Cambridge: Trinity College, MS.O.9.8

Scipio/Caesar controversy; humanist formulary; Cicero

England, s.xv / Italy, s.xvmed

I


II

i 12 4–9 misplaced (as fol.19–24), ii 12 iii 12 wants 1 (before fol.25), iv 10 v 12 | vi–vii 10 viii 2 ix 4 + 2 (as fol.82–3) and with 4 (fol.81) adrift, x9 adrift | xi 127 wants 5–8 (between fol.88–9) xii 12 wants 12 (after fol.103). Closing sections of the manuscript are in a sorry state making collation very difficult. Leaf signatures in I, also some catchwords. Pricking is also occasionally visible in this part.

III

I: written space extremely variable between 193 × 132mm and 154 × 144mm. Throughout an average of 27 long lines. Dry-ruled with a single border; some signs of full pricking.

II: 188 × 132mm. 43 long lines, faintly ruled with single border leaving reddish line.

III: 196 × 136mm. 50 long lines, single border only ruled, sometimes leaving reddish line.

IV

There are six hands in all involved in the writing of this manuscript. In I, there are three English hands, all reflecting to a differing degree French influence. They divide as follows: first hand fol.1–24 (items 1–4); second, which is more florid than the first, fol.25–45 (item 5); third, which is the most clearly French-influenced fol.46–57 (item 6). In II, there are two small late gothic Italian hands, with the first writing fol.58–81 (item 7) and the second, fol.82–84 (item 8–12). III is written by yet another, larger, late gothic Italian hand in thick brown ink.

VI

Several readers have left some mark in this codex, but only two annotate with any regularity. One (reader ‘a’) is a small English hand, showing humanist influence and sometimes drawing a thin maniculum; this hand appears in both I (eg. fol.1, 23, 26) and in II (eg. fol.58, 59, 65) where it notes the subject–matter of sections of the formulary. The other set of frequent marginalia (reader ‘b’) is in a large gothic hand in dark ink, which is confined to I. In that section, however, it adds running titles as well as a distinctive vertical maniculum, complete with extravagant cuff. In one of his annotations, he refers to Salop (fol.42), perhaps suggesting his place of origin. If so, he was a compatriot of Thomas Candour, who corrects the text of part I (eg. fol.9, 13, 24). Among the readers who annotate less frequently, there is one fifteenth century reader who writes against item 4 (fol.22): a bakbyte.

VII

The binding is insignificant and inadequate, being made of two card boards and a flimsy spine.

2o fo.: I: ere alieno fuit...

II: [fol.59] ille quem rumor...

* * *

I

[1] fol.1–3

Poggio Bracciolini, letter to Scipio Mainente, 1435

{incomplete}

tit.: ^Concertatio quedam^ / {Controversia} inter egregios viros Poggium Florentinum et Guarinum veronensem / super prestantia Scipionis Affricam et Caesaris. Et primo Poggius in laude Scipionis.

epist.: Poggius pl. sal. dicit Scipionis ferrariensi v.c. Rem sane arduam ... exercitu adeo res perdite|


The incomplete nature of this and the following article is explained by the misplacing of five fol. after fol.18. Accordingly, the original order of folios would have been: fol.1–3, 19–24, 4–18. So, for rest of this letter, see fol.19–22 below.

Title added by Thomas Candour.
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[2] fol.4–18v: Guarino da Verona, letter to Poggio, 1435 {incomplete}
epist.: ||romanam libertatem quod tamen ... nomen et preconium consequaris. Vale
For opening section of letter, see fol.22–24 below.

sine titulo
epist.: Poggio pl. sal. dicit equiti insigni leonello Estensi. Existi/i/mo magnum pondus...de hac disputacione iudices||
The letter lacks its final lines; they will have appeared on the following folio (preceding the present fol.25), which is now missing.

[1a] fol.19–22: Poggio Bracciolini, letter to Scipio Mainente, 1435 {incomplete}
epist.: ||et desperate essent ... ut quisquis sentiat quod velit. Vale iii Idus aprilis.
Florence.
Completion of letter started at fol.1–3v above.

sine titulo
epist.: Guarinus illustri d. Leonello estensi. Nuncius ecce novus afferrtur...sententiam proferes.
Printed in Sabbadini, op. cit., no.699.

[2a] fol.22–24v: Guarino da Verona, letter to Poggio, 1435 {incomplete}
sine titulo
epist.: Guarinus veronensis c.v. Poggio apostolico pl. sal. dicit. Remeante proximis illustri principe ... opera deletam fuisse||
Opening of letter, the main part of which appears at fol.4–18v above.

