

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.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> Some of these were documents which had not been listed by Knoche. In 1955 J. Campos reported on an eleventh-century manuscript in Navarre.<sup>3</sup> In 1956 A. Grużewski published a study of sixteen Juvenal manuscripts located in Poland (all from the fourteenth century or later).<sup>4</sup> Two years later T. Bieńkowski added to this list another Juvenal manuscript in Poland (copied in the year 1440).<sup>5</sup> In 1957 W. S. Anderson published an account of the Marston Juvenal which dates from the late eleventh or early twelfth century.<sup>6</sup>

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.<sup>7</sup> The *Satires* occupy the first 75 folios of the codex. Fol. 76<sup>r</sup> (not numbered in the manuscript) is blank, but 76<sup>v</sup> contains a short *vita* followed by the statement: "Quinque sunt partes satyrarum, reprehensiva, derisoria, hortativa, deprecative, laudativa." This is in turn followed by a discussion of the Muses which occupies the bottom of fol. 76<sup>v</sup> and the top of fol. 77<sup>r</sup> (also unnumbered in the codex). Ownership of the manuscript is indicated on fol. 77<sup>v</sup> 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 Iuvenalisa

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.

folios 35 and 36, where lines 7. 100–84 are omitted. Since this lacuna begins after the last line on fol. 35<sup>v</sup>, it would appear at first sight that one or more folios may have disappeared from the manuscript. But since the surviving folios regularly have 25 lines on each face or a total of 50 lines per folio, it is clear that the missing lines are too many to have been included on one folio and too few to have occupied two full folios. It is doubtless, therefore, coincidental that the lacuna begins at the end of the verso of one folio. There are several instances in which individual lines or small groups were omitted by the original scribe, but were added later either by the first hand or by some contemporary scribe. These include 1. 25–26, 1. 88, 8. 54–64, 9. 89, 11. 49, and 16. 9. In addition there are some omissions and changes in the order of lines which are characteristic of various other manuscripts, especially of the  $\Omega$  or vulgate group (designated  $\Phi$  by Clausen<sup>8</sup>). Along with  $\Omega$  Vat. Lat. 5204 omits 6. 126, 8. 7, and 9. 134a, and transfers 9. 119 to a position after 9. 123. It also interchanges lines 9. 143 and 144 (with  $\phi$  VB Par 8070 Mon 23475 Neap 44); interchanges 11. 108 and 109 (with  $r(\Xi)_s$ ); transfers 11. 165–66 to a position after 11. 161 (with  $pvm$ s); and omits 14. 1a (with  $P^1pU^1Fk$ s). Folio 55<sup>r</sup>,

containing lines 11. 110–33, has been so badly defaced that it is illegible in parts. Generous scholia are to be found in the margins throughout the manuscript.

From a study of the omissions and changes in line order listed above, it becomes clear that this codex must be classified as belonging primarily to the  $\Omega$  group. It has, however, been influenced to some extent from other sources. An interesting example of this is seen in 9. 14. The Vatican manuscript has two lines at this point, neither of which in its original form agreed entirely with the *textus receptus*. The lines originally read: “Praestabat calidi circum lita fascia visci / Bructia praestabat calidi circum lita tibi fascia visci.” The first of these is identical with the reading of  $\Omega$  and  $P^2$ . In its original form the second was almost identical with the reading of  $P^1$  (with the exception that  $P^1$  omits *lita tibi*). Later the words *circum lita* were expunged from the text of Vat. Lat. 5204. This brought the line into essential conformity with the *textus receptus*. Other examples of the influence of the better manuscripts could be cited, but such instances are relatively rare. In the vast majority of cases this document follows the  $\Omega$  tradition quite consistently.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

8. W. V. Clausen, *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturae* (Oxford, 1959), p. 36.

#### A VARIANT ON PLATO *THEAETETUS* 186C9

The text of the passage *Theaet.* 186C7–10 runs in the editions:  $\Sigma\Omega$ . *Οἶόν τε οὖν ἀληθείας τυχεῖν, ᾧ μηδὲ οὐσίας; ΘΕΑΙ. Ἀδύνατον. ΣΩ. Οὐδὲ ἀληθείας τις ἀτυχήσει, ποτὲ τούτου ἐπιστήμων ἔσται; Besides a meaningless οὐδὲ for οὐ δὲ there seem to be no variants in the manuscripts.*

Proclus, however, quotes line 9 in the form: *ἀληθείας γὰρ ἀτυχήσῃς, ὥς ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ γέγραπται* (*In Tim.* 2, p. 82. 27–28 Diehl [Leipzig, 1904]). That he followed the same reading in his lost commentary on the *Phaedo* is proved by the consensus of Olympiodorus and Damascius, who took most of their material from it: Olympiodorus (*In Phaed.*,

p. 25. 12–13 Norvin [Leipzig, 1913]), *πῶς δὴ ἀτυχήσῃ οὐσίας τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ ἀληθείας φησὶν; Damascius (ibid., p. 101. 15), πῶς ἀτυχήσῃ τὴν αἴσθησιν ἀληθείας λέγει ὁ Πλάτων; Though this may merely represent the form in which Proclus happened to remember the passage, it is more probably what he read in his own copy.*

The variant certainly deserves to be considered. For the verb, this is the only instance cited from Plato (by LSJ; in Ast's *Lexicon* the word *ἀτυχῶ* is omitted entirely); the adjective in the sense “failing to attain” is not limited to later Greek (Aelianus and Maximus, LSJ), but is also found in Plato *Laws* 7, 781D3–4: