

THE RULING AS A CLUE TO THE MAKE-UP OF A MEDIEVAL MANUSCRIPT

T. S. PATTIE

ADDITIONAL MS. 47678,¹ acquired by the British Museum in 1952, is an early ninth-century Cicero manuscript written at Tours in Carolingian minuscules. It was still complete when it was at the Abbey of Cluny but only 39 leaves survive out of the 140 or 150 that it probably once had. It now contains fragments of the speeches against Catiline, for Quintus Ligarius, for King Deiotarus and the second speech in the second part of Verres' trial. Of these, the speech against Verres was the earliest to be composed. Verres was a flagrantly corrupt governor of Sicily in 73-70 B.C., who, on laying down office, was prosecuted for extortion. Cicero's speech in the first part of the trial brought such damning evidence of guilt that Verres anticipated the verdict by going into exile at Marseilles. The five speeches of the second part were never delivered, but were included in the subsequent publication of all seven speeches against Verres, which contain a wealth of information about the provincial government and the art treasures of Sicily. Catiline was a disaffected nobleman who proposed a cancellation of debts in 63 B.C., the year of Cicero's consulship, and stirred up a rebellion, which in the event was easily put down. The speeches for Quintus Ligarius and for King Deiotarus were both delivered before Caesar, in 46 B.C. and 45 B.C. respectively. Ligarius was a republican opponent of Caesar, Deiotarus a tetrarch of the Tolistobogii, a tribe of western Galatia.

A detailed description of our manuscript was published² in 1901 by William (later Sir William) Peterson, who demonstrated its primary authority for the texts it contains. He showed that the Lagomarsinianus 42,³ which contains all seven speeches against Verres, must have made use of our manuscript for two of them. Its text of II.ii ('De Praetura Siciliensi') and II.iii ('De Frumento') is much superior to its text of the other speeches. As the twelfth-century catalogue of the Abbey of Cluny describes the contents of the manuscript (then MS. 498) as including both these speeches against Verres, it must be taken as certain that our manuscript once had both speeches. It has also been suggested that the speech for Marcellus, which was also delivered before Caesar, was once present, because it often accompanies *Pro Q. Ligario* and *Pro rege Deiotaro* and because there appear to be eight leaves of our manuscript (in its original state) unaccounted for. There is no reference to the *Pro Marcello* in the twelfth-century Cluny catalogue, but this is hardly a conclusive argument.

The purpose of this inquiry is to try to reconstruct the original state of the manuscript

using the ruling as a clue. The use of the ruling as a clue to the dating of manuscripts is familiar,⁴ but it is not often as favourable to reconstruction as in this manuscript. It is necessary to make the reasonable assumption that ninth-century manuscripts from the scriptorium of Tours were made up regularly, with some explicable exceptions. For example, a leaf or two was sometimes added so that a full-page miniature could be painted, and the gathering would then be larger than usual and would probably not show the proper alternation of hair-side and flesh-side. Or a short gathering was sometimes used so that a section of the text would end with a gathering and the new text would begin with a new gathering. Even at Tours scribes sometimes made mistakes, and a leaf would be cut away and replaced. The gathering would then be regular in size but would not show all the regular correspondences. I began this inquiry hoping to prove that the Pro Marcello could not have been contained in this manuscript, but regretfully concluded that despite the possibilities of variation, error, and accident, it is a reasonable working hypothesis that some leaves are unaccounted for between fols. 18 and 34, and that the Pro Marcello could have been fitted in.

In Peterson's monograph he quotes on pp. iii-v a letter from G. F. Warner, later Sir George Warner, Keeper of Manuscripts at the British Museum, describing the manuscript. A part of the letter reads:

None of the quires is perfect. They apparently consisted of eight leaves and were signed in Roman numerals at the foot of the last page. Only four signatures, however, remain, viz. q̄.i.(f.4b), q̄.ii.(f.11b), q̄.iii.(f.16b), q̄.x.(f.34b). In the last case two or three letters have been erased after the x. In quire i. leaves 2-5 are missing; in ii. the fifth leaf; in iii. the second, third and seventh leaves; in iv. all except the two innermost leaves (ff. 17, 18). As the leaves now appear to be generally separate, the arrangement of the quires in the rest of the MS. cannot be determined, but at least thirty-five leaves must be lost between f. 18 and f. 35. . . . The ruling is by a hard point on one side of the vellum only, on the verso in the first half of a quire, and on the recto in the other half.

