

## ACIDALIUS ON MANILIUS

Thomas Marshall, who became Rector of Lincoln College in 1672 and died in 1685, left to the Bodleian his collection of books and manuscripts. Two lists of the manuscripts appear in Edward Bernard's *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1697), i (1). 272–3, 373–4, but both omit what is now called MS. Marshall 140, which F. Madan in the *Summary Catalogue* describes as follows:<sup>1</sup>

'In M. Manilii Astronomicon l[i]bros quinque Animadversiones': a 17th-cent. hand has added 'Valentis Acidalii'. These Latin notes appear to have been written somewhat after the death (1595) of Acidalius, and have been corrected by a German or Dutch hand, said in the old list of Marshall MSS. to be that of Johannes Fredericus Gronovius. At fol. 67 are 'Ludovici Carrionis emendationes Manilianae ex antiquis lectionibus'.

Madan should have retained the capitals of *Antiquis Lectionibus*, because the writer was transcribing from a published work (Antwerp, 1576); at fo. 72v he continued with 'Ludovici Carrionis emendationes Manilianae ex Lib. 2 Emendationum et observationum' (Paris, 1583). The *Animaduersiones*, however, show every sign of being autograph, and Madan was unquestionably right in assigning the corrections to a different hand, smaller and more upright. The hand that added 'Valentis Acidalii' wrote nothing else in the volume, but a further hand, or perhaps two, wrote notes inserted on two slips, fo. 15 and fo. 64. To leave aside these other hands, who were the writer and the corrector?

At first sight, both attributions seem reasonable. Valens or Valentinus Acidalius, from Wittstock in Neubrandenburg, died at the age of 28 after publishing a volume of *Epigrammata* (Helmstedt, 1589), an edition of Velleius (Padua, 1590), and notes on Curtius (Frankfurt, 1594). The work that he would have published next, *In comoedias Plauti quae extant diuinationes et interpretationes*, was eventually seen into print (Frankfurt, 1607) by his younger brother Christianus, who performed the same service for more of his poems (Liegnitz, 1603), a number of his letters together with an essay on the elegiac metre (Hanau, 1606), and his notes on Tacitus (Hanau, 1607) and the *Panegyrici* (Frankfurt, 1607); it must also have been Christianus who supplied Scipio Gentilis with the notes on Apuleius' *Apology* that he used in the appendix to his edition (Hanau, 1607).<sup>2</sup> For someone who died so young, Acidalius had already established a considerable reputation as a critic, and anyone these days who recognizes his name will have met it in an apparatus. The letters and his brother's preface to them are the main source of information about his life,<sup>3</sup> and both he

<sup>1</sup> *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* 2 ii (Oxford, 1937), p. 1211, no. 8684\*; I thank Bruce Barker-Benfield for showing me the draft of Madan's description, dated 6.12.1888 and made when the manuscript was called Add. B 53 (*Manuscript Catalogue of MSS. Add. B, R 6 58/2* in Duke Humfrey's Library). For details about Thomas Marshall see p. 992 of the *Summary Catalogue* and *D.N.B.* 36 (1893), 247–8.

<sup>2</sup> Anna Maranini kindly told me that Leiden 760 D 13, a copy of Pricaeus' edition (Paris, 1635), has at the front three leaves of 'Valentis Acidalii notae ineditae in L. Apuleii Apologiam priorum'; they must be the notes that Kristeller mentions in *Iter Italicum*, iv (London & Leiden, 1989), p. 377. Any notes on Apuleius at Leiden seemed unlikely to have escaped Oudendorp, and so it proved: in Oudendorp's posthumous edition (Leiden, 1786–1823), J. Bosscha claims to be publishing Acidalius' notes for the first time (ii.413, iii.553), by which he evidently means that unlike Gentilis he gives them in full and in Acidalius' own words. Bosscha led me to Gentilis.

<sup>3</sup> See also A. Dihle in the *Neue deutsche Biographie*, i (Berlin, 1953), p. 34 and J. IJsewijn in *Die deutsche Literatur: Biographisches und bibliographisches Lexikon* ii A 1–2 (Bern, 1985), pp. 74–92. I owe the latter reference to Gilbert Tournoy.

himself in *Ep.* XII and his brother in the preface mention notes on Manilius; *Ep.* XII is undated but appears to have been sent from Bologna in 1592. He also promises in a note on Curtius to deal with a passage of Manilius 'ad ipsum fortasse, cum erit commodum'.<sup>4</sup> J. F. Gronovius, born in 1611, became an even greater critic, and his many contributions to the understanding and improvement of Latin texts include notes on Manilius, which G. P. Goold lists in his Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1985), xxix. Here, then, are two scholars who emended Manilius at what look like suitable dates for the *Animaduersiones* and the corrections. One attribution is right, however, and the other wrong.

Madan gives no reason for placing the *Animaduersiones* after 1595 (was he going by the script?), and the only *terminus post quem* that they yield is 1590. The writer works from the Heidelberg edition of that year, a reprint of Scaliger's first edition (Paris, 1579) augmented with notes and collations by Franciscus Junius, and despite constant reference to Scaliger and Junius he never cites Scaliger's revised edition (Leiden, 1600). He should therefore have been writing in the 1590s. His identity emerges from this note on 4.532 *deficit* (fo. 43r): 'de hoc uerbo egi ad Vell. Velleianis lectionibus p. 140'. Acidalius discusses the transitive use of *deficere* on p. 140 of his *Velleianarum lectionum liber*, which follows his text of Velleius. Moreover, a letter that he wrote and signed in 1593 is preserved as B.L. Add. 21524 fos. 207–9,<sup>5</sup> and though I have not been able to put it alongside the *Animaduersiones*, I saw them within a few days of each other and do not doubt that the same hand wrote both.

The corrector did not so much correct the *Animaduersiones* as annotate them, sometimes on slips inserted for the purpose, and his annotations consist largely of quotations from Scaliger's revised edition. Madan overlooked an important fact about him: he several times refers to the writer as his brother or cousin (*frater*).

fo. 16 (on 2.494–6) Excusat uero Scal. et Manilium et semet ipsum potius altera editione, ubi pariter cum fratre emendat...

fo. 29 (on 3.4) Lectio Gembl... non procul quoad literas ab emendatione fratris recedit...

fo. 31 (on 3.206) Ita se legisse olim [*subtili*] Scal. post. edit. fatetur. Fuerit itaque uitium typographicum [*subtilis*] quod frater emendat...

fo. 33 (on 5.138) Mauult Scaliger *ut noua per montis quaerunt arbusta capellae*, quemadmodum et frater mutauit...

fo. 39 (on 4.137) Licet u(ero) Scal. nihil mutarit, probari tamen fratris coniectura hinc potest...

fo. 48 (on 4.901–2) ...uti frater postremum uoluit

fo. 55 (on 5.250) Hic Scaliger cum fratre sentit, qui...idem quod frater reponit

I have already mentioned Acidalius' brother Christianus, and the annotations can readily be attributed to someone who took so much trouble over his brother's papers.

