Verses 92–6 look much like an interpolation of the kind which Tarrant[9] calls 'imitation' or 'collaboration'. In this case one would think of someone wanting to try his hand at writing in the metre of 61, and using Catullian building blocks.[10] Another example of this kind of interpolation is Hor. *Carm.* 3.11.17–20. By the deletion of vv.92–6 one removes a passage which is not only redundant, but even very difficult. One avoids all of the problematic implications which the necessary addition of *prodeas nova nupta* after v.90 involves. The refrain now comes in alternating strophes. Finally as a result of this deletion the main caesura of poem 61, the beginning of the bridal procession in v.114, shifts exactly to the middle of the poem.[11]

Wadham College, Oxford　　　　　　　　　　　　BERNHARD GEORG
Universität Bonn

[9] R. J. Tarrant, *TAPhA* 117 (1987), 295: '... its distinctive mark is a desire to prolong, to elaborate or even to surpass the text which inspires it.'
[10] U. Knoche was the first to point out suspect *versus repetiti* in Catullus; cf. *RhM* 85 (1936), 26, particularly n. 1.
[11] This is, of course, only a welcome additional result of the deletion, and not a point upon which the argumentation can be based.

LUCRETIUS, *D.R.N.* 5.948

In his account of primitive people in *D.R.N.* 5 Lucretius says that they led a wandering, nomadic sort of existence (932, 'vulgivago vitam tractabant more ferarum'); ignorant of agriculture and husbandry, they were content to eat nuts and berries and the like (933ff.), while streams and springs called them to quench their thirst (945ff.). We are then told that they dwelt in the woodland shrines of the nymphs (948f.):[1]

> denique nota vagis silvestria templa tenebant
> nympharum...

The rest of the sentence is a lush description of the streams which welled up from those woodland shrines, washing over rocks and moss, and sometimes breaking out over the plain (949–52).

Bailey rendered the line in question: 'Or again they dwelt in the woodland haunts of the nymphs, which they had learnt in their wanderings....' His English hides the syntactic awkwardness of the Latin, in which dative *vagis* refers to the subject of *tenebant*, but hardly the oddness of the idea that primitive people 'held' or 'inhabited' places which were known to them as they wandered about. To obviate those difficulties, Lachmann had proposed the emendation of *vagis* to *vagi*, 'ut ipsi illi primi mortales indicentur', but as Bailey observes, *vagi* 'does not improve matters for it leaves *nota* by itself, and the *templa* could not be *nota* to anyone else...'.[2]

I suppose that the problem lies not with *nota* or *vagis* but with *tenebant*. Any reference to dwelling or settling is surely out of place in this line since the *silvestria templa*... / *nympharum*, with streams of water pouring from them (949–52), will have been far too soggy for human habitation. Besides, it is only at 955f., seven lines later, that Lucretius describes where the primitive people actually lived:

> sed nemora atque cavos montis silvasque colebant
> et frutices inter condebant squalida membra.

[1] This is the MS text as printed by C. Bailey in his 3 vol. edition of *D.R.N.* (Oxford, 1947). I refer to that work and other editions by editor's name only: K. Lachmann (Berlin, 1850); H. A. J. Munro (4th edn, Cambridge, 1886); C. Giussani (Torino, 1896–8): E. J. Kenney (Bk. 3, Cambridge, 1971).
[2] Bailey also mentions Naugerius' *noctivagi* and Bentley's *nocte vagi* for *nota vagis*.

Brieger's *vagi…petebant*, which Giussani printed, removes the reference to habitation but introduces another odd notion, that the primitive folk 'sought' woodland shrines which were known (*sc.* to them) in their wanderings. As in Lachmann's version, *nota* now seems to be quite pointless.

My suggestion is that *tenebant* conceals yet another Lucretian use of the old verb *cluere*, which sometimes serves in *D.R.N.* as a virtual synonym of *esse*.[3] Read:

> denique nota vagis silvestria templa *cluebant* / nympharum…

'Again, the woodland shrines of the nymphs became known to them as they wandered about.…' For *cluere* with *notus*, cf. 2.351, 'quod posse videmus / nec minus atque homines inter se nota cluere' ('…to be known among themselves' = 'to be distinguishable from one another'). The corruption of *cluebant* to *tenebant* would not have been difficult in minuscule script, especially considering the close proximity of *tem-* ('templa cluebant').

Without any distracting reference to settling or habitation, the mention of the nymphs' woodland shrines fits more closely with the central theme of lines 945ff., the variety of watery resources which were available to the primitive people: the shrines became known to them in their wanderings, and they were then aware of additional sources of water; they knew that from those shrines of the nymphs streams of water flowed, washing rocks…(949f., 'quibus e scibant umori' fluenta / lubrica…lavere umida saxa…').[4]

Penn State University   ARCHIBALD ALLEN

[3] It occurs nine times elsewhere in the poem (1.119, 449, 480, 580; 2.351, 525, 791; 3.207; 4.53). On its synonymity with *esse*, cf. Munro on 1.119, '*cluerent*, a favourite archaism of Lucr. = sometimes *audio*, sometimes simply *sum*', and 1.449, '*cluent* is almost the same as *sunt*, as often in Lucr.', and Kenney on 3.207, '*cluebit = erit*'.

[4] I should like to thank Dr Heyworth and an anonymous reader for helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this note.

OCTAVIAN IN THE FOURTH GEORGIC

> Caesar dum magnus ad altum
> fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentis
> per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.
>
> (Virgil, *Georgics* 4.560–2)

Some scholars have seen in 'fulminat' an allusion to Callimachus' βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός (fr. 1.20 Pfeiffer), and that is reasonable enough,[1] since Virgil

[1] It might be objected that 'fulminat' ('hurls lightning') is not the same as βροντᾶν. But I doubt whether the meteorological difference is significant. Both activities are primarily characteristic of Zeus; in Latin the application of both 'fulmino' and 'tono'/'intono' may be extended to human beings. If, as I shall suggest, Virgil's 'fulminat' in *Georgics* 4.561 is based upon Rhianus fr. 1.13 ἶca Διὶ βρομέει, that would tell against Mynors' remark in his *Georgics* commentary ad loc., 'It would be a mistake to see an allusion here to Jupiter the thunder-god.' Some have also wished to connect Virgil's mention of the Euphrates with Callimachus' 'Assyrian River' (*hymn* 2.108). I am not wholly convinced that the link is significant, despite the fact that in both passages (and in *Georgics* 1.509) the river is placed six lines before the end of the poem or book. Suggestion of progress to, and potentially beyond, the Euphrates shows the intoxicating influence of Alexander the Great, which is as apparent in Ptolemy III Euergetes' lost inscription from Adulis (*OGIS* 54, transcribed by Cosmas Indicopleustes in the sixth century), lines 13ff. κυριεύcαc δὲ τῆc τε ἐντὸc Εὐφράτου χώραc…(17) καὶ τοὺc μονάρχουc τοὺc ἐν τοῖc τόποιc πάντατ ὑπηκόουc καταcτήcαc διέβη τὸν Εὐφράτην ποταμὸν καὶ τὴν Μεcοποταμίαν καὶ Βαβυλωνίαν καὶ Couciανὴν καὶ Περcίδα καὶ Μηδίαν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν πᾶcαν ἕωc Βακτριανῆc ὑφ' ἑαυτῶι ποιηcάμενοc κτλ., as it is obvious in *Georgics* 2.171–2 'qui nunc extremis Asiae iam