

the interchange of *e* and *i* is common in the manuscripts of Martianus, and both *a* and *t* and *a* and *ti* are readily confused in various pre-Caroline scripts. Martianus likes to call an intimidating woman a *virago*, and virtually glosses the word in his hymn to Athene (p. 286. 16 Dick): *consultis virum praesis: hinc dicta virago*; compare also *Pallas virago est appellata* (p. 373. 3 Dick). The moon is clearly seen initially as a frightening apparition (*terribili quadam maiestate rutilabat*); and this brings us to the next point.

In the second part of the description we are told that even though the moon might be "horned and harsh," still she is *egestionibus opportuna*. This (*pace* Lenaz, ad loc.) is a clear reference to the moon's function as Diana Lucina, invoked in connection with births (cf. Macrobian *Sat.* 7. 16. 27 and *Orphic Hymn* 36. 3–5 Abel). This is her "gentler" role. The heart of the problem is the word *egestionibus*, which is inappropriate. It is used almost exclusively of the expelling of noxious substances (excrement, menstrual flux, and vomit) and malodorous liquids such as semen (for vomit, see Martianus p. 59. 6 Dick), and is not the right word for births. The manuscripts offer a variant *aggestionibus* (= *incrementis*), which is slightly better than *egestionibus*, but still more useful as a step toward recovery of the original reading: a simple correction of the metathesis would give the right word in *gestationibus*.¹³ The goddess is timely at the bearing of children.

DANUTA SHANZER
University of California,
Berkeley

13. Cf. *TLL* 6, 2–3, 1956, 44 for two Late Latin instances: Lactant. *Div. inst.* 3. 22. 10 *lanam et telam viris et infantum gestationes assignare*; Soranus, p. 10. 10 *concepti pecoris intra uterum gestatio et partus*. The word has a semantic range that extends to the "bearing, or carrying" of the child in the womb—hence pregnancy.

A TALE OF TWO MANUSCRIPTS

The minor works of Tacitus and Suetonius' *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* survive through a codex Hersfeldensis, mentioned by Poggio and described in an inventory of Niccolò Niccoli and in a note by Pier Candido Decembrio.¹ The Hersfeldensis was thought to be lost until in 1902 Cesare Annibaldi discovered codex Aesinas Lat. 8, a manuscript containing the *Bellum Troianum* of Dictys of Crete, the *Agricola*, and the *Germania*.²

1. For the texts, as well as general background, see R. P. Robinson, *The "Germania" of Tacitus: A Critical Edition* (Middletown, Conn., 1935), pp. 1–20; more briefly, but with some additional information and more recent bibliography, D. Schaps, "The Found and Lost Manuscripts of Tacitus' *Agricola*," *CP* 74 (1979): 28–42; and C. E. Murgia, "The Length of the Lacuna in Tacitus' *Dialogus*," *CSCA* 12 (1979): 221–40. The main item unavailable to Robinson is a letter of Poggio's son Jacopo published in N. Rubinstein, "An Unknown Letter by Jacopo di Poggio Bracciolini on Discoveries of Classical Texts," *IMU* 1 (1958): 383–400.

2. The manuscript, owned by Conte Aurelio Guglielmo Balleani of Iesi when Annibaldi examined it, is now in the possession of his great-nephew Conte Balleschi-Balleani, although it has been rumored to be up for sale. We rely on the excellent photographs in the paleography collection of Widener Library. For information and help we are grateful to several Harvard colleagues, especially Professors M. Hammond and J. P. Elder.

