

ME-ΣΗ (807–8).¹³ The signs occurring on the third (and fourth) days are to be differentiated according to the rule of dichotomization (for example, up to mid-month and after mid-month), which in Aratus' poetic code may be understood as a reference to the halves of the hexameter. And, as we have seen, ΛΕ is contained in the first half of line 784 (up to its mid-point), and ΠΤΗ in the second half of line 783 (just after the mid-point).

In conclusion, Aratus inserts in the passage in question, in addition to what has already been detected by the scholars, a sequence of words arranged to form an acronym spelling ΛΕΠΙΤΗ when read *boustrophedon*. This device, like the other ones, does not come as a complete surprise. A little earlier, at 778–9, the reader is asked, metapoetically, to observe (σκέπτεο) on either side (ἐκάτερθε)¹⁴ what the poet inscribes (ἐπιγράφει);¹⁵ the shape of the inscription may be different at different times (ἄλλοτε ... ἄλλη ... ἀγλή). Such a loose poetic formula encapsulates all the variants of Aratus' ΛΕΠΙΤΗ tricks mentioned above.¹⁶

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

JERZY DANIELEWICZ

j.danielewicz@gmx.net

doi:10.1017/S0009838814000780

¹³ Singled out as semiotically correspondent with the content of the embedding lines by M.W. Haslam, 'Hidden signs: Aratus *Diosemeiai* 46ff., Vergil *Georgics* 1.424ff.', *HSCP* 94 (1992), 199–204, at 201.

¹⁴ For yet another possible interpretation of this expression see my article on Virgil (n. 8).

¹⁵ Perhaps I should add that the 'inscription' itself, treated as a separate unit of text (λεπτή εἴη περὶ τρίτον ἡμῶν), makes sense and can be interpreted as a record of the poet's hidden 'scenario': 'apart from the clear (καθαρῆ) instance of ΛΕΠΙΤΗ let me inscribe also a faint one in the description of the moon on the third day; let it go circuitously'.

¹⁶ Since my shorter note is meant as a supplement to the most recent paper by Mathias Hanses (n. 4), which contains an updated bibliography on the subject, I have confined myself to indicating mainly those publications that are directly connected with the arrangement of the ΛΕΠΙΤΗ-occurrences at Aratus 783–7.

LUTATIUS CATULUS, CALLIMACHUS AND PLAUTUS' *BACCHIDES**

Aulus Gellius records an epigram of the Roman consul Q. Lutatius Catulus (*Noctes Atticae* 19.9.14 = fr. 1 Blänsdorf/Courtney):

Aufugit mi animus; credo, ut solet, ad Theotimum
deuenit. sic est, perflugium illud habet.
quid si non interdixem, ne illunc fugitium
mitteret ad se intro, sed magis eiceret?
ibimu' quaesitum. uerum ne ipsi teneamur
formido. quid ago? da, Venu', consilium.

My soul has run away. I believe, as usual, it has gone off to Theotimus. That's it: it has a refuge there. What if I had not given a stern warning that he was not to allow that runaway into his

* In addition to Peter Brown, to whose keen eye and informed mind I owe many improvements in this note, I owe thanks to *CQ*'s referee and the editorial team.

house, but instead to throw him out? We shall go and search. But I'm afraid that we may be caught too. What am I to do? Please advise me, Venus.

This is a version of an epigram by Callimachus, 41 Pf. (= *Anth. Pal.* 12.73):

ἥμισυ μὲν ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'
 εἶτ' Ἔρος εἶτ' Αἴδης ἤρασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.
 ἦ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ὄικετο; καὶ μὲν ἀπειπον
 πολλάκι "τὴν δρῆσιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε, νέοι."
 †ουκισυνηφισον† ἐκέϊσε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος
 κείνη καὶ δύσεως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται.

Half my soul is still breathing, but half has been snatched, I don't know whether by Eros, or by Hades, except it has disappeared. Has it gone again to one of the boys? And yet I often forbade them: 'Don't receive the runaway, youths.' <...> For I'm sure it is hanging round there somewhere, that love-sick one who deserves to be stoned to death.