No Manilian scholar to the best of my knowledge has ever cited the *Animaduersiones* in print, even though some have spent most of their working life at Oxford: Thomas Creech, who published the first English translation of the whole poem (London,

<sup>4</sup> For this information too I thank Anna Maranini, who found the following note on the flyleaf of Leiden 754 G 37, a copy of Manilius (Heidelberg, 1590) owned by Hemsterhuis and one or other P. Burman: 'Manilium promittit Acidalius in Curt. p. 57b'. By courtesy of Anthony Snodgrass I was able to consult a copy of Acidalius' notes on Curtius in the Fellows' Library at Clare.

<sup>5</sup> The letter is *Ep.* LIII in the published collection, which omits 'Vratislavia. Non. Octobr. M.D.XCIII. Tui amantissimus et studiosiss. Valentinus Acidalius' before the last paragraph. Other letters are preserved at Leiden and at either West Berlin or Wrocław, if not both; see Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, iii (London & Leiden, 1983), p. 499, iv.362, 432, 433.

1697); Robinson Ellis, the author of *Noctes Manilianae* (Oxford, 1891); and H. W. Garrod, whose commentary on Book 2 (Oxford, 1911) has a long introduction much concerned with editorial history. My own study of Manilian material in the Bodleian and elsewhere has hitherto been confined almost entirely to manuscripts and collations.<sup>6</sup>

Only a complete transcript could do justice to the *Animaduersiones*, because Acidalius explains every conjecture that he proposes. Naturally he was at the mercy of the text and variants printed by Scaliger and Junius, neither of whom in 1590 knew much about G, let alone L or M; but it is interesting to see how judiciously he uses readings cited by Junius from his Palatinus or from Bonincontrius' edition, and how often he restores by conjecture readings that later emerged among GLM. All that I will do here, in order to convey the quality of his conjectures, is to list those that Goold ascribes to later scholars, of which I have noticed 37.

1.88 *iter in* (Gronovius), 171 *contra actis* (Jacob), 181 *cadat et* (Fayus), 252 *mutua et* (*mutuaque* Bentley), 261 *post omnis punctum* (Fayus), 317 *stimulis* (*stimulo* Scaliger 1600), 481 *brevius* (Bentley), 771 *strictae pondera mentis* (Bentley), 2.7 *cui cura petendi* (cf. Gronovius 1637, Housman 1903), 14 *cursus* (Bechert), 21 *Pallas* (Bentley), 117 *patentis* (Scaliger 1600), 366 *auersaque Tauri* (Huet), 433 *cura?* (Jacob), 541 *auersi* (Gronovius 1662), 582 *foedere* (Jever), 605 *paucisque* (Bentley), 612–13 *quam et dist.* (Bentley), 621 *prorumpere* (Shackleton Bailey), 666 *compare* (Doruillius), 877 *aluum* (Bentley), 3.4 *indictos* (Gronovius), 24 *urbis* (Bentley), 135 *sortimur* (Scaliger 1600), 239 *par* (Bentley), 403 *auerso* (Huet), 4.17 *hinc* (Huet), 388 before 389 (Bentley), 5.91 *imitatus* (Reinesius), 95 *immissos* (Gronovius 1662), 154 *caeca* (Bentley), 172 *curis somnos* (Bentley), 181 *uidere* (Barth), 245 *emessis* (Gevartius), 412 *latitantia* (p<sup>2</sup>, Scaliger 1600), 598 *semet* (Gronovius 1639), 720 *resplendent* (Fayus)

Of Manilian critics since Scaliger, only Bentley and Jacob score higher in Housman's list (v. xvii–xviii). Acidalius also saw 300 years before Breiter that Cic. *Verr.* 5.118–20 underlies 5.619–30, and on 4.367 he mentions Carrion's conjecture *ostentant* (*Ant. lect.* p. 51), which Goold ascribes to Bentley. His other conjectures and interpretations will need to be assessed by experts on Manilius, whose ranks I do not aspire to join.

*Hic alius finisset iter*, and I should have done so myself if there had not seemed to be a chance of killing two birds with one stone: by explaining why someone attributed the annotations to Gronovius, might one not fill the gap in the history of the volume between Christianus Acidalius and Thomas Marshall?

The first steps went well. For his edition of Ausonius (Amsterdam, 1671) Jacobus Tollius used notes of Acidalius' on the *Gratiarum actio*, and it was Gronovius who put them at his disposal. Other papers of Acidalius' could therefore have come into Gronovius' possession. Before he moved from Germany to Holland in 1634, he had studied in 1631–3 at Altdorf (near Nürnberg), where Christianus Acidalius was living when he prepared the publications of 1606–7 mentioned above.<sup>7</sup> Thomas Marshall, who lived in Holland from 1647 to 1672, could have acquired the *Animaduersiones* there either before or after Gronovius' death in 1671. A letter from him to Gronovius, written on a visit to Leiden, survives at Munich, dated 12 August but without the year.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> 'Scaliger and Manilius', *Mnem.* 33 (1980), 177–9; pp. 223–4 of 'Statius' *Silvae* in the Fifteenth Century', *CQ* 71 (1977), 202–25; pp. 519–22 of 'Some Astronomical Manuscripts', *CQ* 74 (1980), 508–22; 'Manilius', in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), pp. 235–8; 'The Marcianus of Manilius', *Vichiana* n.s. 18 (1989), 171–6.

<sup>7</sup> IJsewijn (n. 3), 73; B. Damcke & J. Christenius, *Leben des berühmten Joh. Friderici Gronovii* (Hamburg, 1723), pp. 2–3, and P. Dibon, H. Bots & E. Bots-Estourgie, *Inventaire de la correspondance de Johannes Fredericus Gronovius (1631–1671)* (The Hague, 1974), pp. 3–7.

<sup>8</sup> C.L.M. 618 fo. 38r; see the *Inventaire* (n. 7), 494.

