

Dublin: Trinity College, MS.438 - Notice

humanist miscellany compiled by John Manyingham

Oxford, 1449–51

For full description, see M.L.Colker, *Trinity College, Dublin. Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts* (Dublin, 1991) ii, pp.867-70, noting the following corrigenda:

p.868, item (3) *for* Isocrates, Oratio Nicoclis, tr. Lapus Castelliuunculus...
read Isocrates, Nicocles, tr. Guarino...

p.870, collation *for* i¹⁸ ii²² (lacks 20-22) iii-iv¹⁴...
read i¹⁸ ii²⁰ (wanting final two after fol.40 and with one added before first as fol.22, this being the first folio of a bifolium, the second being wanting after the last of the quire) iii-iv¹⁴...

p.870, script *for* Several hands...a roman hand.
read There are several hands at work in this ms.; O’Sullivan [pp.30-1] counts six (excluding the rubricator at fol.1^v), referring to them as A to F, but admitting that some of the hands might have been written by one scribe. For example, there are differences between the hands A and C - the latter, a neater, more pointed hand, nearly always uses a double-compartment **b**, while A, a rougher, more slanting script, prefers a single-looped **b** with slanting ascender - but there are enough similarities (note, for example, the **g**, which in both hands is formed of two strokes with a short descender) to suggest that they are written by the same scribe at different times. Again, the differences between hands C and F are, as O’Sullivan recognises, “mainly because it [F] is written with less care.” So, the six hands are probably the work of three scribes, with A/C/F writing the bulk of the ms. (fol.4-22, 41-5, 48^v-136), while the more French-influenced hand B writes the second item (fol.23-40^v), hand D writes Henry V’s speeches at fol.45-48 and E adds the final paragraph at fol.48. There is also the rubricating hand which appears not only at fol.1^v where it uses a roman script for the contents list; all the titles, with the exception of fol.23 (where the title, like the text, is by hand B), are also written by this hand, mainly in capitals (but note the lower case inscriptions at fol.51 & 133), and nearly always in humanist script (but note the gothic **M** at fol.66). The rubricator also writes the names of the interlocutors in the fourth and twelfth items, using both humanist and gothic scripts. The evidence of the gothic elements suggests the possibility that this hand is by the scribe A/C/F.

Also insert the following addenda:

p.869, item (12) *after* tr. Cincius Romanus
add with slight changes in the preface of this copy so that it addresses a *strenuissimus comes*

p.870, quire arrangement *after* leaf signatures
add (the third quire is numbered ‘+’, the fourth ‘a’).

p.870, illuminations *after* Full bar borders...in gold and colours.
add The full borders appear at fol.4, 41 & 92, while the partial borders appear at fol.5^v, 23, 48^v, 66, 93^v, 120^v. All these borders seem to be by the same illuminator, but they may have been painted at more than one sitting. The partial borders in the first two items employ straighter branches than the more florid later borders; there is also a lack of yellow pigment in the early ones. Any judgement, however, is made difficult because the illuminations at fol.23 have been reworked when the initial at fol.23^v was replaced.

after Initials in colours...framed with colours).

add These initials appear at fol.23^v, 51, 54^v, 59^v, 62, 63^v, 79^v, 122, 133. The first of these is actually a replacement initial. The initial first painted there was carefully cut out, presumably because it comprised the wrong letter, and a patch of parchment inserted in its place. In the Extract from D. Rundle, ‘Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and 348 their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460’ (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

process, the border on the recto of the folio had to be slightly repainted and some of the text had to be rewritten - perhaps by a different scribe (note the contrasting letter **d**), but one who successfully imitated hand B.

p.870, marginalia *after* 15 cent. corrections
add to item (3) (fol.27, 30, 30^v, 31^v), perhaps by scribe A/C/F. This scribe also writes some marginalia (fol.83, 88, 124, 125, 130^v). At least three other s.xv hands write marginalia in this ms. The most frequent, alternating between black and red ink, draws lines against sections of the text and occasionally draws a flag as a *nota* mark. These notes are clustered in items (2) and (4). In item (9), sections of the text are numbered in a late fifteenth century hand. In item (10), a sixteenth century hand (perhaps that of Wynnesbury) translates words into English and reveals a limited knowledge of Latin: the terms, though correctly translated, are, in most cases, being used in a straightforward manner.

