

A MASS OF DROSS AND ONE PARTICLE OF GOLD:
OBSERVATIONS ON A NEW TEXT OF LUCRETIIUS

Agustín García Calvo (henceforth G.C.) is the editor of a recent text of Lucretius¹, which I have no hesitation in describing as the most eccentric and unconvincing one to have appeared during the twentieth century. Lacking a good feeling for Lucretius' language and style, a good understanding of his philosophy, and good critical judgement, G.C. often rejects widely- or universally-accepted readings and corrections in favour of bizarre readings and conjectures – conjectures which are often his own². Where he cannot find an existing Latin word to fit, he does not hesitate to invent one³. He delights in filling actual or supposed lacunae with his own compositions: after 2.164 he supplies no fewer than forty lines, including two lines and a bit of a third line attributed to Lucretius by Servius.

I shall resist the temptation to list and illustrate all the eccentricities of G.C.'s edition. The exercise would be quite entertaining, but not particularly useful. I want to do two things. One is to correct G.C.'s frequent errors in the attribution of the conjectures which he prints in his text or records in his critical notes. The other is to comment on what is, so far as I can see, the one and only place where he is probably right to adopt an emendation different from that adopted by other modern editors.

I. Many twentieth-century editors of Lucretius have been careless about the attribution of conjectures, especially ones which predate Lachmann's edition of 1850, to their correct sources⁴, but G.C. is a particularly bad of-

¹ *Lucrecio, De la realidad; T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura* (Zamora 1997).

² For example, G.C. eliminates by emendation Lucretius' emphatic and effective repetitions in: 2.955-956 *vincere saepe*, / *vincere* (G.C.: *vim fere saepe* / *vincere*); 3.12-13 *aurea dicta*, / *aurea* (G.C.: *aurea dicta* / *vere ea*); 5.298-299 *ignibus instant*, / *instant, nec loca* (G.C.: *ignibus instans* / *instanti, ac loca*); 5.949-951 *quibus e scibant umori' fluenta* / *lubrica proluvie larga lavere umida saxa*, / *umida saxa* (G.C.: *quibus e scibant umore fluente* / *lubrica proluvie larga cava proluere undas* / *umida saxa*); 5.1189-1190 *per caelum volvi quia nox et luna videtur*, / *luna dies et nox* (G.C.: *per caelum volvi quia vorsata illa videntur*, / *luna dies et nox*); 6.528-529 *omnia, prorsum* / *omnia* (G.C.: *omina prorsum* / *omnia*).

³ See e.g. 5.692 (*concludit*), 706 (*inlumen*); 6.149 (*propiter*), 349 (*transsulat*), 537 (*inperventis*).

⁴ See G.B.A. Fletcher, *Lucretiana*, "Latomus" 27, 1968, 884-893, especially 890; M.F. Smith, *Notes on Lucretius*, in: *Studi in onore di Adelmo Barigazzi*, II = "Sileno" 1985 (Roma 1986), 219-225, at 219.

fender. Most, but by no means all, of his errors involve conjectures which he assigns to himself, and in many cases he could have discovered the original authors of the conjectures by consulting works which he lists in the partly-bibliographical index at the end of his book (pp. 577-590). In the hope of preventing a repetition of his mistakes and making a small contribution towards the production of a thesaurus of Lucretian conjectures⁵, I give a list below. Although the list is a long one, I do not expect that it is complete. In the first column I give G.C.'s attribution, in the second the correct attribution.

1.50 <i>Memmiada</i> G.C.	Lambinus.
1.412 <i>haustis</i> Büchner, Valenti	Lambinus (1563-1564 ed. only) and, according to Havercamp, Codex Bodleianus Auct. F.I.13.
1.555 <i>in summum</i> G.C.	Pascal.
1.566 <i>constent</i> G.C.	Lambinus, who reads <i>constant</i> , notes: "sic legendum, et ita scriptum est in quattuor libris manuscriptis: quibuscum faciunt aliquot typis impressi... quod annotavi, ne quis semidoctus putet repotendum <i>cum constent</i> ".
1.619 <i>minimumque</i> Diels	Pius.
1.739 <i>tripode</i> G.C.	ed. Aldina (1500).
1.963 <i>fatendumst</i> G.C.	ed. Juntina.
1.1013 Indication of lacuna: Marullus	Marcellus ⁶ .
1.1076 <i>motis</i> G.C.	Attributed by Lambinus to "quidam vir doctus".
1.1102 <i>volucrum</i> G.C.	Lambinus.
1.1106 <i>omnes</i> G.C.	Gifanius.
2.86 <i>confluxere</i> Lambinus	Codex Laurentianus 35.31. Lambinus, who did not print it, though he con-

