

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 Olympos.

(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 *ἴσα 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. *κυριεύσας δὲ τῆς τε ἐντὸς Εὐφράτου χώρας... (17) καὶ τοὺς μονάρχους τοὺς ἐν τοῖς τόποις πάντας ὑπηκόους καταστήσας διέβη τὸν Εὐφράτην ποταμὸν καὶ τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν καὶ Βαβυλωνίαν καὶ Σουσιανὴν καὶ Περσίδα καὶ Μηδίαν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν πᾶσαν ἕως Βακτριανῆς ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ ποιησάμενος κτλ.*, as it is obvious in *Georgics* 2.171-2 'qui nunc extremis Asiae iam

contrasts the warlike fulminations of Octavian² with mocking disparagement of his own very different lifestyle (563–4 ‘illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat | Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti’). But it may have escaped attention³ that Virgil seems to be imitating some lines by another Hellenistic poet, Rhianus (mid to late third century B.C.); the parallel has thought-provoking implications. In fr. 1.9ff. Powell Rhianus describes the man to whom the gods have given wealth and rule over many (9–10 ὁς δὲ κεν εὐοχθήσει, θεὸς δ’ ἐπὶ ὄλβον ὀπάξει | καὶ πολυκοιρανίην). Such a one forgets that he treads the earth and is born of mortal parents (10–11 ἐπιλήθεται οὐνεκα γαίαν | ποσσὶν ἐπιστείβει θνητοὶ δέ οἱ εἰς τὸ κῆρ). Furthermore (13–16)

ἴσα Διὶ βρομέει, κεφαλὴν δ’ ὑπέραυχον ἀνίσχει,
καίπερ ἔων ὀλίγος, μᾶται δ’ εὐπηχυν Ἀθήνην,
ἦέ τιν’ ἀτραπιτὸν τεκμαίρεται Οὐλυμπόνδε
ὡς κε μετ’ ἀθανάτοιцин ἀριθμὸς εἰλαπινάξει.

There is a double similarity to the Fourth Georgic within the space of three lines. In both passages the subject is a powerful ruler, who thunders (hurls lightning) and has designs on Olympus. While the ascent to the sky is a commonplace in both languages,⁴ the verbal resemblances between ἀτραπιτὸν τεκμαίρεται Οὐλυμπόνδε and ‘viamque adfectat Olympo’ could hardly be closer. In particular, Virgil’s ‘adfectat’ (562) is an excellent counterpart to Rhianus’ τεκμαίρεται (15). The Greek verb here seems to mean ‘he plans for himself’, although LSJ recognize the sense ‘settle with oneself, i.e. design, purpose to do’ only when linked to an infinitive.⁵ As for ‘adfectat’, OLD s.v. *affecto* 1 translates the verb (when connected to *viam* or *iter*) ‘to try to accomplish, set out on, attempt (a journey etc.)’. Conington (on our passage) commented ‘The sense is apparently nearly = “ingredi viam”, though in one or two passages it seems to denote rather purpose than even an early stage of accomplishment.’

Caution is necessary in the interpretation of Rhianus fr. 1 Powell. It seems very unlikely that the 21 hexameters represent a complete poem.⁶ We do not know whether

victor in oris | imbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum’. The last passage, if taken literally, would put Octavian not (as in reality) in Syria, but in the region of Bactria (Afghanistan). If one looks for a grain of historical fact lying behind the reference to the Indians, it might be sought in one of the numerous Indian embassies which came to Augustus (see Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.12.56, citing *Res Gestae* 31.1 ‘ad me ex India regum legationes saepe missae sunt’). The Romans could have chosen to interpret such an embassy as making an offer of submission. As for Ptolemy III, W. Dittenberger, the editor of *OGIS* 54 (ad loc., n. 22) comments ‘Aliquantum igitur certe ultra Babylona ad orientem processit rex...; sane regiones...enumeratas vix omnes adiit, cum non improbabile sit earum incolas plerosque sua sponte in deditionem venisse’—compare ‘victorque volentis | per populos dat iura’ (*Georgics* 4.561–2).

² In the east from August 30 B.C. (when he formally entered Alexandria) until the autumn of 29 (cf. *Georgics* 2.170–2).

