

ἀηδόνα ᾠδήν. However, Callimachus' two other uses of μελίχρως do not give a clear answer: these are *Epigr.* 27.2 and fr. 118.6. The latter, a fragment possibly from *Aitia* 1 (Apollo's temple at *Anaphe*),³ has the fragmentary sixth line] ηςι μελιχροτ[;⁴ the former is particularly striking, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον | τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο, 'but I daresay upon the very sweetest of his hexameters the Solean modelled himself', as it shows the honey sweetness of μελιχρότατον adopted in the same poetological context as the song of the ἀηδόνες in our *Epigr.* 2.⁵

In their acutely intelligent 2003 study of Callimachus' *Epigr.* 51 Pf. (15 G–P) Andrej and Ivana Petrovic posited that the epigram was a reading of the *Aetia*'s conclusion, the joining of *The Lock of Berenice* to the four-book elegiac poem.⁶ The present study suggests that another epigram, 2 Pf. = 34 G–P, references the long poem's prologue. Both studies suggest that a careful reading of Callimachus' epigrams in light of his longer works may well be in order—but this is the topic of a longer and very detailed study. For the present, let us enjoy the two epigrams that frame the *Aetia*, celebrating its end and its beginning.

I close with a final observation. *sillyboi* were small tags attached to ancient papyri that gave essential information on the contents of the scroll: name of author, title of work. Callim. *Epigr.* 27 Pf. (= 56 G–P) Ἡσιόδου τό τ' ἄεισμα can be said to imitate in poetic form the *sillybos* for Aratus' *Phaenomena*; *Epigr.* 51 Pf. the form of the *sillybos* for the first papyrus roll of the *Aetia* final four-book edition. I have argued elsewhere for something of the same with Catullus 1. With *Epigr.* 2 Pf. (34 G–P) we see a different variation, two Homeric epics encapsulated in one epigram. Once again, Callimachus uses the small to encapsulate the great, which is, as it were, the function of the *sillybos*.

The Ohio State University

BENJAMIN ACOSTA-HUGHES

acosta-hughes.1@osu.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838825100827

A PUZZLE IN THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF POLYBIUS

ABSTRACT

This note offers the solution to a puzzle in the manuscript tradition of Polybius that has baffled eminent modern authorities.

Keywords: Polybius; manuscripts; palaeography; colophon; compendia; shorthand; Constantine Porphyrogenitus

³ E. Livrea, 'Il mito argonautico di Callimaco: l'episodio di Anafe', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (edd.), *Callimaco: cent'anni di papiri. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi. Firenze, 9–10 giugno 2005* (Florence, 2006), 89–99.

⁴ The following line has ἰακριβέε, perhaps two adjectives of one subject?

⁵ I owe this observation to a discussion with Marco Fantuzzi.

⁶ A. Petrovic and I. Petrovic, 'Stop and smell the statues: Callimachus' *Epigram* 51 Pf. reconsidered (four times)', *MD* 51 (2003), 179–208.

In his Sather lectures on Polybius, Walbank discussed the puzzling subscription at the end of Book 39 in manuscript M of Polybius (Vaticanus gr. 73), stating that ‘no wholly satisfactory explanation of this subscription has been proposed’.¹ After the numeral 39 there is a sign which Buettner-Wobst in his edition (vol. 4, page 512) printed as ./., perhaps taking it to be a sign added by the scribe to signify that he had finished his task. This, however, if it was his belief, was mistaken. The sign normally used by copyists at the end of a task was :- . And the sign ./· was an abbreviation for ECTI.

But that is not an accurate representation of what one sees in the manuscript. Walbank attempted to do better: what he printed looks like an omega with two dots attached to the top of the final stroke. Later, in his commentary of 1979, he printed the mysterious sign as an omega with smooth breathing and a grave accent.² He then repeated his acceptance of a transposition in the wording of the subscription which had been proposed by Struve.

The solution to the puzzle is quite different, and was in fact available, admittedly without supporting explanation, in the description of M in the printed catalogue entry for this manuscript.³ The mysterious signs—there are in fact two of them—are interpreted as ZHTEI, ‘look for’ Book 40, which makes perfect sense. The scribe used two shorthand symbols, nos. 189 and 786 in the Byzantine system.⁴ As he was doubtless a highly qualified member of the staff of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus it is not surprising that he had some knowledge of shorthand.

Lincoln College, Oxford

NIGEL WILSON

nigel.wilson@lincoln.ox.ac.uk

doi:[10.1017/S0009838824001125](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838824001125)

NOTES ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF CICERO, *DE HARVSPICVM RESPONSIS**

ABSTRACT

This note examines five passages of Cicero, De haruspicum responsis in light of the commented edition of A. Corbeill. New conjectures are offered on §§29 and 50; the transmitted text of §46 is defended; and a different interpretation of the text is offered at §§37 and 61.

Keywords: anacoluthon; clausula; Clodius; Pompey; religio; saltation error

¹ F.W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley, 1972), 16 n. 82.

² *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1979), 3.743–4.

³ G. Mercati and P. Franchi de’ Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani graeci, tomus I, Codices 1–329* (Vatican City, 1923), 69 (top line).

⁴ See N.P. Chionides and S. Lilla, *La brachigrafia italo-bizantina* (Vatican City, 1981).

* I should like to thank the Editor and the journal’s anonymous reader for helpful advice.