

# THE STATISTICS OF THE CLASSICS IN THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ITALY

JOHN MONFASANI  
UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY – SUNY



A saying that goes back to the late nineteenth century runs: « There are three kinds of lies: lies, damned lies, and statistics ».<sup>1</sup> This witticism came to mind when contemplating the disagreement between Robert Black and me concerning the classics in thirteenth-century Italy.<sup>2</sup> The disagreement itself long predates us and involves some of the most notable scholarly figures of the last hundred years. The issue is whether the thirteenth century brought about the collapse of classical studies in Italy, as Louis Paetow asserted in 1910, seconded by worthies such as Paetow's very influential mentor Charles Homer Haskins (1870–1937), the well-known Italian historian Giuseppe Toffanin (1891–1980), and the distinguished historian of medieval philosophy, Étienne Gilson (1884–1978), or, on the contrary, whether it actually marked the dawn of Renaissance classical studies, as E.K. Rand (1871–1945), Helene Wieruszowski (1893–1978), and Paul O. Kristeller (1905–1999) held.<sup>3</sup> In more recent times Ronald Witt (1932–2017) has

---

<sup>1</sup> See PETER M. LEE at <https://www.york.ac.uk/depts/math/histstat/lies.htm> (last accessed 4 February 2022).

<sup>2</sup> See ROBERT BLACK, « The Rise and Fall of the Latin Classics: The Evidence of Schoolbook Production in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Italy », *Aevum*, 91 (2017), p. 411–464, attacking just one of the arguments in my much more widely focused article: « The Rise and Fall of Renaissance Italy », *Aevum*, 89 (2015), p. 465–481.

<sup>3</sup> LOUIS PAETOW, *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric*, University of Illinois Press, Champaign, IL 1910, that kicked off the debate. For the other participants see MONFASANI, « Rise and Fall », p. 467; BLACK, « Rise and Fall », p. 411–413; and FRANCESCO BRUNI, « Boncompagno da Signa, Guido delle Colonne, Jean de Meung: metamorfosi dei classici nel Duecento », *Medioevo Romano*, 12 (1987), p. 103–128, at 104–106, 120–125. An interesting case is the illustrious Italian scholar Giuseppe Billanovich (1913–2000). BLACK, « Rise and Fall », p. 412, claimed him for his position while WIERUSZOWSKI in her « Rhetoric and the Classics in Italian Education of the Thirteenth Century », *Studia Gratiana*, 11 (1967), p. 169–208 (I used the reprint in EAD., *Politics and Culture in Medieval Spain and Italy*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1971, p. 589–627, at p. 591) did the same for hers. FRANCESCO BRUNI, « Boncompagno da Signa, Guido delle Colonne, Jean de Meun: Metamorfosi dei classici nel

argued for the thirteenth century as marking the take-off stage of Italian Renaissance humanism and classical studies. Indeed, until Witt died, he and Black carried on an almost thirty-year dialectical duel, the opening gambit of which concerned not humanism but rather the question whether reading was taught in the vernacular or exclusively in Latin in Florence's elementary schools.<sup>4</sup> Black supported the latter position in an article of 1991; Witt rejected it in an article of 1995. Black responded to Witt in his 1996 article on Renaissance education but ignored him in his book of 2001 (though listing Witt's article in the bibliography), choosing instead to rebut Paul Gehl and Paul Grendler on the subject.<sup>5</sup> After Witt restated his opposition to Black on vernacular education in his 2000 book *In the Footsteps of the Ancients*,<sup>6</sup> Black responded at length in a 2002 review essay not only on this issue but even more so and more importantly on Witt's understanding of the state of classical studies in medieval Italy and the rise of Renaissance humanism.<sup>7</sup> Black then repeated and expanded upon his position in a 2006 article that appeared in the same volume in which Witt also elaborated upon his argument on the origins of humanism.<sup>8</sup> Witt, in turn, massively

---

Duecento », *Medioevo Romano*, 12 (1987), p. 103–128, at p. 105, would seem to agree with Wieruszowski. Black quotes a passage from BILLANOVICH, *I primi umanisti e le tradizioni dei classici latini*, Edizioni Universitarie, Fribourg 1953, p. 12 (and ID., *Dal Medioevo all'Umanesimo*, Ed. CUSL, Milano 2001, p. 5), where Billanovich laments the contrast between « il bel codice letterario del secolo XII e il codice meschino del XIII »; but elsewhere Billanovich spoke of the rising fortune of classical studies in the later thirteenth century in connection with Lovato Lovati (*I primi umanisti*, p. 13, 17, 20–21; *Dal Medioevo*, p. 6, 9, 11). So, one can read what one wants into Billanovich.

<sup>4</sup> See RONALD WITT, « What Did Giovannino Read and Write? Literary in Early Renaissance Florence », *I Tatti Studies in the Renaissance*, 6 (1995), p. 83–114, at p. 98–109, arguing against ROBERT BLACK, « The Curriculum of Italian Elementary and Grammar Schools, 1350–1500 », in DONALD R. KELLY, RICHARD POPKIN (eds.), *The Shape of Knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht 1991, p. 139–163.

<sup>5</sup> ROBERT BLACK, « The Vernacular and the Teaching of Latin in Thirteenth and Fourteenth-Century Italy », *Studi medievali*, ser. 3, 37 (1996), p. 703–751; and ID., *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001, p. 41–44, refuting PAUL GEHL, *A Moral Art: Grammar, Society and Culture in Trecento Florence*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca–London 1993; and PAUL GRENDLER, *Schooling Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1350–1600*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1989.

<sup>6</sup> RONALD WITT, *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni*, Brill, Leiden 2000, p. 193–194, fn. 74.

<sup>7</sup> *Vivarium*, 40/2 (2002), p. 272–297.

