

is of considerable interest. It reads, "Versus de XL duobus Signis Poli. Et Eo Amplius." In one respect this is similar to the title found in V (= Vat. Reg. Lat. 215, fol. 122^r, saec. ix). The last part of this title is quoted by Riese as *de XII Signis*. I have examined a microfilm of this manuscript, however, and I find that the reading is unquestionably *de XLI Signis*. Since the line is in Rustic Capitals, it is very easy to confuse *L* and *I*, but if one examines the text very carefully, it becomes absolutely clear that the second letter in the numeral is *L* rather than *I*. The answer to the question whether forty-one or forty-two is the correct number depends on one's method of identifying the stars named. If Arctoi is regarded as referring to a single *signum*, the number in the first twelve verses becomes forty-one; if

Arctoi is regarded as designating two different *signa* (Ursa maior and Ursa minor), the number is forty-two. The phrase *Et Eo Amplius* in the title of Regin. presumably refers to the stars added to the list in the four-line supplement.

The copy of *Anthologia Latina* 679 here designated Pal. is without title and contains only the regular twelve verses. The text of Pal. is somewhat more accurate than that of Regin., since its variants are limited to the following minor items: 1: Arctoi] arcti; 2: Arctophylax] artifilax (*altered by a second hand to artofilax*); 3: Cassiopea] casiepia; 5: Delphin] delfin || Aquila] aquilae; 7: Hunc] hinc; 10: Procyon] prochion.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

CALLIMACHUS AND ECHO

This is R. Pfeiffer's text of *Anth. Pal.* 12. 43, in *Callimachus*, II (Oxford, 1951), *Ep.* 38:

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς ᾧδε καὶ ᾧδε φέρει·
μισέω καὶ περιφοίτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.

- 5 Λυσάνη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός—ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς, Ἥχῳ φησί τις· "ἄλλος ἔχει."

I want to suggest a new reading of the last couplet.

Echo's ἄλλος ἔχει is presumed to play on ναίχι καλός, and so to show how αἰ and ε were homophonic in Callimachus' day; but her word order is odd. She should have said ἔχει ἄλλος.¹ Hence, most recently, the emendations of Q. Cataudella² and G. Giangrande.³ Cataudella questioned the play of ἔχει on ναίχι⁴ and rewrote the hexameter, Λυσάνη,

σὺ δὲ καλὸς νήχ' εἶ· ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν, for a better echo (καλὸς νήχ' εἶ—ἄλλος ἔχει). Giangrande proposed ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν ! τοῦτο σαφῶς, ἡχῶ φησι τί; καλὸς ἔχει; Callimachus has heard Echo cry ἔχει καλὸς καλός, mocking ναίχι καλὸς καλός.⁵

Cataudella's reading has been criticized by Giangrande, and Giangrande's by Cataudella.⁶ Here is a further criticism of both. Each pleads Callimachean *Selbstironie*: Callimachus loves Lysanies because the boy is not a περιφοίτος ἐρώμενος, yet cannot have him since another has him already,⁷ or is astonished to learn that his Lysanies is a περιφοίτος ἐρώμενος.⁸ But the poem's strong declarations of taste (ἐχθαίρω, οὐδὲ . . . χαίρω, μισέω, οὐδ' . . . πίνω, σικχαίνω) would seem to demand subtler irony than either allows, a Callimachus

1. Cf. A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), II, 156–57. On Echo's choice of ναίχι καλός for her echo, see G. Luck, *GGA*, CCXIX (1967), 58: Callimachus has read a graffito, Λυσάνης καλός, and endorsed it with his own ναίχι καλός.

2. "Tre epigrammi di Callimaco, I," *Maia*, LXVII (1967), 356–58.

3. "Callimachus, Poetry and Love," *Eranos*, LXVII (1969), 33–42, hereafter cited as Giangrande.

4. So, too, L. P. Wilkinson (*CR*, N.S. XVII [1967], 5), who was content merely with the surer play of ἄλλος on καλός. But if that is the only echo, Echo (and Callimachus) cheated with ἔχει.

5. Giangrande published his emendation first in *L'Épi-*

gramme grecque, *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XIV* (Geneva, 1968), 410, but with different punctuation: ἡχῶ φησι τί; καλὸς ἔχει. Was that a misprint, or is καλὸς ἔχει; a revision?

6. See Giangrande, pp. 41–42, and Cataudella's reply, "Iterum de epigrammate Callimachi . . .," *Eranos*, LXIX (1971), 1–11. Cataudella might have objected to Giangrande's strained syntax: *oratio obliqua* (καλὸν ἔχει;) would be more natural after φησι τί; The parallels for *oratio recta* come from drama, but even if it be granted here, the question should be ἔχει καλός; rather than καλὸς ἔχει; as Cataudella notes.

