Given that Pompey is the subject of the verb, the function and case of *Fortuna* become readily apparent. The word is in the vocative case and should have commas on either side of it. Thus, the correct reading of the sentence must be: "nunc est pro numine summo / hoc tumulo, Fortuna, iacens." It is somewhat remarkable that so many editors of Lucan should have missed this simple solution of adopting Housman's text and Hosius' punctuation.

The above text accords well with the superior manuscripts which read *est* and affords an interpretation which is compatible with certain themes in the epic. For while there is no thematic warrant for the joint burial of Fortuna and Pompey, there is ample precedent for the poet's direct address to Fortuna at this point in the poem. Throughout the *Bellum civile* and especially in Book 8 there is a close connection between the goddess of luck and her former favorite Pompey. For example: "hac facie, Fortuna, tibi, Romana placebas" (8. 686); "hac Fortuna fide Magni tam prospera fata / pertulit" (701–702); "semel inpulit illum / dilata Fortuna manu" (707–708). Especially remarkable is the frequency with which the poet refers to Fortuna throughout

the burial sequence. To begin with, Lucan prefaces the entire passage with the statement that the funeral was the doing of Fortune (712–14):

ante tamen Pharias victor quam tangat harenas
Pompeio raptim tumulum Fortuna paravit,
ne iaceat nullo vel ne meliore sepulchro.

When Cordus prays for some sort of tomb in which to bury the remains of Pompey, the object of his prayer significantly is Fortuna (729–30): "non pretiosa petit cumulato ture sepulchra / Pompeius, Fortuna, tuus." After the completion of the pitiable funeral rites, the poet directs against the goddess of chance a bitterly ironic reproach (792–95):

placet, hoc, Fortuna, sepulchrum
dicere Pompei, quo condi maluit illum
quam terra caruisse socer?

The poet has made it clear that it is Fortune who gave Pompey his tomb. And it is she whom he confronts in lines 860–61 with the declaration that Pompey is now at last the supreme deity. No, Fortune is not buried in the tomb; it is only editors who have put her there, and it is time she were exhumed.

JOHN F. MAKOWSKI

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

BEDE'S *DE ORTHOGRAPHIA* IN CODEX VAT. OTTOB. LAT. 687

According to E. Dekkers[1] and M. Manitius,[2] there are very few manuscripts of Bede's *De orthographia*. Their listing of manuscripts, along with those of M. L. W. Laistner,[3] Charles H. Beeson,[4] and H. Keil,[5] does not include a sizable fragment contained in Codex Vat. Ottob. lat. 687 (34^v–36^v, saec. ix^{ex}). The selection is headed "Incipit Liber Hortographia Bedae Presbiteri," and extends through the entry *Balvae*, *id est thyrae*. This manuscript deserves

attention in the constructing of a critical edition of the text. I propose to add its evidence, under the siglum O, to the apparatus with which Keil equipped his edition: Codex Parisinus 7530, saec. viii (P); Codex Montepessulanus H 306, saec. ix (M); Codex Leidensis bibliothecae publicae 122, saec. x (L); and "lectio vulgata exemplaribus olim impressis propagata" (ς).

Codex Vat. Ottob. lat. 687 is a parchment manuscript of forty-one folios,[6] containing

