

# 17

## Three Textual Notes

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

### I. CITATIONS FROM THE *TOPICA* OF CICERO IN CODEX REG. LAT. 1048

Codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 1048 is an early Carolingian manuscript which contains in its first 20 folios Isidorus *Etymologiae* 5.1.1-5.27.38 and 9.4.1-9.6.22.<sup>1</sup> Most of the remainder of the manuscript is devoted to *Codex Theodosianus*. Folios 21<sup>v</sup>-35<sup>v</sup> are made up of lists of *capitula* of the various items which follow. Folios 36<sup>r</sup>-124<sup>r</sup> contain *Theodosiani Libri XVI* followed by (fols. 124<sup>r</sup>-224<sup>r</sup>) *Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes*. The concluding segment of the manuscript (fols. 224<sup>v</sup>-227<sup>v</sup>) is a trilingual glossary listing certain words in their Latin, Hebrew, and Greek forms. The entire document appears to have been written by a single hand, which is dated in the ninth or tenth century by Beeson in his catalogue of early Isidore manuscripts.<sup>2</sup> Codex Reg. Lat. 1048 has been discussed by Mommsen, who dates it in the tenth or eleventh century.<sup>3</sup> In his edition of *Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes* Paul M. Meyer described this manuscript in considerable detail, pointing out that it contains a marginal note which reads as follows: *Domino sanctissimo atque amantissimo Gualtrio episcoporum eximio humilis congregatio salutem in domino*.<sup>4</sup> Meyer thinks this note is by the original scribe and that the Gualtrius referred to is the Gualtrius (or Walterius) who was Bishop of Orléans 870-891. Hence he reaches the conclusion that the manuscript was copied in the late ninth century. This is a conclusion which is well supported by the palaeographical evidence.

<sup>1</sup> The information about codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 1048 presented in this paper is based on a microfilm copy of the manuscript placed at my disposal by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Henry Beeson, *Isidor-Studien* (Munich, 1913), 93.

<sup>3</sup> Th. Mommsen, *Theodosiani Libri XVI Cum Constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, Pars Prior (Berlin, 1905), C.

<sup>4</sup> Paulus M. Meyer, *Leges Novellae ad Theodosianum Pertinentes* (Berlin, 1905), xxxiv-xxxv. Meyer, probably by a typographical error, states that the entry is on fol. 205<sup>r</sup>. Actually it is to be found on fol. 225<sup>r</sup>.

Reg. Lat. 1048 contains a number of interlinear glosses and marginal scholia written in a Carolingian hand of the early tenth century under strong insular influence. Among indications of such insular influence are the frequent use of ÷ for *est*; exceedingly frequent use of angular *n*; the use of *i-longa* particularly in the preposition *in*; and confusion of *r* and *s*. The *ti* combination is quite similar to that used in pointed insular.

Two of these scholia are particularly interesting because they contain citations from the *Topica* of Cicero. The first is to be found on folio 78<sup>r</sup> where it has been inserted in the lower margin to provide a commentary on *Theodosiani Libri* 4.8 (*De Liberali Causa*). The author of the scholion, in attempting to explain how, among the early Romans, persons could be restored from slavery to freedom, writes as follows:

Priscis temporibus apud Romanos tribus modis dabatur libertas: censu, scilicet, vindicta et testamento. Censu, quoniam institutio fuerat Romanorum ut nullus ex servili genere infra VII miliaria in circuitu civitatis commaneret nisi servitutis vinculo solveretur. Et hoc erat censu fieri liberum, in coloniam transire Romanorum eos qui quondam censum solvebant ut dato censu civis diceretur Romanus. Est (et *in codice*) autem pars altera adipiscendae libertatis quae vindicta vocabatur. Vindicta erat quaedam virgula quam lector ei qui liberandus erat a servitio capiti inponens eundem servum in libertatem vocabat ac vindicabat dicens quaedam verba sollempnia et ideo illa vindicta vocabatur eo quod vindicabat in libertatem servum. Illa etiam pars faciendi liberi est, si quis suprema voluntate in testamenti serie servum suum liberum scripserit, quod et modo fieri solet. Unde Cicero in *Topicis*, volens monstrare eum quem servum esse constiterit non esse liberum factum, huius modi proponit syllogismum: Si neque censu neque vindicta neque testamento liber factus est, non est liber. Atqui nulla earum partium liber factus est. Non est igitur liber.