'Valentis Acidalii', however, is not in Gronovius' hand, of which specimens from various dates can be seen in B.L. Harl. 4933; and that was merely the first setback. For the attribution of the annotations to Gronovius Madan gives as his authority 'the old list of Marshall MSS.', which he explicitly distinguishes from Bernard's printed catalogue but does not otherwise identify. He must have meant the list entered by Thomas Hearne between 1712 and 1716 in the handwritten continuation of Bernard's catalogue that R. W. Hunt describes in the *Summary Catalogue*, i (Oxford, 1953), pp. xl–xli, but at the moment it cannot be traced.<sup>9</sup> In addition to Bernard's catalogue, however, three lists earlier than the missing one survive. The earliest, MS. Bodley 70 fo. 25, corresponds to the first list in Bernard's catalogue, pp. 272–3, and therefore does not include MS. Marshall 140; additions made first in MS. Bodley 71 fo. 13 and then more briefly at the end of the previous list do not include it either. The fuller list in Library Records e 341, written by Hearne according to a modern note, uses the same Marshall numbers as Bernard's second list, pp. 373–4, and the *Summary catalogue*, but runs only to 139. The list recurs, however, in Library Records e 348, and there a different hand added '140 Acidalius in Manilium MS', cancelled it, wrote 'stet', and repeated '140 Acidalius in Manilium'. Together with the lapse of time before the addition was made, the second and third thoughts of whoever made it should be interpreted as doubts not about the authorship of the *Animaduersiones*, since cataloguers usually take problems of attribution in their stride, but about the provenance of the volume. Whatever caused them, the doubts were surely justified. Thomas Marshall's interests can be seen in MSS. Marshall 1–139, and though they look impressively polyglot, as the interests of seventeenth-century scholars often do, the writers of classical Antiquity are absent. Even if 'the old list of Marshall MSS.' comes to light, therefore, I do not expect it either to say anything useful about Gronovius or to establish that the volume has any right to be called MS. Marshall 140.

Meanwhile, I had checked a few catalogues of other libraries on the offchance of finding something that might help to fill the gap in the history of the volume. What I found left me with a tangled web of Manilian studies to unravel. It involves Caspar Gevartius of Antwerp (1593–1666), Edward Sherburne (1618–1702), Creech (1659–1700), and Bentley (1662–1742), and it has several loose ends. The *Animaduersiones* are only one strand, and though I shall try not to lose sight of it, other strands have an equal place in the editorial history of Manilius. As the unpublished evidence is largely undated and the earliest pieces survive only at second or third hand, it would be very hard to tell a sequential story by combining published and unpublished evidence, and so I will begin with published evidence. Manilian scholars since Jacob have made small contributions to it, but I have had to collect most of it from elsewhere. For the moment I exclude details that I published ten years ago about four books from Gevartius' library.

Gevartius hung a millstone round his own neck. In his *Papinianarum lectionum commentarius* (Leiden, 1616), pp. 186–7, he identified Manilius with Flavius Manlius Theodorus, who as consul in 399 received a eulogy from Claudian, and on his deathbed 50 years later he cheered his soul with this prospect:

Manlius ille suo per te iam redditus aevo  
astra tibi consul monstrabit, ad illa uicissim  
ipse uiam pandet, rutilasque hinc ducet in arces.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> I am grateful to Bruce Barker-Benfield and Steven Tomlinson for their efforts.

<sup>10</sup> M. Hoc, *Étude sur J.-G. Gevaerts* (Brussels, 1922), p. 168.

Apart from discussions of a few passages in his *Electorum libri III* (Paris, 1619), the interval, so far as his acquaintances could see, was filled only with promises, first of 'Manilius cum notulis meis', allegedly at the printer's as early as 1618, and after 1635 not just of that but also of *Vindiciae Manlianae*, a rejoinder to an attack by J. Tristan on his dating of Manilius.<sup>11</sup> Already for the *Commentarius* and the *Electa* he had consulted G and a manuscript from the Royal Library at Paris, but the world heard nothing more about such preparations until 1644, when he showed Heinsius G and 'excerpta quaedam Gallicana'.<sup>12</sup> If, as seems likely, these *excerpta* were readings of the Parisinus, Heinsius had ample reason for calling him 'cunctator summus'. In 1650–1 he hoped to borrow an early edition from Vossius.<sup>13</sup> In September 1666, a few months after his death, his library was auctioned at Antwerp; it has been said that only one copy of the printed catalogue survives,<sup>14</sup> and no-one has reported its Manilian contents.

At the auction, a box of his papers on Manilius was bought by Edward Sherburne, who later built a learned work round a translation of Book 1 (London, 1675). Sherburne also borrowed G from Papebrochius in 1678 and returned it in 1693, as a note at the front records.<sup>15</sup> By 1692, he had lent to Bentley 'all he had amassed together towards an edition'. Particulars of this transaction can be found in Bentley's correspondence, edited by C. Wordsworth (London, 1842), and in the second edition of his *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* (London, 1699). He mentions the following things:

1. The box of papers from the library of Gevartius, which included his *Vindiciae Manlianae* (*Corresp.* i.36, 41–2), two letters by Graevius (*Corresp.* i.42), a letter by A(lbertus) R(ubenius) and an essay in the same hand on Flavius Manlius Theodorus (*Corresp.* i.42, *Phalaris* xlv), and two copies of an essay on the date of Manilius by the astronomer Godefridus Wendelinus, one autograph and the other made by Gevartius (*Phalaris* lxiii).

2. A collation of the Pithoeanus in Book 1 (*Corresp.* i.36, 37).

3. 'Some old and scarce editions' (*Phalaris* xlv).

Bentley sent Rubenius' essay to Graevius for publication, explaining that Sherburne owned it (*Corresp.* i.41–2), and Graevius, who returned the original in 1693 (*Corresp.* i.75), embarrassed him by making him the dedicatee of the edition (Utrecht, 1694) and not mentioning Sherburne (*Corresp.* i.163, 170–5, *Phalaris* xlv–lxiii). In a draft of a cordial letter to Bentley, B.L. Sloane 836 fo. 83v, Sherburne asks what progress he has made on Manilius and what he has heard from Graevius. The mention of Graevius cannot be earlier than 1692, when Bentley first wrote to him, and there is almost certainly a later *terminus post quem*: on fo. 83r Sherburne copied an extract from Dryden's dedication to the *Examen poeticum*, published in *The Gentleman's Journal* for June–July 1693. The *terminus ante quem* has been taken to be the

<sup>11</sup> Hoc, pp. 111–13 (cf. p. 35), 87–8, 125–6. By splitting his account of the feud with Tristan he fails to make it clear that between Tristan's first edition (1635) and his second (1644) Gevartius threatened *Vindiciae Manlianae* in his *Pompa introitus... XV Kal. Maii ann. MDCXXXV* (Antwerp, 1641), 136.

<sup>12</sup> See Heinsius' entertaining remarks in Burman's *Sylloge epistolarum* (Leiden, 1727), iii. 139–40, the opening of a letter to Gronovius dated 10.1.1645. F. F. Blok, *Nicolaas Heinsius in dienst van Christina van Zweden* (Delft, 1949), p. 21, documents his visit to Belgium from unpublished letters.

<sup>13</sup> *Sylloge* ii.763–5.

<sup>14</sup> Hoc, p. 75 n. 2. A list of his manuscripts appears in Bodl. d'Orville 397 pp. 25–7, and J. U. Meurer's list in Rawl. D 192 fos. 103v–104r seems to be a copy.

<sup>15</sup> P. Thomas, *Lucubrationes Manlianae* (Ghent, 1888), p. 13 n. 3.

publication of Rubenius' essay in 1694, or Bentley's apologetic presentation of a copy to Sherburne.<sup>16</sup> Be that as it may, the draft does not reveal whether Sherburne's Manilian material was still in Bentley's hands, let alone what it included.