In the Middle Ages skins were prepared for writing by cleaning them on both the inside (flesh-side) and the outside (hair-side). In the most usual arrangement, four sheets were laid one on top of the other and then folded to form a gathering of eight leaves. Usually the gathering was arranged by laying one sheet hair-side down, the next hair-side up, the next hair-side down, and the fourth hair-side up, so that in the folded gathering hair-side faced hair-side and flesh-side faced flesh-side, with hair-side on the outside of the gathering, where most wear occurs. If there is no evidence to the contrary, we can apply the following formula for a regular gathering of eight leaves:

TABLE I

Recto Hair (RH), Verso Flesh (VF): leaves 1, 3, 5, 7
 Recto Flesh (RF), Verso Hair (VH): leaves 2, 4, 6, 8

Guide-lines for the writing were ruled with lead or ink on each page, or on one side of each leaf with a blunt knife, forming a trench on one side (the ruled side) and a ridge on the other. Sometimes, as in our manuscript, the ruling was done two or four leaves at a time, with impressions sharpest on the top sheet and faintest on the lowest sheet. After

ruling, the pile of four sheets could be folded either forwards or backwards, so that the gathering appeared to be ruled either on the inside (ruled on the versos in the first half, and on the rectos in the second half) or on the outside (ruled on the rectos in the first half, and on the versos in the second half).

In gatherings ruled four leaves at a time the impressions of ruling will then be sharpest either on the inside sheet (leaves 4, 5) or on the outside sheet (leaves 1, 8), and the other sheets will have progressively fainter impressions. There are often sufficient variations of detail, e.g. the width of the intercolumniation, to establish which leaves were ruled together. The top sheet would be pricked with holes as guides for the ruling, but there are two examples (fols. 5, 26) in our manuscript of leaves with prickings but with faint rulings, showing that they were not the top sheets. In fact they were the bottom sheets and must have been pricked in error, as the intervening sheets were not pricked. Provided that the gatherings were regular and no leaves have been added or cut away, these considerations can be applied reasonably hopefully to this Cicero manuscript.

Although there has been no opportunity to examine the manuscript in a disbound state, a fresh examination nevertheless showed that two corrections can be made to Warner's description and a few details can be added:

- (1) Gathering I lacks leaves 1, 3, 4, 5 (not 2-5).
- (2) Not all gatherings are ruled on the inside, i.e. on the verso in the first half and on the recto in the second half. This is true of gatherings I, II, VIII, X, and perhaps VI (see Table II). Gatherings III, IV, VII, XII are ruled on the outside.
- (3) Gathering I was ruled two leaves at a time.
- (4) The erased letters after $\bar{q}.x.$ on fol. 34b are visible under ultra-violet light. They are 'vi' and are on a different alignment from ' $\bar{q}.x.$ '. I have not been able to relate the erased 'vi' to this inquiry.
- (5) Parts of other gatherings can be identified by the ruling and by discolorations and imperfections of the parchment running from one conjugate leaf to another:
 - (i) fols. 23-7, with fols. 25-6 the inner sheet;
 - (ii) fols. 28-33, with fols. 31-2 the inner sheet;
 - (iii) fols. 35-9, with fols. 38-9 the inner sheet.

Table II gives a list of each of the surviving thirty-nine folios of our manuscript with the number of leaves required to complete each gap in the text, by comparison with standard editions of the text and assuming no lacunae in the original state of the manuscript. It also notes whether each folio is ruled on recto or verso, whether the ruled side is hair-side or flesh-side, whether it is ruled with a sharp or faint impression, and whether it is pricked or not. The table groups with a bracket those folios which were ruled together, as shown by variations of the ruling pattern, and gives a conjectural arrangement of the gatherings.

The most complete surviving gathering is II, which lacks only the fifth leaf. Table II shows a regular alternation of hair-side and flesh-side, a regular ruling on the versos in the first half and on the rectos in the second half, with the sharpest impressions on the