The citation from Cicero contained in this scholion corresponds to *Topica* 10.2-4, where the reading adopted by Bornecque in his critical edition is: Si neque censu nec vindicta nec testamento liber factus est, non est liber. Neque nulla est earum; non est igitur liber.<sup>5</sup>

The second scholion in Reg. Lat. 1048 containing a quotation from Cicero's *Topica* is to be found in the lower margin of folio 124<sup>r</sup>. It takes the form of a commentary on the second section of *Liber Legum Novellarum Divi Theodosii A.*<sup>6</sup> The text of the scholion is as follows:

Ius civile est quod quisque populus vel civitas sibi proprium in humanis divinisque rebus constituit. Cicero dicit in *Topicis* quod ius civile est aequitas constituta his qui eiusdem civitatis sunt ad res suas obtinendas. Eius autem aequitatis utilis cognitio est. Utilis est igitur iuris civilis scientia.

<sup>5</sup> Henri Bornecque, *Cicéron: Divisions de l'Art Oratoire, Topiques* (Paris, 1925), 68.

<sup>6</sup> Meyer (above, n. 4), 6.

The citation from Cicero here presented corresponds to *Topica* 9.3-6. The version of the passage found in Bornecque's critical edition reads: *Ius civile est aequitas constituta eis qui eiusdem civitatis sunt, ad res suas obtinendas; eius autem aequitatis utilis est cognitio; utilis est ergo iuris civilis scientia.*<sup>7</sup>

In both passages cited above it will be seen that the texts of portions of Cicero's *Topica* included in the scholia of Reg. Lat. 1048 agree very closely with the critical text of Bornecque. Those differences which do exist, however, assume very great importance for purposes of textual criticism by reason of the fact that these scholia are as early as the oldest extant manuscripts of the *Topica* and apparently stem from an insular version of the work. The question of whether this is an independent tradition becomes a significant one.

Editors of all recent critical editions of the *Topica* agree in dividing the manuscripts of this work into two families, fam. 1 and fam. 2. Fam. 1, according to these editors, is made up of two manuscripts: Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1406 (= O), dated in the critical editions as tenth-century, and Codex Vitebergensis (= f), *an.* 1432. Fam. 2, according to the same editors, is comprised of approximately ten manuscripts several of which are dated in the tenth century.<sup>8</sup> In an article published in *Classical Philology* in 1972,<sup>9</sup> I pointed out that O, which is a Beneventan manuscript, had been listed by E. A. Lowe in his *The Beneventan Script* as dating from the end of the eleventh century rather than from the tenth.<sup>10</sup> In the same article I also expanded the membership of fam. 1 by adding three new manuscripts to it: Vat. Lat. 1701, saec. xv (= h); Vat. Lat. 2110, saec. xv (= g); and Vat. Lat. 8591, saec. xi (= C) and provided a list of readings characteristic of the expanded fam. 1. (COghf) as opposed to fam. 2.<sup>11</sup>

A comparison of the texts of the two passages from Cicero's *Topica* quoted in the scholia of Reg. Lat. 1048 with the readings of representative manuscripts of fam. 1 and fam. 2 will show that the readings of the scholia (henceforth designated *schol.*) sometimes agree with fam. 1, sometimes with fam. 2, and sometimes with neither. In 10.2 the first *nec* of the Bornecque text follows fam. 2. This is matched in *schol.* by *necque* which is the reading of most of the fam. 1 manuscripts (Cgh). In the same line, the second *nec* is

<sup>7</sup> Bornecque (above, n. 5), 67-68.

<sup>8</sup> W. Friedrich, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera Rhetorica*, II (Leipzig, 1873), lxxvi; A. S. Wilkins, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Rhetorica*, II (Oxford, 1903), iii; Bornecque (above, n. 5), 61-62.

<sup>9</sup> Chauncey E. Finch, "Codices Vat. Lat. 1701, 2110, and 8591 as Sources for Cicero's *Topica*," *CP* LXVIII (1972), 112-117.

<sup>10</sup> E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914), 366.