³ The parallel is not noted by Mynors or Thomas in their commentaries on the *Georgics*, nor by M. Kokolakis in his booklet *Ῥιανὸς ὁ Κρήσις* (Athens, 1968). Kokolakis does refer to O. Weinreich, ‘Zu Virgils vierter Ecloge, Rhianus und Nonnos’ (*Hermes* 67 [1932], 359–63), but the latter is mainly concerned with the ending of the Fourth Eclogue, and makes no mention of the Fourth Georgic.

⁴ The earliest example in Latin poetry lies in the words which Ennius (*Varia* 23–4 Vahlen²) gave to Scipio Africanus, ‘si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est, | mi soli caeli maxima porta patet’. No doubt we shall in due course be able to consult a full note on Horace, *Odes* 3.2.21–2 ‘Virtus, recludens immeritis mori | caelum, negata temptat iter via’.

⁵ Among other senses LSJ s.v. τεκμαίρομαι also give ‘assign, ordain, esp. of the gods’, and generally of any person in authority, ‘appoint, arrange’, quoting *Od.* 10.563 ἄλλην δ’ ἡμιν ὁδὸν τεκμήρατο Κίρκη.

⁶ This possibility is rightly rejected by Kokolakis (n. 3, above), p. 8.

they are spoken by the poet in his own person or by a character in one of his poems, nor whether the context is contemporary or set in the past. But even if the setting belonged to a previous generation, it seems probable that Rhianus' first readers would think of contemporary ruler cult.⁷ The tone is uncompromisingly hostile to the ruler, who acts *ὑπεροπλήμι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῆμι νόοιο* (line 12); Rhianus, unlike most Hellenistic poets, is not known to have been associated with any royal court.

If the allusion to Rhianus is accepted, one may wonder whether anything of the earlier poet's unfavourable tone should be read into what Virgil says about Octavian. The Latin verb 'adfectare' can (though not when coupled with 'viam' or 'iter') indicate overweening or impious ambition, and indeed may be used in just such a context as this (Ovid, *Met.* 1.152 'adfectasse ferunt regnum caeleste Gigantas').⁸ This alternative sense of the verb would perhaps be felt under the surface, recalling to Virgil's more learned readers the tone of Rhianus' passage and adding a certain astringency⁹ to the description of Octavian's activity, parallel to the hypocritical belittling of Virgil's own pursuits (564, 'studiis florentem ignobilis oti'). At the same time Virgil stresses that Octavian's subjects willingly accept his rule (561 'volentis')¹⁰ and that he rules them with justice (562 'dat iura').¹¹

A final question: we may allow that Virgil has read all the Hellenistic poetry available to us (and a great deal that is now lost), but how wide was knowledge of Rhianus at Rome in the period of the *Georgics*? No evidence survives in the way of testimonia or clear imitations.¹² Although Rhianus seems to have been a relatively

⁷ That is the common view, and probably correct, though challenged by Kokolakis (n. 3, above), pp. 28ff., to whom I assented in *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 699. 'Forgetting that his parents are mortal' (Rhianus line 11) might cover rulers who deified their parents (e.g. the Ptolemies) as well as those (e.g. Alexander the Great, Seleucus I) who claimed that their real father was not a mortal but an Olympian god. Aspiring to marry a goddess (Rhianus line 14), while characteristic of blasphemers in general, was also ascribed to rulers of the fourth century B.C. and later, e.g. the Thracian Cotys, who according to Theopompus (*F.Gr.Hist.* 115 F 31) *δείπνον κατεσκεύαζεν... ὡς γαμουμένης αὐτῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ θάλαμον κατασκευάσας ἀνέμενεν μεθύων τὴν θεόν*. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrept.* 4.54.6 writes of Demetrius Poliorcetes *γάμος ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων αὐτῷ ὁ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἡἱρεπιζέτο*.

⁸ There is also *Amores* 3.8.51–2 'qua licet, affectas caelum quoque: templa Quirinus, | Liber et Alcides et modo Caesar habent'. E. J. Kenney brackets the couplet as spurious in both editions of his OCT; J. C. McKeown (to judge from his text—we await the commentary) considers it genuine.

⁹ Such astringency (which may be considered Callimachean, if one thinks of the *Lock of Berenice*) can perhaps be detected in other addresses to Octavian in the *Georgics*. For example in 1.31 'teque sibi generum Tethys emat omnibus undis': it is in normal circumstances blasphemy for a mortal ruler to woo a goddess (see n. 7 above on wooing Athena in Rhianus), but Octavian is so desirable a bridegroom that Tethys will offer an enormous dowry to secure him as her son-in-law. Or 2.171–2 (see n. 1 above): as has been observed since antiquity, if the Indian is so unwarlike, he does not need much deterring; and if he is so far away, he could hardly threaten the 'Romanae arces' (the Seven Hills of Rome, see Mynors ad loc. and on 2.535).