[5] fol.25–43v: Poggio Bracciolini, defensiuncula {incomplete}
tract.: ||contra ac ius nostre amicicie requirit ... a {probatis simus} /probatis/simis/ auctoribus referuntur. Vale & parce longitudini mee./ EXPLICIT
Only a few lines are missing at the start of the article. The lost preceding folio probably included not only the end of Poggio’s letter to Leonello d’Este (fol.18v above) and the opening to this work, but also Poggio’s covering letter to Francesco Barbaro [Op. Om. I, pp.356–7; cf. Bod., MS.Bodl. 915].

sine titulo
epist.: Petrus de monte apostolice sedis protonotarius Salutem pl. dicit poggio secretario v.c. Proximis diebus cum per absentiam ... laudesque manebunt. Vale & parce ruditati atque ineptie mee. Ex londonijs pridie kls februarias.
Reader ‘b’ adds the title at fol.44: Epistola ad Poggium / per petrum de Monte pontificis / maximi protonotarium missa
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II


  *sine tit.*

  *form.*: Gaudeo plurimum ac letor in ea ... locupletes efficias {aplid}|amp|liores
  Vale Et sic est finis. *Explicit*


Scribe adds at the top of fol.58: *Principium medium finem deus ipse secundet.* Reader ‘a’ also supplies in the margin the title: *Gasparini pergamenensis Epistole. In genere dubio. Through the formulary, this reader adds marginal section headings. Reader ‘b’ adds the explicit.*

[8] fol.82r–v:  **anon.,** university oration (1440)

  *tit.*: incipit sermo magistralis
  *orat.*: Nunquam ego eruditissimi patres tantum de me sperare ... existat in scolorum[?] scolam. Amen anno cccc xl

Unidentified.

[9] fol.82v:  **anon.,** university oration

  *sine titulo*
  *orat.*: Magno ac pene incredibilis anxietas ... celeberrime doctores alme
  universitatis.

Not in Bertalot.

[10] fol.83r–v:  **Antonio da Bergamo(?),** epistle to Antonio de la Massa

  *sine titulo*

  *epist.*: Constitui mecum vir amplissime ... inhumanissime propuleris.

Unprinted: Bertalot, ii/1, no.2607; see also Bertalot, *Studien,* ii, pp.225–6. In neither case is this copy cited. For tentative identification of the author, see [xv] in the list below.


  *tit.*: quidam congratulacio ad dominum apostolicum editum per dominum
  Athonium de bentivolij
  *orat.*: Sepe enim numero antequam ad tue maiestatis conspectum ... in suplicijs
  vicam afferre possit.

Perhaps the same as *Udine: Biblioteca Arcivescovale, MS.70, fol.42v–43, discussed by Bertalot, *Studien,* ii, p.228 - but the *explicit* does not concur.

[12] fol.84r–v:  **anon.,** oration {incomplete}

  *sine titulo*
  *orat.*: Crebris meditacionibus meme ... inspicatis clarissimo homine||

Unprinted: Bertalot, ii/1, no.2745, citing this as the only copy.

III

[13] fol.85v:  **Gasparino Barzizza,** oration to the Duke of Milan {incomplete}

  *orat.*: ||Que vero fuit in aliquo...dignitati salutique consules. Vale principum
  optime et me recomissum habe.

Full oration in Furietti, pp.36–9; for another copy (with some textual differences), see BL, MS.Harl.2268, fol.3v–4v.
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[14] fol.85r–v: Leonardo Bruni, dedication to Innocent VII of translation of Plato’s *Phaedo*

*tit.:* leo aretini Innocencio pp vij

*orat.:* [Q]ui tuam laudant sanctitatem ... ex nostris libris patetur sumpsisse.


*epist.:* tacio que mihi ... relictus proiectus ab hijs.

This collection runs from I.17.6 to IV.5.1.

* * *

The three fascicles of this manuscript were clearly written separately but were brought together early in their life. Parts I and II both have marginalia by reader ‘a’, and reader ‘b’, who copiously annotates part I, adds *explicit* at the end of item [7]. The fragmentary part III does not include any marginalia to assist with discerning its provenance. However, fol.v of this manuscript is of the same paper and ruled in the same manner as part III. In other words, at an early stage the parts I and II seem to have been inserted between the leaves of part III. The significance of this will be discussed in a moment.