The Dictys occupies folia 1–51 of the codex, of which folia 1–2, 5–8, and 11–50 are or once were in Caroline minuscule of the ninth century.³ The remaining folia of the Dictys, as well as the upper script of folium 2^v, are in a fifteenth-century hand which Annibaldi identified as that of Stefano Guarnieri. In fact, folium 51 of the Dictys, the first four folia of the *Agricola*, the last two folia of the *Agricola*, and the first three folia of the *Germania*, all in the same fifteenth-century hand, constitute the outer leaves of an oversized gathering of eighteen folia, enclosing in the middle a single ninth-century quaternion of the *Agricola*. The final gathering of the codex (ff. 69–76) is a normal quaternion in Guarnieri's hand, containing the rest of the *Germania*, the text of which ends at the bottom of the first column of folium 75^v, with the rest of 75^v and all of 76 left blank. The sheet which forms folia 69 and 76 is a palimpsest which formed a unio of the ninth-century manuscript and which contained the end of the *Agricola*. Annibaldi identified the ninth-century quire and the erased unio of the *Agricola* as a remnant of the famous codex Hersfeldensis. Most scholars have agreed. C. W. Mendell, however, challenged Annibaldi's identification, and D. Schaps has recently voiced new doubts.⁴ If sustained, the challenge would have important ramifications for many areas of paleography and textual criticism.

The main stumbling block to the identification is the fact that the Aesinas contains a text of Dictys which is written in the same format as the *Agricola*. Both are written in two columns, with thirty lines to a page, and in a Caroline minuscule compatible with the same scriptorium and the same date.⁵ Schaps points as well to a pattern of marginal prickings which curve inward in the upper and lower edges of the photographs, and he suggests that the parchment folia for both Dictys and *Agricola* were ruled with the same jagged measuring rod, or the edge of an old ruled parchment. But it is risky to judge such things from photographs, in which such curving is common, and caused by the curl in the parchment at the outer corners. Aging of parchment may also introduce an irregularity not originally there. In any event, the correspondence of pricking tells us nothing that we do not already know: the identity of format makes it highly likely that both *Agricola* and Dictys were copied at about the same time at the same scriptorium. This is compatible with their originally having been bound together.⁶ Schaps contends that the two texts *must* have been bound together originally, although he concedes that the current binding cannot antedate Guarnieri and that some work must have fallen out between the Dictys and the *Agricola* (since the five folia connecting the last full quaternion of the Dictys with the extant ninth-

3. For a more detailed description of the Dictys, see our Appendix.

4. For Schaps ("Found and Lost Manuscripts," p. 28, n. 2), Mendell is the "lone, but firm, dissenter." See C. W. Mendell, "Discovery of the Minor Works of Tacitus," *AJP* 56 (1935): 113–30; idem, "Manuscripts of Tacitus' Minor Works," *MAAR* 19 (1949): 133–45; id., *Tacitus: The Man and His Work* (New Haven, 1957), pp. 241–54.

5. Professor Bischoff dates the Aesinas *Agricola* to the middle third of the ninth century and assigns it to the West ("vielleicht an der Loire"): "Das benediktinische Mönchtum und die Überlieferung der klassischen Literatur," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens* 92 (1981): 181.

6. Parchment for the construction of codices would come from a common pool at a given time and scriptorium, usually already pricked and ruled. If that were not so, pricking would vary with the scribe (the Dictys alone is the work of several scribes). Unless the folia were folded before pricking, Schaps' suggestion does not explain why the inward curve at the bottom is symmetrical on each side, always inward, and never (for example) inward on the left side of the sheet and outward on the right, as might happen if a rod was moved over.

century quaternion of the *Agricola* are too few to form a normal quire). But since none of the humanists mentions a text of Dictys in conjunction with the Hersfeld Tacitus, Schaps concludes that the Aesinas *Agricola* is a separate discovery: the Hersfeld manuscript was indeed the ancestor of all extant copies of the *Germania*, the *Dialogus*, and the *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, but the Hersfeld *Agricola* disappeared without a trace—sometime after Decembrio inspected the codex in 1455.

This is untenable. The humanists did not mention the Dictys because they were eagerly and singlemindedly seeking to rediscover the works of classical antiquity. Even if the fourth-century Dictys is considered a “classic,” it was not in need of rediscovery: the text was popular and widely disseminated in the Middle Ages, and Poggio had acquired a copy in 1417.⁷ But hear from Poggio himself in a letter to Niccolò of 15 May 1427, discussing the Hersfeld monk (3. 12 Tonelli):⁸ “Vir ille bonus, expers studiorum nostrorum, quicquid reperit ignotum sibi id et apud nos incognitum putavit. itaque refert illud [the inventory] libris quos habemus, qui sunt iidem de quibus alias cognovisti. mitto autem ad te nunc *partem inventarii sui*, in quo describitur volumen illud Cornelii Taciti et aliorum quibus *cavemus*.” Poggio deliberately omitted works already familiar to humanist circles.

