

caused by uplifts in the river beds, is a sign of a severe earthquake. Although no damage at Rome is reported (easy to ignore amidst the excitement accompanying Nero's fall), the earthquake was strongly felt there. Rome is about ninety miles from Teate, so the earthquake seems to have affected a fairly wide area.¹⁷ Pliny may supply a further indication of widespread damage in 68. Immediately prior to the mention of the Marrucinian landslide, he describes a great earthquake in 91 B.C., near Mutina, when two mountains "inter se concurrerunt crepitu maximo adsultantes recedentesque, inter eos flamma fumoque in caelum exeunte" (2. 199). As a result, "villae omnes elisae, animalia permulta quae intra fuerunt

exanimata sunt." The cataclysm was, therefore, a fitting portent of the Social War, from which, says Pliny, the Italian land suffered more than from the civil wars. But Italy suffered severely in the civil wars following Nero's fall and, by his juxtaposition, Pliny could be tacitly suggesting that the major earthquake of 68 was of sufficient intensity to be a fitting portent of the large-scale suffering and devastation that were to follow. His belief in earthquakes as portents is explicit: "numquam urbs Roma tremuit ut non futuri eventus alicuius id praenuntium esset."¹⁸

R. F. NEWBOLD

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

17. It is true that earthquakes of great intensity can affect minute areas, but it is no less true that their areas of maximum damage can cover tens of thousands of square miles, and the total disturbed area, millions, with tens of thousands of lives lost and thousands of dwellings ruined (depending on density of population). At this point it might be useful to note the features of the violent earthquake which occurred during the battle of Lake Trasimene in 217 B.C. Silius Italicus, 5. 610–26, speaks of cliffs crashing, peaks rocking, the earth rumbling, and great chasms opening. The level of the lake

rose, rivers flowed backwards, and sea waves reversed their courses. None of this is unlikely, and Plutarch attests cities overthrown, rivers diverted from their courses, and fragments of cliffs torn away (*Fab.* 3. 2); cf. Plin. *HN* 2. 200, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7. 3. 2–3.

18. That Suetonius and Dio do not mention earthquake damage in Italy in A.D. 68 is not significant. They do not mention the great Campanian earthquake which caused so much damage to Pompeii in A.D. 63 either: cf. Sen. *QNat.* 6. 1. 3, 1. 13, 12. 2, 27. 1, 31. 1.

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA 666 IN CODICES VAT. LAT. 3325 AND MONACENS. CLM 14613

Item 666 of Alexander Riese's edition of the *Anthologia Latina* is titled "Rescriptum Honorii scholastici contra epistolas Senecae ad Iordanem episcopum."¹ In belabored distichs, Honorius extols Jordanes for a life and for moral principles which offer to him greater and truer examples than those which Seneca in his life and *Epistolae* held out to Lucilius (here called Lucillus).

Riese's text is based on two manuscripts, Valentianus 88, saec. ix (= V) and Parisinus 4860, saec. x (= P). A third copy of the poem, found in Codex Pal. Lat. 920, saec. ix (= Q), mentioned but not investigated by Riese in his Appendix, has recently been examined and reported on by Chauncey E. Finch, who remarks that this manuscript from Lorsch, despite its early ninth century date, "adds

nothing which is not already known from V" and is most likely a *gemellus* of V.²

A fourth manuscript is listed without comment by Riese in the same note in the Appendix; this is Codex Monacensis [CLM] 14613, saec. xi (here designated as M). The poem is found on fol. 85v–86r of this Munich codex.³ It is very close to P, not only in its variants but also in the *incipit* and *explicit* of the poem. It does contain a few minor spelling errors of its own: 4 *exhiliens* for *exiliens*; 16 *docmatis* for *dogmatis*; 20 *Lucellum* for *Lucillum*; 26 *precanda* for *precando*.

Apparently Riese was unaware of the existence of still another copy of the poem, found in Codex Vat. Lat. 3325, saec. xi (here designated as L).⁴ It occurs in a Carolingian hand on fol. 1v, before the text of Sallust but after two

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

2. Riese, *Anthologia*, p. 387. Chauncey E. Finch, "Anthologia Latina 666 (Riese) in Codex Pal. Lat. 920," *CP*, LXV (1970), 46–47.