Bentley's edition, allegedly ready in the 1690s but finally seen through the press by his nephew long after Sherburne's death in 1702 (London, 1739), does not mention him; 'no acknowledgements were required any longer'.<sup>17</sup> The information about Bentley's materials that his nephew gives in the preface can be supplemented from Wordsworth's description of Cambridge Trin. Adv. d 2.13, a copy of Scaliger's revised edition on which he collated manuscripts and early editions (*Correspondence* ii.745; Garrod xlii–xlvii).<sup>18</sup> Editors of Manilius have also mentioned the copies on which Leiden Voss. Lat. O 3 was collated for him in 1709 and L in 1693 and 1709, now Göttingen Philol. 133, Wrocław IV Q 58 m, and B.L. 681 c 21;<sup>19</sup> and one of his biographers saw a copy of the ed. Ven. 1499 on which he collated the ed. Ven. c. 1498–1500 (*B.M.C.* V 598).<sup>20</sup>

Gevartius, Sherburne, Bentley – not one of them mentions Acidalius either in scholarly publications or in published correspondence; yet unpublished evidence reveals that all three knew the *Animaduersiones* in some form. This time it will be simpler if I reverse the order.

In 1753 the royal library passed to the nation, and a Manilian notebook was 'found A.D. 1823' at the British Museum, as a note on the flyleaf says, 'among what had been considered the Refuse of the Royal Collection of Manuscripts'. Catalogued as Add. 6487, it was correctly attributed to Bentley, whether because his initials occur in it, though not where one usually looks for marks of ownership, or because he had not only edited Manilius but been Royal Librarian from 1694 to 1725;<sup>21</sup> it has since become Royal App. 72, and the original pagination, which I shall follow, has been pointlessly replaced by a foliation that skips blanks.<sup>22</sup> Running titles on pp. 1–60, from 'Lib. 1' to 'Lib. 5', indicate the original purpose of the notebook, abandoned before the end of Book 1. Five of its eight sections concern me here.

§3. On pp. 37–40 he copied a letter sent to Sherburne by Vossius from The Hague on 26.1.1670. This is the letter that Sherburne summarizes in the preface to his translation of Book 1.

<sup>16</sup> In his very thorough book *The Poems and Translations of Sir Edward Sherburne (1616–1702) excluding Seneca and Manilius* (Assen, 1961), F. J. van Beeck includes a life of Sherburne and a list of extant autographs. He recounts the misunderstanding with Bentley on pp. xxxv–xxxvi and dates the letter between 1692 and 1694. On the date of the *Examen poeticum* see J. Kinsley, *The Poems of John Dryden* (Oxford, 1958), iv.2020.

<sup>17</sup> Beeck 152 n. 35.

<sup>18</sup> Garrod should have blamed Bentley, not his nephew (pp. xliii, xc n. 1), for confusing Voss. Lat. O 18, his δ, with the Pithoeanus, his α: in the note where he tentatively and mistakenly identifies the former with Voss. Lat. O 3, Bentley calls it 'δ Pithoei'. It does seem, though, that in crediting Bentley with two collations of G (p. xiv) his nephew misunderstood 'γ notat MS Gemblacensem a me denuo collatum'.

<sup>19</sup> Jacob, *De M. Manilio poeta particula altera: Liber tertius et quartus* (Lübeck, 1835), 17 n. 4, and for the current shelfmark *Verzeichniss der Handschriften im preussischen Staate* 1 I (Berlin, 1893), 31; Breiter, ed. I (Leipzig, 1907), iii ('quam collationem Vratislaviensem uocant': who?), corrected by P. Thielscher, *Philol.* 82 (1927), 176; Garrod, p. xvii n. 6.

<sup>20</sup> J. H. Monk, *The Life of Richard Bentley, D.D.* (London<sup>2</sup>, 1833), i.35 n. 26. Where is the copy now?

<sup>21</sup> *Index to the Additional Manuscripts with those of the Egerton Collection Preserved in the British Museum and Acquired in the Years 1783–1835* (London, 1849), p. 38.

<sup>22</sup> G. F. Warner & J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections* (London, 1921), ii.396–7.

§4. Pp. 41–3 have the heading ‘Catalogus elucubrationum Godefridi Vendelini. Charta haec fuit inter schedas C. Geuartii’.

§5. Pp. 44–53, in the order 46–53, 45, 44, contain excerpts ‘Ex Valentis Acidalii notis ad Editionem priorem Scaligeri’.

§6. On pp. 54–6 appear ‘Notae Io. Fred. Gronouii ad lib. 1<sup>um</sup>’ (they include readings of the lost Venetus and the conjectures *sibi* at 721, known to Goold only from Bentley’s edition, and *inuersum* at 830, ascribed by Goold to Breiter). This section concerns me only because it must antedate the previous section, whose order it explains.

§7. The contents of pp. 57–78 ‘excerpta sunt ex schedis C. Geuartii’. They begin with miscellaneous notes, including the statement on p. 60 that ‘editionis Bononiensis principis et primigeniae copiam mihi fecit Isaacus Vossius’. Then follow on pp. 61–5 extracts from letters to Gevartius about Manilius, on p. 65 a brief description of the *Vindiciae Manlianae*, and on pp. 66–78 notes on various passages of the poem, from p. 71 chiefly in connexion with Gevartius’ fourth-century date (on p. 68 he cites from Lipsius the conjecture *in usum* at 5.152<sup>23</sup> and himself proposes *Medos* at 5.264; Goold ascribes both to Bentley).

Bentley must have copied §§3, 4, and 7, from what Sherburne lent him. Presumably the date of the copies is not far from 1692. What was the exemplar of §5, the excerpts from Acidalius’ *Animaduersiones*? In theory, he could have used either the original or a copy made by Gevartius or Sherburne, but it seems clear that he used the original. Here is what he wrote on 2.29 (p. 47):

*soluentemque patrem*] Non intelligo. Mutabam *lugentemque patrem* uel ~~*solantemque*~~ sed cogitandum amplius (sic est inducta illa uox; si *lugentem* uoluisset dicere, cur non potius dixit *flentesque parentes*? R.B.). Haec Ch. Acid.

In the original, the note was added on a slip by Christianus Acidalius, who cancelled *solantemque* by drawing a line through it. Would these details have been reproduced in a copy made by Gevartius or Sherburne? Similarly, at 2.449 (p. 48) Bentley cites in brackets and attributes to Gevartius the reading *tua per ... currat*, which in the original occurs on fo. 15, one of the two slips inserted by someone other than Christianus Acidalius; unfortunately I cannot decipher the two words with which he introduces the attribution, and for the moment I wish to suspend judgement on it anyway, but once again the simplest interpretation is that he was copying from the original. When and where, though? The date and origin of §6 are too obscure to help with the date of §5. It may seem that he could have made the copy as early as 1689–90 while he was living at Oxford, though I have found no evidence earlier than 1692 for any work on Manilius;<sup>24</sup> but the context in which the copy appears and the presence in the original of what he took to be Gevartius’ hand combine to suggest that Sherburne owned the original at the time.