Schaps counters: “but the Frontinus had been found by 1431, and Niccoli cited it anyway.” Niccolò (in 1431) was reproducing the inventory sent by Poggio in 1427. The Frontinus was not discovered until 1429, and in a badly corrupted state: a better exemplar was—and still is—needed. Niccolò also sought an Ammianus Marcellinus from Hersfeld, although Poggio had brought an Ammianus manuscript from Fulda in 1417. Yet Poggio’s Ammianus (now Vat. Lat. 1873) contained only Books 14–31 and was “ita mendosum ut nil corruptius esse possit” (*Epist.* 9. 32 Tonelli). Poggio (and Niccolò) may have hoped for a better text, even though the Hersfeld copy contained the same eighteen books.⁹ Schaps wrongly alleges that “the Suetonius, too, had turned up by Decembrio’s time, but he did not for that reason neglect to note that it existed in his manuscript.” The Hersfeld manuscript is the archetype of all known manuscripts of the *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, and this work did not “turn up” until the Hersfeld codex did: Decembrio duly notes its first appearance.¹⁰

As early as 3 November 1425 Poggio had mentioned to Niccolò the existence in a German monastery of Frontinus and unknown works of Tacitus (2.34 Tonelli = 42 Gordan). Schaps cites this letter, and a letter of Panormita (to Guarino of Verona), which, in listing *Germania*, *Agricola*, Fronto (so also Poggio in his earliest letters, instead of Frontinus), *Dialogus*, and Suetonius, exhibits the same selection as Poggio’s excerpt of the Hersfeld inventory. Panormita’s letter is undated, but Sabbadini claimed a date of April 1426. Schaps did not quote the conclusion of the letter:¹¹ “Hi et innumerabiles alii qui in manibus versantur, et praeterea

7. See R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci* (repr. Florence, 1967), p. 81.

8. No. 49 in the selections translated by P. W. Goodhart Gordan, *Two Renaissance Book Hunters* (New York, 1974). Emphasis is ours.

9. Note that Niccolò did not know the number of folia in the Hersfeld Ammianus. Possibly then the Ammianus was not included in the inventory sent by Poggio in 1427. It is mentioned by Poggio in letter 2. 12 Tonelli, and Niccolò may also have previously been informed of it (e.g., after 2. 34 Tonelli).

10. See G. Brugnoli, preface to Teubner Suetonius (2d ed., Leipzig, 1963).

11. Published by Sabbadini, and cited by Robinson, “*Germania*,” p. 3.

alii fortasse qui in usu non sunt, uno in loco simul sunt; ii vero omnes . . . cui-dam mihi coniunctissimo dimittentur propediem, ab illo autem ad me proxime et de repente; tu secundo proximus eris, qui renatos sane illustrissimos habiturus sis. . . ." We judge from this that Poggio had sent Panormita the same excerpt of the inventory that he had sent Niccolò, with much the same explanation, and had promised to send him the manuscripts or copies of them after he acquired them. Poggio was in friendly correspondence with Panormita in 1426 (2. 40 and 2. 42 Tonelli). Schaps, following Mendell, takes Panormita as independent of Poggio, and his competitor. No matter. Panormita, no less than Poggio, makes it clear that he has excluded from mention "alii qui in manibus versantur." The "numerous testimonia" to the Hersfeld Tacitus/Suetonius are in fact but two: reports derived from the Hersfeld monk's inventory¹² and the description given by Decembrio. And Decembrio's interests were the same as Poggio's: he neglects the Dictys in reporting the newly discovered works that he has seen.