<sup>8</sup> See RONALD WITT, « Kristeller's Humanists as Heirs of the Medieval Dictatores », and ROBERT BLACK, « The Origins of Humanism », in ANGELO MAZZOCCO (ed.), *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2006, p. 21–35 and 37–71 respectively. With a touch of irony, Mazzocco so arranged his volume so that just as Black following Witt criticized Witt, so too did Paul Grendler (« Humanism: Ancient Learning, Criticism, Schools and Universities », p. 73–95), a long-time opponent of Black on schooling in Italy, following Black and, of course, criticized

expanded upon his argument on the origins of Renaissance humanism in his 2012 book *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy* (Cambridge), which Black disputed in a review the next year.<sup>9</sup> Both Witt and Black ascribed *grosso modo* to Paul Oskar Kristeller's interpretation of Renaissance humanism as emerging out of the disciplinary interests of the very large lay legal and notarial class of medieval Italy, giving the back of their hand, gently in the case of Witt,<sup>10</sup> sharply in the case of Black,<sup>11</sup> to Hans Baron's theory of civic humanism, and paying no attention to Eugenio Garin's theory of Renaissance humanism as the philosophy of the civic life.<sup>12</sup>

The odd thing is that although Black and Witt have a variety of interpretative differences and emphases, their biggest divide came down to the statistics of the manuscripts of classical authors in the thirteenth century. To prove against Witt the vitality of interest in classical authors in twelfth-century Italy and the collapse of this interest in the thirteenth, Black provided in his 2001 book on education in medieval and Renaissance Italy a « Handlist of manuscripts of school authors produced in Italy and now found in Florentine libraries », comprising 321 manuscripts by my count,<sup>13</sup> and then in his 2006 critique of Witt he offered up a « Preliminary handlist of non-Beneventan manuscripts of Latin classical school authors produced and/or used as schoolbooks in Italy during the twelfth Century and now found outside of Florence », comprising 127 manuscripts by Witt's count.<sup>14</sup> In response, in an appendix to his *Two Latin Cultures*, Witt challenged not Black's dating of any manuscripts (how could he without himself examining each

---

Black, complaining *inter alia* that the only scholar he seems to approve of was Paul Oskar Kristeller.

<sup>9</sup> In the *American Historical Review*, 118 (2013), p. 804–806.

<sup>10</sup> WITT, 'In the Footsteps', p. 419–425. Witt tries to salvage the salvageable from the Baron thesis, but his analysis really amounts to a repudiation of Baron's fundamental argument. For Black, see also his article « Humanism » in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. VII: C.1415–c.1500, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1998, p. 242–277.

<sup>11</sup> In his review of Witt in *Vivarium*, 40/2, p. 297.

<sup>12</sup> Both Witt and Black, however, like Garin, ascribe an ideological motivation to the origins of humanism. For BLACK, *Origins of Humanism*, p. 53–56, it is an anti-aristocratic animus, for WITT, « Kristeller's Humanists », p. 35, it was a felt need to reform society: « it was the Paduan grammarians' sense of urgency, of moral and political crisis, born of their practical political experience, which sent them to the ancient writers in search of models according to which they could reform their own age ». It should be added that Black also sees Petrarch's religious historical vision as inspiring the humanist movement; see his review of Witt in *Vivarium*, 40/2, p. 295–296, and his article « The Donation of Constantine: a new source for the concept of the Renaissance » in ALISON BROWN (ed.), *Language and Image of Renaissance Italy*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995 p. 51–85.

<sup>13</sup> BLACK, *Humanism and Education*, p. 386–422 (= Appendix IV), analyzed on p. 173–274 (= Chapter 4). Black speaks of « 1,305 manuscripts considered », but does not number the manuscripts he lists.

<sup>14</sup> BLACK, « Origins of Humanism », p. 57–71, where again the listed manuscripts are not numbered. For WITT's count see his *Two Latin Cultures*, p. 490.

of them?), but rather Black's interpretation of his data and also his assumptions.<sup>15</sup> As for the list of manuscripts in Florentine libraries, Witt argued that it cannot be assumed to reflect the whole of Italy, especially when thirteenth-century Florence was in fact exceptional in its preference for vernacular translations of the classics; but even so, 36% of the manuscripts listed by Black are described as being produced in the late twelfth- and early thirteenth centuries, not suggesting therefore a decline. Finally, of Black's inventoried 127 manuscripts outside of Florence, 61 are glossed and 85% of these glosses, by Black own admission, date from the thirteenth century, again suggesting quite the opposite of a collapse of interest in classical authors. In his subsequent review of Witt's book, Black contended that the manuscripts in Florence were drawn from all over Italy,<sup>16</sup> but the fact that he came to expand his inventory to collections outside of Florence suggests that he saw the inadequacy of this assertion.

This was the state of the question when I came to write the 2015 article « The Rise and Fall of Renaissance Italy ». In respect to the statistical evidence for interest in classical authors in thirteenth-century Italy, it occurred to me that a superb database was at hand to resolve the debate, namely, the catalogue of nearly 3,000 Latin classical manuscripts in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Les manuscrits classique latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* (henceforth, *MCLBV*), compiled by an *équipe* of scholars under the direction of Élisabeth Pellegrin (1912–1993).<sup>17</sup> Given that some of the Vatican's largest *fondi*, such as the *Reginenses* and *Palatini*, are collections created in Northern Europe while others of its *fondi* contain a very large number of Northern manuscripts, *MCLBV* offered an excellent cross-section of manuscripts produced throughout Europe in the Middle Ages and could therefore serve for statistical purposes as a proxy for the totality of medieval Latin manuscripts. My analysis of the data provided by *MCLBV* in the 2015 article led to decisive conclusions, and it was precisely one of these conclusions that Robert Black attacked in a 2017 article whose title mimicked the title of my earlier article. He denied that the thirteenth century marked the dawn of Italian Renaissance classical studies. To quote the abstract of Black's article:

Focusing on manuscript schoolbook production in Italy during that period [twelfth- and thirteenth-century Italy], this study examines 317 manuscripts of the canonical classical school authors produced in Italy between 1100 and 1300, based

---

<sup>15</sup> WITT, *Two Latin Cultures*, p. 487–491.

<sup>16</sup> BLACK in the *American Historical Review*, 118 (2013), p. 806.

