

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLII

HELSINKI 2008

INDEX

LUIGI ARATA	<i>Impieghi del λιβυστικόν nella medicina greca antica Una possibile identificazione della pianta</i>	9
DAVID J. BUTTERFIELD	<i>Supplementa Lucretiana</i>	17
VIRGINIA L. CAMPBELL	<i>Stopping to Smell the Roses: Garden Tombs in Roman Italy</i>	31
MAURIZIO COLOMBO	<i>I soprannomi trionfali di Costantino: una revisione critica della cronologia corrente</i>	45
RAMÓN GUTIÉRREZ GONZÁLEZ	<i>A Note on Juvenal 11,156: pupillares testiculi</i>	65
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Julia Kallitekno and Gaius Caesar at Euromus</i>	69
PETER KRUSCHWITZ	<i>CIL VIII 19 Revisited</i>	77
CHRISTIAN LAES	<i>Learning from Silence: Disabled Children in Roman Antiquity</i>	85
TUOMO LANKILA	<i>Proclus' Art of Referring with a Scale of Epithet</i>	123
AVGI-ANNA MAGGEL	<i>The Invention of a Deceptive Dialogue: Reconsidering the False-Merchant scene in Sophocles' Philoctetes</i>	135
ANNA REINIKKA	<i>On the Attribution of a Latin Schoolgrammar Transmitted in MS Clm 6281</i>	147
RONALD T. RIDLEY	<i>Gaetano de Sanctis and the Missing Storia dei Romani</i>	159
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Some Observations on the Use of the Pronoun hic haec hoc in Latin Inscriptions</i>	181
KAJ SANDBERG	<i>The So-Called Division of the Roman Empire in AD 39 Notes on a Persistent Theme in Modern Historiography</i>	199
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXLIV–CCLI</i>	215

JAANA VAAHTERA	<i>On Grammatical Gender in Ancient Linguistics – The Order of Genders</i>	247
DAVID WOODS	<i>Tiberius, Tacfarinas, and the Jews</i>	267
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	285
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	343
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	347
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	355

SVPPLEMENTA LVCRETIANA

DAVID J. BUTTERFIELD

The text of Lucretius' *de rerum natura* as preserved in the three ninth-century mss of the work, O Q GV(U),¹ is manifestly lacunose. Although there is no scope for certainty for modern critics with regard to the restoration of verses lost *in toto*, considerably greater degrees of plausibility can be attained with regard to line-internal lacunae. In such instances, a word or more of a given line has been lost owing to physical damage to a manuscript in the tradition,² the accidental repetition or anticipation of other elements in the verse or its immediate vicinity, or simple scribal omission of a word. The purpose of this article is not to offer a full-scale analysis of Lucretian lacunae but rather to discuss those line-internal instances where I believe that there is scope for disagreement with the vulgate supplement. I shall treat the passages sequentially.

1,217–18: *nam si quid mortale <e> cunctis partibus esset,*
 ex oculis res quaeque repente erepta periret.

217 <e> *suppl.* L: *om.* OQG

The sense demanded is 'if anything were mortal in all its parts', i.e. 'in its parts taken as a whole'. *in* would provide a more natural Lucretian expression than the partitive use of *e(x)* (cf. the simple use of *in* with *partibus* at 2,1075; 5,147; 5,676 and 5,696). At 1,996, where <e> is the typical supplement (a conjecture

¹ Since I am among those scholars convinced that the Italic mss of Lucretius are not independent witnesses to the tradition, I treat the fifteenth-century codices of the poet simply as a repertory of Renaissance conjectures.

² A fact made particularly evident by the prevalence of textual loss at the close of the verse: cf. 1,748; 1,752; 1,1068–75; 2,331; 2,428; 2,1115; 3,159; 3,538; 3,596; 3,705 (s.v.l.); 3,1061; 4,612 and 5,586.

found in M), I would therefore read *cunctis <in> partibus*, a suggestion preceded by certain Italic mss (and also ascribed to Marullus). Although I have not yet found evidence to the contrary, I find it impossible to believe that I am the first to suggest reading *in* here at 1,217. The apparent palaeographical advantage provided by *e*, viz. that it was lost by haplography after *mortale*, is of little force when it is observed that *in* is lost sixteen times elsewhere in the Lucretian tradition, thirteen without any obvious palaeographical reason.³

1,701–4: *praeterea quare quisquam magis omnia tollat*
 et uelit ardoris naturam relinquere solam,
 quam neget esse ignis, tamen esse relinquat?
 aequa uidetur enim dementia dicere utrumque.

