

thesis of the uncreatedness and indestructibility of the earth and its constituent parts with his thesis of the "eternal return" or "eternal recurrence"—the theory that philosophic truth progresses and declines in certain cyclic intervals (*Metaphysics* 1074b1 ff.; *De caelo* 270b19–21; *Meteorologica* 339b28; *Politics* 1264b3 and 1329b25–27). Pseudo-Ocellus *De universi natura* 3, 4, 41 possibly reflects a remote echo of this Aristotelian argument that, despite the uncreatedness and indestruc-

tibility of the universe (or of the earth) as a whole, the economic, technological, cultural, and intellectual achievements of mankind have their cyclic "ups and downs," and that these cyclic "ups and downs" are a result of periodic inundations and desiccations of certain parts of the earth.

ANTON-HERMANN CHROUST

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA (RIESE) 679 IN REG. LAT. 1669 AND PAL. LAT. 1341

Alexander Riese has published as item 679 of his edition of *Anthologia Latina* a poem of twelve (sixteen) verses entitled *De sideribus* and ascribed to Priscianus Grammaticus.¹ Riese based his text of the poem on well over twenty manuscripts, ranging in age from the ninth to the twelfth centuries. Since the vast majority of these manuscripts have a version of the poem made up of twelve verses, Riese printed in the body of his work a poem comprised of these twelve verses. Three of the manuscripts utilized by Riese, however, have four additional verses: *Dresdensis* Dc 183, saec. ix (= Dr); *Reg. Lat.* 2078, saec. ix (= r) and *Parisinus* 12117, saec. xi (= N). For this reason Riese included these additional four verses in his apparatus criticus, with an indication that they had been accepted as genuine by some of the earlier editors, but with no listing provided of the variant readings from the different manuscripts.

I have recently come upon two tenth-century manuscripts of this poem not mentioned by Riese and presumably unknown to him. One is included among miscellaneous items found on fol. 192^r of *Codex Vat. Reg. Lat.* 1669.² The second new manuscript of the poem is at the bottom of fol. 109^r in *Codex Vat. Pal. Lat.* 1341, a manuscript which was almost certainly written at Lorsch.³ The former will henceforth be designated *Regin.*; the latter, *Pal.*

A feature of *Regin.* which makes it especially

worthy of note is that, in addition to the regular twelve verses found in all manuscripts, it also has the additional four verses previously known from only three documents (Dr, r, and N). The text of these four verses in *Regin.* is exactly as it appears in the apparatus of Riese's edition with the exception that in the second line *coque* appears in place of *quoque*. For these lines, therefore, *Regin.* is considerably more accurate than r. As noted above, Riese listed no variants for these last four verses in r or in either of the other two manuscripts containing them. I have a microfilm copy of r at my disposal, however, and on checking its version of the lines in question (fol. 143^r), I find the following variants: 3: et] est || omnia sidera lucens] hoc saturnia stella; 4: Saturnus] cunctis et. The text of the first twelve verses in *Regin.* as revised by the contemporary corrector is also very accurate, with only minor orthographical errors appearing. The variants are: 1: Anguis] angues; 2: Arctophylax] artophilax || hercules inserted above genuque by the corrector; 3: Cassiopea] casiephia; 4: above Deltoton the word Triangulus was inserted by the corrector; 5: Anguitenensque] anguis tenensque; 7: Virgo] virga (changed to virgo by the corrector); 8: Libra om., but added in margin by corrector || Arcitenens] arquitenens; 10: Procyon] prochion; 11: quoque] coque; 12: Eridanique] heridanique. The title of the poem in *Regin.*

1. A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, I² (Leipzig, 1906), 154–55.

2. Information about the four Vatican manuscripts cited 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.

3. See Chauncey E. Finch, "Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* in *Codex Vat. Pal. Lat.* 1341," *TAPA*, XCVII (1966), 184.

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.