

**Cambridge: Corpus Christi College, Parker Library, MS.472**Isidore; del Monte, *De Vitiourum Differentia* & humanist miscellany**Oxford, s.xv<sup>1</sup>-s.xv<sup>med</sup>**

**I** Parchment (skin-skin, hair-hair), 136 × 95mm (size is very variable); vi (2 paper, 4 parchment) + 292 + vi (4 parchment, 2 paper) fol.; red crayon pagination (by Parker): 1–583; there are several errors in this pagination. First, one folio, following p.208, has not been counted because it was partially torn out. Later, the pagination repeats three sets of page numbers: pp.241–2, 315–6, 325–6. So, by the end of the codex, the pagination is eight less than is correct. **NB: throughout description, accurate pagination is used.**

**II** i<sup>12</sup> ii<sup>12</sup> wants 3 (after p.28) | iii<sup>12</sup> + 1 leaf after 6 (as pp.59–60), iv–viii<sup>12</sup> ix<sup>10</sup> wants 1 (before p.143) and most of 10 (pp.209–10) is torn out, x<sup>12</sup> xi<sup>10</sup> xii<sup>8</sup> wants 1 but 1 leaf inserted (as pp.253–4), xiii<sup>10</sup> xiv<sup>8</sup> xv<sup>8</sup> xvi–xxi<sup>12</sup> xxii<sup>14</sup> wants 1 (before p.441) and 3 (before p.465), xxiii<sup>10</sup> xxiv<sup>14</sup> xxv<sup>14</sup> wants 3 (after p.542) xxvi<sup>12</sup> wants 5 (after p.566) and 12 (after p.578). Some catchwords. Evidence of leaf signatures through manuscript in two series, each part having a discrete continuous series.

**III** Average written space is variable: I 95 × 68mm. II (item [2]) 85 × 64mm; II (items [3]–[12]) 92 × 67mm. 23 long lines throughout, in an unlined single border.

**IV** Three gothic cursive scripts appear in this manuscript. The hand of part I is of the first half of the fifteenth century and earlier than the rest of the volume. The second script writes item [2], while the third writes the rest of the codex (items [3]–[12], as well as the titles to [2]). The last script undergoes variation over the length of the manuscript but it is notable for its straight ascenders (eg. **d**), its wisp-like long final **s** and its purple titles which, for the early rubrics, competently attempt *lettera antica*. Despite these differences from the second script, it is possible that both of these are by the same scribe. This scribe of part II has tentatively been identified as Thomas Chaundler [*DHL*]; however, it is difficult to decide this case with any certainty as there are few definite specimens of his hand. He did probably write the marginal text in BL, MS.Harl. 43, but the script there bears little relation to the less tidy handwriting in this manuscript.

**VI** Several hands annotate this manuscript, although each hand is confined to particular pieces. Annotations are most concentrated in the del Monte, where one reader notes names (e.g. pp.48, 52) while another marks sections of the work (e.g. pp.85, 113). Among the readers of the other items (who include Parker), one from the fifteenth century notes with approval *sententiae* in item [11] (eg. p.524: *bonum dictum*; p.526: *verissimum dictum est*).

**VII** Modern binding (1953) of light brown leather.

**2<sup>o</sup> fo.:** I: Enoch filius...

II: [p.49] ut plerisque...

\* \* \*

p.vi: contents list

## I

[1] pp.1–45: **St. Isidore**, *De Ortu et Obitu Patrum*  
*sine titulo*

*tract:* Quorundam sanctorum nobillissimorumque virorum ... ibique sepultus est in pace.

Printed in *PL*, lxxxiii col.128–156.

