F as the foundation of the text. This honour he gives to L<sup>3</sup>. The fact, however, remains that in a number of cases F alone has the reading of the *Coloniensis* as against L<sup>3</sup> together with all other MSS., and, what is still more remarkable, in several cases these unique readings are written in the margin by a second hand. Blass makes the highly suggestive remark that the writer of these had an opportunity of again consulting the archetype from which F was taken. As to the hand employed by the writer of F, Blass remarks that he begins with a *Gothic* minuscule, then adopts a cursive style on ff. 2, 3, on ff. 4, 5, resumes his first manner, then goes back to his second style, which with certain varieties he maintains until the end.

Blass considers the question as to whether F may be the original MS. brought to Italy by Bartolomeo, but decides in the negative on 'internal grounds,'<sup>3</sup> presumably the ignorance of the writer, and the difficulties in the way of deriving QVG from it. He thinks that it as well as QVG, is copied from the apograph of Bartolomeo. The reader naturally wonders how it was that the most ignorant of the copyists of this author so frequently preserved unique readings, and how it was that so ignorant a person writing a *Gothic* hand came to copy the apograph after it was brought to Italy.

It is impossible, while reading this in the light of Poggio's letter quoted above, not to suspect that F is the copy made for him by his local scribe, the *ignorantissimus omnium viventium*. If this is so, all difficulties disappear. The two families FL<sup>3</sup> and QVG represent two apographs, one made for Poggio, and the other for Bartolomeo, both written *Germani librarii manu*, the first being attested by Poggio's letter, the second by the statements of Philelfo. This explains the 'Gothic hand' employed by the writer of F

<sup>3</sup> p. 239, n.

on the first pages of the MS., the bad spellings, the monstrous corruptions, together with the survival of unique readings. Stupidity is often a valuable quality in a scribe, since it is frequently coupled with great fidelity. The readings in the margin of F, which Blass thinks were entered by a second person after a fresh examination of the archetype, are at once intelligible, if we suppose this second person to have been Poggio. Finally, the fact that F was supposed to have been copied by Ambrogio is easily explained. Who was more likely than Ambrogio to have Poggio's MS.? I therefore, suggest that F is the transcript made for Poggio, while QVG represent the *familia Montepoliciana*, Q, as in the case of Valerius Flaccus, being the best member of the group.

Before quitting the subject I would remark that Bartolomeo's MS. would naturally be preferred to Poggio's, if written by a less illiterate copyist. That this was so appears probable from Q, the writer of which, though very ignorant, does not make such extraordinary mistakes as those found in F. The statement of Philelfo that Bartolomeo's copy was the only one brought to Italy deserves no credence in view of his feud with Poggio.

I now proceed to consider the second Madrid MS. (M. 31), containing Manilius and the *Silvae* of Statius. The presumption that this is very closely connected with the MS. found by Poggio is very great in view of the fact that it was once bound up with the companion MS. (X. 81). It cannot, however, possibly be written by Poggio, since the hand is quite different, and not Italian in character. Professor Ellis in *Hermathena* (xix. pp. 261 sq) thus describes it: 'The writing is at starting very large, clear and careful, somewhat in the Gothic style, and possibly in imitation of an earlier form of writing. By degrees it becomes smaller: a palpable and distinct diminution begins on f. 4 a. But on f. 4 b it begins to be large again, though it soon becomes smaller, and this smaller hand, but in varying degrees of smallness, is retained through the rest of the poem' (*Hermathena*, viii. p. 262). This description of M. 31 curiously resembles that which Blass gives of F.

Dr. Krohn, in his Preface to Vollmer's edition, forms two groups of MSS. containing the *Silvae*. Of one group M. 31, which he terms M, is the best. Of the other the best MS. is *Vallicellanus* C. 95 (G). It is, he says, possible that the G group is derived from M, but this cannot be definitely

proved. He thinks that the members of the M group are copied from M, though he hesitates about one of these, Bodl. auct. F. 5, (F). I have myself compared portions of F with photographs of M, and cannot doubt that it was copied from M. All readings of the second hand in M are adopted in F, and blunders in F are often due to obscurity of particular letters in M. Dr. Krohn finds that M agrees far more closely with the *vetus liber Poggi*, which was afterwards collated by Politian, than does any other MS. Politian quotes the *liber Poggi* 80 times. In 74 cases M agrees with his citation. The rest of the M group agree in dwindling proportions, while G agrees only 43 times. Some of the discrepancies appear to be doubtful cases. One is of real importance, viz. 1.4.86, where M contains the line 86 a—

*attollam cantu, gaudet thrasymennus et alpes,*

which Politian says was not in the *liber Poggi*.