Another book of Bentley’s sheds some light on his preparations for the edition but none on his knowledge of the *Animaduersiones*: Cambridge Trin. Adv. d 2.13, which

<sup>23</sup> He made it in his fifth edition of Tacitus (Antwerp, 1589) on p. 49 of the commentary.

<sup>24</sup> He incorporated from Wadham on 4 July 1689, reclaimed his caution money on 30 July 1690, and had left Oxford when Edward Bernard wrote to him on 20 December; see R. B. Gardiner, *The Registers of Wadham College, Oxford, from 1613 to 1719* (London, 1889), p. 359, and *Corresp.* i.12. The possibility that he began work on Manilius in 1689–90, despite the lack of evidence earlier than 1692, was aired by Garrod, pp. xc–xci (for ‘thirty’ read ‘forty’).

I mentioned above. The descriptions given by Wordsworth and Garrod are incomplete and unstratified. His collations began with G, Junius' reports of his Palatinus, and the ed. Ven. c. 1498–1500,<sup>25</sup> and continued with Edward Bernard's manuscript (now Bodl. Auct. F 4 34), Oxford C.C.C. 66, a Vossianus (now Leiden Voss. Lat. O 3), a collation of an unnamed manuscript (now Voss. Lat. O 18) 'ad oram Editionis Bononiensis' (now Bodl. Auct. O 5 17), the ed. Bonon. itself, the ed. Rom. 1484, a collation owned by Edward Bernard (now Bodl. Linc. D 5 13) of the Pithoeanus (now Boston Public Library q. Med. 20), L, and Gronovius' collation (now Leiden 755 H 15) of the lost Venetus. The only thing that he mentions borrowing from Sherburne is 'etiam' the ed. Rom. 1510, but it must have been through Sherburne that he saw G: at the back of the volume, where he lists abbreviations found in G, he also copies the note of the loan to Sherburne in 1678 but not 'restitutus est an. 1693'. Besides entering all these collations in the margin, he noted at the foot of the page a few conjectures, but I have found none from the *Animaduersiones*.

From Bentley, back to Sherburne. He made collations and notes on an interleaved copy of Scaliger's revised edition, now Cambridge U.L. Adv. d 44.5, and put his signature on the frontispiece.<sup>26</sup> At the head of the text he names three sources:

(1) Variants *quas illustriss. et doctiss. Isaacus Vossius ad oram libri sui annotauerat mihiq[ue] transcribendas humanissime praeuit*, from Leiden Voss. Lat. O 3; he enters them on the text itself.

(2) G, borrowed from Papebrochius in 1678 and collated in September of that year; he collates it in the left-hand column of the inserted leaves.

(3) The collation of the Pithoeanus later used by Bentley; on the text itself he records the omissions and transpositions of the Pithoeanus, and in Book 1 he makes a full transcript of the collation under the heading 'C. Pyth.' in the right-hand column of the inserted leaves.

The volume must be the collation of the Pithoeanus mentioned by Bentley, whose hand can be seen in it: at 2.952, where Sherburne writes '*mortique locatur non est in G. Cod. sed manu Scaligeri additum*', Bentley appends the correction '*imo alius cuiusdam*'. In Book 1 Sherburne also collates on the text what he calls '(edit.) Pog(g).', namely the ed. Ven. c. 1498–1500; he evidently took it to be the *editio princeps* and interpreted too precisely Scaliger's statement in the revised edition of his commentary (p. 5) that Poggio 'primus publicauit' Manilius 'iam tum nascente typographia'.<sup>27</sup> At the beginning of Book 2, readings of the Pithoeanus are succeeded on the inserted leaves, with no more warning than the absence of the heading 'C Pyth.', by conjectures from the *Animaduersiones*. One, 2.14 *primos...cursus*, appears

<sup>25</sup> Wordsworth omits ' $\phi$  (notat) editionem principem in 4<sup>to</sup> ex Biblioth. Arundeliana. Imo posterior est editio Bononiensi'. I take this opportunity of mentioning that what Garrod calls 'the first Naples edition (1475)', 'the second Naples edition (1475–80)', and 'editio Neapolitana prior, 1475–80' (pp. lxxvi, 155), are all the same, and that what he calls 'the folio edition *sine loco et anno*' (p. lxxvi n. 3) was obviously an incomplete copy of the ed. Bonon., the ed. Ven. 1499, or the ed. Rheg. 1503, whether or not the designation came ultimately from the *Catalogus selectissimae bibliothecae Nicolai Rossii* (Rome, 1786), 68 'Manilii Astronomicon et Arati Phenomenon, fol. sine loco et anno'. Cambridge U.L. Norton a 29, an incomplete copy of the ed. Rheg. 1503, would fit both this description and Garrod's.

<sup>26</sup> *A Catalogue of the Adversaria and Printed Books Containing MS. Notes, Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1864), p. 57 (Oo V 8); Beeck, op. cit. (n. 16), 147.

<sup>27</sup> Similarly, Garrod, p. lxxvi, read too much into Scaliger's remarks in his earlier edition about the influence of Bonincontrius.



on the text, and alongside on the inserted leaf Sherburne writes 'L(egendum) f(orte) *et primo titubantia sidera cursu*'. The conjectures from the *Animaduersiones* stop at the end of Book 2, and nothing follows them.

Sherburne's collation of the Vossianus helps to clear up an old problem that recent editors have ignored. Jacob reported from the Diez collection at Berlin a collation made at Vossius' house in 1679 by Spanheim, MS. Spanh. 44 fos. 46r–72v.<sup>28</sup> The title that he cites from Spanheim, which has *Antiochi Boemi* where Voss. Lat. O 3 has *EQOM*, persuaded him that Spanheim collated a third Vossianus and not Voss. Lat. O 3 (his Vossianus secundus), but he later saw that Spanheim must have been copying a collation of Voss. Lat. O 3 mixed up with notes of Vossius'.<sup>29</sup> Sherburne's title agrees with Spanheim's except that it has *-tii* above the *-ci* of *Marci* and *Poeni* for *Boemi*. Now Sherburne, who copied a collation made *ad oram libri*, cannot have been copying Spanheim's, which Jacob describes as made on *schedae*. Both, therefore, must have been copying another collation not yet identified, presumably one made by Vossius himself as Sherburne says. I have not tried to work out whether Bentley, who gives the same title as Sherburne but without the superscript *-tii*, copied the missing collation or Sherburne's copy; if, as I suspect, the latter, then that will be another unacknowledged debt to Sherburne. Variants that he added later doubtless came from the collation of 1709. It remains, however, to account for *Antiochi Boemi* or *Antiochi Poeni*, which continued to puzzle Jacob. In fact Jacob simplified the reading of Spanheim's collation: 'an der fraglichen Stelle steht *Poeni*, aber darüber *Boemer* geändert in *Boemi*'.<sup>30</sup> How *Poeni* came into existence is shown by a passage of Vossius' letter to Sherburne (p. 38 of Bentley's notebook):

Sic...concipitur titulus huius Astronomici in optimo nostro libro: *M. MALLII BOENI ASTRONOMICON DIVO OCT. QUIRINO AVG.* In priore quidem libro literae sunt turbatae, sed in epigraphe libri tertii plane ita exprimuntur, ut ne dubitandum quidem sit quin pro *BOENI* scribendum sit *POENI*.