The only fascicle to be written in England was part I. Collation suggests that this copy of the Scipio/Caesar controversy may be derived from del Monte’s presentation copy, CUL, MS.Gg.i.34 (i) {= C}. What is more, Thomas Candour’s interest in this volume suggests that he may have used it as a prototype for his own copies of the controversy [see Bod., MS.Bodl. 915 {= B}] but collation also reveals that his transcription corrects errors in the other two manuscripts and, at the same time, introduces mistakes found elsewhere. In other words, it is likely that he also had access to another copy. This can be demonstrated by a few examples from item [1] above, using Crevatin’s edition as the base-text and with this copy signified as T:

p.310, l.9 iudicant B, C, T: iudicent
p.312, l.13 inaurati C, T: deaurati
p.313, l.17 epistolis Pompeium B: epistolis ad Pompeium
p.318, l.18–9 imperatoribus B, C, T: exercitibus
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Accordingly, the stemma of these copies would seem to be:

```
  x
 /  \
 C   T
  \\
 B
```

The annotations of reader ‘b’ in part I show an interest in the substance of the controversy; on the other hand, that this fascicule was stored with Barzizza’s popular form letters (item [7]) suggests at least one reader regarded it as a guide to epistolary style [on this, see further Cambridge: Jesus, MS.Q.G.15]. The interest of parts II and III, despite their fragmentary nature, is the evidence they provide for the range of humanist orations available in England. What is more, this includes at fol.v°, written in an Italian hand, a list of orations, many of which do not appear here. Though mentioned in James’ description, this list has not been previously transcribed or discussed. I present it here, numbering the entries in roman numerals and providing identifications (where possible) beneath each item:

**[I]** oratio pogii in exequis kardinalis fol/v/entini [sic]


**[II]** oratio demo Stephens ad alexandrum translata [sic] a g[rec]o in l[atinum] per l[eo]n[a]rdum a[r]etinum


**[III]** oratio gasparini perf[gamensis] ad papam

*Gasparino Barzizza*, oraition to either Alexander V or Martin V, printed in Furietti, pp.15–17 or 76–79.
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oratio ga[parini in laudes medicine & pro petendis insignis doctora{..}]

Id., university oration, perhaps that printed in Furietti, pp.50–2 but cf. [XVII] below.

oratio guarini veronensis ad populum v[eronensem] in laude Rectorum

Guarino da Verona, oration on the change of rector at Verona (1409), opening alone printed in Sabbadini, Epistolario, iii, p.10.

oratio gasparini p[ergamensis] ad ducem medioli

oratio ga[s]parini p[ergamensis] ad ducem medioli


oratio leonardi aretini ad innoc[entium papam

Leonardo Bruni, dedicatory letter to Innocent VII, printed in Baron, Brunì, pp.3–4 - cf. above item [14].

oratio francissi [sic] barbaro in promotione alberti gaidolori cum suscipet in signia doctoratus

Francesco Barbaro, oration on Alberto Guidalotto (1416), printed in A.Quirini, ed., Diatriba praeliminaris (Brescia, 1741) pp.162–7. Another copy at MS.Harl.2268, fol.34–5v (item [24]).

oratio antonii pergamensis congratulando antonium bentevolgium

A piece with the same title appears at *Florence: Biblioteca Riccardiana, MS.976, fol.24v–25, on which and on other manuscript copies, see Bertalot, Studien, ii, p.225.

On the difficulty of providing a surname for Antonius Pergamensis, see MS.Harl.2268, fol.58v–60v (item [43]).

oratio {g. p.} ad papam per populum bononensem

There are a series of possibilities for this oration. There is no evidence that Gasparino Barzizza wrote a speech for such an occasion but it could, for example, be the speech made by Vasco of Lisbon, which is at MS.Harl.2268, fol.38v–39v (item [26]); for another possibility, cf. above item [11].

oratio habita in exequis magistri andre Phisici [?]