<sup>17</sup> *Les manuscrits classiques de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. Catalogue établi par Élisabeth Pellegrin [et al.]*, 3 vol. in 5 (vol. II and III have two parts), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris 1975–2010. Members of the *équipe* consisted at different times of Jeannine Fohlen, Colette Jeudy, Yves-François Riou, Adriana Marucchi, François Dolbeau, Jean-Yvres Tilliette, Paola Scarzia Piacentini, Anne-Véronique Gilles-Raynal, Marco Buoncore, and Pierre-Jean Riamond.

on an overall study of 1,843 manuscripts preserved in Italy, Vatican City, Great Britain and the United States. This conclusion is that there was a marked decline in the study of the Latin classics at school in Italy during the thirteenth century, as compared with the twelfth century.<sup>18</sup>

At the end of the narrative part of the article, Black's conclusion was:

When reconsidered on the basis of direct examination and explicit methodology, the Vatican manuscripts considered here offer a picture of classical study from the eleventh to the thirteenth century different from the second-hand synthesis provide by John Monfasani. Rather than a continuum up to the beginning of the fourteenth century, the thirteenth century represents a marked decline of Italian classicism.<sup>19</sup>

By dismissively characterizing my use of *MCLBV* as a « second-hand synthesis », Black showed that he misunderstood one of the great advantages of the evidence of *MCLBV*, namely, that it is the product of neutral, disinterested scholarship. The *équipe* of É. Pellegrin dated and localized manuscripts without any regard for the Black-Witt debate. However confident Black may have been in his paleographic judgment, nonetheless the fact remains that he had a strong vested interest in how he dated the same manuscripts. Witt was not in a position to challenge Black's dating nor did he have a third party to whose judgment he could have appealed. But with *MCLBV* we now have such an impartial third party. We should thus value the dating of the *MCLBV* precisely because it is disinterested, and all the more so because, as we shall see shortly, it also mirrors with remarkable exactness all we know from other sources about classical studies in all the different parts of Europe from the eighth to the sixteenth century, except uniquely in the case of thirteenth-century Italy, if we are to believe Black.

The data of *MCLBV* unequivocally confirmed that classical studies collapsed in Northern Europe in the thirteenth century (a drop off of 40% in extant manuscripts of classical texts, followed by a further decline of 37% in the next century).<sup>20</sup> Italy, however, was different. In Italy, the manuscript statistics suggest, I concluded in 2015, that classical studies suffered only a modest decline, with a drop of only 12% in classical manuscripts produced.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, revisiting anew the data from *MCLBV* for the purposes of this article, I now see that there

---

<sup>18</sup> BLACK, « Rise and Decline », p. 411.

<sup>19</sup> BLACK, « Rise and Decline », p. 419.

<sup>20</sup> See MONFASANI, « Rise and Fall », p. 470. *MCLBV* counted 142.5 Northern manuscripts for the twelfth century, 85.5 for the thirteenth, and 53.5 for the fourteenth. The bizarre « .5 » in these numbers, as explained further on in the present article, reflects how manuscripts dated XII/XIII or XIII/XIV are counted in the statistical compilation.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*: 72.5 manuscripts in the twelfth century, 64 in the thirteenth, and 272.5 in the fourteenth.

was no decline at all. *MCLBV* reports exactly same number of thirteenth-century classical manuscripts for Italy as it does of twelfth-century manuscripts.<sup>22</sup> Italy thus resisted the northern collapse in classical studies. The Italian thirteenth century set the stage, in stark contrast with the North, for an enormous fourteenth-century surge with a 326% increase in classical manuscripts produced between 1300 and 1399. In short, as far as the reading classical authors is concerned, Transalpine Europe and Italy were moving in opposite directions in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Furthermore, Northern Europe and Italy were no less different, if inversely so, before the thirteenth century than they were after. From *MCLBV* we can see that from the eighth to the eleventh centuries Italy produced hardly more than a third as many classical manuscripts as did the North, and in the twelfth century only half the amount produced in the North.<sup>23</sup> These statistics mirror quite closely the cultural situation in Europe from the eighth to the twelfth centuries that nearly all scholars agree was actually the case. The same is certainly true for Northern Europe in the thirteenth century. So, the question is why should we believe that *MCLBV* data are wrong only when it comes to Italy in the thirteenth century? Did the *équipe* of É. Pellegrin suddenly become incompetent when dating manuscripts to the Italian thirteenth century, as one must believe in order to accept Robert Black's rejection of *MCLBV*'s data?

In point of fact, though Black believes that the *MCLBV* data contradict the evidence of the massive documentary base that he has created, i.e., a survey of 1,834 manuscripts examined *in situ*, Black's refutation, based on the 317 Vatican manuscripts he discussed in the article,<sup>24</sup> suffers from serious methodological flaws, four to be exact, the last of which essentially renders his argument null and void.<sup>25</sup>

The first of Black's mistakes is his criticism that my conclusion concerning the thirteenth century is based on descriptions of manuscripts that I did not myself examine.<sup>26</sup> In other words, he took as a defect what is in fact, as pointed out above, one of the great virtues of relying on *MCLBV*. Black has been arguing now

---

<sup>22</sup> Taking into account manuscripts that could be ascribed to France or Northern Italy as well as a few thirteenth manuscripts I overlooked, I now see that a total of 94 manuscripts are relevant. Once the 43 manuscripts with split attributions are divided by half, we get the result:  $94 - 21.5 = 72.5$  thirteenth-century manuscripts, which is the same number as that for the twelfth century. See Appendices I and II below for a listing of the 94 relevant manuscripts and of the 43 split manuscripts in that total.

<sup>23</sup> See Appendices I and II below.

<sup>24</sup> It should be noted that Black included in the article an inventory of another 177 manuscripts outside the Vatican that I do not discuss here since they are not pertinent to the data of *MCLBV*.

<sup>25</sup> I record here that when I first read Black's article, I considered his enormous inventory of manuscripts as settling the debate. Only subsequent reflection on how he employed his data against the evidence of *MCLBV* caused me to change my mind.

<sup>26</sup> BLACK, « Rise and Fall », p. 416: « his information and analysis is entirely second-hand ».

for close to twenty years, i.e., well before he could have seen the 1,834 manuscripts mentioned in his article, that classical interests collapsed in thirteenth-century Italy.<sup>27</sup> He therefore publicly has long been a party to one side of the debate. On the other hand, É. Pellegrin's *équipe* had no vested interest in the debate while Black did. This does not mean that Black's dating is wrong or deliberately biased. Indeed, he himself dated to the Italian thirteenth century three manuscripts that *MCLBV* had dated otherwise.<sup>28</sup> But it does mean that we should value the data of the *MCLBV* for its impartiality.