Accordingly, Sherburne in the preface to his translation (p. blv) simply gives the title as *M. MALLII POENI*... Vossius' views on the identity of Manilius also account for the addition of *Antiochi* from Plin. *HN* 35.199. In short, Jacob was right to renounce his Vossianus tertius: the manuscript behind the collations was Voss. Lat. O 3.<sup>31</sup>

Other notes of Sherburne's in the volume include a reference at 5.619–30 to L. Holstenius, *Passio Ss. Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (Paris, 1664), p. 113. Holstenius too, independently of Acidalius, saw before Breiter that Cic. *Verr.* 5.118–20 underlies the passage.

It has not been noticed that Sherburne annotated another copy of Manilius in Cambridge University Library, namely Inc. 3 B 3 134 [1827] (ed. Ven. 1499).<sup>32</sup> His unmistakable hand occurs among its annotations, and like Adv. d 44.5 it has on the

<sup>28</sup> *De M. Manilio poeta particula prior* (Lübeck, 1832), p. 3 n. c and *particula altera: Liber tertius et quartus* (Lübeck, 1835), p. 17 n. 4. Dr Ursula Winter of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek has kindly confirmed that the shelfmark is still the same. <sup>29</sup> Ed. (Berlin, 1846), xiv.

<sup>30</sup> I quote what Ursula Winter kindly reports.

<sup>31</sup> The Vossianus tertius still existed for Bechert, *Leipziger Studien*, i (1878), pp. 14–15. Garrod, pp. xlv–xlvii, postulated a Vossianus tertius different from Jacob's and similar to Voss. Lat. O 18 (Jacob's Vossianus primus), but I showed in *CQ* 71 (1977), 224 n. 98 that he was muddled, and predictably he also tied himself in knots by misapplying to his own Vossianus tertius what Jacob and Bechert had said about theirs.

<sup>32</sup> J. C. T. Oates, *A Catalogue of the Fifteenth-Century Books in the University Library* (Cambridge (Cambridge, 1954), p. 373 no. 2189.

title page 'F.S. L.A.'. I could make nothing of this until I looked at B.L. Sloane 832, which includes on fos. 10r–38r a draft of Sherburne's translation, 'begun 12 [or 22?] Sept. 1656 at Paris'. Alternative title pages occupy fos. 10r and 38r, and the first gives the author's name in two versions, 'E.S. Esq.' and 'Felix Seruator Lympidarum aquarum Armiger'. Edward means 'happy guardian', Sherburne 'bright stream'.<sup>33</sup> 'F.S. L.A.' is therefore his *ex libris*. At the head of the text, an earlier hand wrote 'Astronomicon. Hoc scriptum Manlii cum Gemblacensi codice contulit Geuartius et seorsim Wendelinus anno 1644'. Sherburne obviously bought the incunable at the auction of Geuartius' library; his 'Catalogus librorum meorum mens. Sept. a. D. 1670', B.L. Sloane 857 fos. 182–94, includes the ed. Ven. 1499 and three other editions, though without mentioning provenance or annotations. The previously unattested collation chimes with the news that Heinsius brought back from Antwerp in the same year, and the note can be attributed to Wendelinus by comparison with a letter that he wrote in 1654 to Rubenius, preserved as B.L. Harl. 4936 fo. 344 = 181.<sup>34</sup> Wendelinus also entered in the margin a few astronomical explanations and a large number of readings, almost all unlabelled. Surely readings of G, one imagines, and indeed many of them are; but when the volume passed into Sherburne's hands and he began entering further readings of G, things like this happened:

1.360 *testemque* mg.<sup>1</sup> *pestemque*, mg.<sup>2</sup> (Sherburne) 'est Geuartii coniectura; Gembl. h(abet) test.'

In fact it was not just Geuartius' conjecture, published in his *Electa* (pp. 62–4), but Lannoius', reported by Junius. Three more conjectures from the *Electa* reappear: 4.388 before 389 (attributed by Goold to Bentley), 5.245 *emessis*, 521 *fatum*. Many other readings were taken from Scaliger. The remainder, or some of them, must be conjectures, and these include 14 that Goold cites from later or not obviously earlier publications:

1.917 *Roma* (Bentley), 2.7 *patriam cui cura petentum* (cf. Gronovius 1637, Housman 1903, Housman 1912), 21 *Pallas* (Bentley), 115 *munere nosse* (Gataker 1652, Gronovius 1662), 565 *Nemeaeus* (Gronovius 1662), 3.4 *indictos* (Gronovius), 17 *germanosue* (Bentley), 4.17 *hinc* (Huet), 23 *an* (Barth 1624), 191 *ducet* (Bentley), 533 *partus* (Bentley), 642 *reclisit* (Fayus), 5.461 *Atrei* (Housman 1900, from Jacob), 598 *semet* (Gronovius 1639)

Five of these conjectures, and also those at 4.388 and 5.245 that Geuartius published, had already been made by Acidalius; but the overlap is only a small proportion of each total, and failing other evidence to connect Wendelinus or Geuartius with the *Animaduersiones*, one could well invoke chance. I have already mentioned, however, that Bentley attributed to Geuartius the note on fo. 15 of the *Animaduersiones*, and I shall presently come to more evidence.

On going back beyond Sherburne to Geuartius, who owned and annotated four volumes in the Bodleian that I briefly described ten years ago<sup>35</sup> and a fifth that I have

<sup>33</sup> E. G. Withycombe, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names* (Oxford<sup>3</sup>, 1977), p. 94; E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Oxford<sup>4</sup>, 1960), p. 416.

<sup>34</sup> There is a letter of 1632 in Add. 11759, which I have not inspected, but I did inspect a Flemish letter of 1664 preserved as Harl. 4933 fo. 59, and the unlabelled plates between pp. 92 and 93 of F. Silverijser's two-part article on Wendelinus, *Bull. de l'Inst. Arch. Liégeois* 58 (1934), 91–158, 60 (1936), 137–90, apparently show him annotating copies of his own published works. The three letters that I have cited are absent from Silverijser's list of his correspondence (p. 96), nor did I notice any mention of Manilius in either part of the article.