In their recent book *Callimachus in Context* Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Susan Stephens bring out the Platonic element in the Greek poem, with its evocation of the divided soul, driven by rational and appetitive forces, and note the loss of this in the Latin version.¹ However, some complications arise from a phrase introduced by Catulus that recalls a rather different text. As was noticed by Giovanni Pascucci,² *ad Theotimum deuenit* is drawn from Plautus, *Bacchides* 318 *deuenit ad Theotimum*.³ The name Theotimus, which Plautus takes from the Menandrian original (*Dis Exapaton* line 55), occurs nowhere else in extant Latin literature; given its sense ('honoured by the gods'), it is not an obvious name for an *eromenos*.⁴ Whether or not there was a name in the garbled phrasing at the start of verse 4 of the Callimachus epigram, Catulus had a free choice both on whether to include a name and on what it might be.⁵ Moreover, he has marked the presence of the echo, as happens often later in Latin,⁶ by

¹ (Cambridge, 2012), 210–12. Unfortunately their translation of verses 3–5 of the Catulus poem confuses the runaway *animus* with Theotimus, who provides the refuge.

² G. Pascucci, 'Praeneoterica: Lutazio, Callimaco e Plauto', *Studi di poesia latina in onore di A. Traglia* (Rome, 1979), 109–26. On pp. 123–6 he explores the Plautine aspects of the diction of the epigram as a whole; similarly A. Perutelli, 'Lutazio Catulo poeta', *RFIC* 118 (1990), 257–81, at 259–69 [= *Frustula poetarum* (Bologna, 2002), 31–58, with small changes and addenda] and R. Maltby, 'The language of early Latin epigram', *Sandalion* 20 (1997), 43–56, at 53–4. The discussion of A.M. Morelli, *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo* (Cassino, 2000), 164–77 concentrates on the influence of Hellenistic epigram on Catulus' poem.

³ There are allusions to the *Bacchides* also in *Amores* 2.12 (as registered in the commentaries of J. Booth [Warmminster, 1991] and J.C. McKeown [Leeds, 1998]): Ovid reprises Chrysalus' repeated equation of his success in an erotic campaign with the Greek victory in the Trojan War (925–78, 1053–75); note especially 925–30/*Am.* 2.12.9–12; 1070–1/*Am.* 2.12.5–6, 27; Ovid transforms the play with *curare* in 1066–7 into a pun on *cura* (= 'love' as well as 'care') in *Am.* 2.12.16.

⁴ Perutelli (n. 2), 263–6 traces the name back to *Theognidea* 881, where it occurs in a sympotic (but not erotic) context; he goes on to explore the etymological aptness of the name employed by both Menander's Syrus and Plautus' Chrysalus to make their story more believable.

⁵ Unless Schneider were right to conjecture Θεύτιμον at the start of verse 4 (accepted in T. Gärtner, 'Zur spät-hellenistischen und früh-römischen Rezeption von Kallimachos *AP* 12.73 = *HE* 1057–62 = *Epigr.* 41 Pfeiffer', *Mnemosyne* 63 (2010), 438–44; but see 438 n. 2). However, Gow (A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. [Cambridge, 1965]), 2.159 objects to the violence of the change and points out that we are hardly entitled to assume that Catulus retained the name. This note will show that the name is more likely to be drawn, along with the verb, from Plautus than from the original; the vagueness of the rest of Callimachus' final couplet also argues against reference to an individual. See further Pascucci (n. 2), 125 n. 46.

⁶ For example, the very phrase *ut solet* is used with this implication at Ovid, *Ars am.* 3.144,

the use of *solere*. The chosen and precisely similar phrasing, combined with this marker, suggests the intertextuality should be more than inert. What point does the original context suggest? The scene from which the tag is drawn has the *seruus callidus* Chrysalus reporting a false tale⁷ to the old master Nicobulus about how the young master Mnesilochus was nearly tricked out of 1,200 gold philippics by Nicobulus' banker in Ephesus, Archidemides. Having avoided a pirate attack arranged by Archidemides, they deposited the money with Theotimus, the priest of Diana and admired public figure, for safe-keeping in the temple (*Bacch.* 306–13). Theotimus thus provides a place of safety for the gold, akin to the *perflugium* he grants the soul in Catulus' poem. Next (315) Nicobulus asks whether they brought none of the money home, and Chrysalus replies that they have brought some, but he does not know how much, going on to explain the reason (317–20):

Quia Mnesilochus noctu clanculum
deuenit ad Theotimum, nec mihi credere
 nec quoiquam in naui uoluit: eo ego nescio
 quantillum attulerit; uerum hau permultum attulit. 320

Because Mnesilochus went to Theotimus secretly, at night, and didn't want to trust me or anyone on the boat: that's why I don't know how little he's brought; but it's not much.