The second of Black's methodological mistakes is his belief that in organizing my statistical tables I arbitrarily ascribed to the thirteenth century all the manuscripts that *MCLBV* had dated as XII/XIII or XIII/XIV. I did no such thing. Rather, following traditional practice as endorsed L. D. Reynolds and Birger Munk Olsen, and as a reasonable statistical simplification, I split the difference and assigned half of the manuscripts with split centuries to the thirteenth century and half to the twelfth or fourteenth centuries.<sup>29</sup> Save for some rare exceptions, these are not manuscripts partly written in one century and partly in another, but simply manuscripts the *équipe* could not decide to which century they belonged and therefore settled for « XII/XIII » or « XIII/XIV ». So, Black attacked a strawman. Instead of inflating the number of Italian thirteenth-century manuscripts, as Black imagined, my statistical analysis actually did the complete opposite, paring them down by eliminating half of those that could possibly have been attributed to the thirteenth rather than to an adjacent century.<sup>30</sup>

The third of Black's methodological missteps is a category error. Because he was interested in authors read in the schools, Black explicitly eliminated from consideration authors not current in the schools before the fourteenth century, such as Livy, Seneca, Frontinus, and Apuleius, as well as authors in circulation but not meant for students, primarily Priscian. Implicitly, Black also eliminated from consideration late classical authors such as Claudianus, Maximianus, and Palladius, as well as Chalcidius and Boethius. Hence, by fiat Black has discarded as irrelevant a great deal of evidence that is eminently relevant to the question at hand. But *MCLBV* counted manuscripts of all these late antique authors (as well as

---

<sup>27</sup> See BLACK, *Humanism and Education*, p. 192–200; and ID., « Origins of Humanism », p. 46–52.

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix III.2 below.

<sup>29</sup> See MONFASANI, « Rise and Fall », p. 470. See for instance, L. D. REYNOLDS (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Study of the Latin Classics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1983, p. xxxvii, fn. 102: « I count manuscripts dated to the turn of a century as belonging to the later century »; and BIRGER MUNK OLSEN, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, Éditions du Centre national de la recherche scientifique, Paris 1982–2014, 4 vol. in 6, at 4.2, p. 11: « Tous ces manuscrits à cheval sur deux siècles [...] risquent de faire obstacle à une vue d'ensemble [...] nous avons donc opté pour la solution pratique [...] qui consiste à attribuer la moitié des manuscrits à cheval au siècle précédent et l'autre moitié au siècle suivant ».

<sup>30</sup> See Appendix II below.

a few that the medievals mistakenly thought to be classical), and as long *MCLBV* counted manuscripts of these authors consistently, as in fact it did, in order to maintain a stable yardstick by which to measure the evidence from century to century, then its statistics remain a true and powerful indicator of classical interest through the centuries. If by its understanding of whom to include as a classical author *MCLBV* in point of fact overstated the interest in Latin classics in the Italian thirteenth century, it did so also for all other parts of Europe in all other centuries. Consequently, the statistical results of the *MCLBV* data on a relative basis remain absolutely sound.

The fourth error of Black's refutation relates to the previous one and, as has already been said, is ultimately disqualifying. Of the 94 Italian thirteenth-century classical manuscripts in the Vatican according to *MCLBV*,<sup>31</sup> Black explicitly excluded 19 of them as irrelevant, i.e., 20% of the total.<sup>32</sup> On the assumption that these manuscripts did not contain in one way or another what he viewed as schoolbooks, Black was right to exclude them from his census. But their existence nonetheless reflects classical interests and illustrates the fallacy of limiting evidence of classical interests exclusively to what Black deems school texts. More significantly, Black does not even consider another 48 of manuscripts inventoried by *MCLBV*, i. e., 51% of the total.<sup>33</sup> Consequently, in rejecting the evidence of *MCLBV* Black ignored 71% of that evidence. This is not a refutation of the evidence, but an evasion of most of it. Black actually did not refute the *MCLBV* data. Instead, he substituted his own data, which in fact leaves out more than half of the relevant manuscripts listed in *MCLBV*. Compounding this failure is the fact that even if one agrees with Black's decision to disregard manuscripts of Priscian as well as late antique and pseudonymous classical authors, which in the case of pseudonymous authors is reasonable when evaluating interest in classical authors, nonetheless, more than half of the manuscripts he ignored without explanation (35 out of 67, 41 out of 67 if *contra* Black we also count Apuleius and Boethius)<sup>34</sup> contain texts of the major Latin authors, from Cicero, Horace, and Ovid to Sallust, Seneca, and Virgil. So, out of the 94 total Latin classical manuscripts reported by *MCLBV*, Black disregarded more than a third of them containing major classical authors, or, with Apuleius and Boethius included, more than 40% of them. This is less than 71%, to be sure, but still a sizeable percentage of the evidence to be ignored without explanation.

---

<sup>31</sup> See Appendix I below.

<sup>32</sup> See Appendix I below.

<sup>33</sup> See Appendix I below.

<sup>34</sup> These manuscripts are nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19 of Appendix III.3, and nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46 of Appendix III.4. For Apuleius, add nos. 16 and 18 of III.3 and nos. 20 and 25 of Appendix III.4; for Boethius, add nos. 14 and 35 of Appendix III.4.