703 summam ante tamen suppl. Itali : quiduis K. Lachmann : ignem O² : aliam Q² : aliud M. Ferguson Smith : om. OQG

The metrically defective 703 has received a large number of supplements, although it should be said at the outset that the marginal corrections in O and Q have no authority, added by readers of the eleventh(?) and fifteenth centuries respectively. Although a number of conjectures are almost certainly off the mark,⁴ most critics are in agreement about the required sense of the missing word (plural words hardly being a plausible option). Lucretius here seeks to attack Heraclitus' monism (treated in 1,635–704), in which fire was posited as the underlying substance of everything, by stating that this is philosophically as foolish as denying that fire exists and instead positing [lacuna]⁵ as the root element. Lucretius' point would here be strongest if the lost word in 703 is as wide as possible in application: the meaning 'anything else' would bear far more weight than a single element, such as earth or water.

³ 1,1078; 2,543; 2,882; 2,1102; 3,391; 3,438; 3,705; 4,636; 5,142; 5,1009 (if not *im*); 5,1243; 6,1171; the causes of its loss at 1,1078; 3,421 and 6,401 are obvious.

⁴ Among which are W. Everett's unlucretian *istam*, F. Nencini's awkward *eadem* and D. R. Shackleton Bailey's inappropriately narrow *terrae*. C. Bailey rightly observed (*Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Oxford 1947, comm. *ad loc.*) that attempts to introduce another form of *ignis* (*ignis* K. Winckelmann; *ignem* A. G. Roos, after O²) "are due to misunderstanding of the passage".

⁵ *relinquat*, answering to the simplex *linquere* in 702, guarantees that this missing word is the alternative physical element (or elements) posited as the sole fundamental substance of the universe.

Yet what is to be made of the transmitted *ignis* in 703? Some critics have sought to take it as an accusative plural but such a notion of plurality would be unnatural in context, where the singular is regularly employed to denote the substance as a whole (cf., in the immediately preceding verses, 690, 691, 695 and 696). It is therefore more naturally taken as a genitive singular, dependent upon *naturam* in the preceding line (like *ardoris*, with which it is equated). Since Lucretius does not allow metrical 'lengthening' at the caesura, the supplementary word in 703 must be either a spondee or anapaest opening with a consonant, if it is to be placed before *tamen*; if it follows *tamen*, there is scope for further variation. For *ignis* to be taken readily as genitive (with *naturam* supplied from the preceding verse), the missing word in 703 should be either dependent upon *naturam* or in agreement with it. The latter construction strikes me as being considerably neater.

It remains then to offer a feminine accusative singular adjective that can bear the force of 'any at all' (simply 'other' would be too weak). I believe that *quamuis* is this word,⁶ a form of *quiuus*, the indefinite adjective used by Lucretius in some 27 instances elsewhere (*quamuis* itself occurs at 3,516). Although it is accompanied by *alius* eleven times,⁷ it would here naturally bear the pregnant force 'any other at all'. Lachmann came closest to this suggestion with *quiduis* but, as I have argued above, to ensure that genitival *ignis* in the preceding clause is intelligible, agreement with *naturam* is desired.⁸ To turn at last to the *ductus litterarum*, W. A. Merrill objected almost a century ago that "[a]ll of the various stopgaps proposed for this line are palaeographically improbable except *aliam*, the correction of Q".⁹ This is not the case with *quamuis*, the final three letters of which would have borne a close similarity to the end of *ignis* (particularly in minuscule) and thereby easily inspired that most pervasive of scribal errors, the *saut du même au même*.

⁶ Although conjunctive *quamuis* is common in Lucretius, the Roman ear could have been left in no doubt that a part of *quiuus* was here employed. One could compare the more convoluted verse 3,397, where we find *ad uitam quam* (relative adverb) *uis* (noun) *animai*.

⁷ 1,1073; 2,734; 2,782; 2,794; 2,825; 3,516; 3,556; 3,994; 5,369; 5,372 and 6,657.

⁸ If editors are to print *quiduis*, *ignem* ought to be read for *ignis*.

⁹ W. A. Merrill, "Criticism of the Text of Lucretius with Suggestions for its Improvement. Part 1, Books I–III", *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 3 (1916) 1–46, at 7.