Nicobulus then tries to define more precisely the fractions of the gold left with Theotimus and brought home, first asking at 321 *Etiam dimidium censēs?* ('Do you reckon it was actually a half?'). *Dimidium* here deserves attention: Catulus' allusion to a context that contains the Latin for half looks pointed in a version that has omitted any reference to the ἡμισυ so emphasized by Callimachus' opening line. Finally, at 325–6, Chrysalus tells his master that he will himself have to go to Ephesus to regain the remaining gold, a suggestion picked up by *ibimus quaesitum* in line 5 of the epigram:

nunc tibimet illuc naui capiundum est iter,
 ut illud reportes aurum ab Theotimo domum.

Now it's up to you so take a boat there, so you may get the gold from Theotimus and bring it home.

There are further verbal coincidences between the epigram and the play. *Sic est*⁸ is found in verse 2 of Catulus' poem and at *Bacchides* 468 and 1108, of which the former is perhaps worth notice: Lydus asserts of Pistoclus 'your friend has perished' (*periit tibi sodalis*); Mnesilochus prays to the gods that this is not true (*ne di sirint*), and Lydus then confirms and explains his assertion, starting *sic est ut loquor*. More significant, however, is the broader context. The *Bacchides* is a play that explores the seductive power of the life of love, as can be seen in two matching early scenes: first 40–100, where Pistoclus is persuaded by Bacchis to arrange a party at her house against his better judgement. He describes her promise of a drink and a kiss as 'pure birdlime' (*uis-cus meru' uostra est blanditia*, 50) in its power to ensnare him; nothing, he says, is more

pointing the allusion to the picture of Diana at Callimachus, *Hymn* 3.11–12, and at *Met.* 5.606 *ut solet accipiter trepidas urguere columbas*, where it recalls Virgil's dove similes at *Ecl.* 9.13 and *Aen.* 11.721–4, and Ovid's own at *Ars am.* 1.117 and *Met.* 1.506.

⁷ One attraction for Catulus may have been that the Greek name not only distances the homoerotic element but in recalling this made-up story lends an air of comic fantasy.

⁸ The phrase appears only six times in Plautus, according to a PHI search.

enticing to a young man than ‘night, a woman, and wine’ (*nox, mulier, uinum*, 88). Though Catulus’ word *formidare* does not appear in the scene, Pistoclerus repeatedly expresses his fears in other ways: he uses the verb *metuere* in verse 53 *quia, Bacchis, bacchas metuo et bacchanal tuom* (‘Because, Bacchis, I’m afraid of the Bacchantes, and your Bacchic shrine’), and it then recurs in 54, 55, 65, 78, 92.

The next scene (109–69) has Pistoclerus now returning from market to provide the food and other things needed for the party, and rejecting the sober advice of his old *paedagogus*, Lydus. He identifies the inhabitants of Bacchis’ house as *Amor, Voluptas, Venu’, Venustas, Gaudium, | Iocu’, Ludus, Sermo, Suauisaiutio* (115–16), and contrasts the wisdom he used to find in Lydus (wiser than Thales then, 122) with the folly he sees in him now. Not surprisingly, the language of education is prominent, e.g. *ludus* (129 ‘school’, but playing on the sense ‘play’, found in 116, and on the name *Lydus*, as in 138, where the name is set against *paedagogus*), *disciplina* (135), *magister* and *discipulus* (152–3, 163–4), *docere* (163–4). Master and pupil bandy *sententiae* (118, 129, 151), historical and mythical exempla (111, 155–7), and tags from Homer (128 = *Il.* 2.489) and Pindar (144 = *Ol.* 13.104); they engage in comic versions of philosophical discussion, on the nature and names of divinity (115–24), on epistemology (145), and throughout on proper behaviour (*placet*, 125–6; *addecet*, 128; *conuenit*, 129; *prodest*, 135; *non par uidetur neque sit consentaneum*, 139). Note especially the tutor’s words at 132–3:

Iam perdidisti te atque me atque operam meam,
qui tibi nequiquam saepe monstraui bene.

Now you have destroyed yourself and me and wasted the efforts I made when I frequently pointed things out well to you, in vain.