But even the 29% of the evidence from *MCLBV* that Black did consider is not without its nuances. Of the 27 manuscripts that *MCLBV* dated to the Italian thirteenth century and that Black treated in his inventory, he agreed with *MCLBV* in the case of sixteen of them. That leaves eleven manuscripts in dispute (leaving aside the three Black dated to the Italian thirteenth century *contra MCLBV*). Of these eleven, Black dated nine to the second half or to the end of the twelfth century. So, in fact he and *MCLBV* are really not that far apart concerning these nine since without other intrinsic and/or external indices paleography alone normally cannot fix with any degree of certainty the date of a manuscript beyond a thirty-year range, i.e., approximately the active lifetime of a scribe.<sup>35</sup> So, explicit strong disagreements between Black and *MCLBV* resolve themselves to a mere two manuscripts! These are Barb. Lat. 39 and Ottob. Lat. 1464, both of which Black dates to the twelfth century (the latter to the first half of the century) rather than the thirteenth. But both have the crossbar of 't' slightly bisecting rather than surmounting the ascender, a characteristic that Black himself says is more characteristic of the fourteenth century and therefore *a fortiori* of the thirteenth century rather than of the twelfth century. Furthermore, the Ottobonianus often has 'g's with open lower boles, again a characteristic that Black himself associates with later manuscripts. So, by his own paleographical prescriptions, a case can be made that both manuscripts date from the thirteenth rather than from the twelfth century. In short, even for less than a third of the *MCLBV* evidence with which Black engaged, the verdict on whose dating is correct is not as easily discernible as one might initially suppose. Moreover, as Witt has shown (see *supra*), when glosses are taken into account, Black's own evidence actually contradicts his thesis and suggests significant thirteenth-century interest in classical texts.<sup>36</sup> So, quite apart from not accepting Black's infallibility in dating manuscripts, one has multiple grounds for doubting his insistence that his evidence unequivocally demonstrates the collapse of classical interests in thirteenth-century Italy. To be sure, Black can in the future consult all the manuscripts in *MCLBV* that he had ignored and declare them not to be from thirteenth-century Italy. But such an assertion returns us to the problem we noted at the start, namely, the conflict between the disinterested judgment of *MCLBV's* *équipe*, whose dating conforms perfectly with what we otherwise know about the classical tradition in different periods and places in the Middle Ages,

---

<sup>35</sup> AS ARMANDO PETRUCCI, « Censimento dei codici dei secoli XI-XII », *Studi medievali*, ser. 3, 9 (1968), p. 1115–1125, at p. 1125, remarked: « non è certo facile indicare criteri utili a distinguere codici scritti sul finire del secolo XII da codici scritti all'inizio del secolo seguente ». In addition to the more jagged execution of letter forms (*spezzato tratteggio*) of the later manuscripts, Petrucci called attention to the cessation of both 'e' with a cedilla and the 'et' ligature as well as the rise of the practice of dotting 'i'.

<sup>36</sup> See fn. 15 above.

and Black's vested interest in arguing that *MCLBV* is wrong about thirteenth-century Italy.

Ultimately, the discrepancy between the conclusions that can be drawn from the data presented by *MCLBV* and the data presented by Black stems from a difference of perspective. Black was looking exclusively at the schools and what he considered school authors while *MCLBV* sought to encompass all classical authors of every stripe. In other words, what Black and *MCLBV* inventoried were different and therefore, within the parameters they set for themselves, they each produced useful results. The fact, however, that Black disregarded without explanation so many manuscripts that *MCLBV* categorized as thirteenth-century Italian or possibly so when unable to be definitive, renders his argument about the Latin classics in the thirteenth century a case of special pleading.

The *MCLBV* data show no overall decline in classical manuscripts in the thirteenth century as compared to the twelfth, but by the same token therefore no surge. We know there was a surge in classical studies in the later thirteenth century, especially in northern Italy. So, it is conceivable, though not strictly demonstrable that there was a drop (not collapse!) in classical interests earlier in the century. However, dividing up cultural movements strictly by centuries is to impose an artificial chronological construct upon them. But as far as the beginning of Renaissance humanism is concerned, we can at least say that the surge in the second half of the thirteenth century was sufficient to overcome any supposed crisis in classical studies earlier in the century and set the stage for the explosion of these studies in the first half of the fourteenth.

Differences of perspective are to a large extent at the root of much of the debate on the Italian thirteenth century. The first proponent of the thirteenth-century collapse, Louis Paetow, was looking primarily at Northern Europe, where in fact the *MCLBV* data fully confirm his argument, while Giuseppe Toffanin, who famously called the thirteenth « the century without Rome », was especially on the alert for pivotal literary figures such as Dante and Petrarch, of which the thirteenth century had none.<sup>37</sup> On the other hand, Helene Wieruszowski and Paul Oskar Kristeller have argued for the clear growing classical interests in thirteenth-century Italy within the large body of notaries, jurists, bureaucrats, and *dictatores* (i. e., teachers and practitioners of the dominant form of medieval rhetoric), the very group from which the Renaissance humanists would emerge.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> His book *Il secolo senza Roma*, which first appeared in 1943, eventually became vol. I of his four volume *Storia dell'Umanesimo*.

<sup>38</sup> See WIERUSZOWSKI, « Rhetoric and the Classics ». Kristeller first made his view clear in his oft reprinted article « Humanism and Scholasticism in the Italian Renaissance », *Byzantion*, 17 (1945), p. 346–374, and would give his argument its classic formulation in *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1955, also much reprinted; see THOMAS GILBHARD, *Bibliographia Kristelleriana: A Bibliography of the Publications of Paul Oskar Kristeller, 1929–1999*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2006, items. no. 73 and 172. See also the section

Ronald Witt and Roberto Weiss focused on one such group in late thirteenth-century Padua led by the judge Lovato de' Lovati that can rightly be viewed as the first humanist circle.<sup>39</sup> If we switch our attention away from Black's list of school authors, we learn that the extant manuscript evidence demonstrates that at least two major classical Latin authors not on that list, Livy and Seneca, had something of a Renaissance precisely in thirteenth-century Italy,<sup>40</sup> reflecting therefore quite the opposite of a decline of interest in classical texts. And then there are the powerful non-grammarians witnesses to thirteenth-century classical learning, such as the theologian Thomas Aquinas, the imperial chancellor Petrus de Vineia, the jurists Rolandino of Padua, Lovato dei Lovati, and Geri of Arezzo, the *dictatores* Bene of Florence and Guido Faba, and so on,<sup>41</sup> all impressionistic and non-quantifiable evidence, as both Black and I recognize, but in its range of figures and genres significant evidence nonetheless. In sum, if one does not discard evidence relevant to the question, it is clear that unlike what happened in Northern Europe, classical interest and studies did not collapse in thirteenth-century Italy. Rather, starting from a modest base, they held their own. Furthermore, by being integrated into the culture of a large and growing secular professional class, they started on a growth trajectory that would blossom into Renaissance humanism.