<sup>11</sup> Finch (above, n. 9), 113.

based on both fam. 1 and fam. 2 readings, but in *schol.* it is replaced by *neque*, which follows neither family. In 10.3 Bornecque has *neque nulla est earum*, which is the reading of fam. 2; the other editors follow the reading of fam. 1—*necque ulla est earum rerum*. *Schol.* has: *atqui nulla earum partium liber factus est*, which, though somewhat different from both fam. 1 and fam. 2, agrees more closely with the former. In this case it is rather difficult to determine whether the scholiast has rephrased the passage on his own initiative or has taken the text unchanged from an exemplar which perhaps belonged to a third family of manuscripts.

In the second citation from the *Topica* in Reg. Lat. 1048, the reading *his* appears in *schol.* for *eis* (9.4) in the Bornecque text. Here Bornecque is following fam. 2, whereas COg of fam. 1 have *his* in agreement with *schol.* In 9.6 Bornecque accepts the reading *est ergo* based on fam. 2. Other editors have *ergo est*, which is the reading of fam. 1. *Schol.* reads *est igitur* which follows the word-order of fam. 2 by placing *est* first, but disagrees with both families by substituting *igitur* for *ergo*, perhaps correctly. It is probably significant that according to the Index Verborum of Cicero's Rhetorical works by Abbott, Oldfather, and Canter, Cicero uses *ergo* only three times in the *Topica* while using *igitur* twenty-eight times.<sup>12</sup> In 9.5-6 the reading *cognitio est* of *schol.* is at variance with *est cognitio* found in both fam. 1 and fam. 2.

Since such a variety appears in the readings of *schol.*, with some agreeing with fam. 1, some with fam. 2, and some with neither, it seems certain that these citations have been taken from some manuscript which has been lost or, at least, is not among those previously utilized by editors of the *Topica*. Since the scholia themselves were written in the early part of the tenth century, the manuscript which was their source may very well have been earlier than any of those now extant and, in view of the insular influence present in the scholia, may have represented some thus far unknown insular tradition of the *Topica*. For these reasons the two citations, however brief, deserve the attention of future editors of the *Topica*.

## II. SOME NEW MANUSCRIPTS OF *ANTHOLOGIA LATINA* (RIESE)

392 AND 798

Item 392 in *Anthologia Latina* (Riese) is a poem of eight verses, beginning with the line: *Ut belli sonuere tubae violenta peremit*. This was published without title by Riese in his 1894 edition on the basis of the following manuscripts: Vossianus q. 86, saec. ix (= V); Parisinus 8071, saec. ix-x (= B);

<sup>12</sup> Kenneth Morgan Abbott, William Abbott Oldfather, Howard Vernon Canter, *Index Verborum in Ciceronis Rhetorica* (Urbana, 1964), 427, 537.

Sangallensis 899, saec. ix (= G); Bruxellensis 10859, saec. ix (= D); Parisinus 8069, saec. x-xi (= C); Vossianus q. 33, saec. x (= L); Reg. Mus. Brit. 15 B 19, saec. ix-x (= R); Parisinus 13026, saec. x (= P); and numerous late documents.<sup>13</sup> The same poem had been published by Riese as item 392 in his earlier edition of *Anthologia Latina*<sup>14</sup> with the title, *Traiani Imperatoris: e bello Parthico versus decori*. In this earlier edition Riese had used codices VGDC from the group listed above and in addition had cited (with the designation *Maius*) readings from a copy of the poem published by Angelo Mai in his *Classici Auctores*<sup>15</sup> with no information about its source other than a statement that it had been found "in vetere admodum vaticano codice," from which he was also publishing in full a poem by Aldhelm entitled *De Basilica aedificata a Bugge* previously known from only fragmentary copies.<sup>16</sup> This Mai manuscript was disregarded by Riese in his later edition of item 392 presumably because, being unaware of its date and other identifying features, he assumed that it had been superseded by other early manuscripts which had come to light in the intervening period. Despite this fact, however, Mai's manuscript may be restored to its former position of prominence among the sources of this work since it can now definitely be identified as Vat. Reg. Lat. 251, fol. 11<sup>r</sup>, saec. ix (henceforth designated M).<sup>17</sup> Aside from the fact that the text of M corresponds quite closely with the version of the poem printed by Mai, there are several other factors which confirm beyond a doubt the identification of this manuscript with Mai's unnamed source. Chief among these is the presence in Reg. Lat. 251, fols. 2<sup>v</sup>-4<sup>v</sup>, of the poem by Aldhelm referred to above as being included by Mai in the same volume of *Classici Auctores* (pp. 387-390). Furthermore, on folios 2<sup>r</sup> and 4<sup>v</sup> of this codex notes appear in the margins in the writing of Angelo Mai with the signature *A. Maius*.

