

dew is peculiar to the Greek point of view'.²³ Thus, Catulus' etymology of the name *Roscius* may arguably be based on a perceived similarity between dew and a *παῖς καλός* of the sort that Roscius conspicuously was. The common etymon linking Aurora and Roscius would then extend beyond mere nomenclature and would reflect an actual association of dew not only with dawn, but also with youth and innocence. In any case, even if the perception of the young Roscius as *roscidus* was 'peculiar to the Greek point of view', no Roman of his day would have been more receptive to such a view than would Q. Lutatius Catulus.

Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio

CLIFFORD WEBER

²³ E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus: 'Agamemnon'* (Oxford, 1950), II 83; see also J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New York and Oxford, 1991), p. 145, n. 194 ('dewiness is frequently associated by the Greeks with freshness and innocence').

CATULLUS 61.90-6

talis in vario solet	
divitis domini hortulo	
stare flos hyacinthinus.	
sed moraris, abit dies.	90
<prodeas nova nupta.>	
prodeas nova nupta, si	92
iam videtur, et audias	
nostra verba. viden? faces	
aureas quatiant comas:	95
prodeas nova nupta.	

As the majority of the editors read the text of Catullus 61.90-6, it contains a couple of emendations, among which the most significant is the addition of the line *prodeas nova nupta* after v.90 in order to complete the strophe.

The presence of the refrain *abit dies: prodeas nova nupta* in the 22nd and the 24th strophes makes it quite obvious that the 19th strophe must also conclude with *prodeas nova nupta*. The corruption can be easily explained by haplography. But on the other hand there are some oddities. Firstly, those concerning the refrain. The last line of the 19th and the first seven syllables of the 20th strophe become identical; this is unique in poem 61. Nowhere else does the last line of a strophe and the first line of the following strophe have more than one word in common:

- a) vv.81/2: *flet* quod ire necesse est.
 flere desine...
- b) vv.193/4: perge, ne *remorare*.
 non diu *remoratus es*.
- c) vv.203/4: multa milia *ludi*.
 ludite ut lubet,...

Normally the refrains occur periodically in poem 61:

- a) str.(1), 8, 10, 12
- b) str.13, 14, 15
- c) str.(25), 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38

The refrain *prodeas nova nupta*, on the other hand, occurs in str.19, 20, 22, 24¹.

¹ This refrain cannot be supplied at the end of str.16, because it would introduce a second person between the transmitted third persons *adest* and *flet*.

But there are also some peculiarities in the 20th strophe itself. To begin with the refrain: those refrains that occur repeatedly are normally identical. There are only two instances of slight variation:

a) str.13/14:	...at potest te volente. quis huic deo compararier ausit?	63/68
str.15:	...at queat te volente...	73
b) str.19	sed moraris, abit dies ⟨prodeas nova nupta.⟩	90
str.22/24:	...sed abit dies prodeas nova nupta.	105/112
but str.20:	aureas quatiant comas: prodeas nova nupta.	95

Such a considerable variation of the refrain as in the 20th strophe is unique in the poem.

Then the first seven syllables and the last line of str.20 are, for no particular reason, identical, and this feature too does not appear anywhere in 61. Finally vv.94b/95 are conspicuously similar to vv.77b/78.

Obviously vv.92–6 is one of the least expressive passages in 61; and it does not contribute anything to the train of thought. As Kroll² says: 'Diese Strophe wiederholt fast nur schon gebrauchte Wendungen.' Precisely where the text does not repeat from elsewhere in 61, i.e. in *si iam videtur, et audias / nostra verba*, it appears most prosaic and lacking in direction. Hence the variety of interpretations: Ellis³ calls *si iam videtur* 'a gentle rebuke for delaying'; Fordyce⁴ comments: '*iam* adds a touch of impatience to the normal polite formula'; Syndikus:⁵ 'Scheinbar unpoetische Ausdrücke wie *viden ut* oder *si iam videtur* sollen der Rede einen lebhaften Ton verleihen bzw. als Höflichkeitsfloskel des urbanen Gesprächs den Eindruck einer allzu großen, also wenig passenden Nähe zur Braut vermeiden.' Fedeli⁶ calls *si iam videtur* 'a polite formula peculiar to the most refined familiar language'. The problem with this expression is its level of style, which does not fit the context.⁷ The only other example of *si videtur* is Plaut. *Capt.* 218, and of *si iam videtur* there is no other example.

Et audias nostra verba, which according to Fedeli 'belongs to the language of prayer', is completely redundant. Catullus seems to use it only as a filler. Moreover *prodeas...et audias nostra verba* must be a hysteron proteron, since the other conceivable assumption that the point of the bride's appearance is presented as to listen to Catullus's songs does not make sense, as is clearly shown by the other three places where *prodeas nova nupta* occurs—especially the 22nd and the 24th strophe. Only Scaliger⁸ has thought *si iam videtur* problematic: 'Quum Catullus dixerit paulo ante nuptam nimium morari, quare nunc illam vult prodire sub ea conditione, modo illi ita videatur?' However, his outlandish conjecture (*sis—iam uidetur*) is as unconvincing as the modern explanations of the passage. One obviously has to think of another way of making the text acceptable.

² W. Kroll, *C. Valerius Catullus* (Stuttgart,⁵ 1968), ad loc.

³ R. Ellis, *A commentary on Catullus* (Oxford, 1889), ad loc.

⁴ C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford, 1961), ad loc.

⁵ H. P. Syndikus, *Catull: Eine Interpretation, Zweiter Teil* (Darmstadt, 1990), p. 32.

⁶ P. Fedeli, *Catullus' carmen 61* (Amsterdam, 1983), p. 74.

⁷ Cf. Fedeli ad loc.: 'The words *si videtur* (*videbitur*) are actually found, besides Plautus (*Capt.* 218), in polite expressions of some of Cicero's correspondents...and in a letter from Fronto to Marcus Aurelius (*Epist.* 84.6 van den Hout).'

⁸ I cite from the 1680 Utrecht Variorum edition.

Verses 92–6 look much like an interpolation of the kind which Tarrant⁹ 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
Universität Bonn

BERNHARD GEORG

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*.