Reason points out the proper course,⁹ but desire sends the young man in a different direction. In other words the comedy dramatizes the Platonic division of the soul by representing Pistoclerus in debate with two characters who clearly symbolize the lustful and rational elements within him.¹⁰ It is likely that the scenes go back to the Menandrian model, the *Dis Exapaton*, which also had Lydus as a character (1.14).¹¹

Lydus tries to forbid Pistoclerus to go to Bacchis’ (cf. *interdixem*, Catulus 1.3), and the notion of slavery developed by Catulus in *fugitium* is present in the *Bacchides* scene too, especially when Pistoclerus asks ‘am I your slave or you mine?’ (*tibi ego an tu mihi seruos es?*, 162). Over the course of the play Pistoclerus will be followed into the house of ill-repute briefly by Lydus, who departs in disgust,¹² but then by

⁹ Is it possible that Plautus wrote *bonum* (i.e. τὸ καλόν) in 133, not *bene*? He regularly uses the neuter substantive with this force when it accompanies *aequom*, but *OLD* s.v. *bonum*, 6 cites also *Capt.* 45 *prudens boni*, where it occurs alone.

¹⁰ Peter Brown points out that this is also a version of Prodicus’ Choice of Heracles (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21–34).

¹¹ See e.g. J. Barsby, *Plautus, Bacchides* (Warminster, 1986), 105–10. E. Lefèvre, *Plautus’ Bacchides* (Tübingen, 2011), esp. 84–6, shows that some elements here are Plautine innovations. Menander has since antiquity been linked with Theophrastus (Diogenes Laertius 5.36) and the Peripatetics (see K. Gaiser, ‘Menander und der Peripatos’, *Antike und Abendland* 13 [1967], 8–40, with earlier bibliography); awareness of the *Phaedrus* would not be surprising.

¹² But not as promptly as he claims: verse 374 *quae ut aspexi, me continuo contuli protinam in pedes* (‘When I saw this, I immediately took to my heels’) is at odds both with the time that has elapsed since his entry at 169 and the extended and prurient account he gives of his pupil’s lovemaking at 477–88. But see the discussion of Lefèvre (n. 11), 63.

his friend Mnesilochus, and their fathers Nicobulus and Philoxenus. Both Lydus and Philoxenus regard Mnesilochus as a figure of sobriety and restraint (453–98, 1084–6), but he has already been seduced by the Samian Bacchis. The two fathers carry the stamp of reason with their years, but when they encounter the Bacchides in their search for their lustful sons, they too will be exposed to their beguiling behaviour and they too will be caught: the equivalence of their capture to that of Pistoclusus at the start is nicely encapsulated in Philoxenus' *tactus sum uehementer uisco* ('I'm completely caught by the birdlime', 1158, echoing 50).¹³ In Nicobulus' case he enters in pursuit of half – not of his soul but – of his gold (*dimidium auri*, 1184, 1189). He too at the end expresses his fear as he follows his son, and verse 1196 for a final time illustrates the duality of the male soul.

NI. Quid ago? PH. Quid agas? rogitas etiam? NI. **Lubet et metuo**. BA. Quid metuis?

NIC.: What am I to do? PHI.: What are you to do? Do you even ask? NIC.: **I want to and I'm scared**. BAC.: What are you scared of?

It may be no coincidence that the line opens with a deliberative *quid ago?*¹⁴ This produces a third precise echo in Catulus' epigram, one that occurs, aptly, in the final line of the poem. Catulus turns his question to an addressee with the following *da, Venus, consilium*.¹⁵ Plautine editions¹⁶ attribute the next words *quid agas? rogitas etiam?* to Philoxenus, but 1191–1206 is otherwise apparently an exchange between Nicobulus and Bacchis, and I can see no reason for the momentary change of speaker here, especially as Catulus seems to have seen or read the play with a response from Bacchis, apotheosed into Venus in his version. He need not tell us what advice Venus will give: asking such a prejudiced advisor can elicit only encouragement to follow the *animus*. In any case readers of the epigram are expected to have seen the outcome when Bacchis' final line (1206) marks the entrance of the old men into the house in words that will be echoed in Catulus's *ipsi teneamur*:

Lepide **ipsi hi sunt capti**, suis qui filiis fecere insidias.

It appears then that by using a rare name and a precise echo Catulus was inviting readers to notice the connexion of his poem with a familiar play and then to consider the reasons behind it. He had seen in *Bacchides* concern with the duality of reason and desire, and realised that this matched the duality of the soul briefly explored in Callimachus' epigram. Given the way Cicero in Books 2–3 of *De oratore* celebrates his interest in

¹³ So Lefèvre (n. 11), 142. Pistoclusus' acknowledgement of Bacchis's *blanditia* is likewise matched by Nicobulus's *Vt blandiloqua est!* (1173).