* * *

This manuscript fortunately provides an unusual amount of information about its creation and history. John Manyngam, who compiled this manuscript, calls himself at fol.1^v *secretarius et scriba alme universitatis Oxonie*; he was Registrar of the university from late 1447 to the end of 1451. The date of compilation can be narrowed down to the period after 1 July 1449, the date on which John Tiptoft (addressed as *strenuissimus comes*) is made earl of Worcester [R.Mitchell, *John Tiptoft* (London, 1938) p.19]. However, it has been suggested that an even narrower timespan can be posited: on 6 April 1451, Manyngam was granted grace to have an undergraduate copy texts for him in the university's library. This manuscript has been thought to be a result of this dispensation and so datable to April–December 1451. It might, though, be quibbled that the production of a collection of humanist works apparently for presentation to John Tiptoft hardly fits the condition that the scholar would copy *certas res sibi necessarias* [DHL, no.71]. Moreover, its palaeographical and codicological evidence suggests that the codex had a complicated genesis: it was certainly not the product of a brief period of copying by one scholar.

Separate stages in the compilation of this ms. can be discerned. The first two articles (items (2) and (3)) are written by different scribes but were soon brought together, the copy of Isocrates' *Nicocles* being folded within a bifolium, the first half of which

Extract from D. Rundle, 'Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and 349 their reception in England, c. 1400 – c. 1460' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

included the last lines of the first article. At this point, they were both illuminated. The rest of the codex forms a booklet of its own - the quire signatures begin a new series at the start of its first article (item (4)), and the illuminations are in a slightly different style. While the bulk of this is written by one scribe (probably the same person who wrote item (2)), it is notable that the construction of the Lucianic dialogue, with the addition of speeches by Henry V, was a collaborative effort. The opening is written by the main scribe, but the section of contemporary relevance is written by a different hand; O'Sullivan has suggested that this person might have been Manyingham himself, but there is no corroborating proof. Though Manyingham was university scribe and though his name is subscribed to three letters in the university register (Oxford: Oxford University Archives, Register F, fol.79, 81^v, 84^v), in each case it is written in a different script, none of them definitely identifiable with this passage (or any other) in this manuscript. After the Henry insertion in the dialogue, the final speech was added by yet another hand; it is unclear whether this was immediately added or was a later insertion.

That Manyingham intended to present this ms. to John Tiptoft is apparent not only from the appearance of his coat of arms (fol.4, 5^v, 92); it has not been noticed before that the compiler also goes to the extent of altering the preface to one work, the Ps-Plato *Axiochus* (item (12)), so that it addresses an earl and refers to the translator, Cencio de' Rusticci, only in the third person - these changes are further developed in **Aberystwyth: National Library of Wales, MS.Peniarth 336A**, which was made for Reginald Boulders, bishop of Hereford. Perhaps the reason for omitting some other prefaces (items (3) & (4)), which surely appeared in Manyingham's sources, was to remove references not relevant to Tiptoft.

It has been suggested that the speech of Henry V added to item (4) was written before 1440, since it contains a very sanguine view of events in France; this, in turn, raised questions of authorship, with Frulovisi the favoured candidate [O'Sullivan, pp.36-7; Weiss, p.197]. However, there are two factors which militate against this early dating. First, as already mentioned another scribe (hand D) was brought in to write the section involving Henry (but not to complete the work). This section includes a crossing out [fol.46^v] where the removed words are not ones which reappear elsewhere in the work - that is, it is not a case of the scribe's eye slipping to another line but, rather, the scribe included a phrase which he immediately decided to remove. This evidence, and the fact that the section is written with some frustratingly unclear abbreviations, suggests that the scribe was not attempting to make a presentation copy of another copy of this section, but rather may have been composing into this manuscript. This scenario would conform with the practice of altering the *Axiochus* preface, both here and in the **Aberystwyth MS**.