<sup>35</sup> *Mnem.* 33 (1980), 179. The volumes were unknown to Hoc (n. 10) and Hoc's book to me.

encountered since, I found that I was still in the company of Sherburne. The volumes are these:

(1) Auct. O 5 18, a copy of the ed. Rom. 1484 marked up by Gevartius apparently with a view to reprinting Bonincontrius' commentary.<sup>36</sup> On the flyleaf appears Sherburne's *ex libris*, 'F.S. L.A.'.

(2) Auct. S 2 23, a copy of Scaliger's revised edition copiously annotated by Gevartius. On the title page, below 'Jan. Casperius Gevartius ex dono Gul. Merulae Paull. fil.', appears 'F.S. L.A.'.

(3) Auct. S 2 24, a printed but unpublished copy, annotated by Gevartius, of 'Casperii Gevartii Vindiciarum Manliarum liber I'<sup>37</sup> and a text up to 5.279. At the foot of p. 128, the last page, Sherburne wrote 'Deest ultima pagina'. On p. 125 he noted two readings of 'Renes.', published in the ed. Strasb. 1655.

(4) H 5 14 Art., a copy of the ed. Basil. 1551 into which Scaliger copied Susius' collation of G. This volume has four notes of ownership: on p. 144 'D.D. Iano Rutgersio amico suo dono dedit A. Nicolai' and 'Rutgersius Gevartio', on the title page 'Ex bibliotheca C. Gevartii' in Gevartius' hand and 'F.S. L.A.'. Nicolai also wrote on the title page 'Cum animaduersionibus manuscriptis Doctiss. Josephi Scaligeri'. Gevartius added a few readings of G, and on p. 159 Sherburne adjusted the text of 1.797–8.

(5) Linc. 8° F 107, an interleaved copy of the ed. Lugd. 1566 on which Carrion collated G.<sup>38</sup> This volume has at the beginning a note by Gevartius about G and on 2.5 a note by Sherburne, 'f. *belli geminata per agmina notum*'. On the flyleaf Gevartius wrote the title 'Notae ad Manlii Astronomicon', and someone else, possibly the person who wrote 'Valentis Acidalii' in MS. Marshall 140, added 'i.e. Variantes lectiones ex m<sup>sto</sup> codice Gemblacensi.' 'F.S. L.A.' appears in three other copies of Manilius at the Bodleian, none of which has any trace of Gevartius' ownership:

(6) Auct. O 5 19, a copy of the ed. Ven. c. 1498–1500 previously owned by Vossius. On this copy someone who was not Vossius had already collated what must have been Regiomontanus' edition. Most of the readings added by Sherburne, which stop at 2.5, are accompanied by 'D.B.'; I do not know what it means or where he found the readings, which include 1.20 *impositis...fibris*, 181 *cadat et* (Acidalius, Fayus), 198 *currusque* (Bentley), 245 *vocamus* (Burman), 253 *altera* (Fayus), 270 *mittens iam iamque*.

(7) Auct. S 5 29, a copy of Scaliger's first edition into which someone (Vossius?) copied collations of the lost Venetus (up to 2.100) and Voss. Lat. O 18. I did not notice anything in Sherburne's hand except the *ex libris*.

(8) 4° I 29 Art., a copy of the ed. Rom. 1510. Sherburne adjusted the text of 1.797–800 and wrote this note on 1.88: 'lege *fecit et ignotas inter commercia terras*, i.e. nauita fecit, non itiner'.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>36</sup> I ascribed this diagnosis to Anthony Grafton (n. 10), but it had already been made by C. Grayson, *Diz. Biog. degli Ital.* 12 (1970), 210.

<sup>37</sup> Subsequent catalogues of printed books in the Bodleian (Oxford, 1738, 1843) register it under both Gevartius and Manilius. The internal date, 1656, is confirmed by a letter of 1.10.1656 sent to Gevartius by the censor; see p. 65 of Bentley's notebook.

<sup>38</sup> The volume had been inaccessible to readers because the catalogue gave its place and date of publication but not its shelfmark. The collation that it turned out to contain, mentioned by Goold on p. vii of his edition, has now been discussed by Ruth Taylor, *CQ* 83 (1989), 454–7.

<sup>39</sup> Sherburne repeats the conjecture not only in Auct. O 5 19 but also in his interleaved volume, where he refers to 2.346, 466, 3.103, 117, 4.126, 5.52, 332, 334, 371. P. E. Knox, *CQ* 83 (1989), 564–5, has made it again.

Altogether, Sherburne made little use of these eight volumes or of the incunable at Cambridge. His working copy was plainly the interleaved volume at Cambridge, and he transferred none of Gevartius' material to it – unless Gevartius' material included Acidalius' *Animaduersiones*.

It is now time to look at what Gevartius himself left to posterity in the material preserved at the Bodleian. Except that all five volumes contain specimens of his hand,<sup>40</sup> only Auct. S 2 23 sheds any light on two questions that remain to be answered: did he write the note on fo. 15 of the *Animaduersiones*, which Bentley attributes to him? and did he make the unsignalled conjectures entered by Wendelinus in the incunable at Cambridge?

On the evidence of script I can say without hesitation that Bentley was right. Several notes in Auct. S 2 23, for instance on 1.88, 1.317, 2.666, 5.619–30, 5.729, confirm the attribution by naming Acidalius or 'A.'; other conjectures made by Acidalius are noted as though made by Gevartius himself, and at 1.252 he proposes not Acidalius' *mutua et* but Bentley's *mutuaque*. The second question is much harder to answer. Of the 14 conjectures that I listed above, 11 occur in Auct. S 2 23, one of them on the flyleaf as well as alongside (5.461 *Atrei*), but another (4.642 *reclusit*) occurs with the attribution 'Wendelin.'. I see no prospect of adjudicating between Gevartius and Wendelinus, because they worked closely together; Gevartius enters readings of G in the incunable at 5.321–2, and Wendelinus restores two verses on p. 21 of Bodl. Auct. S 2 24.

If the whole of Gevartius' material were available, further progress might be made, but the papers that Sherburne lent to Bentley are in large part untraced. Bodl. Auct. S 2 24 must be the copy of the *Vindiciae Manlianae* that Bentley saw, and the copy of Wendelinus' essay in B.L. Sloane 77 must be the one that he attributed to Gevartius; I am not sure that he was right, but it is not the autograph,<sup>41</sup> and besides annotations by Sherburne (fos. 11r, 12r, 14) it certainly has corrections by Gevartius on two passages (fo. 4r), one of which concerns Gevartius himself. On the other hand, the volumes in the Bodleian do not include all the notes that Bentley copied on pp. 66–78 of his notebook,<sup>42</sup> and I have not come across the list of Wendelinus' works, the autograph of his essay on Manilius, Rubenius' essay, any of the letters cited on pp. 61–5, or for that matter Vossius' letter to Sherburne.<sup>43</sup> It would surprise me if they did not survive, but outside Oxford, London, and Cambridge, I do not know where to look.

