

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*

and *Elucidations*) is ingenious but has not won support.

Ellis defends *tubam* with misplaced erudition. Following Voss, he cites Polyaeus *Strategemata* 1. 1 (Διόνυσος κυμβάλοις καὶ τυμπάνοις ἐσήμαινεν ἀντὶ σάλπιγγος) and adds Justin 41. 2: "signum his [sc. the Parthians] in proelio non tuba sed tympano datur." From these parallels he deduces a metaphorical meaning, that the tympanon "plays the same part in the *cultus* of the Mother as the trumpet in other rituals." Neither passage supports his explanation, but both provide the clue. The tympanon, or at least its function as a signal, was apparently remarkable enough to warrant an explanation. That explanation has crept into the text here.

Tubam may have glossed *typanum* in either line 8 or line 9. I think the latter more likely, in which case the line began *leve typanum*. Repetition of either the end of one line at the

beginning of the next (cf. 12–13, 59–60), or of one word in a prominent position (cf. 21–25, 49–50, 62–64, 65–66, 68–71, 91), is a feature of the poem, but still unusual enough to explain how the gloss became incorporated in the line. Catullus' ingenuity with the meter in this poem makes the *typanum* / *tympanum* variation acceptable here: "leve tympanum Cybelle, tua mater initia."

If the gloss comes from line 8, we have a larger and probably insoluble gap. But note the association of *typanum* with *cymbalum* at lines 21 and 28. In the opening description it would be particularly apt. *Cavum* is the epithet of *cymbalum* at line 28. Catullus' fondness for alliteration in this poem supports it here: "cava cymbala o Cybelle, tua mater initia."

R. D. SCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

A NOTE ON TERENCE *HECYRA* 670

The pressure on Pamphilus to take back his wife, Philumena, has been increased by the discovery made by his father-in-law, Phidippus, that Philumena has given birth to a child. Laches considers that the birth no longer leaves his son room for choice in the matter, but Phidippus is still prepared to leave the decision in the hands of Pamphilus, merely requiring some guidance as to what will become of the child. Laches certainly has no doubts:

LA. ridicule rogas:
quidquid futurumst, huic suum reddas scilicet
ut alamu' nostrum. PA. quem ipse neglexit pater,
ego alam? LA. quid dixti? eho an non alemu',
Pamphile?
prodemu' quaeso potiu'? quae haec amentias?

[*Hecyra* 668–72]

It has become customary to accept the reading *ipse* in the comment of Pamphilus and to punctuate after *pater*. Such is the reading of the current Oxford Classical Text of Terence, following the better manuscripts.¹ There is, however, a variant reading: "PA. quem ipsa neglexit, pater, / ego alam?"

1. R. Kauer, W. M. Lindsay, and O. Skutsch, *P. Terenti Afri comoediae*² (Oxford, 1958).

This reading is attested and even preferred, although no reason for the preference is given, in the fourth-century commentary of Donatus² on *Hecyra* 670:

1 UT ALAMUS NOSTRUM scilicet Pamphili filium, nepotem meum, utrumque 'nostrum'. 2 QUEM IPSE NEGLEXIT si 'ipsa' legeris, clare dictum est, si 'ipse' pater, lentius dictum est. et videbitur senex ob murmurationem eius intellexisse [non] quod nolit puerum tolli, et ideo appositum 'quid dixti?' 3 QUEM IPSE NEGLEXIT legitur et 'ipsa'. et hoc est melius, ut sit 'pater' vocativus casus. 4 QUEM IPSE NEGLEXIT PATER EGO ALAM hic sibi obmurmurans vultu et verbis ostendit nolle suscipere filium.

Both readings would appear to have their difficulties. Pamphilus has promised to keep secret the unfortunate circumstances of his wife's confinement and the details given to him by his mother-in-law (402). If the reading *ipse* is accepted, it would seem that Pamphilus is referring to the father of the child as someone other than himself. Yet this surprising piece of new information is not seized upon by the old

2. The text quoted is taken from the edition of P. Wessner, *Aeli Donati commentum Terenti*, II (Leipzig, 1905), 311–12.