A description of codex Reg. Lat. 251 has been provided by Andreas Wilmart in the second volume of his catalogue of the first 500 Latin manuscripts of the Reginensis Collection.<sup>18</sup> In his description he indicates that M is a copy of *Anthologia Latina* 392, but does not identify it with Mai's text of the poem. He lists the title of M as *de tribus mulieribus victricibus atque*

<sup>13</sup> Alexander Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, Pars prior, Fasc. 1 (Leipzig, 1894), 306.

<sup>14</sup> Alexander Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, Pars prior, Fasc. 1 (Leipzig, 1869).

<sup>15</sup> Angelus Maius, *Classicorum Auctorum e Vaticanis Codicibus Editorum Tomus V* (Rome, 1833), 458.

<sup>16</sup> Maius (above, n. 15), 387.

<sup>17</sup> Information about this and other Vatican manuscripts discussed in this paper is based on microfilm copies of these documents placed at my disposal by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

<sup>18</sup> Andreas Wilmart, *Codices Reginenses Latini*, Tomus II (Vatican City, 1945), 1-6.

*ab eisdem de totidem viris interiectis*. This is given by Mai as *de tribus mulieribus victricibus deque totidem viris interfectis ab eisdem*.<sup>19</sup> The wording actually found in M is *de tribus mulieribus victricibus atque ab eisdem de totidem viris interfectis*. In other words, the order as given by Wilmart agrees with the manuscript, but Mai was correct in reading *interfectis* in place of *interiectis*. Incidentally, the title given in M is almost identical with that found in D.

A comparison of M with the 1894 text of Riese shows the following variants: 2 *Hippolyte*] *ypolite Lyce*] *licae Alce*] *alcae*; 5 *Clonus*] *clonos* (corrected to *clonus* by a later hand); 7 *Iphicli*] *aepidi* or *aepicli Dorycli*] *doracli*. Mai has *Aepidii* as the first word of line 7; this does appear in the writing of M to be *aepidi*, but could just as easily be interpreted as *aepicli* in agreement with CD, since M frequently confuses *d* and *cl*. In line 3, for instance, the word which is clearly intended to be *Clonon* appears in M in a form which could easily be read as *donon*.

Another early copy of *Anthologia Latina* 392, apparently unknown to Riese, is to be found in codex Vat. Pal. Lat. 281, fol. 308<sup>v</sup>, saec. ix. The main body of this manuscript is made up of a copy of the *Etymologiae* of Isidore which was written in the ninth century, probably at Lorsch. It is described briefly by Henricus Stevenson Jr. in his catalogue of the first 921 of the Palatini Latini codices in the Vatican Library.<sup>20</sup> Stevenson refers briefly to the poem with the words: "Carmen paene deletum; inc. *Ut belli sonuere tubae*, f. 308<sup>v</sup>," but does not identify it as a poem in *Anthologia Latina*. Bernhard Bischoff discusses Pal. Lat. 281 in his recent monograph on the Lorsch manuscripts, pointing out that it resided in Lorsch in the ninth century and probably was corrected there.<sup>21</sup> He makes no references, however, to the copy of *Anthologia Latina* 392 contained in it. As indicated by Stevenson, the text of the poem has been almost completely obliterated. Apparently no title was ever included. Only the first few words of each line are legible, and for this reason any attempt to provide a systematic collation of the text is hopeless. Those words which can be read agree closely with the text of Riese. Perhaps the chief value of the manuscript for purposes of textual criticism lies in the fact that it provides evidence for the first two letters of *Hippolyte* in line 2. Manuscripts previously used have *ypolite* (with the symbol c over the y in G). M has *ypolite*. But Pal. Lat. 281 clearly reads *Hipolite* thus becoming the first document to provide manuscript evidence for the *Hi*- previously accepted into the text as an emendation. Enough of the original text of the poem as copied in Pal. Lat. 281 is

<sup>19</sup> Maius (above, n. 15), 458.