⁵ The production of such a thesaurus is a project which I announced in *Notes on Lucretius* (n. 4 above) 219; see also the notice in "Gnomon" 60, 1988, 192. So far the project has made little progress, mainly because I have been busy with other things, partly because a young transatlantic scholar, who had agreed to collaborate with me, withdrew after being informed by his superiors that, if he wanted to continue his career as a university-teacher, he must abandon textual work on Lucretius forthwith and instead write a book on a literary subject. If any scholar is now interested in collaborating in an unfashionable project and is not seeking tenure in an American university, I shall be pleased to hear from her or him.

⁶ See M.D. Reeve, *The Italian tradition of Lucretius*, "IMU" 23, 1980, 27-48, at 47.

2.268 <i>connixa</i> Gifanius	sidered it a “scriptura probabilis”, found it “in quibusdam libris manuscriptis”. Ascribed to certain mss. by Lambinus.
2.291 <i>devincta</i> G.C.	Bockemüller.
2.300 <i>consuerunt</i> G.C.	Lambinus.
2.356 <i>linquit</i> A. Allen	Q corr.
2.422 <i>tibi res</i> Martin	J.P. Postgate, “Journ. Phil.” 24, 1896, 134; <i>res</i> already suggested by Brieger, as Postgate points out.
2.462 <i>dentatum</i> Martin	L. Grasberger.
2.477 <i>quom</i> Munro	J. Roos, <i>Dissertatio critica continens annotationem ad Lucreti poematum libros tres priores</i> (Groningen 1847) 35. <i>ostendi</i> (without <i>ut</i>) Brieger.
2.529 <i>ostendi ut</i> G.C.	Marginal correction in Q.
2.830 <i>ultra</i> G.C.	Wakefield, tentatively.
2.922 <i>aliam</i> G.C.	Creech.
2.926 <i>quod figimus</i> G.C.	Lambinus (1570 ed., notes).
2.928 <i>terra</i> Martin	E. Orth, “Helmantica” 11, 1960, 131.
2.1049 <i>super superque</i> G.C.	Lambinus: “sic restitui secutus cod. manuscr.”.
3.154 <i>itaque et pallorem</i> G.C.	3.474-475 retained by Diels, as lines which Lucr. wrote, but forgot to delete. “quidam doctus” (Lambinus).
3.474 “cum omnibus edd. deleo” (G.C.)	Lachmann.
3.553 <i>liquuntur</i> Isaac Voss	Wakefield, tentatively: <i>contage e</i> or <i>ex</i> .
3.702 <i>dispertitus</i> Pius	ed. Veneta.
3.734 <i>contagi e</i> G.C.	O corr.
3.742 <i>cervis</i> ed. Veronensis	Lambinus.
3.775 <i>immortali</i> Q corr.	B, British Library Harl. 2694.
3.794 <i>quoniam in nostro</i> G.C.	Diels.
3.856 <i>multimodis</i> Lachmann	CF, ed. Aldina (1500) (<i>attigit</i>).
3.910 <i>sei</i> G.C.	Pius: “alii. Nam si grata fuit”.
3.922 <i>adtigit</i> G.C.	Krokiewicz.
3.935 <i>si grata fuit</i> Naugerius	<i>clausa (ita cl.)</i> already conjectured by Brieger.
3.962 <i>iam annis</i> Traina	Isaac Voss.
4.81 <i>ibi clausa</i> G.C.	M.F. Smith ⁷ , tentatively.
4.166 <i>omnis</i> Cartault	
4.345-346 (= 320-321 in OQ)	
<i>ater / aer</i> G.C.	