---

*Ars Dictaminis* in my article « Humanism and the Renaissance » forthcoming in ANTHONY PINN (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Humanism*.

<sup>39</sup> For WITT see his *In the Footsteps of the Ancients'* and *Two Latin Cultures*. For WEISS see his *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy: An Inaugural Lecture*, H.K. Lewis, London 1947; and *Il primo secolo dell'Umanesimo*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1949.

<sup>40</sup> For Seneca see L. D. REYNOLDS, « The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's *Dialogues* », *The Classical Quarterly*, n. s., 18/2 (1986), p. 355–372, at p. 364 for thirteenth-century Italian manuscripts; and SENECA, *Dialogorum Libri Duodecim*, ed. L. D. REYNOLDS, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1977, p. xiv. For Livy see L. D. REYNOLDS, N. G. WILSON, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford 1991, p. 130: « The manuscript that everyone immediately associates with Petrarch and Avignon is a famous Livy now in the British Museum [...] the nucleus [of which] is a manuscript of Livy's third decade, written in Italy about 1200. [...] But it has long been known that the Spirensian tradition of the fourth decade, in a form close to that used by Petrarch, had circulated among the [late thirteenth-/early fourteenth-century] prehumanists in Padua »; similarly, REYNOLDS, *Texts and Transmission*, p. 213, whose opinion derives from the work of GIUSEPPE BILLANOVICH, « Petrarch and the Textual Tradition of Livy », *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 14 (1951), p. 137–208, which Billanovich expanded upon in his *La tradizione del testo di Livio e le origini dell'umanesimo*, Antenore, Padua 1981.

<sup>41</sup> See here the classic article of Wieruszowski, « Rhetoric and the Classics », which in a way is more comprehensive than Witt's book in that she includes figures such as Aquinas, whom Witt did not treat.

*Appendix I*

THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ITALIAN CLASSICAL MANUSCRIPTS  
ACCORDING TO *MCLBV*

I have put in bold split manuscripts (XII/XIII, XIII/XIV, Northern Europe/Italy) in order to distinguish them from those dated exclusively as Italy, s. XIII. See Appendix II below for more detail.

- (1) Arch. S. Pietro G. 46 – Maximianus
- (2) **Arch. S. Pietro H. 40** – Palladius
- (3) Barb. Lat. 26 – Ovid
- (4) **Barb. Lat. 37** – Lucan
- (5) Barb. Lat. 39 – Sallust
- (6) Barb. Lat. 40 – Sallust
- (7) **Barb. Lat. 66** – Anthologia. Latina, Lucan
- (8) Barb. Lat. 70 – Ovid
- (9) **Borgia 326** – Cicero
- (10) Chigi E.VIII.252 – Seneca
- (11) **Chigi H.IV.129** – Horace
- (12) **Chigi H.IV.130** – Seneca
- (13) **Chigi H.V.152** – Sallust
- (14) Chigi. H.V.153 – Seneca
- (15) **Chigi H.V.156** – Frontinus
- (16) **Chigi H.VI.212** – Claudianus
- (17) Chigi I. IV. 106 – fragment of Statius
- (18) Chigi L.VII.244 – Papias
- (19) Ottob. Lat.1203 – Virgil
- (20) Ottob. Lat. 1207 – Quintilian
- (21) **Ottob. Lat. 1237**– Virgil
- (22) **Ottob. Lat. 1330** – Priscian
- (23) Ottob. Lat. 1337 – Solinus
- (24) Ottob. Lat. 1464 – Ovid
- (25) Ottob. Lat. 1644 – Priscian
- (26) Ottob. Lat. 1978 – Priscian
- (27) Ottob. Lat. 2150 – Terence
- (28) Pal. Lat. 892 – Sallust
- (29) Pal. Lat. 1648 – Virgil
- (30) Pal. Lat. 1663 – Ovid
- (31) **Pal. Lat. 1664** – Ovid
- (32) Pal. Lat. 1666 – Ovid

- (33) **Regin. Lat. 902** – Livy
- (34) Regin. Lat. 1114 – Chalcidius
- (35) **Regin. Lat. 1618** – Ps.Seneca, Publius Syrus
- (36) **Regin. Lat. 2080** – Claudianus
- (37) Urb. Lat. 1141 – Apuleius
- (38) **Vat. Lat. 1466** – Papias
- (39) **Vat. Lat. 1577** – Virgil
- (40) Vat. Lat. 1592 – Horace, Boethius
- (41) **Vat.Lat. 1661** – Claudianus
- (42) **Vat. Lat. 1834** – Sallust
- (43) **Vat. Lat. 1840** – Livy
- (44) **Vat. Lat. 1844** – Virgil
- (45) **Vat. Lat. 1847** – Livy
- (46) Vat. Lat. 2186 – Apuleius
- (47) Vat. Lat. 2206 – Seneca
- (48) Vat. Lat. 2717 – Priscian
- (49) Vat. Lat. 2718 – Priscian
- (50) Vat. Lat. 2721 – Priscian
- (51) Vat. Lat. 2723 – Priscian
- (52) **Vat. Lat. 2759** – Virgil
- (53) Vat. lat. 2772 – Horace
- (54) **Vat. Lat. 2774** – Horace
- (55) **Vat. Lat. 2788** – Ovid
- (56) **Vat. Lat. 2792** – Ovid
- (57) **Vat. Lat. 2799** – Lucan
- (58) **Vat. Lat. 2807** – Claudianus
- (59) Vat. Lat. 2809 – Claudianus
- (60) Vat. Lat. 2826 – Boethius
- (61) **Vat. Lat. 2909** – Cicero
- (62) **Vat. Lat. 3110** – Martianus Capella
- (63) Vat. Lat. 3239 – Cicero, Horace
- (64) **Vat. Lat. 3261** – Horace
- (65) **Vat. Lat. 3266** – Ovid
- (66) Vat. Lat. 3267 – Ovid
- (67) Vat. Lat. 3278 – Stadius
- (68) Vat. Lat. 3292 – Ovid
- (69) **Vat. Lat. 3306** – Terence
- (70) **Vat. Lat. 3339** – Dares Phrygius
- (71) Vat. Lat. 3606 – Comment. in Virgilium
- (72) Vat. Lat. 4086 – Seneca
- (73) **Vat. Lat. 4200** – Cicero, Macrobius