<sup>20</sup> Henricus Stevenson Iunior, *Codices Palatini Latini Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, Tomus I (Rome, 1886), 72.

<sup>21</sup> Bernhard Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Munich, 1974), 30, 110.

still visible to indicate that line 7 was completely omitted. This omission suggests a close affinity with codex B in which the same line is missing. This poses the interesting question: was B or any of its ancestors ever located in Lorsch? Certainly the presence of this poem in a Lorsch manuscript provides a small amount of additional proof of the richness and variety of the holdings of the Lorsch Library in the ninth century.

Item 798 of *Anthologia Latina* is a poem of twelve verses dealing with the seven planets and edited by Riese from a single manuscript of the thirteenth century—Parisinus 7461 (= P).<sup>22</sup> Two additional manuscripts of this poem have recently come to my attention: Vat. Pal. Lat. 1514, fol. 137<sup>v</sup>, saec. xiii (= V) and Bodleian Canon. Misc. 517, fol. 52<sup>r</sup>, saec. xv (= B).<sup>23</sup> Codex Pal. Lat. 1514 is a well-known manuscript of the *Tusculanae Disputationes* of Cicero and has been used in the preparation of numerous critical editions of this work. The first part, extending through *Non mihi videtur omni animi perturbatione posse sapiens vacare* (*Tusc.* 4.8.2–3), occupies the first 95 folios of the manuscript and was copied in a Carolingian hand usually dated at the end of the tenth century. The rest of the manuscript (fols. 96–137) contains the remaining portions of the *Tusculanae Disputationes* copied in two different thirteenth-century hands, with the first having written the first two folios of this segment and the second, the remainder of the codex. On fol. 137<sup>v</sup>, immediately after the conclusion of the *Tusculanae Disputationes*, the second thirteenth-century hand added the text of *Anthologia Latina* 798. This is followed on the same folio without explanation, by a declension (with a few errors included) of the singular and plural, but not the dual, of the Greek definite article. In his Budé edition of *Tusculanae Disputationes*, Fohlen<sup>24</sup> has collated both the tenth-century portion of Pal. Lat. 1514 and the thirteenth-century portion, but neither he nor any other editor of Cicero calls attention to the copy of *Anth. Lat.* 798 at the end of the manuscript.

The Bodleian manuscript—B—is either a direct or an indirect copy of V, since it agrees with V in every detail with the exception that in line 8,

<sup>22</sup> Alexander Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, Pars prior, Fasc. 2 (Leipzig, 1906), 274.

<sup>23</sup> I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Ruth Joseph for securing a photograph of codex B for me from the Bodleian Library. I also wish to thank the Librarian of the Bodleian for permitting a photograph of the manuscript to be made for export. The first line of B, along with the title of the poem, is recorded by Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), 1503. Thorndike and Kibre do not, however, list any other manuscripts as containing the poem nor do they identify the poem with *Anthologia Latina* 798.

<sup>24</sup> George Fohlen, *Cicéron Tusculanes*, Tome I (I–II); Tome II (III–V), with a French Translation by Jules Humbert (Paris, 1931).

where V has the correct *ast*, it has *astra*—apparently a scribal conjecture. All of the errors of V are to be found in B. Hence the two may be treated together in a discussion of their textual peculiarities. Both have the title, *De Septem (vii B) Planetis et Cursu eorum*, as opposed to P, which has no title. Both V and B omit line 7 in its entirety. In line 2, where Baëhrens has conjectured that the reading should be *se sede*, V and B, like P, have *seseque*. In the same line, however, where P has *tenus*, both V and B have the correct *tenet*. V and B have *ciclus* in line 5 for *cursus*. As noted above, B has *astra* in line 8 where V and P have *ast*. In summary, then, the two new manuscripts have the effect of confirming Riese's conjecture that *tenet* is the correct reading for the *tenus* of P in line 2, and of establishing a title for the poem.