We do not know for sure that the Dictys was bound into the same volume as Tacitus/Suetonius in Hersfeld. The Dictys shows a close codicological affinity with the *Agricola*, and it was, to be sure, in the same place in the fifteenth century. In addition, the forty-nine or so folia of the original Dictys together with the fifty-one or so folia indicated for the Tacitus/Suetonius could have formed a single volume of normal size.¹³ But it may be that the Dictys and the Tacitus/Suetonius formed separate volumes of a two-volume set. We find such two-volume sets, though not always so evenly balanced.¹⁴ One volume or two: it hardly matters. There is nothing but humanists' silence to suggest that the Dictys and the *Agricola* arrived "in two halves in Italy at the same time." If they could have arrived together, it is "naturalness itself" that they could find their way into the hands of the same collector, and for them to be bound together.¹⁵ The *Agricola* would be bound with the Dictys for a combination of two reasons: the fourteen folia of the *Agricola* (or twenty-five of *Agricola/Germania*) are too few to form a codex by themselves, and the Dictys has the same format and page size, and so combines to make a compatible volume. Guarnieri's own replacements, some with palimpsests from the original book, provide clear evidence for some degree of dismemberment which the original Aesinas had undergone. Pontanus' note tells us

12. Since Poggio sent Niccolò only the part of the inventory that contained books which they lacked, and the extant inventory of Niccolò contains—except for the Ammianus (see n. 9 above)—only books which they (in 1427) lacked, it follows that the letter of Jacopo (above, n. 1), which lists no Hersfeld texts not already in Niccolò's inventory, drew on the same excerpts made by Poggio, and not on the Hersfeld monk's original.

13. Calculation of the number of folia in the original codex will vary with the estimate of the size of the lacuna in the *Dialogus* (after chapter 35). Murgia ("Length of the Lacuna") has argued that the lacuna was of a single folium, and that Decembrio's figures indicate a total of 51 folia, with the last verso left blank. The text of Dictys had 49 folia: six quaternions plus an extra folium containing the text of the current f. 51 of the Aesinas: see our Appendix. Binding in a single folium at the end of a gathering would have been hazardous (usually single folia are found in the center of a gathering). If the Dictys were a separate volume, it is more likely that it ended with a unio, the final folium of which was left blank. This would give 50 folia for the Dictys.

14. For instance, codex Paris. Lat. 11308, now bound as one volume, was originally two (as indicated by the quire signatures). The two parts are consistent in style, format, date (second quarter of the ninth century), and probable scriptorium (Reims). The first part (ff. 1–67) contains a miscellany of texts related to Virgil, the second (ff. 68–113) contains glosses on *Aeneid* 1–5. See C. E. Murgia, *Prolegomena to Servius 5: The Manuscripts* (Berkeley, 1975), p. 26.

15. Schaps, "Found and Lost Manuscripts," p. 41.

that the *Germania*, the *Dialogus*, and the Suetonius were in circulation by 1460,¹⁶ whereas the *Agricola* (which Decembrio had seen with them in 1455) failed to turn up for some years thereafter.

For the tendency of texts to "play musical chairs," one might compare the progeny of the Hersfeldensis, which vary widely in contents and arrangement; in fact, no two of them correspond precisely.¹⁷ For instance, the codex Aesinas contains the *Germania* bound after the *Agricola*; yet the text of the *Germania* was not copied directly from the Hersfeldensis, but is many copies removed. Here text once joined in the Hersfeld archetype has been reunited by different paths. The Aesinas was in turn the exemplar of codex Toletanus 49. 2. This codex (T) contains *Germania*, *Agricola*, *Io. Antonii Campani Oratio*, and several other works, including letters of Pliny. Two facts should be noted: the Dictys has disappeared, and other unrelated works have taken its place; the order of the Hersfeldensis (*Germania*, then *Agricola*) has been restored by sheer coincidence. Another descendant of the Aesinas is codex A (Vat. Lat. 3429). This contains only the *Agricola*, but it is bound with the *editio Veneta Spirensis* (from which the *Agricola* was missing), and so has been reunited with the *Germania* and the *Dialogus*. From A's *Agricola* descends indirectly codex B (Vat. Lat. 4498).¹⁸ This contains Frontinus *De aquaeductibus*, Rufus *De provinciis*, Suetonius *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, "C. Plinii Secundi *De viris illustribus*," *Agricola*, *Dialogus*, *Germania*, followed by a variety of works. Its *Germania* does not descend from the Aesinas, so again text has parted company and been reunited. Similarly, although a text of Frontinus was at Hersfeld, the Frontinus in this manuscript descends rather from the surviving archetype at Monte Cassino (see below).