A later hand adds at end: *explicit Isidorus de ortu & obitu sanctorum*.

p.46: blank

Extract from D. Rundle, 'Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

© David Rundle 1997

## II

- [2] pp.47–231:**Pietro del Monte**, *De Vitiorum inter se Differentia* (with preface)  
*tit.*: Ad illustrissimum principem / humfredum ducem Glow/cestrie  
*pref.*: Tuas eximias laudes virtutesque ... [p.51] colloquentes ac disputantes  
audiamus./ *Explicit prohemium incipit liber primus.*  
*dial.*: [p.52] [C]um petrus emilianus pontifex vi{n}centinus ... & osculata  
presulis dextra discescerunt./ FINIS HUIUS

Preface alone printed (without reference to this copy) in Sammut, pp.151–3.

This copy does not share the mistakes of the ‘Virtue and Vice’ manuscripts (eg., **Bod., MS.Auct.F.5.26**); it was probably copied directly from the Oxford manuscript of the work [Sammut, p.84 {no.273}]. Of the surviving copies, it is textually closest to **London: Lambeth, MS. 354**. Note, for example, the following readings in the preface shared by this manuscript {C} and Lambeth, MS. 354 {L} and which differ from the ‘Virtue and Vice’ manuscripts: Sammut, p.152, 1.47 *libri in unum non C, L: libri in numerum non* p.153, ll.65–6 *nonnullos libellum C, L: nonnullos inuerecundum iudicare debere qui tanto principi.*

Text divided into three books, which break at pp.109 & 170.

At the top of p.47, a sixteenth century hand notes the author’s name: *Petrus de Monte*, while at p.46, Parker tentatively identifies him as *presul brixienensis ut refert gesnerus*.

pp.232–4: blank

- [3] pp.235–59:**Isocrates Latinus**, *Ad Demonicum* (**Castiglionchio**)  
*tit.*: Oracio Isocratis ad demonicum / incipit  
*orat.*: Cum in aliis permultis bonorum ... industria diligenciaque superare /  
FINIS HUIUS

Edited, without reference to this copy, by K.Müllner, “Zur Humanistischen Übersetzungsliteratur”, *Wiener Studien*, xxiii (1901) pp.280–89.

- [4] pp.260–68:**Plutarchus Latinus**, *De Virtute et Vitio* (**da Rusticci**, with preface)  
*tit. pref.*: Prefacio Cincij Romani in sermonem / Plutarchi [*sic*] de virtute &  
vicio incipit.  
*pref.*: Ab hac tantula mea lucubratione ... [p.261]felicitas atque miseria nascatur.  
*tit.*: Plutarchi [*sic*] sermo de virtute & vicio per eundem in latinum traductus  
Cardinali / sancti marci tunc episcopo Cavensi dedicatus  
*tract.*: Indumenta quidem hominum calorem ... non deiciens semper letabitur./  
FINIS HUIUS

Preface alone edited, without reference to this copy, by M.Lehnerdt, “Cencio und Agapito de’Rustici”, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, n.s. xiv (1900) pp.149–172 at pp.160–1.

Bertalot, ii/1 no.9616.

- [5] pp.269–72:**Cencio da Rusticci**, letter to a certain Velleius  
*tit.*: Epistola disertissimi viri Cincij / Romani ad Vellium de traductione / operis  
sequentis  
*epist.*: Locus quidem suavissime velli ut tu ... coram una loqui videamur. Vale.  
Bononie

Edited, without reference to this copy, in Hankins, pp.508–9; previously in Lehnerdt, “Cencio und Agapito de’ Rustici”, pp.160–1.

- [6] pp.272–97:**Ps–Plato Latinus**, *Axiochus* (**da Rusticci**, with preface)

Extract from D. Rundle, ‘Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460’ (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

© David Rundle 1997

*tit. pref.:* prefacio clarissimi viri Cincij Romani / ad reverendissimum d. Jordanum Cardinalem Ursinum

*pref.:* Magno profectoque exquisita ... [p.275] gravissime disputantem accedamus.

*tit.:* Socrates de morte contempnenda / latinus ex greco factus ab Cincio / Romano / Socrates loquitur

*dial.:* Cum ex athenis decederem ... vocatus huc progressus. Finis

Preface alone edited, without reference to this copy, in Lehnerdt, "Cencio und Agapito de' Rustici", pp.163–4 [reprinted in Bertalot, *Studien*, ii, pp.134–5].