- (74) **Vat. Lat. 4251** – Boethius
- (75) Vat. Lat. 4252 – Boethius
- (76) **Vat. Lat. 4357** – Ps.Alexander Magnus, extracts from Valerius Maximus and Aulus Gellius
- (77) Vat. Lat. 4363 – Cicero, ps.Seneca
- (78) Vat. Lat. 5157 – Ovid
- (79) Vat. Lat. 5179 – Ovid
- (80) Vat. Lat. 5367 – Helpericus Autissiodorensis, *Liber de computo*; ps.Ovid
- (81) Vat. Lat. 5859 – Ovid
- (82) Vat. Lat. 5941 – Seneca
- (83) **Vat. Lat. 5960** – Priscian
- (84) Vat. Lat. 6024 – Ps.Seneca
- (85) Vat. Lat. 6323 – Lucan
- (86) Vat. Lat. 6846 – Sallust
- (87) Vat. Lat. 8100 – Ps.Seneca
- (88) Vat. Lat. 8519 – Ovid
- (89) Vat. Lat. 9377 – Cicero, Virgil, Ovid
- (90) **Vat. Lat. 9657** – Boethius, Ovid
- (91) **Vat. Lat. 10676** – Priscian
- (92) **Vat. Lat. 10916** – Horace
- (93) **Vat. Lat. 11471** – Virgil
- (94) **Vat. Lat. 11474** – Priscian

*Appendix II*

SPLIT MANUSCRIPTS ACCORDING TO *MCLBV*

There are 43 split manuscripts, divided into three groups, of 19, 16, and 8 manuscripts respectively.<sup>42</sup> These groups are:

1. Manuscripts dated Italy, s. XII/XIII.

(2) Arch. S. Pietro H. 40	(58) Vat. Lat. 2807
(12) Chigi H.IV.130	(61) Vat. Lat. 2909
(13) Chigi H.V.152	(69) Vat. Lat. 3306
(14) Chigi H.VI.212	(70) Vat. Lat. 3339
(41) Vat. Lat. 1661	(73) Vat. Lat. 4200
(42) Vat. Lat. 1834	(83) Vat. Lat. 5960
(43) Vat. Lat. 1840	(91) Vat. Lat. 10676
(44) Vat. Lat. 1844	(93) Vat. Lat. 11471
(54) Vat. Lat. 2774	(94) Vat. Lat. 11474
(57) Vat. Lat. 2799	

2. Manuscripts dated Italy, s. XIII/XIV

(7) Barb. lat. 66	(35) Regin. lat. 1618
(9) Borgia 326	(38) Vat. Lat. 1466
(11) Chigi H.IV.129	(39) Vat. Lat. 1577
(15) Chigi H.V.156	(45) Vat. Lat. 1847
(21) Ottob. lat. 1237	(62) Vat. Lat. 3110
(22) Ottob. lat. 1330	(74) Vat. Lat. 4251
(31) Pal. Lat. 1664	(76) Vat. Lat. 4357
(33) Regin. lat. 902	(90) Vat. Lat. 9657

3. Manuscripts France/Italy (The four s. XII/XIII manuscripts are counted only here.)

(4) Barb. lat. 37
(36) Regin. lat. 2080 (also XII/XIII)
(52) Vat. Lat. 2759 (also XII/XIII)

---

<sup>42</sup> Each manuscript is preceded (in parentheses) by its sequential number in Appendix I above. Manuscripts that are also split in location, such as France/Italy, I have placed in group 3 below rather than in group 1.

- (55) Vat. Lat. 2788
- (56) Vat. Lat. 2792
- (64) Vat. Lat. 3261 (also XII/XIII)
- (65) Vat. Lat. 3266 (also XII/XIII)
- (92) Vat. Lat. 10916



*Appendix III*

A COMPARISON OF *MCLBV* AND BLACK'S HANDLIST OF MANUSCRIPTS IN RESPECT TO THIRTEENTH-CENTURY ITALIAN MANUSCRIPTS

Robert Black's « Ongoing handlist of manuscripts of Latin classical school authors produced and/or used as schoolbooks in Italy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries » (Black, *Rise and Fall*, p. 447–461, for Vatican manuscripts) by definition excludes authors not viewed by him as school authors but included in *MCLBV*, which sought to capture all classical authors in its catalogue. Hence, as I pointed out in the article proper, there is a disjunction between the two databases. However, as we shall see, not only did Black set aside manuscripts of major authors, such as Livy, Seneca, and Apuleius, in addition to a slew of minor authors, whom he considered non-school authors, but also manuscripts of authors such as Cicero, Horace, and Ovid, whom he labelled as school authors.

I break down the comparison into four categories: 17 manuscripts in the first, 10 in the second (10 apart from the 3 that Black ascribes to the thirteenth century against *MCLBV*), 19 in the third, and 48 in the fourth for a total of 94 that corresponds to the number of manuscripts in Appendix I.

1. Manuscripts upon whose dating to the thirteenth century Black and *MCLBV* agree, even if one or the other opts for a split date (XII/XIII or XIII/XIV) instead of a date of a pure “s. XIII.” I have inserted between parentheses the manuscript's number in Appendix I above.

1. (3) Barb. Lat. 26
2. (8) Barb. Lat. 70
3. (12) Chigi H.IV.130
4. (13) Chigi H.V.152
5. (19) Ottob. Lat. 1203
6. (29) Pal. Lat. 1648
7. (32) Pal. Lat. 1666
8. (37) Regin. Lat. 2080
9. (41) Vat. Lat. 1592
10. (54) Vat. Lat. 2772
11. (61) Vat. Lat. 2826
12. (66) Vat. Lat. 3266
13. (67) Vat. Lat. 3267
14. (74) Vat. Lat. 4200
15. (80) Vat. Lat. 5179
16. (82) Vat. Lat. 5859

17. (93) Vat. Lat. 10916

2. Manuscripts on whose dating Black and *MCLBV* disagree. I have put in bold the three manuscripts *MCLBV* has dated to s. XII, but Black to s. XIII or XII/XIII. Neither of these three is included in the list in Appendix I since *MCLBV* did not deem them as belonging to the thirteenth century. For the other manuscripts I have placed in parentheses the number they have in Appendix I.