Schaps is disturbed by "coincidences," but the coincidences he requires would be most extraordinary. The extant ninth-century quire of the Aesinas *Agricola* fits exactly the description of the Hersfeldensis given by Niccolò and Decembrio in being of two columns and indicating a length of fourteen folia¹⁹ (as Guarnieri supplied it). Schaps underestimates this coincidence: "the number of pages in so short a treatise would probably be nearly the same in any manuscript of roughly the same style."²⁰ Guarnieri tried to duplicate precisely the style of the ninth-century *Agricola* when he copied the *Germania*, but his *Germania* consumed but nine and three-quarters folia, whereas both Niccolò and Decembrio tell us that the Hersfeld *Germania* occupied twelve folia. Codex T, in copying the Aesinas, consumed twenty-one folia on the *Agricola*, fifteen on the *Germania*. The range of possibilities is apparent with a glance at Robinson's survey of the witnesses to the *Germania*.²¹ Of twenty-three witnesses whose folia are listed (omitting fragments and editions), the range is from eight to twenty-four folia, and only one codex (W) has exactly the twelve folia (twenty-four pages) of the Hersfeldensis. Out of a range of eight to twenty-four folia, the odds against correspondence by

16. See B. L. Ullman, "Pontano's Handwriting and the Leiden Manuscript of Tacitus and Suetonius," *IMU* 2 (1959): 309–35.

17. See G. Brugnoli, "La vicenda del Codice Hersfeldense," *RCCM* 3 (1961): 68–90.

18. See C. E. Murgia, "The Minor Works of Tacitus: A Study in Textual Criticism," *CP* 72 (1977): 323–26.

19. Niccolò: "Qui liber continet xiiii folia"; Decembrio: "Opus foliorum decem et quattuor in columnellis."

20. "Found and Lost Manuscripts," p. 34.

21. "*Germania*," pp. 78–89.

coincidence in a predetermined number are eighteen to one if only complete folia are counted, thirty-six to one if pages are counted, or perhaps as much as seventy-two to one if one counts columns (as Decembrio did). These odds must then be multiplied against the odds for other coincidences noted in order to arrive at the total odds against overall correspondence. A noncoincidental correspondence could occur if the Aesinas was a quire-by-quire copy of the Hersfeldensis, or vice versa. If the former were true, we would find evidence of it in the scribe's writing near the end of the quire (we do not). If the Hersfeldensis were a quire-by-quire copy of the pre-Guarnieri Aesinas, that manuscript would indeed still be, as most believe, the archetype from which these texts descend.

The Aesinas *Agricola* conforms as well to the Hersfeldensis in starting the gathering exactly where it should if preceded by a text of the *Germania* filling twelve folia as described in the Hersfeldensis:²² that is, two preceding quires of eight folia would have contained the twelve folia of the *Germania* and four folia of the *Agricola*. If the first four folia of the *Agricola* were separated from the last four folia of the *Germania* (with which they had formed a quaternion), they could no longer conveniently be bound together, and this would necessitate their re-copying. Unless prompted by an arrangement precisely as described in the Hersfeldensis, there is no apparent motivation for Guarnieri's destruction of the ninth-century text of the first four and last two folia of the *Agricola* and his creation of the unusual gathering of eighteen folia. The title that survives in palimpsest is also the same as that attested for the Hersfeldensis.²³ Further, the *Agricola* corresponds with the evidence of the manuscripts of the *Germania* that the archetype was filled with marginal variants, and these variants are consistent in kind.²⁴

The usual explanation of the current composition of the Aesinas is that Enoch of Ascoli sold his treasures separately, the Dictys and the *Agricola* going to one buyer, the *Germania*, *Dialogus*, and Suetonius to another. This resulted in a dismantling of the Hersfeldensis, with the *Agricola* (of which the fourteen folia were too few to form a codex by themselves) then being bound with the Dictys—and with a copy of the *Germania*, the proximate source of which is not the Hersfeldensis itself. As a result, the *Agricola* is missing in most manuscripts of the minor works and in the earliest printed edition. Schaps must claim the coincidence both of the disappearance of a work described as seen in Rome in 1455,²⁵ and of the sudden emergence of a different manuscript of the work which fits exactly the description of the missing one. Just how likely this is can be seen by comparing the parallel circumstances of Frontinus.