On the last seven pages some of the text is rubbed away.

[7] pp.298–381: **Lucianus Latinus, Toxaris (Aurispa, with preface) (1429–30)**

*tit. pref.:* Ad leonellum estensem & ludovicum / de gongata adolescentes illustres / Aurispa

*pref.:* Amiciciam exhortanti mihi... [p.300] dictionis mirificijs datur.

*tit.:* Lucianus de amicicia traductus per/ m angelum Arietinum. nuncipis loquitur

*dial.:* Quid ais o toxaris ... [p.381] videris presenti oratione. *Finis*

Unprinted. Other English copies at **Oxford: Balliol College, MS.315**, fol.30<sup>v</sup>–44 & \*Washington: Catholic University, MS.Mullen 114, fol.166<sup>v</sup>–194<sup>v</sup>.

Part of p.299 absent, most of p.300 and some of p.301 illegible.

At the top of p.298, Parker has written: *hic angelus aretinus scripsit ad Leonellum Estensem marchionem ferrarie sic gesnerus.*

p.382: blank

[8] pp.383–421: **Xenophon Latinus, Hiero (Bruni, with preface)**

*tit. pref.:* leonardi Arietini prefacio in librum Xenophontis

*pref.:* Xenophontis philosophi quendam libellum...[p.386] ausi sumus attingere.

*tit.:* Xenophontis philosophi liber qui dicitur tirannus incipit

*dial.:*[C]um ad hieronem tirannum Symonides ... felix enim cum sis nemo tibi invidet./ Explicit feliciter

P.Beroaldus *ed.*, *Xenophon* (Bologna: Benedictus Hectoris, 1502) sig.Rvi–Sv; preface alone edited, without reference to this copy, in Baron, *Bruni*, pp.147–9.

As with [2] above, this item lacks the errors of the 'Virtue & Vice' manuscripts; it is textually close to **London: British Library, MS. Harl 3426**. Note, for example, that the preface opens in both manuscripts: *Xenophontis philosophi quendam libellum quem ego ingenii excercendi gratia* where in the 'Virtue & Vice' manuscripts and in **Dublin: Trinity College, MS.438**, the clause ends *excercendi causa*. Later in the preface, the other manuscripts read *Qua quidem in re excelluit* where this and the Harley manuscript read *Qua quidem in re ita excelluit*.

[9] pp.422–56:**S. Basilius Magnus Latinus, De Liberalibus Studiis (Bruni, with preface)**

*tit. pref.:* leonardi Arietini prefacio ad / Collucium Salutatum in librum magni / Basillii incipit feliciter

*pref.:* Ego tibi hunc librum Coluci ... [p.424] animadvertite queso quanta gravitas sit

*tract.:* Multa sunt filij que hortantur ... recta consilia aspernantes. Explicit deo gratias

Edited, without reference to this copy, in S.Basil, *Discorsi ai giovani*, ed.M.Naldini (Florence, 1984) pp.229–248.

Extract from D. Rundle, 'Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

© David Rundle 1997

The title to the tract has not been written into this copy but a note at the bottom of p.424 shows that it would read: *Magni Basilij ad iuvenes quibus studijs opera danda sit.*

[10] pp.457–498: **Leonardo Bruni, *Isagogicon***

*tit.*: ysagogicum philosophie moralis compi/latum per leonardum Arietinum  
*tract.*: [S]i ut vivendi galiothe ... ut boni simus virtutesque exerceamus./ Explicit  
ysagogicum philosophie moralis.

Edited, without reference to this copy, in Baron, *Bruni*, pp.20–41.

[11] pp.499–545: **Plato Latinus, *Apologia Socratis* (Bruni, with preface) [2nd version]**

*tit. pref.*: leonardi Arietini prologus / in Apologiam Socratis  
*pref.*: [S]ocrates philosophus vir omnium innocentissimus ... [p.500] victorie tum  
inimica fuere  
*tit.*: liber platonis qui dicitur Apologia / Socratis incipit feliciter. Socrates  
loquitur  
*dial.*: [p.501] [Q]uid vobis acciderit iudices ... omnibus preterquam deo./ Finit  
Apologia Socratis

Preface alone edited, without reference to this copy, by Hankins, pp.504–5.