2,251–52: *denique si semper motus conectitur omnis
et uetere exoritur nouos ordine certo,*

251 motus FCAB : motu OQGL 252 motu *ante* nouos *suppl.* L. Havet (*ap. A. Ernout*) : motus
F. Bockemüller : semper LFC : porro J.S. Reid: *exacto ante* exoritur Lachmann

There can be no real doubt that the Renaissance restoration of the nominative *motus* for *motu* in 251 is correct. Most critics of the twentieth century have repaired the metrically defective 252 by supplying Havet's *motu* (often wrongly attributed to Bailey) in agreement with *uetere*. They could be right in doing so but, with *motu* so easily understood from the preceding line, we would here expect a more emphatic word. The Italic supplement *semper* is, I believe, semantically appropriate but, because of its presence also in 251, it introduces a weak, rather than a striking, repetition. Perhaps we should read *et uetere exoritur nouos usque ex ordine certo*,¹⁰ thereby bringing *uetere* and *nouos* into closer juxtaposition, and further emphasising the hypothetical unbroken chain of physical atomic collisions. For *ex ordine* in Lucretius, cf. 1,605; 4,370; 4,574; 4,973; 5,418; 5,679 (*ex ordine certo*, as also found at Man. 2,961), and for *usque* in the sense 'continually', cf. 2,530; 2,1046; 3,1080 and 4,374.

2,331–32: *et tamen est quidam locus altis montibus
stare uidentur et in campis consistere fulgor.*

331 unde *post* montibus *suppl.* Itali : om. OQG

There has been no disagreement voiced about the Quattrocento supplement to close 331. Indeed, if we turn to the most recent treatment of the passage, in one of the greatest partial commentaries upon a Classical poet,¹¹ we find that *<unde>* receives only three words of comment: "a certain supplement." The words of the author of the longest Lucretian commentary are equally unequivocal, terming *unde* "a necessary and obvious addition".¹² Although the suggestion could well be correct, I think to accept it as *certissimum* is perhaps a

¹⁰ *et uetere exoritur nouus atque ex ordine certo* is found in A, but any conjunctive particle is certainly unwanted.

¹¹ D. P. Fowler, *Lucretius on Atomic Motion: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura 2.1–332*, Oxford 2002, comm. *ad loc.*

¹² Bailey (above n. 4) comm. *ad loc.*

little rash. For comparison of the most similar passage in Lucretius offers forth an alternative: *quod genus Idaeis fama est e montibus altis / dispersos ignes orienti lumine cerni* (5,663–64). There seems to be no good reason why *ex quo* [sc. *loco*] could not have stood at the close of 331.¹³

2,422–29: *omnis enim, sensus quae mulcet quomque †uidentur†
 haud sine principali aliquo leuore creatast;
 at contra quaequomque molesta atque aspera constat,
 non aliquo sine materiae squalore repertast. 425
 sunt etiam quae iam nec leuia iure putantur
 esse neque omnino flexis mucronibus unca,
 sed magis angellis paulum prostantibus
 titillare magis sensus quam laedere possint.*

422 quomque uidentur (u. *e fin. u.* 421) OQG : q., figura *F.W. Schneidewin* : q. iuuatque *Avancius*¹⁴ : q. uidendo F : q. uidentum *G. Wakefield* : q., tibi res *J.P. Postgate* : q. et alit res *K. Büchner* : quaeque iuuat res *A. Brieger* 428 utqui *ad fin. u. suppl. N.P. Howard (H.A.I. Munrone, qui olim quique coni., idem secum iam cogitante)* : et quae *Itali FC* : quaeque *Lachmann* : unde *Bernays* : ut quae *J. Martin* : usque *E. Orth* : om. OQG 429 possint O : possunt QG

There are two supplements that I wish to discuss in this passage, the last words of 422 and 428. It is clear in the first instance that the final three (or four) syllables of the line have been ousted by the nonsensical repetition of *uidentur*, which closes the preceding verse (421). It is equally obvious that *omnis* must qualify a new noun: it cannot here function on its own (unlike *omne*) nor could *species* (cf. *specie* in 421) serve as a suitable subject in agreement with it, *quae... quomque* later in the line and *quaequomque* in 424. The earlier proposal of *Avancius* can therefore be disregarded, as can the *prima facie* neat suggestions of F and *Wakefield*; equally inappropriate is *Avancius'* later

¹³ *e(x)* is also used in connection with mountains of the falling of water (1,283; 1,1085 (1086) and 5,946); *de* is employed at 4,1020 and 6,735.

¹⁴ In his Aldine Lucretius (Venice 1500); two years later, however, amidst the Lucretian emendations offered at the close of the Aldine Catullus (Venice 1502, at F2^v–4^v), he suggested *causa iuuatque*, a suggestion typically attributed to Marullus (who perhaps read *mulctat* for *mulcet*). *uidentur* was impossibly retained by the first three printed editions of the poet (Brescia 1473, Verona 1486, Venice 1495).

introduction of *causa* (see below n. 14), which renders 423 unintelligible. Schneidewin's *figura* has been widely accepted by editors without any extended argument given in its support. Yet, in the present section of the work, *figura*, used specifically to describe the atomic structure of a given element, does not elsewhere stand alone as the cause of sensory perception (cf. 385, 409, 480, 484). Verses 408–9 demonstrate clearly this subordinate use of *figura*: *omnia postremo bona sensibus et mala tactu / dissimili inter se pugnant perfecta figura*. Further, the use of *principiali* ('pertaining to its *principia*') in 423 implies a contrast between the thing at the macroscopic (i.e. visible) level and at the microscopic (i.e. atomic) level. It is more natural therefore that our missing subject in 422 refers to 'every object' taken as a whole rather than their specific atomic structures. *res*, first suggested by Brieger, is therefore the most natural word to supply (*omnis res* equating to *omnia*).