The suggestion which I would offer to the consideration of students of the *Silvae* is, that M. 31 is itself the copy of Manilius and the *Silvae* made for Poggio by his local scribe. This would explain how it came to be bound up with X. 80, and how it is that this, the most valuable member of the Poggian family, alike in the case of Manilius and the *Silvae*, is not written in an Italian hand. It is noticeable that Politian when describing the *vetustissimus liber Poggi qui e Germania in Italiam est relatus* says that it was written *Gallica manu*.<sup>1</sup> The *subscriptio* to the *Silvae* quoted by Mr. Souter would naturally proceed from Poggio's ignorant hireling.<sup>2</sup> As to the internal evidence, I would submit that 74 agreements out of 80 practically amount to identity. Few ancient

<sup>1</sup> That this description does not necessarily imply great antiquity has already been pointed out by Dr. Krohn. He says 'Es war höchst wahrscheinlich keine alte Handschrift, sondern eine Abschrift. . . aus der Zeit des Kostnitzer Konzils, die aber nach Polizianos Urteil die Mutter aller ihm bekannten Silvenhandschriften, in diesem Sinne also die älteste, war.' ed. Vollmer, p. 42. The Editor of the *Review* sends me the following citation from the praefatio to Schwabe's Catullus, which shows how a MS. at Milan (Ambrosianus D 24) written about 1500 was dated by a historian of that city not very far on in the 16th century:—"Ripamontius in hist. urbis Mediolani 20, 15 narrat Frederico Borromaeo Cardinali ab ep. melfitano donatum esse 'Catullum, quem aut poetae ipsius manu aut aetate certe illa scriptum diceret quisquis perite faciem ductusque litterarum aestimaret.'"

<sup>2</sup> FINIS ADEST VERE PREGIVM VVLT SCRIPTOR HEBERE (*Class. Review*, December, 1898, p. 445).

scholars would have quoted with such accuracy. Whether the existence of two families of MSS. in the case of the *Silvae* may show that two copies were taken as in the case of the authors previously discussed is a question which may also deserve investigation.

To sum up the results of this discussion. When the first discovery of MSS. was made at St. Gallen in 1416, consisting of Quintilian, Asconius, and Valerius Flaccus, Poggio copied these authors and sent his copy to Leonardo Aretino and Niccolo Niccoli—the latter of whom kept the Asconius and Valerius Flaccus for thirteen years. The Madrid MS. (X. 81) is the archetype of the *Poggiana familia*, and very probably the transcript made by Poggio himself. Bartolomaeo also copied the Asconius, a copy of his transcript being now in Florence (Laur. plut. LIV. 5.) An independent copy of Valerius Flaccus was taken, apparently by a local writer, which there is reason to suppose was executed by Bartolomaeo. This is represented by Q Ott. of which Q may possibly be the transcript in question.

Shortly afterwards other authors were discovered by one or other of the friends, viz. seven (or eight) speeches of Cicero, Lucretius, and Ammianus Marcellinus. Poggio sent the speeches early in 1418 to Francisco Barbaro—who kept them until 1436. The next discovery was that of Silius Italicus, Manilius, and the *Silvae* of Statius. We do not know where these were found. Poggio employed a local scribe to copy all three authors. Bartolomaeo did the same in the case of Silius. His MS., which was seen by Philelfo, who describes it as *Germana manu exscriptus*, became the archetype of the ordinary Italian MSS. Its best representative is Q. The apograph made for Poggio is represented by FL<sup>3</sup>, of which F., which is connected by tradition with Poggio's friend Ambrosio, may well be the original. The Madrid MS. (M. 31) is probably the copy of Manilius and the *Silvae* made for Poggio at Constance. As to whether a copy of these authors was also made for Bartolomaeo I make no statement. The work of these Swiss or German scribes is characterised by their ignorance and curious spelling, as shown notably in Q F.

If it be asked why Poggio and his friend entrusted the work to ignorant persons, instead of making transcripts themselves, two reasons may be given: (i) that they were unable to keep up with the supply of new material, and (ii) that as the dissolution of the Council was imminent, there was no

time to lose. A further possibility is that the original MSS. may not have been in the neighbourhood, and that they could only obtain copies.

I would conclude by making a few remarks about the neglect with which Poggio's correspondence has been treated, which is very strange in view of his fame as a letter-writer, and the numerous references to his discoveries which his letters contain, especially as the letters of most of his contemporaries have been published in full. In the *ed. Bebel*, 1538, only 45 of his letters are included. Mehus in his *Vita Ambrosii Camalduni* refers to a large collection of them in a *Riccardiana* MS. No. 759, and announced his intention of publishing them. In this century Tommaso Tonelli began to put together an exhaustive collection, taking the *Riccardiana* MS. as his basis, and adding to it letters from other sources. He does not include the letter which I print, nor does he appear to know of the mutilated copy in existence at Venice printed by Mittarelli.<sup>1</sup> It should come sixth in order among Poggio's letters. Poggio in later life made preparations for the publication of his letters, and mentions his inability to procure copies of those which he wrote in early years. Thus, in a letter to Niccolo Niccoli, he urges him to look through his library for letters, especially those which he wrote from Gaul and Germany mentioning his discoveries of MSS., and in a later letter to Francisco Marescalco complains that he cannot bring out his book because Niccolo will not answer him or send the letters. Tonelli published one volume in 1839 at Florence which contains 129 letters divided into four books, but his work was cut short by death. I have myself looked through the *Riccardiana* MS., and made extracts. It consists of (a) a first collection of letters, originally 89 in number, of which the two first have perished, and (b) two volumes of 170 and 176 letters forming 10 and 7 books respectively. This arrangement was made by Poggio himself, as we learn from a statement on f. 226 b.