7. Cataudella, after Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* (n. 6), p. 3.

8. Giangrande. His ἡχῶ φησι τί; displays great amazement.

less precious than Cataudella's, less surprised than Giangrande's.

Perhaps *Λυσανίη*, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός—ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν / τοῦτο σαφώς, Ἥχῳ φησι· “τίς ἄλλος ἔχει;” Before Callimachus can say clearly that he loves Lysanies,⁹ Echo asks if the boy has another lover.¹⁰ Her question echoes the question which Callimachus will have asked himself even as he said, “I love

you” (“Who else is his lover?”).¹¹ It reveals his true feelings for Lysanies. That they were scornful, that his “I love you” was ironic, that he considered the beautiful boy a typical *περίφοιτος ἐρώμενος*, would be more than a fair guess.

ARCHIBALD ALLEN

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

9. Σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός = ἐρώ σου. Cf. Giangrande, pp. 35–36.

10. For Callimachus' use of *φάναι* with a direct question, cf. *Hymn* 5. 79–82 (προσέφασεν Ἀθάναι / “τίς . . . / . . . δαίμων;” / ἃ μὲν ἔφα . . .). Cf. also *Hymn* 6. 41 (εἶπε . . . “τίς . . . κόπτει;”). The proposed reading understands *με* as subject of *εἰπεῖν*. For the ellipse, see K. J. McKay (*CR*, N.S. XIX [1969], 143), against Wilkinson, *op. cit.* (n. 4), who suggested

that *μ'* may have dropped out after *σαφώς*. If *σαφώς εἰπεῖν* could mean “to echo,” this punctuation might be preferable: τοῦτο σαφώς Ἥχῳ, φησι “τίς ἄλλος ἔχει;” Before she echoes the words of love, Echo wants to know if the boy is a *περίφοιτος ἐρώμενος*.

11. Word play, between *ναίχι καλός* and *ἄλλος ἔχει*, is still possible, but will be the cynical lover's word play rather than Echo's.

A GODDESS IN CATULLUS (25. 5)

idemque, Thalle, turbida rapacior procella,
5 cum diva †mulier aries† ostendit oscitantes

So Sir Roger Mynors' Oxford text (revised impression, 1967). To the host of conjectures,¹ L. A. MacKay added *Murcia arbitros*,² and that is what K. Quinn printed in the most recent, complete edition of the poems.³ *Murcia*, goddess of sloth and inactivity, will be the soft and languid Thallus' patron, alerting him to the chance of quick thefts when possible witnesses are drowsy and inattentive. But it is surely a bit odd that the goddess of laziness should prompt her lazy devotee to the energetic activity suggested by *turbida rapacior procella*.

Read “cum diva mollior, Quies, ostendit oscitantes.” Thallus is “mollior cuniculi capillo / vel anseris medullula vel imula oricilla / vel pene laguido senis situque araneoso” (1–3). But when quiet descends on a dinner party, when Quies, a goddess softer even than Thallus, shows by her presence that

host and guests are sleepy, Thallus becomes *turbida rapacior procella* and snatches their belongings.⁴

Corruption might be accounted for as follows. *MOLLIORQVIES* was copied as *MOLLIORES*, by simple lipography. *MOLLIORES* then was seen to be inadequate, inviting emendation. Blame was placed on *mollior* (1) which commands the first three lines, and an appropriate substantive adjective was sought to replace *MOLLIORES*. A bright scribe, appreciating Thallus' sexual preferences and dislikes, thought of *MULIERARIOS*, and that entered the archetype as *MULIERARIES*, canonized for us in O, and glossed probably by X's scribe as *MULIER ALIOS AL. AVES*.⁵

ARCHIBALD ALLEN

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

1. See, conveniently, J. Granarolo, *REA*, LX (1958), 290–306.

2. *CP*, LXI (1966), 110–11, after M. C. J. Putnam's *Murcia aridos* (*CP*, LIX [1964], 268–70) after H. A. J. Munro's *Murcia atrieis* (*Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus*, pp. 63–65).

3. *Catullus: The Poems* (London, 1970).

4. On the goddess Quies, cf. Liv. 4. 41. 8 (“iam consul . . . ad fanum Quietis erat”), Stat. *Theb.* 10. 89 (“opaca Quies et pigra Oblivio”), and W. Eisenhut, *s.v.* “Quies (1),” *RE*,

XXIV (1963), 877 ff. For the ellipse of *conivae* or *homines* or some such noun before *oscitantes*, cf. especially 12. 3 (*rollis lintea neglegentiorum*). Catullus does not state explicitly that Thallus steals at a dinner party—hence MacKay's deliberately vague *arbitros*—but he has stolen a *sudarium Saetabum* (7), and so had Asinius (12. 11 ff.), in *ioco atque vino* (12. 2).

5. Cf. Mynors' critical note: “mulier aries O, mulier alios al. aves vel aries G, mulier aves al. aries vel alios R.” Haupt emended *mulier aries* to *mulierarios*.