Poggio and his friends never succeeded in acquiring the Hersfeld Frontinus.²⁶ Instead, Poggio found an exemplar at Monte Cassino, which he mentions in a

22. See Robinson's chart ("*Germania*," p. 19).

23. *De Vita Iulii Agricolae*, which Guarnieri (followed by A and B) changed to *De Vita et Moribus Iulii Agricolae* (so Guarnieri's *explicit*).

24. Murgia, "Length of the Lacuna," p. 230; id., "Minor Works of Tacitus," pp. 327–40; Robinson, "*Germania*," pp. 30–78.

25. So begins Decembrio's note: "Corneli taciti liber reperitur Romae uisus 1455." On the basis of Pontano's notes in codex Leidensis Periz. XVIII Q 21 (quoted by Robinson, "*Germania*," p. 351), it is generally believed that the Hersfeldensis was brought to Rome by Enoch of Ascoli, who is known to have returned to Rome with manuscripts in the autumn of 1455.

26. See H. Bloch, "The Hersfeld Manuscript of Frontinus' *De Aquaeductu Urbis Romae*," *AJP* 69 (1948): 74–79; R. H. Rodgers, "The Textual Tradition of Frontinus' *De Aquaeductu Urbis Romae*: Preliminary Remarks," *BICS* 25 (1978): 101–5.

letter to Niccolò of 9 July 1429 (3. 37 Tonelli = 73 Gordan): "Vidi autem bibliothecam Monasterii, repperique librum, in quo erat Julius Frontinus de Aquaeductu Urbis. Et item Firmici Matheseos libri VIII. sed in principio desunt primus liber, et item pars secundi. . . . Portavi volumen hoc mecum, ut transcribam libellum Frontini. . . ." *Et item* (Gordan translates "it also contains") and *volumen hoc* seem to represent that the Firmicus and the *De aquaeductu* were bound into the same *liber* when Poggio removed it from Monte Cassino. In letter 3. 39 Tonelli (75 Gordan, of 23 July 1429) he talks of sending the Firmicus to Niccolò. But in letter 4. 2 Tonelli (79 Gordan, of 13 December 1429) he states: "Liber Montis Cassini repetitur a me. itaque remittam eum. transcripsi enim, ut nosti, de aquaeductibus, quod mihi curae erat: reliqua non magnopere me delectant." Niccolò evidently expressed disappointment over not being able to have the Firmicus, since in 4. 4 Tonelli (81 Gordan, of 25 December 1429) Poggio answers his complaint and offers to send the Frontinus instead (presumably the copy mentioned in 4. 2 above).²⁷ If this were all that we knew about the Frontinus, we should suppose that the codex when discovered would contain Frontinus *De aquaeductu* and Firmicus *Matheseos libri VIII*.

As it happens, the codex survives as Casinensis 361, and textual studies confirm that this is indeed the source of all humanist copies of Frontinus' treatise.²⁸ The codex contains 222 pages (111 folia), almost all in the hand of the twelfth-century Cassinese librarian, Peter the Deacon. Pages 1–41 contain Vegetius *De re militari*. Page 42 (f. 21^v) was apparently left blank. Pages 43–65 contain Frontinus *De aquaeductu urbis Romae* (the same title as cited by Poggio, 3. 37 Tonelli). The Frontinus ends two-thirds of the way down page 65. The rest of page 65, continuing on to page 67, is filled with a fragment of Varro *De lingua latina*, still in the hand of Peter the Deacon. Below the Varro on page 67 begins Peter's own *Liber de locis sanctis*. The rest of the codex contains a variety of works, many by Peter the Deacon, but including, on pages 219 ff., a fragment of Cicero *In Verrem* 2. 3. 53–56. There is no Firmicus. Yet Poggio's conjunction was not entirely accidental, for the two works appear in close proximity in a later fifteenth-century catalogue of the Monte Cassino library.²⁹ Poggio never mentioned the Vegetius, because he had acquired a copy of Vegetius in 1417,³⁰ the same year he had acquired Dictys. The *De lingua latina*, too, was already known: it had been copied in Florence in 1427.³¹ The situation is exactly parallel to the suppression of the Hersfeld Dictys.