### III. TWO UNPUBLISHED RIDDLES IN CODEX REG. LAT. 1260

The recto of the front flyleaf of codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 1260, which is parchment, contains two unpublished Latin riddles written near the top of the page in a twelfth-century Carolingian hand.<sup>25</sup> The text of the first is:

Est domus in terris set vivit semper in undis.  
 Si caput abstuleris, apparet fortis in armis.  
 Si medium tollis, ictus mucrone patescit.  
 Si finem abstuleris, volucer petit aethera pennis.

The four verses making up this riddle are encircled by a line to set them apart from the second riddle which follows immediately after the last line of the first, in the same hand, but in smaller writing. The text of the second is:

Non sata conubio, nascor de virgine virgo.  
 Nascor per coitum coitus et conscia non sum.

The remainder of the recto of the flyleaf is completely vacant except for the entry "1260 Reg." near the bottom in a much later hand. The verso of the same folio is completely blank.

The main body of codex Reg. Lat. 1260 is a Carolingian manuscript of the ninth century containing a variety of works dealing for the most part with astronomy and the arrangement of the calendar. The following is a list of the items to be found in this codex: (1) Beda, *De Natura Rerum* (fols. 1<sup>r</sup>–7<sup>v</sup>); (2) Beda, *De Temporibus* (fols. 7<sup>v</sup>–10<sup>r</sup>); (3) an anonymous tract on various ages of the world (fols. 10<sup>r</sup>–12<sup>r</sup>); (4) Beda, *Epistola ad Wichthedum*

<sup>25</sup> The information about codex Vat. Reg. Lat. 1260 provided in this paper is based on a microfilm copy of the manuscript placed at my disposal by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University.

(fols. 12<sup>r</sup>-14<sup>v</sup>); (5) paschal computations (fols. 14<sup>v</sup>-16<sup>v</sup>); (6) Isidorus, *De Natura Rerum* (fols. 17<sup>r</sup>-44<sup>r</sup>); (7) Hyginus, *De Astronomia* (fols. 44<sup>v</sup>-83<sup>v</sup>); (8) an anonymous work about the stars without title (fols. 84<sup>r</sup>-86<sup>r</sup>); (9) *Anthologia Latina* (Riese) 679, with musical notes, inserted in the eleventh century on a page previously left blank (fol. 86<sup>v</sup>); (10) an anonymous work entitled *Pauca de Ratione Computandi secundum Solem et Lunam* accompanied by numerous paschal tables (fols. 87<sup>r</sup>-124<sup>v</sup>); (11) Aethicus, *Cosmographia* (fols. 125<sup>r</sup>-164<sup>v</sup>); (12) four glossaries of Greek and Latin medical terms (fols. 165<sup>r</sup>-178<sup>v</sup>).

In the lower margin of fol. 1<sup>r</sup> appears the entry "Petri Danielis Aurel." in Peter Daniel's own handwriting. This indicates that the manuscript is one of the famous collection which Peter Daniel owned at one time and that it, like many other manuscripts belonging to this collector, probably came from Fleury.

Codex Reg. Lat. 1260 was listed by Charles W. Jones in his edition of *Beda Opera de Temporibus*<sup>26</sup> and by M. L. W. Laistner and H. H. King in their hand-list of Bede manuscripts.<sup>27</sup> It was described in greater detail by Charles Henry Beeson in his *Isidor-Studien*.<sup>28</sup> Both Laistner-King and Beeson assign the manuscript to Fleury, and Beeson calls attention to its having been owned at one time by Peter Daniel.

Whether the content of the main body of Reg. Lat. 1260 was in any way responsible for the insertion of two riddles on its flyleaf in the twelfth century is highly doubtful. In all probability this was a matter of accident. But it is just possible that there is some connection between the fact that the first part of the manuscript is made up of works of Bede and that five riddles of Symphosius<sup>29</sup> (in the order 1, 7, 77, 12, 10) and five of Aldhelm<sup>30</sup> (in the order 3, 90, 3, 4, 9) are to be found in the *Flores* of Pseudo-Bede.<sup>31</sup> If the twelfth-century scribe who copied the new riddles was by any chance familiar with the work of Pseudo-Bede, he may have been led by this to associate riddles with the name of Bede and thus may have considered a manuscript containing works by Bede a proper home for the riddles added on the flyleaf.