⁷ G.C. includes my Loeb edition in his index and not infrequently records my readings,

4.352 <i>conlecta</i> G.C.	Gifanius.
4.418 <i>atque avium</i> G.C.	Munro, tentatively.
4.437 <i>fractas</i> G.C.	Falsely alleged by Havercamp to be the reading of OQ; adopted by Wakefield – “absurde”, as Lachmann says.
4.471 <i>minuam</i> Martin	Palmerius (see Havercamp II 78).
4.637 <i>alis</i> G.C.	M.F. Smith, tentatively.
4.795 <i>cum sentinus</i> Munro	Naugerius.
4.896 <i>hinc</i> G.C.	ed. Aldina (1500).
4.897 <i>corpus ut ac</i> G.C.	ed. Aldina (1500); <i>corpus</i> Codex Bodleianus Auct. F.I.13, ed. Brixienensis.
4.961 <i>intust</i> Bailey	W. Everett, “Harv. St.” 7, 1896, 32.
4.1089 <i>pluria</i> G.C.	ed. Aldina (1500).
4.1209 (1208) <i>semen</i> Munro	ed. Aldina (1500).
4.1225 <i>e</i> G.C.	British Library Add. 11912, according to Wakefield.
4.1282 <i>secum vir</i> G.C.	ed. Aldina (1500).
5.44 <i>tunc</i> Lambinus	Cod. Bodl. Auct. F.I.13, British Library Harl. 2612 and 2694 according to Wakefield; Marullus, according to Gifanius.
5.182 <i>hominum dis</i> Wakefield	Said by Havercamp to be the reading of OQ (a mistake) and Cod. Bodl. Auct. F.I.13.
5.241 <i>nativo mortalibus</i> G.C.	Naugerius, to whom G.C. wrongly ascribes <i>nativo ac mortalibus</i> .
<i>nativo et mortalibus</i> Avancius in ed. Aldina (1500)	Avancius at the end of his <i>Catullus</i> (in his <i>Lucretius</i> he has <i>nativo immortalibus</i>).
5.372 <i>possint</i> G.C.	ed. Veronensis; I suspect that ed. Brixienensis reads the same, but I have not been able to check.
5.429 <i>coniecta</i> Martin	Lambinus (notes).
5.553 <i>aerii</i> G.C.	E. Orth, “Helmantica” 11, 1960, 323.

which makes it the more puzzling that he attributes three of my conjectures (4.345-346, 637; 6.1281) to himself. He probably thinks that I am dead, for he shows me as the author of the Loeb editions of 1924, 1928, and 1937. These editions, all published before I was born, are in fact the work of W.H.D. Rouse. The new Loeb, containing my introduction, bibliography, Latin text, critical and explanatory notes, and index, with the revised translation of Rouse, first appeared in 1975; a second edition was published in 1982, a further-revised edition in 1992, and it is a pity that G.C. uses the 1975 version rather than the latest one.

- 5.597 *hunc* G.C. Printed in the text facing the French translation of Baron de Coutures (Paris 1692²). I have not been able to check the 1st ed. (Paris 1685). I am not aware that *hunc* was printed by any earlier editor, but I have not made an exhaustive search.
- 5.614 *nec recta* G.C. Mentioned by Havercamp, who wrongly says that it is the reading of OQ and ed. Veronensis.
- 5.747 *algor* Lachmann Gifanius.
- 5.839 *necutrumque* Diels ed. Aldina (1500) (*necutrunque*).
et utrimque G.C. Lambinus (*necutrunque et utrinque*).
- 5.1210 *vorset* G.C. Wakefield.
- 5.1368 *terrae* G.C. Gassendi, according to Havercamp.
- 5.1425 *residit* G.C. Lambinus.
- 6.49 *furerent* Bailey Wakefield.
- 6.131 *magnum* Isaac Voss Cipellarius in Codex Placentinus Landi 33: see Reeve (n. 6 above) 31, 48⁸.
- 6.147 *continuo ut* ed. Juntina, Lambinus Lambinus (1570, 1583) only, not ed.
ut continuo G.C. Juntina.
 Lambinus (1563-1564, 1565).
- 6.199 *fremitum* G.C. Wakefield (notes).
- 6.216 *ingratiis* Diels Lambinus.
- 6.219 *quanam* G.C. E. Orth, "Helmantica" 11, 1960, 331.
- 6.223 *saepe* Isaac Voss Cipellarius (see above, under 6.131).
- 6.370 *inter se res* Lachmann ed. Veronensis.
- 6.429 *sunt* G.C. ed. Juntina.
- 6.512 *opprimit* G.C. Isaac Voss.
- 6.605 *abstracta* G.C. British Library Harl. 2554, according to Wakefield.
- 6.1007 *ut qui* G.C. ed. Brixiensis, according to Wakefield; certainly ed. Veronensis.