Unidentified. *BAV, MS.Barb.lat.1809 includes a letter to an Andreas Phisicus [Iter, ii, p.460b]. Not in J.MacManamon, *Funeral Oratory* (London, 1989): the only oration close to this is [pp.265–6] on Andreae Mutinensi medici by Elio Cerva (c.1462-1520) which is too late for this list.

oratio antonii pergamensis ad papam

See note to [X] above.

oratio ad dominum immole [?] in laude scienice

Possibly Coluccio Salutati, letter to Lodovico degli Alidosi (1395) on studia litterarum, printed in F.Novati, ed., Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati, iii (Rome, 1896) pp.598–614; there is, however, no sign that this circulated on its own or with this title [see Bertalot, ii/1, no.8197]. There is no sign of a later work to suit: the Manfredi of Faenza became signori of Imola in 1439 [L.Simeoni, *Le Signorie* (Milan, 1950) p.607] but *Iter* has no reference to an appropriate oration.

oratio ad fratrem antonium de la massa de laudibus suis per a[ntonium] per[gamensem]

See item [10] above. This reference is the only evidence for authorship and is (once again) frustratingly imprecise; see [X] above.

oratio gasparini pergamensis in exequis magistri Jacobi de forlivio

Gasparino Barzizza, funeral oration on Jacopo da Forlì (1413), printed in Furietti, pp.23–26.

oratio gasp[ar]ini p[ergamensis] in laude medicine

See [IV] above.

oratio leonardi aretini in funere othonis florentini


oratio Babtiste nevii in laudem medicine

Baptiste di Lorenzo del Nevo(?), university oration. An oration with this title appears at *Venice: Biblioteca Marciana, MS.lat. XI.102, fol.9–10, on which and on other manuscript copies see Bertalot, Studien, ii p.227.

oratio perorata in principio studij pro universtate Iuristarum
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Too vague to be identifiable. One possibility is Gasparino Barzizza, university oration (1416?) for a copy of which see MS.Harl.2268, fol.50v–53 (item [38]).

Leonardo Giustiniani, funeral oration on Carlo Zeno, edited in RIS, n.s. xix (Rome, 1941) pp.141–6; another copy at MS.Harl. 2268, fol.24–27v (item [19]).

The connexion between this list and the manuscript’s parts II and III is unclear. As mentioned, the list is written on the same paper as part III; moreover, orations [VII] & [VIII] in the list appear incomplete at fol.85. Perhaps this list catalogues the contents of the manuscript of which part III is the only surviving part. At the same time, part II also seems to bear some relation to the list. Even if item [10] is not [XV] in this list, both show an interest in Antonio de la Massa, as well as in Antonio Bentivoglio [cf. item [11] & [X] above]. It is difficult, however, to relate the other orations of part II to anything in this list. At the least, it would seem likely that part II originates from the same environment as this list and part III. That environment might perhaps be Padua university: several of the orations in the list appear in a Paduan miscellany, *Udine: Biblioteca Arcivescovale, MS.70 [discussed by Bertalot, Studien, ii, pp.209–235; [I] = 12, [II] = 23, [III] ?= 39, [IV] ?= 32, [V]–[VII] = 27–9, [VIII] = 42, [IX] = 17, [X] = 30, [XV] = 31, [XVI] = 15, [XVIII] = 16, [XIX] = 37, [XXI] = 43]. So, this list and the manuscript’s parts II and III may be signs of the continuity of the interest earlier displayed in BL, MS.Harl. 2268 in ‘north-eastern humanism.’

All the more notable is the fact that several of the orations in the list [[I], [V]–[IX]] appear in order in a codex compiled for William Gray, Oxford: Balliol, MS.125. Now, none of the orations in Gray’s manuscript is a rare piece but that they fall in the same order is suggestive (note also that in the Balliol manuscript, as at [14] here, the author is called leo aretinus). According to Mynors, Gray’s manuscript was written in Cologne in 1442-4; could it be that parts II and III of this manuscript were available in their complete form in Germany and then travelled to England soon after?
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However that may be, the use of the list of orations now is to suggest a group of texts that once circulated in England but are now lost. From the list, there is no surviving English copy of [X], [XII]–[XIV] or [XVI]–[XX].

There are several signs of ownership in this manuscript. At the end of part I, there is the signature *Jacobs Norwych* (fol.57v) - that is, James Goldwell, bishop of Norwich and humanist book-collector. If Goldwell owned the whole volume, that would mean he had two (unrelated) copies of Barzizza’s form letters, the other being a Christ Church, Canterbury volume that was (unlike this manuscript) among his gifts to All Souls, Oxford (+Tokyo: Imperial University Library, MS.A.100.1300); however, the position of his *ex libris* allows the possibility that he owned only this first part. Probable owners of the whole manuscript are recorded at fol.103v (recte 102v), where there are two names: at the very top, written twice, *Jhon Dowman*. Beneath that is written: *Samuel Sancky precium - ii s viij d*. The manuscript is in Bernard [II/6089] as no.255 from the library of Thomas Gale.
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