1. E. Dekkers, "Clavis patrum latinorum," *Sacris Erudiri*, III (Steenbruge, 1951; rev. 1961), Item 1566.

2. M. Manitius, *Gesch. der lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, I (Munich, 1911), 75–76.

3. M. L. W. Laistner and H. H. King, *A Hand List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1943), pp. 137–38.

4. C. H. Beeson, "The Manuscripts of Bede," *CP*, XLII (1947), 73–87.

5. H. Keil (ed.), *Grammatici Latini: Scriptores de orthographia*, VII (Leipzig, 1880), 261 ff.

6. Foliated 1–39. There are two unnumbered leaves, one following fol. 6 and a second following fol. 12.

various items copied in eight different hands. Fols. 1ʳ–5ʳ, copied by a late fifteenth-century hand (A), contain the first 624 lines of Ovid's *Remedia amoris*. Fol. 5ᵛ is blank except for eight lines of informal notes written at the top in another fifteenth-century hand (B). Fol. 6ʳ is completely blank; 6ᵛ contains three epigrams in French, probably copied by hand B, but possibly by another fifteenth-century hand. The next folio (unnumbered because the upper right-hand corner of the recto has been mutilated) and fol. 7 contain lines 400–555 of the *Captivi* of Plautus, written in a Carolingian hand of the eleventh century (C).[7] Fols. 8ʳ–12ᵛ, copied in a late twelfth-century hand (D), contain entries about the Church of Angoulême (*Ecclesia Engolismensis*), including communications from Popes Paschal II, Innocent II, Anastasius IV, and Adrian IV. This section is followed by a single unnumbered folio, copied in a Carolingian hand of the tenth century (E), consisting in a fragment of some ecclesiastical work which remains unidentified, partly because the folio is badly mutilated at the top and on one side. Fols. 13ʳ–28ᵛ contain selected letters of Ennodius in an early thirteenth-century hand (F).[8] Fols. 29ʳ–34ᵛ are made up of selections from the *Epigrammata* of Prosper in a Carolingian hand of the late ninth century (G).[9] Fols. 34ᵛ–36ᵛ contain the fragment of the *De orthographia* of Bede, which is the subject of this paper, in the same ninth-century hand (G) in which the *Epigrammata* of Prosper are written. The remaining folios (37ʳ–39ᵛ) contain chapter headings, in a fourteenth-century hand (H), of some work on law which was presumably intended for inclusion in the codex, but was not actually included. The first five headings are *De institutione legis, De iure, De iurisdictione, De iusticia et iure,* and *De iusticario et eius officio.*

Characteristics of hand G which point to the end of the ninth century include the appearance of bulges at the tops of most tall letters, with some admixture of spindle-shaped tall strokes. Both loops of *g* are consistently open. Open *a* and angular *n*, however, are never used. Moreover, the letter *t* with a 2-shaped symbol superimposed is often employed for *-tur.*

O clearly comes from the same archetype as PML, as can be seen from the following instances in which it agrees with all three in error:[10] 261. 11 conscriptos] conscripti; 261. 12 praenominis] nominis; 263. 16 nominis] nomen; 264. 6 Atacinus] et acinius; 264. 33 Lucilius] lucillus; 265. 16 in publicis] in *om.*

Further evidence of O's affinity with PML is provided by the following examples, in which O agrees in significant error with one or two of the PML manuscripts: 261. 7 accipe aggere] accipere aggere *MO*; 261. 9 Numerium] numerum *PMO*; 263. 2 metallica] metalla *MLO*; 263. 19 scriptura dico] scriptura et dico *MO*; 263. 31 scribendum] scribenda *MO*; 264. 25 exciderant] excederant *PMO*; 265. 7 e contrario] e contra *MO*; 265. 13 dices] dicimus *MO*.

Despite its close relation to PML, however, O cannot have been copied from any one of these, as is clearly indicated by the fact that in numerous instances one or more of these manuscripts contain significant omissions not shared by O. In the following cases, for instance, words omitted by P are present in their correct form in O: 261. 11 post; 261. 19 gentium; 262. 2 me *ante* factus; 262. 8 sermone ‖ est; 262. 16 est. The following are instances in which M omits words present in O: 262. 15 audeo audes perfectum facit ausus sum; 264. 4 ubi; 264. 10 littera; 264. 23 locum; 264. 24 deportare deponere exportare tollere; 264. 35 apud per d scribendum caput per t quia (quod *O*) facit capitis. The following are instances in which L omits words

7. A collation of the text of this fragment can be found in A. Ernout, *Plaute*⁴, II (Paris, 1957), 112–20, where the manuscript is designated by the symbol O.