⁸ On the significant and sometimes brilliant improvements which Bernardinus Cipellarius (or Cippellarius, as he once spells himself) made to the text of Lucretius, see also now M. Deufert, *Die Lukrezemendationen des Francesco Bernardino Cipelli*, "Hermes" 126, 1998, 370-379. Deufert presents an impressive list of cases where Cipellarius anticipates emendations made by later scholars. The revelation of Cipellarius' contribution means that the critical notes in all editions of Lucretius, including my own, require some revision. Since Deufert's article appeared after G.C.'s edition was published, I have not of course included in my list of incorrectly-attributed proposals those emendations of Cipellarius, mentioned by Deufert, which G.C. assigns to later scholars.

- 6.1233 *animi maestro* G.C. Wakefield, tentatively.
 6.1245 *lanigerae* G.C. Büchner.
 6.1259 *is maeror* Munro Suggested by Lachmann as being
 preferable to *maeror is*.
 6.1281 *pro re et pro tempore* G.C. M.F. Smith.

- II. *contemplator enim, cum montibus adsimulata*
nubila portabunt venti transversa per auras, 190
aut ubi per magnos montis cumulata videbis
insuper esse aliis alia atque urgere superne
in statione locata sepultis undique ventis:
tum poteris magnas moles cognoscere eorum
speluncasque velut saxis pendentibu' structas 195
cernere, quas venti cum tempestate coorta
conplerunt, magno indignantur murmure clausi
nubibus, in caveisque ferarum more minantur;
nunc hinc nunc illinc fremitus per nubila mittunt,
quaerentesque viam circum versantur, et ignis 200
semina convolvunt e nubibus atque ita cogunt
multa, rotantque cavis flammam fornacibus intus,
donec divolsa fulserunt nube corusci. (6.189-203)

These lines, given as in my Loeb text, conclude the second of Lucretius' four explanations of lightning (6.173-203). The explanation is this: wind enters a cloud and, by its movement inside it, creates a hollow and generates heat, so that, when the cloud can no longer withstand the internal pressure and breaks, fire flashes out and the sound of thunder is emitted (173-184). Lucretius emphasises that, for this to happen, the clouds must be dense and high-stacked (185-186). He recognises that we can more easily judge the width of clouds than their height (187-188), but in the passage quoted above mentions cases where their height can be observed and it can be seen that they contain cavernous vaults inside which the winds, imprisoned like wild animals in cages, move to and fro, roaring and seeking a way out.

It is with the "roaring" of the caged winds that this note is concerned. In 6.199 O and Q have the impossible *fremitu*. The generally-accepted reading is *fremitus*, which is found in the Italian manuscripts. Now, the readings of the Itali, when they disagree with those of O, have no ancient authority, for the lost manuscript from which they are derived was a child, not, as used to be thought, a brother, of O, from which it was copied after O had been

“corrected”. Therefore *fremitus* is to be treated as a conjecture. Is it correct? It may be, but I think that G.C. is right to prefer *fremitum* – a conjecture which he claims as his own, unaware that it had been proposed two hundred years earlier by Wakefield.

Why is *fremitum* preferable to *fremitus*? G.C. does not offer an explanation. Wakefield seems to have been influenced by two considerations: he implicitly suggests that *fremitum*, when written *fremitu*, is palaeographically closer to *fremitu* than is *fremitus*⁹; and he thinks that it is significant that Virgil never uses *fremitus* in the plural. The latter consideration has no validity whatsoever, seeing that Lucretius himself (see below, final paragraph) four times uses the plural. The former consideration, however, is a just one.