(epistolas) . . . in volumen coegi, quod decem libros continet: detraxi autem omnia, quae praeter epistolas in priori volumine inserta erant: hoc vero ex epistolis solis constat. Cepi quoque secundum epistolarum volumen, cuius libri tres iam sunt confecti et nescio an id consummabitur: sum etenim factus tardior in exscribendo.

I have recently heard from Prof. Sabbadini that two other volumes, containing the

<sup>1</sup> Mittarelli's catalogue was published in 1779.

rest of the *sylloye Riccardiana*, have been published since the death of Tonelli, appearing in the years 1859 and 1861, but that they are excessively rare, so rare that, to the best of his belief, only two copies are in existence, of which one is at Berlin, and the other in the National Library at Florence. He informs me that Dr. Willmanns, chief librarian of the Berlin Library, has undertaken to edit anew the letters of

Poggio. It is to be hoped that this will not be long delayed. Pages in the catalogues of our libraries are taken up by the successive editions of Poggio's scandalous *facetiae*, or of his *risqué* letter upon the public baths of Baden, but his letters generally, which throw so much light upon classical literature, are still not accessible to scholars.

A. C. CLARK.

---

### NOTES ON QUINTILIAN.

THE object of the present paper is to point out several misstatements that have been made in regard to the usage of Quintilian.

#### I. ETSI.

Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*<sup>2</sup> § 305 says this Conjunction is not found in Quintilian ('nicht bei Quint.'). Landgraf, Note 427 b to Reisig's *Vorles. über lat. Spr.* p. 269 says it is wanting in Quintilian ('bei Quintilian fehlt *etsi*'). *Etsi*, however, is found in Quintilian 8 times, 7 times with the Indicative and once with the Subjunctive: *Ind.* i. proem. 19; 5, 28; ii. 5, 19; vii. 8, 7; ix. 1, 19; 2, 100; xi. 3, 18. *Subj.* v. 13, 3.

#### II. DUMMODO.

*Dummodo* did not find favour with either Tacitus or Quintilian. Gudeman, *Dialogus*, p. 257 says that it occurs only two times in Tacitus. Bonnell Meister and Hild in a note to Quint. x. 3, 7, say that *dummodo* is not found in Quintilian ('Dummodo findet sich bei Quint. nicht, sondern nur *dum*, oder *modo*, oder *si modo*'). These latter particles occur frequently in Quint., but it is a mistake to say that *dummodo* is not found at all, for he uses it in i. 6, 8: 'at quae o solam habent, dummodo per eandem litteram in infinito exeant,' etc.

#### III. IGITUR.

Neue, *Formenlehre*,<sup>3</sup> p. 975 says that in

Quintilian *igitur* begins the sentence 12 times. In point of fact, however, it is the first word in the sentence 16 times; it begins a book twice: i. 1, 1; viii. 1, 1; a chapter, once, v. 14, 1; a paragraph, once, ii. 14, 5; a section, 8 times, i. 9, 2; ii. 11, 3; iii. 8, 24; v. 12, 22; vii. 10, 3; viii. 3, 42; x. 1, 46; xi. 3, 153; and is placed elsewhere 4 times, i. 6, 44; ii. 14, 5; vii. 1, 3 and ix. 2, 44. Its use, therefore, in an important position is to be noted.

Quintilian's statement (i. 5, 39) in regard to the varying position of *igitur* at the beginning of a sentence is well-known: 'Maximos auctores in diversa fuisse opinione video, cum apud alios sit etiam frequens, apud alios numquam reperitur.' Quintilian's own usage therefore is interesting in view of the above remark: he uses *igitur* 16 times in the first place, 114 times in the 2nd and 25 times in the 3rd.

#### IV. ITAQUE.

Neue, *Formenlehre*,<sup>3</sup> p. 975 says that in Quint. *itaque* is found in the 2nd place in the sentence only 6 times. In point of fact, Quint. places it thus 12 times: i. 1, 14; v. 8, 57; vi. 3, 28; vii. 2, 45; viii. proem. 3; 16; 3, 20; 35; 4, 12; x. 4, 3; xi. 1, 63; 85. (A new example in prose is Mart. *Praef.* to viii. line 5 Gilbert).

EMORY B. LEASE.

---

### SUDHAUS' AETNA.

*Aetna*, erklärt von SIEGFRIED SUDHAUS. Teubner, 1898.

THIS new edition of *Aetna* will be received by most English scholars, if I am not mistaken, with very mixed feelings. They will

be grateful to the German editor for the large amount of scientific illustration drawn from ancient no less than modern authorities which he has brought to bear upon the acknowledged obscurities of the poem; they will be amazed at the extravagant self-con-