1. (5) Barb. Lat. 3. *MCLBV*: XIII; Black: XII
2. (24) Ottob. Lat. 1464. *MCLBV*: XIII; Black: XII<sup>1</sup>
3. **Ottob. Lat. 1648. *MCLBV*: XII fin., France/Italy; Black: XII/XIII, Italy**
4. **Pal. Lat. 1531. *MCLBV*: XII; Black: XII/XIII**
5. (40) Vat. Lat. 1577. *MCLBV*: XIII/XIV; Black XII<sup>2</sup>
6. (42) Vat. Lat. 1661. *MCLBV*: XII-XIII; Black: XII<sup>2</sup>
7. (43) Vat. Lat. 1834. *MCLBV*: XII-XIII; Black: XII ex.
8. (58) Vat. Lat. 2799. *MCLBV*: XII-XIII; Black: XII<sup>2</sup>
9. (64) Vat. Lat. 3239 I. *MCLBV*: XII/XIII; Black: XII ex.
10. (65) Vat. Lat. 3261. *MCLBV*: XII-XIII; Black XII ex.
11. **Vat. Lat. 3280. *MCLBV*: France, s. XII; Black Italy. s. XII/XIII**
12. (69) Vat. Lat. 3292. *MCLBV*: XIII; Black: XII<sup>2</sup>
13. (72) Vat. Lat. 3606. *MCLBV*: XII/XIII; Black XII<sup>2</sup>

3. Manuscripts Black, *Rise and Fall*, 464, explicitly discarded as « seen and excluded » (their numbers in appendix 1 are given in parentheses):

1. (4) Barb. Lat. 37 – Lucan
2. (6) Barb. Lat. 40 – Sallust
3. (7) Barb. Lat. 66 – Lucan
4. (17) Chigi I. IV. 106 –fragm. of Statius
5. (18) Chigi L.VII.244 – Papias
6. (21) Ottob. Lat. 1237 – Virgil
7. (28) Pal. Lat. 892 – Sallust
8. (52) Vat. Lat. 2759 – Virgil (*Culex*), Ovid
9. (54) Vat. Lat. 2774 – Horace
10. (55) Vat. Lat. 2788 – Ovid
11. (56) Vat. Lat. 2792 – Ovid
12. (58) Vat. Lat. 2807 – Claudian
13. (61) Vat. Lat. 2909 – Cicero
14. (67) Vat. Lat. 3278 – Statius
15. (71) Vat. Lat. 3306 – Terence

16. (75) Vat. Lat. 4252 – Boethius
17. (88) Vat. Lat. 8519 – Ovid
18. (90) Vat. Lat. 9657 – Boethius, Ovid
19. (93) Vat. Lat. 11471 – Virgil

4. Manuscripts in *MCLBV* that Black did not consider at all (their number in Appendix I is given in parentheses):

1. (1) Arch. Cap. S. Pietro. G. 46 – Maximianus
2. (2) Arch. Cap. S. Pietro H. 40 – Palladius
3. (9) Borg. Lat. 326 – Seneca, Cicero
4. (10) Chigi E.VIII.252 – Seneca
5. (11) Chigi H. IV. 129 – Horace
6. (14) Chigi H. V. 153 – Seneca
7. (15) Chigi H. V. 156 – Frontinus
8. (16) Chigi H. VI. 212 – Claudianus
9. (21) Ottob. Lat. 1207 – Quintilian, *Declamationes*
10. (22) Ottob. Lat. 1330 – Priscian
11. (23) Ottob. Lat.1337 – Solinus, ps.Alexander Magnus
12. (25) Ottob. Lat. 1644 – Priscian
13. (25) Ottob. Lat. 1978 – Priscian
14. (27) Ottob. Lat. 2150 – Boethius
15. (30) Pal. Lat. 1663 – Ovid
16. (31) Pal. Lat. 1664 – Ovid
17. (33) Regin. Lat. 902 – Livy
18. (34) Regin. Lat. 1114 – Chalcidius
19. (35) Regin. Lat. 1618 – Seneca, Ps. Seneca
20. (37) Urb. Lat. 1141 – Apuleius
21. (38) Vat. Lat. 1466 – Papias
22. (43) Vat. Lat. 1840 – Livy
23. (44) Vat. Lat. 1844 – Livy
24. (45) Vat. Lat.1847 – Livy
25. (46) Vat. Lat. 2186 – Apuleius
26. (47) Vat. Lat. 2206 – Seneca
27. (48) Vat. Lat. 2717 – Priscian
28. (49) Vat. Lat. 2718 – Priscian
29. (50) Vat. Lat. 2721 – Priscian
30. (51) Vat. Lat. 2723 – Priscian
31. (61) Vat. Lat. 2809 – Claudianus
32. (62) Vat Lat. 3110 – Hyginus, Fulgentius
33. (70) Vat. Lat. 3339 – Dares Phrygius

34. (72) Vat. Lat. 4086 – Seneca
35. (74) Vat. Lat. 4251 – Boethius
36. (76) Vat. Lat. 4357 – Ps. Alexander Magnus;; extracts from Valerius  
Maximus and Aulus Gellius
37. (77) Vat, Lat. 4363 – Cicero, ps.Seneca
38. (78) Vat. Lat. 5157 – Claudianus
39. (80) Vat. Lat. 5367 – Ovid
40. (82) Vat. Lat. 5941 – Seneca
41. (83) Vat. Lat. 5960 – Priscian
42. (84) Vat. Lat. 6024 – ps.Seneca
43. (85) Vat. Lat. 6323 – Lucan
44. (86) Vat. Lat. 6846 – Sallust
45. (87) Vat. Lat. 8100 – ps.Seneca
46. (89) Vat. Lat. 9377 – Cicero, Virgil, Ovid (Extracts)
47. (91) Vat. Lat. 10676 – Priscian
48. (94) Vat. Lat. 11474 – Priscian