To the point about the palaeographical preferability of *fremitum* one can add two more points in its favour.

One point is that Isidore of Seville, *De natura rerum* 46.1, discussing earthquakes, whose occurrence, like that of lightning, is attributed by him, as by Lucretius (6.557-595), to the action of trapped winds, seems to be recalling Lucretius 6.199-200¹⁰, when he writes *huc atque illuc ventus fremitum et murmura mittit, dehinc quaerens*¹¹ *viam evadendi*.

The other point, which I consider the more significant of the two, is that *fremitum* continues the rumbling sounds of 6.197-198: *magno indignantur murmure clausi / nubibus, in caveisque ferarum more minantur*¹². Lucretius is very fond of making onomatopoeic use of *m* and *um* when he is de-

⁹ Wakefield notes: “L.M. [= OQ] *fremitu*; unde me persuasum habeo rescribi debere *fremitum*; i.e. *fremitu*”.

¹⁰ The passage of Isidore is compared by Lachmann in his note on Lucretius 6.199.

¹¹ Readings offered by the manuscripts include *qu(a)erentes*, *quaerentis*, *qu(a)erens*. G. Bekker (Berlin 1857) and A. Laborda (Madrid 1996) are among those editors who make the odd choice of *quaerentis*. J. Fontaine (Bordeaux 1960) conjectures *quaerente eo*, but *quaerens* seems to me to be preferable. L.A. Holford-Strevens (letter of 25 July 2000) tentatively suggests *quaerendo* as a possible alternative to *quaerens*. The textual uncertainty does not, in any event, affect the sense of the passage. (My thanks to J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, and to J. Perkins of the Warburg Institute’s Library, for faxing to Foula relevant pages of various editions of Isidore’s *De natura rerum*.)

¹² Housman’s one-letter emendation (in his *editio maior* of Manilius, on 3.535) of *minantur* to *minantum*, with no punctuation after it, is approved by W.S. Watt, *Lucretiana*, “Philologus” 140, 1996, 248-256, at 253. Housman saw two advantages in his proposal: “qua mutatione et quod necessarium est efficitur, ut caveae ferarum ac non ventorum sint, et tollitur asyndeton”. A third advantage is that the introduction of *-um* enhances the rumbling-sound-effect of the line. Although I am not completely persuaded by it, the emendation may well be right, and Professor Watt has done well to bring it to our attention.

scribing rumbling, roaring, or growling sounds: see, for example, 1.68-69 *quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti / murmure compressit caelum*; 1.275-276 *ita perfurit acri / cum fremitu saevitque minaci murmure ventus*; 1.722-723 *hic Aetnaea minantur / murmura flammaram rursum se colligere iras*; 2.1101 *tum fulmina mittat*; 3.296-297 *leonum / pectora qui fremitu rumpunt plerumque gementes*; 4.545-546 *cum tuba depresso graviter sub murmure mugit / et reboat raucum retro cita barbara bombum*; 5.1063-1064 *inritata canum cum primum magna Molossum / mollia ricta fremunt*; 5.1193 *murmura magna minarum*; 5.1221 *magnum percurrunt murmura caelum*; 6.101 *tam magis hinc magno fremitus fit murmure saepe*; 6.287-288 *altum / murmura percurrunt caelum*. Outside 6.199 Lucretius uses *fremitus* nine times – four times in the singular (1.276; 3.297; 5.1076, 1316; 6.101) and four times in the plural (5.1193; 6.270, 289, 410). In the two occurrences where the word is accusative, we have the singular once (5.1076) and the plural once (6.410), but it is to be noted that in the latter line (*cur tenebras ante et fremitus et murmura concit*) *fremitum* would have been unmetrical. In 6.199, on the other hand, either *fremitus* or *fremitum* is metrically suitable, and one would expect Lucretius to have chosen the more onomatopoeic singular.

Isle of Foula, Shetland Islands

MARTIN FERGUSON SMITH