The other reason for believing that the Henry V addition could not have been composed before 1440 concerns the manuscript from which item (4) and other articles were copied. There is some similarity of contents with Gray's anthology, **Oxford: Balliol College, MS.315**, and, in those cases, the two manuscripts are textually close, but one is not copied from the other. So, for example, in the preface of the *Axiochus*, note the following differences (using Bertalot, *Studien*, ii, pp.134-5 and with D = TCD, MS.438 and B = Ball, MS.315): ll.8-9 *evolato* D: *evelato* 1.9 *relinquant* B: *relinquunt* D: *derelinquunt* *necessitate* D: *necessitati* 1.14 *exoptandum* B: *exportandum* 1.17 *amoveat* B: *immoveat*. Moreover, the *orationes Homeri* have been edited and collation has shown that both derive from the same manuscript: *Padua:

Biblioteca del Seminario, MS.119. This codex, written in Florence c.1440, must have

Extract from D. Rundle, 'Of Republics and Tyrants: aspects of quattrocento humanist writings and 351 their reception in England, c. 1400 - c. 1460' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1997)

been in England by 1442 [on this, see **Oxford: Balliol College, MS.315**]. However, even though it arrived in Oxford so quickly, it is too late to allow a pre-1440 date for the Henry V addition.

The Padua manuscript was probably the source for items (4), (5), (12) and (13) in this manuscript. For the other items, the prototypes may have been manuscripts belonging to Humfrey but, at least in the case of item (2), Bruni's translation of Xenophon's *Hiero*, it does not appear to be derived directly from Humfrey's manuscript (**BL, MS.Harl. 3426**); this copy appears to share some errors with the 'Virtue & Vice' manuscripts, as well as adding some of its own. So, the preface in Humfrey's copy opens: *Xenophontis philosophi quendam libellum quem ego ingenii excercendi gratia*. In this manuscript, it reads (ungrammatically): *Zenophontis philosophi qui quendam libellum quem ego ingenii excercendi causa* [on this, see also **Cambridge: CCC, MS.472**]. Indeed, all the humanist items that do not appear in the Padua manuscript could derive from the 'Virtue & Vice' collection, with the items here appearing in **Bod., MS.Auct F.5.26** as follows:

(2)	=	[3] in the Bodley manuscript
(3)	=	[9] but the Dublin manuscript lacks the preface
(9)	=	[6]
(10)	=	[8]
(11)	=	[10]

However, collation also suggests that, if they do derive from that collection, it is not from one of the surviving 'Virtue & Vice' manuscripts. Two examples from the *Hiero* will have to suffice, comparing fol.168 of Humfrey's copy {H} with the Dublin manuscript {D} and the Bodley 'Virtue & Vice' codex {A}. H, D: *Iurgia vero rem auribus amaram nunquam auditis* A: *auditis* omitted. H, D: *tyrannos esse atque bibere* A: *tirannos esse atque vivere*.

The conclusion from this discussion is that the humanist sections of Manyingham's collection may well have been copied from two manuscripts, neither of which was in Humfrey's collection, although one was derived from his codices. If this is the case, there is no reason to imagine that Manyingham had to ensure access for his scribes to the university's library; accordingly, there is no need to assume the narrow date of April–December 1451. On the other hand, it is likely that his scribe had this manuscript in front of him when he wrote the preface to the *Axiochus* in **Aberystwyth: NLW, MS.Peniarth 336A**, for which the *terminus ante quem non* is February 1451. In other words, it is quite possible that the collection for Tiptoft was constructed between the second half of 1450 and the end of 1451.

Our knowledge of the history of this manuscript is not confined to its production. A few years later, Tiptoft went on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. It would seem that he left this manuscript in England, giving it for safe-keeping to the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury. Item (2), Bruni's Xenophon, was certainly copied there in 1459 by Henry Cranebroke (into his miscellany, now BL, MS.Royal. 10.B.ix); Cranebroke's version includes all the errors which have been mentioned as distinguishing the Dublin manuscript from the Virtue & Vice collection. At the same time, Cranebroke must also have had access to other humanist manuscripts: his copy of Guarino's translation of Isocrates' *Nicocles* includes the full preface and could not, therefore have been transcribed from item (3) in this codex. Perhaps instead it was copied from a copy of the 'Virtue and Vice' miscellany [on this, see **Bod., MS.Auct. F.5.26**].

Perhaps Tiptoft never took Manyingham's collection back into his possession. It may well have remained at Christ Church: in the early seventeenth century, it was owned

by Richard St.George who also possessed other manuscripts from the former monastery (eg. Bod, MS.Laud.misc.730).

* * *

T.K.Abbott, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Dublin* (London, 1900), p.68; W.O'Sullivan, "An early Oxford humanist", *BodLR*, vii (1962) pp.28-39; *Iter*, iii, p.195B; *DHL*, no.72.

On Manyingham, see *BRUO* sub Mannyngham.

On Cranebroke, see c.vii pp.264-5 above.