As to what precedes this final monosyllable, Postgate's *tibi res*, though metrically unproblematic,¹⁵ will hardly do: the dative awkwardly narrows the sense data to the second person, itself out of place amidst the first person plural pronouns and pronominal adjectives in the vicinity (*nostris / sensibus* 406–7, *nobis... tactus* 433, *nobis* 444).¹⁶ I am much more taken by the suggestion of the prolific Emil Orth, which seems apparently forgotten: *hominis res*.¹⁷ Nonetheless, the singular *hominis* is puzzling and the suggestion can undoubtedly be improved by reading *hominum res*; explicit statement of the 'senses of men' is particularly appropriate in this context, since Lucretius was acutely aware of how different living creatures can have widely differing responses to the same sense data. We can aptly compare his writing *in nares*

¹⁵ The Lucretian hexameter often closes with an iambic word followed by a monosyllable, a practice that the Augustan poets strove to banish from their typical usage. With regard to textual lacunae, an instance of this rhythm is restored by providing a supplementary verb at 3,453 (*claudicat ingenium, delirat lingua, mens*), where Lachmann's *labat* is typically read before *mens*. Future editors, however, could consider introducing *furit*, 'raves', a stronger climax to the verbal tricolon.

¹⁶ It is therefore surprising that Postgate's conjecture has been accepted by Martin (who persisted in attributing it to himself), W. H. D. Rouse and E. Flores (the last, incidentally, conjectured *q. et iuuat res* at 422, *metro uementer repugnante*)

¹⁷ Conjectured in his "Lucretiana", *Helmantica* 11 (1960) 121–34, at 129. Orth there provides no argument beyond stating "omnis res quae sensus hominis mulcet... ita sententia construi debet".

hominum just above at 2,415. For the rhythm at line end, cf. *homini res* at 6,781; monosyllabic forms of *res* close the Lucretian hexameter in 46 other instances.¹⁸

We come now to the final word, or words, of 428. Unfortunately, there is discrepancy between O and QG as to whether *possint* or *possunt* respectively should be read in 429. Evidently ψ , the parent of QG, transcribed the reading of the archetype as *possunt*, O (almost certainly an immediate descendant of the archetype) as *possint*; a double lection existing in the exemplar is unlikely. On the principle of *utrum in alterum abiturum erat?*, and to provide a more natural development to the argument, the subjunctive in a subordinate clause seems more probable. We should therefore follow the most faithful of our extant mss in reading *possint*, as most previous editors have indeed done, and accordingly supply a subordinating conjunction at the close of 428.¹⁹ A moment's thought offers forth consecutive *ut* as the most natural option, which can conveniently occupy the first syllable of the final foot. Lucretius does use an intensified form of *ut*, namely *ut qui*,²⁰ at 1,755, 2,17 and 3,738 (s.v.l.), and it was conjectured in the present passage by the elusive N. P. Howard.²¹ He could be right, although as Bailey rightly objects (above n. 4, comm. *ad loc.*), the sense 'so that they can' would be "a little too teleological". Martin's *ut quae* is a slight improvement, although there is no parallel for the precise collocation in Lucretius. Perhaps Lucretius wrote *ut sic*, a pairing used in the desired sense ('so [=with the result that] thus') at 1,1011?

¹⁸ Punctuation need not be added after *hominum*, with *res* being an example of the introduction of the nominal subject of the sentence's primary verb within the subordinate clause.

¹⁹ It cannot be denied that the purely conjunctive suggestion *et quae* of certain Italic manuscripts, or Lachmann's *quaeque*, creates a rather plain expression. Worse still is Wakefield's solecistic *ac quae*, a conjecture made upon the misleading and nonsensical *aeque* found in the *ed. Veron.* and *ed. Ven.* (the *ed. Brix.* neglected to provide any supplement; for these three editions see above n. 14).

²⁰ It is probable that Lucretius regarded the collocation as two distinct words.