It transpires, then, that Acidalius' *Animaduersiones* were known in the original to Bentley and presumably in the same form to Gevartius and Sherburne. If, as I argued on other grounds, the original never belonged to Thomas Marshall, it surely belonged to Gevartius and Sherburne. How it reached Gevartius from Christianus Acidalius I have no idea, but it may have reached the Bodleian in 1697. In that year, as the *Register of Benefactions* records, Sherburne gave the Bodleian ten printed editions of

<sup>40</sup> His hand can also be seen in a letter written to Camden on 5.11.1618, preserved as B.L. Cotton Julius C V fo. 280 (formerly 133).

<sup>41</sup> Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* iv.56, describes the dedication as 'signed at the end by Godefridus Wendelinus'.

<sup>42</sup> Not surprisingly, there is some overlap. The notes include the conjecture *terrae commercia* at 1.88, followed by 'nec male Acidalius *iter in*'. Both conjectures appear in Auct. S 2 23, but the note on Acidalius' is longer.

<sup>43</sup> The letter from Sherburne that Vossius was answering survives as Amsterdam Univ. RK III E 10 fo. 136; see Beek (n. 16), 147. Sherburne also kept a draft of his reply to Vossius, partially preserved as B.L. Sloane 836 fo. 46.

Manilius.<sup>44</sup> Seven or eight of these I identified above, and in 1712 Hearne mentions one of them in a note about Mr Urry of Christ Church:

He hath likewise Jul. Firmicus &c. Bas. (Hervag.) 1533. In this edition is Manilius, and in M<sup>r</sup> Urry's copy there are added the various readings of several old edd. from a copy of Joseph Scaliger. These readings were put down in the margin by M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Creech's own hand, to whom the book once belong'd. He bor'ow'd Scaliger's copy of S<sup>r</sup> Edw. Sherburne, which I think is now in Bodley.<sup>45</sup>

'Scaliger's copy' will have been H 5 14 Art., in which he reproduced Susius' collation of G. The two volumes now in Cambridge University Library arrived there from the library of John Moore, bishop of Ely, which after his death in 1714 was bought by George I and given to the University;<sup>46</sup> why Sherburne did not give them to the Bodleian with the others can only be guessed.

Hearne's statement that Sherburne lent one of the volumes to Creech, who published his translation in 1697 and handed himself in 1700, clears up another problem. Garrod pointed out that at 2.21 Creech renders Bentley's *Pallas* ('the olive'), which I have now pushed back to Gevartius and Acidalius. Housman uncharitably surmised that he took it from Bentley 'Oxonii commorante' (V 137–8), and there is yet another possibility: as Gevartius noted in Bodl. Auct. S 2 23, Lilius Gregorius Giraldus in his account of Hesiod, *Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem* (Basel, 1545), 232, prints it when he quotes Manilius' lines on Hesiod, 2.11 *sed proximus illi* – 24 *condit in usus*. At 2.14, however, Creech probably renders Acidalius' *cursus* ('infant-stars first stagger'd in their way'), which he could only have found in the *Animaduersiones*, Sherburne's interleaved volume, or Bodl. Auct. S 2 23. If he borrowed Bodl. H 5 14 Art. from Sherburne, he may well have borrowed other volumes too.

Bentley and Creech were not the only people to whom Sherburne lent some of his Manilian material. Cambridge U.L. Kk 5 38, a thick notebook mostly written by one Abednego Seller, includes numerous transcripts of letters, the two latest written in 1692 (p. 466) and 1696 (p. 461). On pp. 123–49 appears a copy of Wendelinus' essay 'e MS. honoratiss. viri Edoardi Sherburne Equ. Aur. senis doctiss.'. <sup>47</sup> Unlike Sloane 77, it has a title page: *GOTIFRIDI WENDELINI / Canonici Condatensis / PROMETHEA / FERULA / Ad IOAN. TRISTANVM / SANCTAMANTIVM Gallum / transmissa: / Qua C. GEVARTII, IC<sup>ti</sup> et Archigrammatei / Antuerpiani de MANLII Astronomici / Scriptoris aevo / SENTENTIA / Argumentis Coelo petitis asseritur. / ANN. M.DC.XLIIII*. Despite this date, the internal date is 20 years after Gevartius' publication of 1616, whereas the internal date of Sloane 77, a somewhat different version, is 33 years after it. On p. 151, 'e MS. ejusd. cl. v. Edoardi Sherburne Eq. Aur.', follows *VIRGO / AVGVSTI CAESARIS / HOROSCOPIVS / CVM NATALI HORA / SERENISSIMI / PEDIMONTIORVM PRINCIPIS / CAROLI*

<sup>44</sup> For this information I thank Steven Tomlinson, who found it cited by W. D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian* (Oxford<sup>2</sup>, 1890), p. 430. The catalogue of 1738 (cf. n. 37) has 22 Manilian entries with shelfmarks, some still current but others not; most of the volumes that I have mentioned are readily identifiable.

<sup>45</sup> *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, iii, ed. C. E. Doble (Oxford, 1889), p. 306.

<sup>46</sup> Adv. d 44.5 appears under Manilius on fo. 126v of U.L. Oo 7 49, a handwritten catalogue of his quarto books; Luigi Lehnus kindly brought the catalogue to my attention. U.L. Inc. 3 B 3 134 [1827] should appear in the handwritten catalogue of his folio books, Bodl. Add. D 81\*.

<sup>47</sup> I am much obliged to Ornella Bellavita and Luigi Lehnus for bringing the notebook to my attention. In a forthcoming article on Callimachus Professor Lehnus will explore Seller's connexions with Sherburne and Bentley.

I discussed parts of this article with Anna Maranini and Luigi Lehnus, whom I should like to thank for their comments.

*FRANCISCI HYACINTHI / RELATVS / Quam a viro docto nuper assertam / Comprobat / GODEFRIDVS VENDELINVS / Condatensis Canonicus*; it ends in mid sentence on p. 175 with the note 'caetera desiderantur'. Seller foliated the notebook and wrote at the front a table of contents, which promises on p. 315 'Epistolae vv. doctorum (Peirescii, Cambdeni, Pontani, Bucherii, Graevii, Gaulmini, aliorum, praecip. G. Wendelini) ad Casp. Gevartium majori ex parte de aetate Manilii, ex autographis penes v. cl. Ed. Sherburne Equit. Aur.'; but pp. 315–16 are blank, and though they are the last of a quire and could in theory have been followed by a quire or quires now lost, the next thing promised in the table of contents begins as it should on p. 317. The structure of the notebook does not reveal when Seller used the Manilian material, but in any event no light falls on the *Animaduersiones* from this quarter.

Whether it was negligence or dishonesty that the *Animaduersiones* suffered up to 1739, at least they were spared neglect and ascription to someone else. Their gifted and shortlived author deserves more than the limited amends that I have made here – perhaps a full and annotated publication for the 400th anniversary of his death, 1995?

*Pembroke College, Cambridge*

M. D. REEVE