27. Gordan's translation well captures the flavor: "You have now kept the Lucretius for fourteen years and the Asconius Pedianus too. . . . But you even complain about the Julius Firmicus. If the book had been mine, I would have presented it to you; but since it belonged to the Monastery of Monte Cassino, do you believe the Abbot would have waited for it for ten years? As for the Frontinus and the fragment of Aratus which you mentioned, they are here with me and I shall send them to you when I know that you have copied the earlier ones I mentioned."

28. See Rodgers, "Textual Tradition"; further documentation will appear in forthcoming studies by M. D. Reeve and W. W. Ehlers. For a description of the manuscript, see M. Inguañez, *Codicum Casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus*, vol. 2 (Monte Cassino, 1934), pp. 208–12.

29. Vat. Lat. 3961, f. 14^v (composed 1464–71): see M. Inguañez, *Catalogi codicum Casinensium antiqui* (Monte Cassino, 1941), p. 38. The Frontinus listed there, in company with Vegetius and Peter the Deacon, is undoubtedly the text in codex Casinensis 361.

30. Sabbadini, *Scoperte*, p. 80.

31. Codex Laurentianus 51. 5 was copied in Florence in 1427 from Laur. 51. 10, which had been brought to Florence from Monte Cassino. There is, however, no indication of authorship attached to the scrap of Varro in Casinensis 361.

How much coincidental correspondence is there between Casinensis 361 and the Hersfeld codex of Frontinus? The title is different: *Julii Frontini de aquaeductibus qui in urbem inducuntur* in the Hersfeld inventory;³² *Incipit prologus iulii frontini in libro de aqueductu urbis romae* in red in the first line of the codex. The order of books is apparently different: what the inventory describes as *De aquaeductibus* is labeled Book 2 in the Cassino codex; following the description of this book, the inventory gives *Item eiusdem frontini liber incipit sic*, and follows this with a quotation of the beginning of the prologue of Book 1. The codex is in the hand of Peter the Deacon, incompatible with Hersfeld. It contains only eleven and one-third folia, versus twenty-four for the two parts of the work in Hersfeld. Even the proportions are different: nine pages for book 1, and thirteen and two-thirds for Book 2 in the Casinensis; eleven and thirteen folia for the equivalent books in Hersfeld. Book 1 is about two and one-half pages short of what it should be if proportionate to the Hersfeld codex. In brief, about every difference that could exist does exist. And that is the difference we should find between the Aesinas *Agricola* and the described Hersfeld *Agricola* if they were not in fact identical.

APPENDIX

All published descriptions of the section of the codex Hersfeldensis that contains the Dictys are confusing, incomplete, and contradictory. Annibaldi's account is closest to accurate, but gaps in his report have led to serious misinterpretation by Robinson (who never saw the MS) and Eisenhut (to whose 1958 Teubner edition we refer in this discussion). In the interest of clearing up misunderstandings, preventing new ones, and laying the groundwork for a more precise understanding of the status of transmission of the Dictys, we offer the following description based on the facsimiles available to us.