²¹ See N. P. Howard and H. A. J. Munro, "On Lucretius", *JPh* 1 (1868) 113–45, at 118–21; Munro records (*T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Cambridge 1886⁴, comm. *ad loc.*) that he had "intended to give [*utqui*] in [2,428 and 3,738], before [he] received Mr Howard's letter".

2,1168–69: tristis item uetulae uitis sator atque †fatigat†
temporis incusat momen saeclumque fatigat.

1168 fatigat (*e* 1169) OQV : uietae *N. Heinsius* : caducae *Merrill* : putator *F. Olivier* :
uaciuae *Orth* : minutae *K. Müller* : putrentis *A. García Calvo* 1169 momen *Pius* : nomen
OQG saeclumque OQ : caelumque *Wakefield*

There has been almost no dissent from Heinsius' tentative replacement for *fatigat* of 1168, a manifestly accidental anticipation of the close of the following verse.²² Heinsius was right to discern that the structure of the verse most naturally requires a second adjective at the close of 1168 in agreement with *uitis*.²³ His *uietae*, typically taken as 'shrivelled' or 'wrinkled', has been widely accepted into the text, despite the inherent uncertainty of the passage. However, a lengthy objection to the suggestion was made by F. Olivier,²⁴ who went so far as to declare that *uietae* was a "conjecture de savant latiniste, parfaitement ignorant des choses de la terre". His primary objection was that *uietus* (a deverbial adjective < *uiere*) has the primary sense of 'pliant' or 'supple' (and by extension 'bent out of shape', 'wrinkled'), a term which can never be applied to a vine, which is rigid at any age. He therefore believed that a noun more suited to the context had been lost and offered *putator*, 'pruner', 'trimmer'.²⁵ Although I agree that the force of *uietus* is potentially problematic, and not supported by a clear parallel in Latin literature, I do not find Olivier's introduction of another noun suited to either the sense or the rhythm of the line: for the singular verbs of the passage we do not desire a second, yet more specific agent noun.

However, the adjectival conjectures in the wake of Heinsius that I have come across – *caducae*, *uaciuae*, *minutae*, *putrentis* – will appeal to few. From the two closing verses of the Book (*nec tenet omnia paulatim tabescere et ire / ad scopulum, spatio aetatis defessa uetusto* 1173–74) it is clear that Lucretius

²² Prior to Heinsius' suggestion, the verse was either retained with *fatigat* (sometimes reading *uiti* for *uitis*) or, in accordance with the widespread critical method, condemned as spurious.

²³ The suggestion can be found in his posthumous *Adversaria* (P. Burman [ed.], Leiden 1742, 455). Nonetheless, Munro, who owned Heinsius' copy of the second Gifanius edition (Leiden 1595; now in the Wren Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, Adv.d.13.3) reports that Heinsius also suggested in his margin *uietae* (for *uetulae*)... *senectae*, on account of the scansion *uiētus* attested by Hor. *Ep.* 12,7 (cf. Munro [above n. 21] app. crit. *ad loc.*).

²⁴ F. Olivier, "En relisant Lucrèce", *MH* 10 (1953) 39–67, at 47.

²⁵ Cf. Lucretius' sole use of the adjective at 3,385 of a spider's web, a structure of remarkable strength and pliancy for its size.

seeks to outline the decay to the point of death of the world's organisms. Accordingly, I believe that the second adjective should compound this idea of natural decay. Nonetheless, a methodical search of metrically possible trisyllabic adjectives (or quatrissylic, with initial vowels or *h*-) yields no probable candidate.²⁶ It therefore seems very likely to me that *atque* is a metrical repair of *ac*: once a scribe had written *satorac*, it is possible that his eyes returned to *seclumat* in the line below, thereby copying *que fatigat* prematurely.²⁷ With this change made, we can insert a highly appropriate adjective, *moribundae*: the farmer rebukes his old and dying vine without knowing that its decrepit state is a necessary part of the natural course of the world's decay.²⁸ Like *uetulus*, *moribundus* is mostly used of humans (cf. Lucr. 3,129; 3,232; 3,542; 3,653; 3,1033) but Ps.-Quintilian provides a parallel of its use of a plant, i.e. corn (*decl.* 12,4). The two adjectives add an apt anthropomorphic element to the dying vines, starkly contrasted with *uineta... laeta* of 1157.²⁹

3,1060–62: *exit saepe foras magnis ex aedibus ille,* 1060
esse domi quem pertaesumst, subitoque
quippe foris nilo melius qui sentiat esse.