TABLE II

GATHERING	FOLIO	CONTENTS	Ruled on R or V	Ruled on hair or flesh	Sharp or faint impression	Pricked or not	Ruled together
I	1	1 lacking 1 Catiline 1-5 3 lacking	V	H	S	P	
q.i.	2 } 3 } 4 }	1 Catiline 17-29	R R R	F H F	F S F	— P —	}
II	5 } 6 } 7 } 8 }	1 Catiline 29 to 2 Catiline 11 1 lacking	V V V V	F H F H	F F S S	— — — P	}
q.ii.	9 } 10 } 11 }	2 Catiline 15-27	R R R	F H F	S F F	— — —	}
III	12	2 Catiline 27 to 3 Catiline 1 1 lacking	R	H	S	P	}
q.iii.	13 } 14 } 15 }	3 Catiline 9-19	R V V	F F H	F F F	— — —	}
IV	17 } 18 }	3 lacking 4 Catiline 8-15 3 lacking to end of 4 Catiline	R V	F F	F F	— —	}
V		8 lacking: 1-6 Pro Marcello 7-8 Pro Q. Ligario					
VI	19 } 20 }	1 lacking Pro Q. Ligario 23-8 2 lacking Pro Q. Ligario 38 to Pro Deiotaro 6 2 lacking	V V	H F	F F	— —	}
	21		R	F	F	—	
VII	22 } 23 } 24 } 25 } 26 } 27 }	Pro Deiotaro 15 to end 1 or 2 lacking?	V R R R V V	H F H F F H	S F F F F F	P — — — P —	}
VIII	28 } 29 } 30 } 31 } 32 } 33 }	Verres II.ii, 1-30 2 lacking	V V V V R R	F H F H H F	F S S S S S	— — — P P —	}
IX		8 lacking					
X	34	7 lacking Verres II.ii, 112-17	R	F	F	—	
q.x.							
XI		8 or 9 lacking					
XII	35 } 36 } 37 } 38 } 39 }	Verres II.ii, 157-83 3 lacking to end of Verres II.ii	R R R R V	H F H F F	S S F F F	P — — — —	}
XIII-XIX		55 lacking for Verres II.iii					

Conjectural total: 151 leaves

inner leaves. Both inner leaves must have been pricked (leaf 4 survives, leaf 5 is lost), and leaf 1 was also pricked but the prickings were not used because leaves 1 and 8 formed the lowest sheet with the faintest impressions. This gathering has an additional outer vertical column that is not found in any other gathering. This arrangement is confirmed by a hole in the parchment at the join of leaves 2 and 7 (fols. 6, 10). Gatherings I, III, and IV can be readily restored. Let us note that fol. 1 is ruled on the verso which is the hair-side, and we saw from Table I that a leaf with the pattern RFVH will be an even-numbered leaf. Consequently here it could be 2 or 4, not 1, 3, or 5. But three leaves are lost between fol. 1 and fol. 2 (leaf 6); fol. 1 must therefore be leaf 2.

The next fixed point is gathering X, of which only the last leaf survives. By comparison with the standard text, it appears that nine leaves are lost between fol. 34 and fol. 35. Table II shows clearly that fols. 35–8 are ruled on the rectos, with a regular alternation of hair- and flesh-sides, and they are all ruled together, fol. 35 being on the top. Fol. 39 is faintly ruled on the verso (a flesh-side), and therefore was at the bottom of the pile. There are two possibilities only: either (*a*) fols. 35–8 are the second half of a gathering, in which case fol. 34 is followed first by a gathering of four or five leaves and then by the first half of the gathering of which fols. 35–8 is the second half, and fol. 39 with the three leaves that contained the rest of *In Verrem* II.ii formed the first half of another gathering, or (*b*) the tidier solution described in Table II, where fols. 35–9 are leaves 1–5 of gathering XII.

Between fol. 33 and fol. 34 seventeen leaves have been lost. The gap could be computed at sixteen or eighteen leaves, but then a gathering of seven or nine leaves would be required between fols. 31–2 (inner sheet) and fol. 34 (last leaf of a gathering). Of the seventeen leaves, seven can be allocated to gathering X, eight to a lost gathering IX, and two to gathering VIII (fols. 28–33). Fols. 31–2 are (or were) conjugate, and fols. 30, 33 are (or were) possibly conjugate. The pattern of ruling is regular, and the inner leaves were on top of the pile and were pricked for ruling.

The portion comprising fols. 19–27 is rather less certain, and may once have included the *Pro Marcello*. If indeed the *Pro Marcello* was not included, the gatherings must have been arranged either (*a*) V and VI together ten leaves, VII eight leaves, or (*b*) V and VI together eleven leaves, VII six leaves. Both arrangements are unlikely. If this speech was placed after *In Verrem* II.ii (i.e. after fol. 39), we have no means of reconstructing its position. We can exclude fols. 1–18, because the transition from the First to the Second *Catilinarian* survives on fol. 6, the transition from the Second to the Third on fol. 12, and since fol. 16 is labelled *q.iii.*, there is no room before it for the six leaves needed for the *Pro Marcello*. The transition from *Pro Q. Ligario* to *Pro rege Deiotaro* is on fol. 21. Thus only two places in the surviving portion of our manuscript could possibly have contained the speech *Pro Marcello*, between the Fourth *Catilinarian* and *Pro Q. Ligario* (between fol. 18 and fol. 19) and between *Pro rege Deiotaro* and *In Verrem* II.ii (between fol. 27 and fol. 28). Something does appear to be missing here, as *Pro rege Deiotaro* has a subscription (fol. 27b), but there is no title to *In Verrem* II.ii.

