

contrary, it would seem reasonable to assume that Aristotle the naturalist did not think bats were affected by day in ways which they are not, and would, therefore, never have constructed the simile in question even if he had

believed that it accurately represented the facts of epistemology.

CARL MITCHAM

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA 666 (RIESE) IN CODEX
PAL. LAT. 920

Item 666 of Alexander Riese's edition of *Anthologia Latina* is a poem of twenty-eight verses entitled, "Rescriptum Honorii scholastici contra epistolas Senecae ad Iordanem episcopum."¹ In the poem Honorius lauds Jordanes as a teacher of morals, affirming that he in his works presents to him, Honorius, a better set of principles than Seneca was able to provide for Lucilius (here called Lucillus) in his *Epistolae*.

The text of the poem as published by Riese is based on two manuscripts: Valentinus 88, saec. ix (= V), and Parisinus 4860, saec. x (= P). A third copy, not mentioned by Riese, is to be found in Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 920, fols. 1^r-1^v (here designated Q). Since Q dates from the early part of the ninth century, it is certainly older than P and probably older than V.

Codex Pal. Lat. 920, of which Q is the first folio, is made up of 106 folios in all, of which the remaining 105 contain a copy of the *Romana* and *Getica* of Jordanes. The hand which copied the codex proper is the same as that which produced the lines of Honorius at the beginning of the manuscript. Although there are no abbreviations of *-tur* in the poem, the use of *t* surmounted with an apostrophe symbol for *-tur* is frequent in other parts of the codex. This indicates that the document as a whole almost certainly dates from some period preceding A.D. 820.²

A note on the flyleaf which reads "Codex sancti Nazarii de monasterio quod dicitur

Lauresham" indicates that the manuscript comes from Lorsch. Its Lorsch origin causes it to be included by W. M. Lindsay in his article on the early Lorsch scriptorium where it is dated as early ninth century.³

In view of the relatively early date of Q it might be expected that it would have much to contribute to our knowledge of the work contained in it. Unfortunately such is not the case. Q adds nothing which is not already known from V, to which it is obviously very closely related. In fact, Q reproduces every error contained in V, as will be seen from the following list of variants: 4 *lympa*] *nymfa* QV; 8 *imbutis*] *inbutis* QV; 10 *factor opus*] *fator* (corr. V) *opis* (corr. Q) QV; 12 *quique monens*] *quem ut moneas* QVP; 17 *commenta*] *monumenta* QV; 21 *beatos*] *beato* QVP; 22 *obitu*] *obito* (corrected by a second hand in Q) QV; 25 *alium*] *aliam* QV; 28 *duce*] *disce* QVP. In addition, Q adds three minor errors of its own, two of which were later corrected: 1 *si*] *sic* Q; 6 *sterilis*] *sterelis* Q (corrected by a second hand); 11 *sed*] *set* Q (corrected by a second hand). Q, like VP, has *Lucillus* for *Lucilius*.⁴

In view of the close affinity existing between Q and V, it clearly must be assumed either that one of these derives from the other or that both come from a common archetype. Since V contains no errors which are not also present in Q and has the correct *si* (line 1) where Q has *sic*, it might be concluded, on the basis of the evidence of the poem alone,

1. A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, Part I, fasc. 2 (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 137-38.

2. See W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 376-77, and E. K. Rand, "Prickings in a Manuscript of Orléans," *TAPA*, LXX (1939), 338-39.

3. W. M. Lindsay, "The (Early) Lorsch Scriptorium," *Palaeographia Latina*, III (1924), 20. In a discussion of Lorsch manuscripts this document is also listed by T. Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1890; repr.

Graz, 1955), p. 335, where it is dated simply "saec. ix." H. Stevenson, Jr., *Codices Palatini Latini Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, I (Rome, 1886), 327, dates the manuscript as "saec. ix vel x."