1061 per quem OQ : *corr.* Itali reuertit post subitoque P. Leto : reuentat FC : reuertens Pontanus : reuisit K.W.F. Proll : adamat rus F. Polle : rebetit Nencini : remigrat Merrill : recurrit uel resistit Orth : om. OQ

In this striking passage, Lucretius provides a satirical portrait of the wealthy man that can never be satisfied by his location and dashes back to the city as

²⁶ The least inappropriate would be *senentis* (< *senere*, attested in Pacuvius, Accius and Catullus); the semantically similar *senilis* and *uetustae* would lack close parallels for their use of plants.

²⁷ Alternatively, the scribe was more careless and instead simply wrote the last word of the following line without any palaeographical motivation: a later scribe or reader would therefore naturally have corrected *ac* before *fatigat* to its trochaic byform.

²⁸ *moribundae* is more probable than the comparatively weak *morientis* (or, e.g. *atque obientis*), which would also deprive the line of its leonine rhythm, so often employed by Lucretius.

²⁹ A monosyllable followed by a quadrisyllabic word is not an unlucretian rhythm: cf. 1,68; 1,182; 1,1033; 2,483; 3,949; 4,347 (322); 4,720; 4,759; 4,979; 4,1217; 4,1246; 5,479; 5,929; 5,1228; 6,1009, 6,1025. Nonetheless, owing to the proclitic semantics of *ac*, the pairing *ac moribundae* would be treated as a single unit and words of Adonean shape close the work's hexameters very frequently.

soon as he left it for the countryside. It is clear that the missing element at the close of 1061 is a verb to parallel *exit* of 1060, denoting his return back to the city, for which 1062 provides his misguided reasoning. Pomponio Leto's simple *reuertit*, long attributed to Politian, has found wide favour. But it would perhaps be more striking for Lucretius to say that he 'goes back' at once, rather than merely 'turns round/back'. Proll's case against the use of intransitive, active *reuertere* in Lucretius is worth considering,³⁰ notwithstanding the fact that 5,1153 seems to provide a sufficient parallel for the usage (though it is also bolstered by a prepositional clause with *ad*). Orth's *recurrat* is the most striking of the suggestions above and deserves a place in the apparatus. A more emphatic alternative perhaps worth consideration is *refert se*, the simple *refert* more closely answering *exit* of 1060.³¹ Reflexive *se* is no stranger at the close of the Lucretian hexameter.³²

4,98–101: *postremo speculis in aqua splendoreque in omni*
 quaequomque apparent nobis simulacra, necessest,
 quandoquidem simili specie sunt praedita rerum, 100
 †*ex† imaginibus missis consistere eorum.*

401 ex OQ : *exin* H. Purmann : *ex ea* H. Lotze : *excita* F (*ac Lachmann suo Marte*) : *extima* Munro

The text of 4,101 presents a tantalising problem: whether the transmitted *ex* is retained or not, how can metre be restored to the opening of the line without transgressing Lucretian style? Since Lachmann's suggestion introduces an unwanted participle and Munro's an inappropriate narrowing of the sense, only two suggestions have found favour, Purmann's *exin* and Lotze's *ex ea*. Neither seems to me attractive. The former gives odd sense, unless *exin* is taken as 'therefore', a sense not attested until Tacitus (*ann.* 14,48). Yet more importantly, in Classical (i.e. pre-Tacitean) Latin, *exim/exin*, the shortened byform of *exinde*, is not employed in a prevocalic position, as is also the case with *proin*, *dein* and

³⁰ K. W. F. Proll, *De formis antiquis Lucretianis*, Breslau 1859, at 44.

³¹ It is not impossible that Virgil's absolute use of *se referunt* at *georg.* 4,181 of the tired young bees' returning to the hive contains an echo to the present passage.

³² 1,33; 1,116; 1,508; 1,978; 3,209; 3,219; 3,885; 4,957; 6,87; 6,89; 6,383; 6,385; in prepositional phrases at 1,445; 1,729; 2,241; 2,586; 2,810; 2,968; 2,1050; 2,1156; 3,115; 3,137; 3,704; 3,718; 4,995; 5,319; 6,877; 6,898; 6,911; 6,985; 6,1029; 6,1054.

ac among others. Lucretius presents no exception, using pre-consonantal *exim* at 3,160 and prevocalic *exinde* at 5,786 (both in the sense of '(immediately) thereafter'). The latter conjecture, by contrast, breaks a stylistic law observed in Lucretius which, although I have not seen it recorded elsewhere, is manifest under close observation: any monosyllabic preposition must (i) immediately precede the noun (or adjective) it modifies or a genitive dependent upon that noun, or (ii) immediately follow the dependent noun (or adjective). Therefore, in the present instance, no extraneous matter can appear between *ex* and the dependent elements that follow.³³