8. W. A. von Hartel (ed.), *Magni Felicis Ennodii Opera omnia* (Vienna, 1882), pp. 1–260.

9. The *Epigrammata Sancti Prosperi Aquitani* can be found in Migne, *PL*, LI, 499–532.

10. All readings for O are taken from a microfilm copy of Codex Vat. Ottob. lat. 687 located in the Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at St. Louis University. Numbers refer to page and line in Keil.

present in O: 263. 14 demo; 263. 16 cum dativo; 264. 16 intellectus; 265. 17 frequenter balneas. In addition, in 262. 13, both L and M omit the words *agilis agillimus non agilissimus*, which are retained by P and O. It should be noted that O has the correct spelling for *agilissimus*, where P has *agillissimus*. Certainly the scribe of O, if copying from P, M, or L, could not possibly have restored the lacunae found in these manuscripts individually. It must be concluded, therefore, that O, though from the same archetype as PML, represents an independent tradition and thus has potential value as a new source of readings for the text of Bede.

This potential becomes an actuality in the following cases in which O provides readings superior to those found in other manuscripts. In 261. 5, where M reads *cum galum*, P *cum vel gaium*, L *cum Caesarem*, O alone has the correct *cum Gaium*. In 262. 2, O adds *est* after *praelatus*, where *est* is omitted by PML. In 263. 8–9, where PM read *pares sunt contraria potestate sunt* and L has *pares sunt contraria potestate*, Keil adopts the reading *pares sed contraria potestate sunt*, partly on the basis of the texts of Diomedes and Dositheus, which read *pares* (om. Diomedes) *contraria potestate sunt*. The reading of O at this point is *pares contrariae potestatis sunt*, which, by omitting the *sunt* found after *pares* in PML, comes closer to the readings of Diomedes and Dositheus. In 265. 6, O restores *est* after *dicendum* where it is omitted by PML, and in 265. 11 *est* is added in O after

masculino where it is omitted by PML. In 263. 19, O joins with M in reading *et* before *dico*. Since *et* is found in the Biblical text, it should be restored on the evidence of OM, even though it is omitted by PL.

Although this high percentage of correct readings attests the worth of the O text, it is not without errors, beyond those in which it agrees with PML. Yet the majority of errors, both in the Latin and the Greek text, can be ascribed to minor spelling variants. For example, in transcribing the Greek words in 262. 8, 11, 17, 29, 30 and 263. 13, 15, the scribe exhibits a marked tendency to confuse omicron and omega, as well as mu and omega, although in each instance the word's meaning is clear. There is, moreover, one lengthy omission, owing to homoeoteleuton, which occurs in 263. 10–11: "tribunal et ad tribunal venire non unum est quia ad."

It should be noted that there are two additions to the text which do not appear in the other manuscripts: 261. 7 attende: nota] attende D nota (where the insertion of the letter *D* anticipates the ensuing phrase *cum Decium sola significat*); and 261. 8 quingentos L sola] quingentos G gaudium L sola (where the *G gaudium* insertion follows the established alphabetical sequence).

Because of its relatively early date and accurate text, it is suggested that O's existence deserves to be noted by scholars interested in the *De orthographia*.

VALERIE M. LAGORIO

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

THE ETIOLOGY OF A MISINTERPRETATION:
ARISTOPHANES *BIRDS* 30

We have all heard the truism that each generation must read and discover the classics for itself, see them through its own eyes. This process of rediscovery, however, as Eduard Fraenkel once observed, is becoming increasingly difficult as our classical texts are more and more deeply overlaid by the crusts of centuries of scholarly industry.[1] More often than we realize, when we are most sure to have finally uncovered our author's *ipsissima verba*, we are in fact blunting our wits against the adamantine surface of yet another, invisible exegetic crust. In what follows I attempt to bring

---

1. *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), p. vii.