4. These citations are taken from a microfilm copy of Codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 920 placed at the disposal of the writer by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

that Q derives from V. Aside from the fact, however, that Q is apparently somewhat earlier than V, there is evidence from another source which denies the validity of this conclusion. Like Q, V is a part of a manuscript containing the works of Jordanes. Mommsen, who has used both of these documents in the preparation of his critical edition of Jordanes, points out that, although the Vatican manuscript (called P by him) is closely related to V in its Jordanes text,

5. T. Mommsen, *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, MGH, AA, V, Part 1 (Berlin, 1882), xlviii–xlix.

V contains several errors peculiar to itself.⁵ This would indicate that the two manuscripts are *gemelli*, deriving from a common source.

Although the qualities of Q discussed above detract considerably from its importance for purposes of textual criticism, even so its existence as probably the earliest known witness to the text of item 666 in *Anthologia Latina* certainly deserves to be noted.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

JUVENAL IN CODEX VAT. LAT. 5204

Manuscripts of the *Satires* of Juvenal are quite numerous. In his excellent critical edition of this author U. Knoche has provided a list of almost 300 Juvenal manuscripts.¹ Most of these are, of course, late, but approximately seventy date from the twelfth century or earlier. Since the appearance of Knoche's work several additional Juvenal manuscripts have been reported. In 1951 F. H. Sandbach published a short note in which he listed a number of manuscripts of Juvenal cited by C. E. Stuart in a notebook which had shortly before that been placed in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge.² Some of these were documents which had not been listed by Knoche. In 1955 J. Campos reported on an eleventh-century manuscript in Navarre.³ In 1956 A. Grużewski published a study of sixteen Juvenal manuscripts located in Poland (all from the fourteenth century or later).⁴ Two years later T. Bieńkowski added to this list another Juvenal manuscript in Poland (copied in the year 1440).⁵ In 1957 W. S. Anderson published an account of the Marston Juvenal which dates from the late eleventh or early twelfth century.⁶

Despite the great amount of study which has been devoted in recent years to the manuscripts of Juvenal, there is one which has remained unnoticed and which, by reason of its relatively early date, deserves to be identified. This is Vat. Lat. 5204—a manuscript which was copied in a clear Carolingian hand by several contemporary scribes in the early twelfth century.⁷ The *Satires* occupy the first 75 folios of the codex. Fol. 76^r (not numbered in the manuscript) is blank, but 76^v contains a short *vita* followed by the statement: "Quinque sunt partes satyrarum, reprehensiva, derisoria, hortativa, deprecativa, laudativa." This is in turn followed by a discussion of the Muses which occupies the bottom of fol. 76^v and the top of fol. 77^r (also unnumbered in the codex). Ownership of the manuscript is indicated on fol. 77^v by the entry, *Iuvenalis est mei Petri Victorii*, in a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century hand.

The text of Juvenal in Vat. Lat. 5204 is almost complete. The Oxford Fragment (6. 365, 1–34, and 6. 373a–b) is, as would be expected, missing. Apart from this the only significant gap in the text occurs between

1. U. Knoche, *D. Iunius Iuvenalis Saturae* (Munich, 1950), pp. xii–xxxii. Throughout this paper the symbols used to designate manuscripts or groups of manuscripts, unless otherwise noted, are those employed by Knoche in this edition.

2. F. H. Sandbach, "Some Manuscripts of Juvenal," *CR*, I (1951), 11.

3. J. Campos, "Un códice de Juvenal en Navarra," *Helmantica*, VI (1955), 435–58.

4. A. Grużewski, "De XVI Iuvenalis codicibus qui in Polonia asservantur," *Auctarium Maeandream*, V (Warsaw, 1956), 1–93.

5. T. Bieńkowski, "Jeszcze jeden Kodex Juwenalisa

w Bibliotekach Polskich, De Iuvenalis codice in bibliotheca urbis Thorunni asservato," *Meander*, XIII (1958), 137–38, Latin summary p. 144.

6. W. S. Anderson, "The Marston Manuscript of Juvenal," *Traditio*, XIII (1957), 407–14. For a more detailed summary of work done on Juvenal manuscripts in recent years see M. Coffey, "Juvenal Report for the Years 1941–1961," *Lustrum*, VIII (1963), 170–71.

7. The study of Codex Vat. Lat. 5204 contained in this paper is based on a microfilm copy of this manuscript placed at the disposal of the writer by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.