In fact, the sense of the passage is complete with *imaginibus missis consistere eorum*: *consistere* often takes a bare ablative in Lucretius (cf. 1,1028; 2,906; 5,60; 5,65; 6,44) and need not therefore take a prepositional construction with *e(x)*, which cannot be retained without breaking the rule above. The words opening the line cannot therefore bear much semantic weight. Perhaps we could read *haec et imaginibus missis consistere eorum*, 'these too consist of their [=i.e. the objects'] emitted images'. *et* is sufficiently well attested for *etiam* in Lucretius (e.g. 1,830; 3,234; 3,290; 5,610; 6,7; 6,749; 6,818; 6,1234), notwithstanding Lachmann's perverse attempt to remove it.³⁴ *haec et* could have easily become *ec et*,³⁵ and the latter particle removed as an apparent repetition (the two being near-identical in early minuscule); the resultant *ec* would have thereafter been taken as *ex*.³⁶

There is no need to alter *eorum* at the close of the line to *earum* (Marullus) or the inelegant *rerum* (Lachmann), since the neuter pronoun in Lucretius can be used with *res* (here *rerum* in 100) as its antecedent.

4,987–90: *quippe uidebis equos fortes, quom membra iacebunt,*
in somnis sudare tamen spirareque semper
et quasi de palma summas contendere uires,
aut quasi carceribus patefactis f̄saepe quietef̄. 990

³³ It is therefore strangely inaccurate for H. Lotze, when making his suggestion, to state that it presents a "minime insolit[us] verborum ord[o]" (*Philologus* 7 [1852] 723). Of course *ex non sensibus* (2,930) and *ex non sensu* (2,932) are the result of Lucretius' attempt to convey 'non-sensation' and are therefore akin to *in tam tranquillo et tam clare luce* at 5,12, not an exception to the above canon.

³⁴ See his note *ad* 1,830, where he claims that such a usage offends against the "antiqui sermonis... castita[s]"; cf. also his notes on the other passages mentioned above.

³⁵ *haec ab* was conjectured by N. H. Romanes (*Further Notes on Lucretius*, Oxford 1935, 38) but *ab* is unwelcome and not used by Lucretius with *consistere*.

³⁶ To suggest *ex et* would, of course, contravene Lucretius' practice as outlined above.

The close of 990 is a much-discussed crux, perhaps on the podium with 5,1442 and 6,550 as one of the most contested passages in the work. About Lucretius' text there is sufficient uncertainty to keep even the best conjectures in the apparatus, obelising in the text *saepe quiete* as an indubitable anticipation of the end of the subsequent verse.³⁷ These four lines treat the dreams of horses, which the human observer can discern from the sweating and movement of their bodies. It is beyond doubt that the close of 990 must contain a second infinitive dependent upon *uidebis*. Of the many suggestions that have been made,³⁸ the least inappropriate in sense are R. Bouterwek's *membra mouere* and H. Diels' *tendere crura*. Yet, as E. J. Kenney rightly noted in his review of Richter's

³⁷ 991 occurs in the manuscripts after 998, with a repetition of 992–95. The explanation of Ernout (*Lucrece, De la Nature: Commentaire exégétique et critique*, Paris 1925, comm. *ad loc.*) is the most probable: during the writing of 990, the scribe's eyes accidentally moved into 991, of which he copied the verse end (*saepe quiete*). He then unwittingly continued to write 992 and following. The error was noted after the scribe had written 998 (or at a later stage in a ms in which 4,998 ended a page), whereupon 991 was added and followed by a repetition of the four lines that followed 991 in the archetype, both to make clear where the verse should be rectified and to provide sense and context for 991, the opening of a new paragraph. Any marginal annotations denoting the correction were presumably ignored or not understood by later scribes with the result that these four verses were transmitted in their incorrect position.

³⁸ In chronological order: *tempore puncto* D. Lambinus, *exequitet quis* S. Bosius, *colligere aestum* Lachmann, *uelle uolare* Munro, *membra mouere* R. Bouterwek, *corripere artus* L. Deubner, *surgere raptim* G. Bossart-Oerden (misreported as "Bessart" by Martin and, in turn, Richter), *saepe cieri* Bockemüller, *corripere aequor* Everett, *edere uocem* O. Probst, *arrigere aures* K. Hosius, *tendere cursum* C. Brakman, *semper auere* M.E. Deutsch, *edere uoces* Martin (after Probst), *tendere crura* H. Diels, *saepta pauire* J.B. Bury, *frendere dentes* E.L.B. Meurig-Davies, *se reciere* Orth, *corpus ciere* Büchner, *fundere sese* Richter, *rumpere sese* Ferguson Smith, *tundere terram* or *currere auere* K. Müller, *contremere armis* García Calvo, *quaerere cursum* Flores (his alternative, *tendere cursum*, being preceded by Brakman). S. Havercamp suggested greater changes, transposing 989–90: *haud, quasi carceribus patefactis, stare quiete / et quasi de palma summas contendere uires*. Merrill suggested, even less plausibly, that *saepe quiete* was correct and that a line had been lost after 990, in which the infinitive *mitti* occurred. The prevailing habit among the early editors was to regard 990 as an extraneous addition to the poem. Gilbert Wakefield's colourful comment on the many emendations is, as so often, worth quoting, notwithstanding my disagreement: "apprime inutile est, et puerile, conjecturis arbitrariis, ad acuminis tantummodo ostentationem facientibus, lascivire" (*T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, London 1796–97, comm. *ad loc.*).