3. A photostat and a microfilm of this manuscript were courteously sent for this study by the Bayrische Staatsbibliothek, Munich.

4. The study of Codex Vat. Lat. 3325 is based on a microfilm copy of this manuscript placed at the disposal of the

flyleaf pages containing some liturgical fragments written in a wretched Insular script.⁵ The *ex libris* at the bottom of the folio, 1v–2r, “Liber Sancti Petri de Blandinio monasterio,” as well as two similar notices further in the text, indicates that this manuscript once belonged to the celebrated abbey of Blandain near Tournai.

L presents an even more accurate rendition of the poem than M, hardly differing from the printed text except where the latter represents editorial surmise. It shows an affinity to V and has the same *incipit*; in the reading *nympha* for *lympa* in line 4 it agrees with V, as does Q.

A comparison of the readings of all five manuscripts, relating QML to VP, should be of assistance in establishing an even more correct text. The principal variants are these: 1 *demersa*] *dimersa* PM; 4 *lympa*] *lymfa* PM, *nympha* L, *nymfa* VQ; 8 *imbutis*] *inbutis* VQL; *domare*] *donare* PM; 10 *opus*] *opis* VM and Q (corrected to *opus* by a later hand); 12 *quique monens*] *quem ut moneas* all codd.; 17 *commenta*] *monimenta* PLM, *monumenta* VQ; 21 *beatos*] *beato* all codd.; 25 *alium*] *aliam* VQ; 28 *duce*] *disce* all codd.

Variants such as *demersa* / *dimersa*, *lympa* / *nympha* are equally attested and of no great importance. But the fact that all five manuscripts give the same readings, *quem ut moneas*, *monimenta* or *monumenta*, *beato*, and *disce*, should raise some doubt about the validity and necessity of the editorial emendations con-

jectured for them. One might argue that the exemplar for all these manuscripts was corrupt, and indeed it must be admitted that *quem ut moneas* is metrically unsatisfactory and *beatos* makes better sense than *beato* (although *beato* could agree with *obitu*, 22). The other readings, however, are possible, if not ideal, as they are found in the manuscript tradition. The citations from Terence, Ovid, and Firmicus noted in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, contrasting *commentum* with *verum*, explain why Buecheler would emend the adequate *monumenta* to *commenta*, but it remains moot whether Honorius originally used the more attractive word. Similarly, *disce* of line 28 can stand as a late Latin rendering of the equivalent of *doce*, as the *Thesaurus*, noting Plasberg’s argument for keeping *disce* in this line, and Lewis and Short, citing Ammianus, indicate.⁶

Hence, although the heretofore unexamined manuscript readings of the poem in Vat. Lat. 3325 and in Monacensis CLM 14613 do not reveal any surprisingly new material, they, along with the Codex Pal. Lat. 920, do manifest a unanimity with the texts of Valentianus 88 and Parisinus 4860. Since these five manuscripts, though similar, come from various hands, lands, and periods, it seems unwise to accept too readily emendations in their common readings.

GEORGE HARDIN BROWN

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

writer by The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University. I am indebted to Chauncey Finch for calling my attention to the manuscript.

5. The Sallust text of Codex Vat. Lat. 3325 was used by A. Kurfess, following A. Wahlberg, in *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Fragmenta ampliora*³ (Leipzig, 1957). The

liturgical fragments were investigated by Henry M. Bannister in *JTS*, IX (1907–1908), 412–13. Neither Kurfess nor Bannister mentions the poem of Honorius in the same manuscript.

6. *TLL*, III, 1867b, 53–58; V.1, 1335a, 41–49. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, p. 588.

CATULLUS 63. 9

niveis citata cepit manibus leve typanum
typanum † tubam, Cybelle, tua mater initia [63. 8–9].
timpanum tubam cibeles tu V

The monolithic transmission of Catullus has left us with a line of which the first four words are corrupt or misspelled. Three have been corrected simply enough, though the modern preference for *Cybebe* (Kroll, Mynors, Fordyce) rather than *Cybelle* (Ellis, Baehrens,

Munro) is at least questionable. But the crux is *tubam*. It is both awkward beside *typanum* and out of place in the great mother’s rites. Lachmann’s *tuom* (accepted by Mynors as *tuum* and by Kroll) is weak in an otherwise vigorous passage. Munro’s *typum* (*Criticisms*