¹⁰ Compare Callimachus, *hymn* 4.167 *οὐκ ἀέκουσα Μακρῶν κοιρανέεσθαι* (the realm of Ptolemy II Philadelphus).

¹¹ The phrase nearly always has favourable implications (e.g. *Aen.* 8.670 'his dantem iura Catonem').

¹² Francis Cairns, *Tibullus: a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 60, quotes Rhianus fr. 1.10–16 in connexion with Tib. 1.3, but he recognizes that any link is tenuous. One might try to argue that the myth of Apollo in love with Admetus at Tib. 2.3.11ff. comes from Rhianus, who, according to Schol. Eur. *Alc.* 2 (not necessarily wrong if Callimachus' Second Hymn belongs to the reign of Euergetes, as stated by the scholiast on line 26) was responsible for that version (fr. 10 Powell). But Tibullus is more likely to have derived the erotic motivation from Callimachus (*hymn* 2.49).

simple and straightforward poet, I suspect that he was less well-known at Rome in the triumphal period than the much more formidable Euphorion (admired by Cornelius Gallus), let alone Callimachus. The position would probably have been different in the next generation, from which we have two indications (perhaps connected) of Roman interest in Rhianus. Together with Euphorion and Parthenius, Rhianus was one of the favourite poets of Tiberius Caesar, who saw to it that their works were available in public libraries and stimulated scholarly writings, dedicated to himself, on these poets (Suetonius, *Tib.* 10.2). Secondly, when Manilius catalogues the subjects which he does not intend to treat, and includes among them 'annosa... Messenes bella nocentis' (3.14), he surely alludes to the most famous poem by Rhianus (at least among the Greeks), his epic *Messeniaca*.¹³

Keble College, Oxford

A. S. HOLLIS¹⁴

¹³ cf. Pausanias, 4.6.3 'Ριανῶι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσιν οὐδὲν Ἀριστομένης ἔστιν ἀφανέστερος ἢ Ἀχιλλεύς ἐν Ἰλιάδι Ὀμήρῳι. The fragments of the *Messeniaca* in Powell (nos. 49–55) are nearly all geographical references from Steph. Byz. But the anonymous papyrus, *Suppl. Hell.* 946–7, is very plausibly ascribed to this poem (with less confidence also *SH* 923) and allows us to gain some impression of the overall style (largely Homericizing, similar to that of fr. 1 Powell).

¹⁴ I am grateful to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet and to the Editors for comments on earlier drafts of this note.

PROPERTIUS AND 'COAN PHILITAS'

This is our well received text of Propertius' celebrated address to the shades of Callimachus and Philitas at 3.1.1–2:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.

Well received it may be, but scholarly worries and disagreements about the precise meaning of *sacra*, and indeed about the real purpose of the address, perhaps have diverted editors' eyes from a possible corruption. I would like to suggest that the pairing of ethnic adjective and personal name, *Coi* and *Philitae*, in line 1 may not be Propertian.¹

In general, of course, the use of 'Coan' with personal names is quite unobjectionable; cf. e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 12.18 'Cous...Amyntas' and Ov. *Ars* 3.401 'Cous Apelles'. In the case of Philitas, however, the practice of Latin elegy would seem to require that when 'Coan' is used 'Philitas' is not used; he is then the 'Coan poet' or simply the 'Coan': antonomasia appears to be the rule.² Thus Ovid speaks of the 'Coan poet' at *Ars* 3.329,

sit tibi Callimachi, sit Coi nota poetae,
sit quoque vinosi Teia musa senis,

and twice of the 'Coan', at *Rem.* 760,

Callimachum fugito, non est inimicus amori,
et cum Callimacho tu quoque, Coe, noces,

and *Trist.* 1.6.2,

nec tantum Clario est Lyde dilecta poetae
nec tantum Coe Bittis amata suo est.

¹ Let me thank Dr S. J. Heyworth for helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this note.

² On antonomasia in Latin poetry, and its precedents in Greek poetry, see J. Farrell, *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (Oxford, 1991), 27ff.