Textstudien zu Lukrez,³⁹ the closing words of the present passage were presumably more striking and expressive than mere bodily movement. Richter was right, however, to emphasise the literary topos of horses' bursting from their gates,⁴⁰ and it is a strong verb of rushing forth that is required: the presence of a second *quasi* in 990 gives leave for a vivid expression, of which the manifest sweating and panting of the dreaming horse provide some small indication. I believe that *proruere*, 'rush forth', is that verb.⁴¹ Perhaps we should therefore read *proruere acres*, the adjective being taken adverbially as 'swiftly' or 'keenly'. It is worth noting that Lucretius speaks earlier in the book of *an ecus (=equus) acer* at 4,420, a collocation taken up by Virgil (*Aen.* 1,444), Ovid (*met.* 3,704; 7,542; 14,344), Martial (6,38,7) and Silius (10,467–68), among others.

5,705–9: *luna potest solis radiis percussa nitere* 705
 inque dies magis lumen conuertere nobis
 ad speciem, quantum solis secedit ab orbi,
 donique eum contra pleno bene lumine fulsit
 atque oriens obitus eius super edita uidit.

706 magis OQ : m. id F¹ (*ac Lachmann suo Marte*) : m. hoc F : m. et AB : m. hinc Merrill : maius Marullus

No supplement to the metrically defective 706 is particularly arresting: either *hoc* or *id* would have little force, Merrill's *hinc* is exactly contrary to the desired meaning and the other early suggestions are impossible.⁴² Bearing in mind that

³⁹ *CR* 26 (1976) 180–81, at 180.

⁴⁰ W. Richter, *Textstudien zu Lukrez*, Munich 1974, at 86–89.

⁴¹ For the intransitive usage of *proruere* in this sense, we can compare Pacon. 4, Curt. 4,16,4, Gell. 1,11,4, Frontin. *strat.* 2,1,4 (s.v.1.); Lucretius uses *ruere* intransitively in the sense of 'rush' at 1,1105 and 5,313. There is therefore no need to offer a transitive conjecture, such as *se ruere acres (uel sim.)*.

⁴² I also regard as impossible the *ad hoc* neologisms created by Merrill (*allumen*) and García Calvo (*illumem*), nor can I believe in monosyllabic *eius*, tentatively suggested by Ferguson Smith, for which there is no close parallel. The least dissimilar instance of such synzesis is in fact illusory, for at 1,149 *cuius* and *principium* should be transposed (so Avancius), thereby removing the sole monosyllabic occurrence of *cuius* in the poem.

Lucretius often uses *hinc* earlier in the present book to mean 'from (planet) Earth' (572 (571), 584, 585), could we not here read *huc*, 'hither', i.e. 'to our Earth'? The pleonasm is not unlucretian: 'hither towards our sight'⁴³?⁴⁴

Christ's College, Cambridge

⁴³ For the same usage of *ad speciem* with *nobis* as dative of possession, cf. 5,724.

⁴⁴ I take this opportunity to record my agreement with supplements to other Lucretian lacunae that are generally overlooked by editors: 2,279 *no<bis>* (Reid), 2,291 *<hoc>* (Munro), 2,512 *<at>* (Ernout), 2,1049 *<super>* (Orth), 3,853 *iam <nil>* (García Calvo, after Merrill's *<nil> iam*), 3,887 *<ipsum>* (Orth), 4,71 *sunt <in>* (*Itali*), 4,346–47 *ater / <aer>* (Winckelmann), 4,804 *nisi quae<rere> se ipse* (Romanes), 4,862 *<haec>* (Wakefield), 5,468 *<fudit>* (K. Müller), 5,970 (969) *par<il>es* (H.W. Garrod), 6,201 *<in>* (T. Creech). I offer conjectures in forthcoming articles upon the lacunae at 3,594; 3,596; 5,901; 5,1010; 5,1160; 6,15; 6,83; 6,112; 6,1156 and 6,1281.