[12] pp.546–74: **Plato Latinus, *Crito* (Bruni, with preface) [2nd version]**

*tit. pref.*: Leonardi Arietini argumentum in librum platonis qui dicitur crito.  
*pref.*: Damnato Socrate & in carcerem ... ad cognitionem disciplinamque  
nostram.  
*tit.*: Platonis Crito vel de eo quod / agendum est. Socrates loquitur  
*dial.*: Quid tu hoc temporis venisti ... deus agenda monstrat./ Explicit Crito  
platonis sive de eo quod agendum est.

E.Berti ed., *Il Critone latino di Leonardo Bruni* (Florence, 1983) pp.205–22, with reference to this copy at pp.197–8.

pp.575–84: blank

\* \* \*

Part II of this manuscript appears to have been constructed in Oxford. Some of the items, most notably [2] and [8], were probably copied directly from Humfrey's manuscripts. This raises the question of where the scribe found the other texts. [3], [9] and [10] were certainly among Humfrey's gifts but the same can not definitely be said about the other items. [11] and [12] may well have appeared together in one manuscript; they were certainly paired in other English manuscripts (Oxford: New College, MS.286

and a volume of John Gunthorp's, now \*Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, MS.lat. 6729A Extract from D. Rundle, 'Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings 319 and their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

© David Rundle 1997

[*Iter*, iii, pp.219B–220B]). The prototype for both could have been a codex of Humfrey's, perhaps one made up of Bruni translations - certainly [11] was transcribed in Oxford with Bruni's covering-letter for the *Politics* to Humfrey (Bod., MS.Auct. F.6.2). Yet, the modern editor of the latinised *Crito* has found both this manuscript and Gunthorp's to include many textual errors which distinguish them from all of the surviving manuscript-groups; in other words, it would seem that the prototype was of textually poor quality. Would Humfrey have been offered as a gift or a purchase such a corrupted manuscript? It is not impossible, but it certainly would contrast with his copy of other Bruni translations, from which this scribe also worked (**BL, MS.Harl. 3426**).

The case of items [4]–[7] is all the more problematic. All these items appear in **Oxford: Balliol, MS.315** but they could not have been copied directly from there. Collation of the preface to [4] suggests that the Balliol copy {=B} and this {=C} are close, although there are notable if slight differences [for example, taking Lehnerdt's edition as the base text: 1.4 scriptitatas *B,C*: scriptitas 1.8 effundunt *B*: effundant 1.10 crateras *B*: cratheras *C*: cathedras [*sic*] 1.16 quidem *B*: siquidem]. However, the difference between the two codices lies in the titles: the Balliol manuscript does not include the detailed titles which appear in this manuscript (and which could not be derived from internal evidence alone). Another possibility could be that both these manuscripts were derived from one prototype; indeed, it has been suggested that the Balliol manuscript derives from Humfrey's copy of Bruni's *Isagogicon* which, it is hypothesised, included all the relevant items. There are, however, a couple of difficulties with this supposition. First, recent research has suggested that the Balliol manuscript was transcribed directly from \*Padua: Biblioteca del Seminario, MS.119 [on this, see **Oxford: Balliol, MS.315** below]. The hypothesis could, of course, be altered by simply suggesting that this

manuscript was also derived directly from the Padua codex but there is another complicating factor. For items [4]–[6], there are two other English copies, with substantially the same detailed titles; they both contain a colophon reading Ferrara, 1458 (Bod., MSS.Bodl. 881 & Hatton 105 - collation suggests the former is derived from the latter; could the prototype have been written by one of Guarino's English pupils?). As both of these are English, the colophon must be taken from their prototype, but it at least gives a *terminus ante quem non* for their construction. In other words, though collation again suggests that they are textually close to the Balliol manuscript, they can not be derived from that or its prototype [taking the above examples, these copies have same readings as B for ll.4 & 8, and read *crateras* at l.10]. They are distinguished by their detailed titles; as these also occur in this Corpus manuscript, it is at least plausible that items [4]–[6] were derived from their prototype rather than the Balliol codex. If this is the case, it also provides a narrower dating for this manuscript.