¹⁴ The phrase recurs in Plautus, but only five times in total, four of them deliberative (*Epid.* 693, *Persa* 666, *Trin.* 1062 being the others).

¹⁵ Morelli (n. 2), 176 n. 168 reports that V. Tandoi, on p. 148 of his article 'Gli epigrammi di Tiburtino a Pompei, Lutazio Catulo e il movimento dei preneoterici', in *Quaderni dell'A.I.C.C. di Foggia* (1981), 133–75 compares Ter. *Hec.* 715 *quid ergo agam, Phidippe? quid das consili?*

¹⁶ According to the edition of C. Questa (Sarsina and Urbino, 2008), none of the three prime descendants of P has any original identifications of speakers in this line, so the manuscript evidence is particularly tenuous – and we should in any case probably give no weight to it for speaker attributions. The rubricating hand in B and the third hand in D, who make the attribution to Philoxenus, also give him the final words in the line (*quid metuis?*), which editors follow Merula in attributing to Bacchis. On the other side of the argument, Peter Brown points out that *quid agas? rogitas etiam?* does match what Philoxenus has said at 1189–90.

Greek philosophy,¹⁷ it is even conceivable that Catulus was aware of the Platonic background, such as it is.

Wadham College, Oxford

S.J. HEYWORTH

stephen.heyworth@wadh.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0009838814000810

¹⁷ NB *De or.* 3.187 *atque haec quidem ab eis philosophis, quos tu maxime diligis, Catule, dicta sunt.*

AN EMENDATION TO A FRAGMENT OF VARRO'S *DE BIBLIOTHECIS* (FR. 54 *GRF* FUNAIOLI)¹

Varro wrote three books *De bibliothecis*, according to a list by Jerome (*Ep.* 33.2 = testimonium 23 *GRF* Funaioli). The work may have had something to do with his commission to build a massive public library for Julius Caesar (Suet. *Iul.* 44.2), though Caesar was assassinated before the library could be built. It may also have some connection to Rome's first public library, which Asinius Pollio added to the Atrium of Liberty in the 30s B.C. Pollio, after all, gave a portrait to Varro alone among living authors (Plin. *HN* 7.115). The known fragments are few.

There are places where Varro is quoted on book-related matters, but without an attribution to his *De bibliothecis*. One example is a note on the history of papyrus in Pliny's *Natural History* (13.69–70). Pliny reported that Varro had written about the origins and history of papyrus and other writing materials (palm leaves, bark, lead, linen, wax). Varro apparently wrote that papyrus was only discovered after Alexander the Great had founded Alexandria, and that parchment was invented at Pergamum in response to a papyrus embargo from Egypt, which had been instituted when the Ptolemies became jealous of the rival library. Such a history of papyrus could easily have fit in the *De bibliothecis*, but it could just as well have fit in some of Varro's voluminous other writings.

It is sometimes supposed that all of Isidore of Seville's *Origines* 6.3, 6.5 and 6.9–14 come from Varro, with Suetonius as an intermediary.² This is certainly possible. Isidore's treatment of books and libraries in his *Origines* included chapters on writing materials (wax at *Orig.* 6.9, papyrus at 6.10, parchment at 6.11, various others at 6.14). But we should keep in mind that the only certain connection between Isidore's Book 6 and Varro's *De bibliothecis* is in subject matter (i.e. books and libraries). The role of Suetonius as intermediary is based on the fact that Isidore cited Suetonius elsewhere, and on the fact that Isidore made use of Suetonius once in regard to a book-related matter.³ Given these tenuous connections, the temptation to use Isidore to reconstruct Varro's *De bibliothecis* should be resisted.

¹ I would like to thank Dylan Sailor, Bruce Gibson and the anonymous reader for their helpful comments and suggestions.

² So P. Schmidt, 'Suetons "Pratum" seit Wessner (1917)', *ANRW* 2.33.5 (1991), 3794–3825, esp. 3806, 3814–15.

³ Isidore cites Suetonius explicitly at *Orig.* 8.7.1, 18.2.3 and 18.6.8. At *Orig.* 6.14.1, Isidore gives a definition of *bibliopola* that is also found in a scholiast (on Hor. *Ars P.* 354), who attributes it to Suetonius.