<sup>26</sup> Charles W. Jones, *Beda Opera de Temporibus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1943), 167, 171.

<sup>27</sup> M. L. W. Laistner and H. H. King, *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Ithaca, 1943), 121, 143, 147.

<sup>28</sup> Charles Henry Beeson, *Isidor-Studien* (Munich, 1913), 67.

<sup>29</sup> For the text of the riddles of Symphosius see Fr. Glorie, *Collectiones Aenigmatum Merovingicae Aetatis*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina CXXXIII A (Turnholt, 1968), 611-723. The Latin text in this edition is accompanied by the English translation originally published in Raymond Theodore Ohl, *The Enigmas of Symphosius* (Philadelphia, 1928).

<sup>30</sup> For the text of the riddles of Aldhelm see Glorie (above, n. 29), 359-540.

<sup>31</sup> Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 94, 543-548.

Be that as it may, there can be no doubt about the adherence of the new riddles to the Symphosius tradition. Symphosius is the name regularly assigned to a writer of the late fourth or early fifth century A.D. who produced a hundred riddles of three dactylic-hexameter lines each, dealing with a great variety of topics.<sup>32</sup> The riddles of Symphosius became quite popular in the middle ages, as is indicated by the large number of manuscripts of them which are now extant<sup>33</sup> and the presence of ten of them in *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, which is thought to be a Latin adaptation of a lost Greek romance.<sup>34</sup>

One feature which very definitely connects the new riddles (written, incidentally, in dactylic-hexameter verses) with the Symphosius tradition is the identity of the first four words of the first riddle (*Est domus in terris*) with the first four words of Symphosius 12. The subject of Symphosius 12 is *Flumen et piscis* and its text is:

Est domus in terris clara quae voce resultat.  
Ipsa domus resonat, tacitus sed non sonat hospes.  
Ambo tamen currunt, hospes simul et domus una.

Despite the similarity of the first new riddle in tone and meter to the riddles of Symphosius, the addition of a fourth line suggests some influence from Aldhelm, who was himself under the influence of Symphosius, as is indicated by his mention of Symphosius by name<sup>35</sup> in the prose prologue of his collection of 100 riddles produced in the late seventh century. The riddles of Aldhelm, which are also in dactylic hexameters, vary in length, but riddles 1-7, 9-17, 19, 51, 90 contain four lines each. Furthermore, the third line of riddle 16 (*Cum volucrum turma quoque scando per aethera pennis*) in its vocabulary resembles the fourth line of the first new riddle very closely, and almost certainly exercised considerable influence over the unknown composer of this riddle. The subject of Aldhelm 16 is Luligo, "Flying-fish."

The second new riddle, although made up of only two lines, is also distinctly reminiscent of the riddles of Symphosius. The fact that it is in the first person, as contrasted with the first, which is in the third person, is significant, since the vast majority of the 100 riddles of Symphosius are also in the first person with the only exceptions being 12, 24, 29, 30, 62, 72, 76, 79, 90, 95, and 96. The theme of "peculiar circumstances of

<sup>32</sup> For additional details see Chauncey E. Finch, "Codex Vat. Barb. Lat. 721 as a Source for the Riddles of Symphosius," *TAPA* 98 (1967), 173-179.

<sup>33</sup> Glorie (above, n. 29), 612-614. To the list of manuscripts provided by Glorie should be added Vat. Barb. Lat. 721. See Finch (above, n. 32).

<sup>34</sup> Alexander Riese, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Leipzig, 1893).

<sup>35</sup> Glorie (above, n. 29), 371.1.

conception and birth" present in this new riddle is one which is popular with Symphosius, as can be seen in his riddles 14, 15, and 37.

I have no suggestion to offer with regard to the subjects of the new riddles. It should perhaps be noted that the two known riddles which have influenced the first of the new ones—Symphosius 12 and Aldhelm 16—both deal with fish. I find it hard to believe, however, that this is true of the first riddle in Reg. Lat. 1260.\* Since in most manuscripts of riddles the subject of each is recorded as its title, it may be hoped that one or both of the new riddles will be found in other manuscripts where titles will be provided.

*Saint Louis University*

\* [Vulturnus. *Editor.*]