Item [7], however, remains unaccounted; this is a rare item which certainly was available in the Balliol manuscript. Yet again, however, the text includes a detailed title, although admittedly it is garbled (the scribe does not seem to realise that Aurispa is actually the name of the translator). So, perhaps there was another copy of this work in Oxford which is no longer surviving; maybe it was in the prototype of items [4]–[6] but was not transcribed by the other copyists. Another manuscript of the work does survive in \*Washington: Mullen Library, MS.114, which was made for Edmund Norton [*DHL*, no.77; *Iter*, v, 406a-b]; however, in that manuscript the title is even more garbled. It is perhaps more likely that Norton's copy was transcribed from this manuscript (all but the last of the humanist works appear here; it includes in order: [9], [4], [10], [8], [7] and Guarino's *De Assentatoris et Amici Differentia*, on which see **Bod., MS.Auct. F.5.26**).

Extract from D. Rundle, 'Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

© David Rundle 1997

Though it is beyond the scope of this description to delineate all the manuscripts related to the Corpus codex, brief reference should also be made to another related manuscript: Gunthorp's miscellany mentioned above and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale; it includes (following other texts) items [5], [6], [4], [11] and [12], with similar titles. This manuscript includes the date 1473, providing a *terminus post quem non* for its construction.

To summarise this incomplete evidence about the Corpus manuscript's sources, they can (with some uncertainty) be listed as follows:

[2]: Sammut, no.273

[3]: Sammut, no.232

[4]-[6]: the prototype of Bod., MSS.Bodl.881 & Hatton 105

[7]: lost manuscript

[8] & [9]: **BL, MS.Harl.3426**

[10]: Sammut, no.243

[11] & [12]: ?Sammut, no.234 OR an independent copy, now lost

In conclusion, the stemma of the Corpus manuscript has to be more tentative than previously thought. It is far from certain that all the items derive from Humfrey manuscripts; instead, this manuscript probably demonstrates the fluidity of humanist interest in Oxford in the third quarter of the century, with more copies (often duplicates) of humanist works arriving in the town and being copied. Oxford's importance to English humanist interest may reside mainly in its holdings of Humfrey's books but its significance continued to increase as it attracted more humanist readers and their manuscripts.

De la Mare tentatively suggests that the third scribe is Thomas Chaundler, on whom see **Oxford: New College, MS.288**. If Chaundler was the scribe, this could explain the reference to *Apologia Socratis* in his *Liber Apologeticus* [Cambridge: Trinity College

MS.R.14.5, fol.11<sup>v</sup>; edition of D.Enright-Clark Shoukri (London, 1974) p.52; Weiss, p.135n], although that reference is too vague to demonstrate Chaundler's acquaintance with anything more than the name of the work.

Though there are a series of inscriptions at the end of the manuscript [pp.i, v-vibis], none of these provide signs of provenance before it entered into the collection of Archbishop Parker who (as recorded above) added notes in red crayon.

\* \* \*

M.R.James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* ii (Cambridge, 1911) pp.408–11; *DHL*, no.74; Hankins, *Cat.A*, no.39.

On Chaundler's script, see *DH&EH*, p.16 & no.34–6.

On Bod., MSS.Bodl. 881 & Hatton 105, see Hankins, *Cat.A*, no.207, 210.

On Gunthorp generally, see Weiss, pp.122–7; *BRUO*; c.vii p.238 & c.viii pp.296–7 above.

On Norton, who is mentioned only briefly in *BRUO*, see L.Boyle & R.Rouse, "A fifteenth-century list of the books of Edmund Norton", *Speculum*, 1 (1975) pp.284–8.