Fols. 25–6 are (or were) conjugate and are the inner leaves of a gathering. Fols. 23–5

were ruled together, and fols. 26–7 were ruled together. If the speech Pro Marcello fitted in between fol. 27 and fol. 28, it could have been contained in a gathering of six leaves, in which case fols. 23–7 must have been an implausibly irregular gathering of five or (with fol. 22) six leaves. Alternatively, the Pro Marcello could have been contained on the last two leaves of the gathering fols. 22–7, and on one gathering of four leaves, which in itself is reasonable, but requires gathering V (fols. 19–21) to contain ten leaves. If the Pro Marcello is placed after the Fourth Catilinarian and before the Pro Q. Ligario, Table II will then show a series of regular gatherings of eight. Fols. 19 and 20 are both ruled on the verso, with a faint impression, and fol. 19 ought to be an even-numbered leaf, fol. 20 an odd-numbered leaf (see Table I). Fol. 21 (ruled on the recto) must be either in a different half of the gathering from fols. 19, 20 (as reconstructed in Table II) or in a different gathering from them. It ought to be an even-numbered leaf.

Fol. 22 requires an explanation. It is ruled on the verso, a hair-side, with a sharp impression. It ought therefore to be the last leaf of a gathering or half-gathering. It can hardly belong to the same half of a gathering as fol. 21, which is ruled on the recto. It cannot be part of the outer sheet of which fol. 19 is the first half, because the pattern corresponding to fol. 22 would be RHSP, but fol. 19 has a pattern VHF – (see Table II). It cannot belong to a gathering of four leaves of which fol. 21 is the first (outer) leaf, because the ruling on fol. 21 is a faint impression. It cannot belong to a gathering of six leaves of which fol. 21 is the third leaf, because the third leaf of such a gathering would have its recto hair-side, its verso flesh-side. Fol. 22 was not ruled together with fols. 23–5 or with any other surviving folio, as can be verified by comparing the space between the two columns on each page. For these reasons, and because the script on fol. 22 is in a different hand from the other leaves, it seems clear that fol. 22 is a replacement leaf. Its position cannot be reliably reconstructed but is arbitrarily allocated to gathering VII.

I have not yet considered another reconstruction of the manuscript, that of A. C. Clark,⁵ which differs from mine in some details. It is based on the amount of space occupied by the text, and consequently agrees with my reconstruction in the smaller lacunae, including postulating a first (probably blank) leaf before fol. 1. It differs from mine in allocating seven leaves to the Pro Marcello (instead of my six), none after fol. 27 (where I postulate two leaves, which may have been blank or cut away), eighteen leaves after fol. 33 (I argue for seventeen), eight leaves after fol. 34 (which I prefer, but do not exclude the possibility of nine), and fifty leaves after fol. 39, i.e. presumably three to the end of Verres II.ii and forty-seven for Verres II.iii. My figure for Verres II.iii is fifty-five, and the difference is comparable with the difference between eight and nine leaves missing after fol. 34. However, certainty on this point is unattainable.

The conclusions of this inquiry are (1) that the ruling is useful in reconstructing a damaged manuscript such as the Cluny Cicero, (2) that the speech Pro Marcello fits neatly into the reconstructed original state of the manuscript and its presence improves the regularity of the gatherings, and (3) that the evidence can be fairly successfully interpreted on the assumption that the gatherings were regular and contained eight leaves. The contents of the reconstructed manuscript are tabulated for convenience:

Contents	Reconstructed numeration	Lost leaves	Surviving folios
1 Catiline	*1-10	*1, *3-5	1-6
2 Catiline	*10-17	*13	6-12
3 Catiline	*17-25	*18, *19, *23	12-16
4 Catiline	*25-32	*25-27, *30-32	17-18
Pro Marcello	*33-38	all	—
Pro Q. Ligario	*39-46	*39-41, *44, *45	19-21
Pro rege Deiotaro	*46-54	*47, *48	21-27
?	*55-56	both	—
In Verrem II.ii	*57-96	*63-79, *81-88, *94-96	28-39
In Verrem II.iii	*97-151	all	—

- 1 Formerly Holkham MS. 387, and much earlier MS. 498 of the Abbey of Cluny, whose ownership mark (de cōuētu cluñ) is on fol. 1.
- 2 W. Peterson, *Collations from the Codex Cluniensis s. Holkhamicus* (1901), [*Anecdota Oxoniensia, Classical Series, Part ix*].
- 3 Now Florence, Badia, MS. 2618.
- 4 See E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours* (1929), pp. 11-18.
- 5 A. C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 235-52.

Copyright of British Library Journal is the property of British Library Board 96. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.