Folia 1–2, ruled in the ninth-century manner (with pricking and the impression of a stylus), now constitute a unio, but had originally formed the outer sheet of the first quire of the Dictys. Folium 1 contains (in Caroline minuscule written over by a humanist³³) on the recto a letter of Septimius to Rufinus and on the verso the beginning of Book 1 through *transmissa* (p. 4. 22 Eisenhut). Text does not start with the top of the first column of folium 1^r. The first line of the first column seems to be blank. Lines 2–5 contain *Incipit historia belli troiani / quam dictis apud grecos scripsit. / Traducta per Septimum / Incipit prologus*. Lines 2–3 and 5 are in red (according to Annibaldi), and basically in Caroline minuscule. Line 4 (*Traducta per Septimum*) is in black (so Annibaldi), and is by the humanist. The next thirteen lines are blank. Line 19 has, in the hand of the humanist, *Septimio Q. Rufino Sal.* The next three lines are blank. Text of the letter starts

32. This version of the title is reconstructed from the testimony of two witnesses to Poggio's inventory: Niccolò's inventory and Jacopo's letter (omitting, that is, the minor errors of one or the other). Jacopo's letter draws on the same source as Niccolò's inventory and helps confirm the existence of the inventory among Poggio's papers. It is less complete in its description of the minor works and Suetonius, although apparently more accurate in some individual words. The consensus of Niccolò and Jacopo gives us one testimony: Jacopo had no firsthand knowledge of the Hersfeldensis.

33. The humanist may be the same who wrote much of the remaining codex (Guarnieri), but the circumstances of writing (now mixed with Caroline script, now in a casual hand) make secure identification difficult.

with line 23 (in Caroline minuscule, often written over by the humanist) *Aefemeriden belli troiani dyc-*. Text of the letter continues through line 30 of column 1, and to lines 26–28 of column 2: *Tu Rufine mi ut par est fave / ceptis atque in legendo dyc / tym*. Most of what is now visible of this text is in the humanist's hand, and the text stops abruptly after the first syllable of line 28, with lines 29–30 completely blank (or vanished). The first two lines of column 1 on folium 1^v are also left blank (perhaps for the rubricator), with the result that the first two words of Book 1 (*Cuncti reges*) are omitted with the title. Text starts on line 3 with *qui minois ioue geniti prone-*. Although the outside corners of the first folium have perished, the margins are very wide, and this damage did not approach the area of the text. It is, by the way, noteworthy that the name Septimius is not attested in Caroline writing, so far as is now legible. Ultraviolet inspection of the codex itself would be desirable.

Folium 2 is erased: the recto is now blank, but the verso contains in Guarnieri's hand the prologue which begins the work in codices known before the Hersfeldensis was discovered (the letter to Rufinus is found only in the Hersfeldensis and in some fifteenth-century MSS, all with the final lacuna). The underscript of folium 2 contained the end of Book 1 and the beginning of Book 2, through *secundo* (p. 21. 30). Folia 3–4 and 9–10, the two outer leaves of the first full quire of the manuscript in its present state, are ruled in the manner of the fifteenth century, and the writing is Guarnieri's. On what is now folium 3^v Guarnieri first wrote the prologue, but erased it after transferring its text to folium 2^v; in its place he copied (from f. 1^r) the letter to Rufinus. Folia 3^v and 4 contain the beginning of Book 1 through *sermonem partius* (p. 7. 5). Folia 5–8, in a Carolingian hand, continue the text from *quaeso* (p. 7. 6) through *vicariam* (p. 17. 10). Folia 9–10, again Guarnieri, contain *victimam* (p. 17. 10) through *secundo* (p. 21. 30); folium 10^v corresponds precisely to the textual arrangement in the underscript of folium 2^v of which it evidently is a copy. The present arrangement preserves the two inner bifolia of the first quaternion of the ninth-century codex (ff. 5–8), enclosed by two sheets copied from that original quaternion. Folia 1–2 (ff. 1 and 8 of the original), apart from the prologue on folium 2^v, now function as flyleaves. The second bifolium of the original codex has disappeared. Folia 11–50 form five regular Carolingian quires. Folium 51, as noted above, is in Guarnieri's hand, part of the leaf which also supplies the third folium of the *Germania*.

The Hersfeldensis therefore began with the letter to Rufinus, but lacked (at least at the beginning) the prologue. Other early manuscripts, starting with codex Sangallensis 197 (listed by Eisenhut as saec. IX vel X), possess the prologue but lack the letter. The post-Guarnieri Aesinas possesses both letter and prologue, and contains therefore a conflation of the two traditions.

C. E. MURGIA
*University of California,
Berkeley*

R. H. RODGERS
New Haven, Vermont