

TWO LUCRETIAN EMENDATIONS

2.464-468:

*sed quod amara vides eadem quae fluvida constant,
465 sudor uti maris est, minime mirabile debet.
nam quod fluvidus est, e levibus atque rutundis
est †e levibus atque rutundi† admixta doloris
corpora; nec tamen haec retineri hamata necessumst.*

465 *debet* OQ : *habebis* K. Lachmann : *habeto* H.A.J. Munro : *habendum* Itali quidam : *cuiquam* ed. Veron.¹ lac. post 465 stat. J. Bernays 467 *e levibus atque rotundi* (ex 466) OQ : *et squalida sunt illis* Bernays : *et squalida multa creant* Munro : *et levibus sunt aliunde* (aut *de terra*) Lachmann : alii alia

Lucretius here explains how it is possible for some substances that are smooth and fluid (*fluvida*) to be bitter (*amara*) to the senses. The sole seat of textual difficulty lies in 467², where the four final words of 466 have clearly been accidentally repeated, by dint of a rather striking ‘Perseverationsfehler’, in the following line³. There is no scope for retaining the string of words *e levibus atque rutundi*<*s*>: their repetition from 466 lacks any purpose and takes up the very space in which we require elements vital to the sense of the rest of the sentence (on which see below). It is surprising, therefore, that it took until the mid-19th century for editors to reject the paradosis and seek out new supplements⁴. Yet more striking, however, is the fact that Bernays’ supplement (Leipzig 1852), which has a claim to be called the vulgate of the last 150 years, has enjoyed such widespread fa-

¹ Since this edition (P. Fridenberger, Verona 1486) is not particularly given to conjecture, this reading presumably arises from an Italic manuscript. Nonetheless, since I do not believe that the Italic manuscripts of Lucretius provide manuscript evidence independent from our 9th-century mss, I treat them purely as a repertory of renaissance conjectures.

² I do not see sufficient need to emend *debet* at the close of 465. It is not too harsh to suppose, as did earlier editors (and, in the 20th century, W.A. Merrill, New York 1907, A. Ernout, Paris 1920, M.F. Smith, London 1992³), the ellipse of *esse* with *debet* (cf. the bare *nec mirum* at 2.338 and 6.130, and *quid mirum* at 5.1238). At any rate, if a change is to be made, emendation is simpler than positing, with Bernays and many others, a lacuna between 465 and 466, for what would such a verse contain other than *esse*? In the same line, Bentley’s *udor* for *sudor* is a misguided stroke of ingenuity, removing as it does the salty and bitter connotations of *sudor*. In 468, D. Lambinus’ *necessumst* (which develops *necessum* of ABL and other Itali) is the most probable suggestion for the impossible *necessu* of OQ (cf. 4.256).

³ The colourful word used by W.H.D. Rouse in his Loeb apparatus *ad loc.* (Cambridge 1937; subsequently revised by M.F. Smith: n. 2) – “gallimaufry” – is hardly an overstatement.

⁴ The vulgate prior to this period was the line as presented by Marullus: *est, at levibus atque rutundis mixta doloris / corpora*, which is dissatisfactory for a considerable number of reasons, as my discussion below shall argue.

vour⁵. As shall become clear, I am not much attracted to the conjectures of Bernays or his two fellow Lucretians of the 19th century. I can most easily explain my objections to these suggestions by outlining what information I believe the supplement in 467 must include.

Firstly, *doloris* / *corpora* cannot stand either alone or as an appropriate parallel to *e levibus atque rotundis* [sc. *corporibus*] in 466⁶. It is of utmost importance, though strangely neglected by most commentators⁷, that the construction in its present form is not Latin, for *doloris* without an epithet cannot serve as a genitive of quality, nor a genitive of sphere, since *corpora* and *dolor* are not genus and species respectively. Understandably, there is no true parallel for the expression in Lucretius, and the instance in *DRN* which is least dissimilar to it is certainly corrupt⁸. In order to salvage the construction, *doloris* must be bolstered by an adjective: the genitive of quality that would result is more natural than Lucretius' having employed an adjective that modifies *corpora* and takes a dependent genitive (e.g. *plena*) or a noun bound by a copula to *corpora* (e.g. *causa*, as H. Diels suggested⁹).

Secondly, to produce due balance with *e levibus atque rotundis* in 466, *corpora* should be modified by an adjective that denotes the atomic shape of those atoms that create the bitterness.

Thirdly, as Lachmann noted (comm. *ad loc.*: n. 7), if a conjunction is to be added after *est* in 467¹⁰, which one would expect, then a verb is explicitly

⁵ It has been accepted by C. Giussani (Turin 1896-8), Merrill (n. 2), A. Ernout (n. 2), W.E. Leonard & S.B. Smith (Madison 1942), E. Valentí (Barcelona 1961), M.F. Smith (n. 2) and E. Flores (Naples 2002) *inter alios*.

⁶ Although no noun is supplied with *e levibus atque rotundis* / *esse*, we find the same phrase qualified with *seminibus* at 2.402-403 and 2.451-452 and with *corporibus* at 5.455-456 (with *constare* rather than *esse*) and 3.204-205 (cf. also 3.194-195).

⁷ I can find no recorded objection to the phrase beyond Lachmann's passing observation ("quamquam sic quoque mirationem faciunt illa *corpora doloris*, quae sunt pungentia sensus et laedentia" (comm. *ad loc.*, Berlin 1850)), with which Munro (app. crit. *ad loc.*, Cambridge 1886⁴) agrees, and W. Richter's brief dismissal: "Beide Lesungen [i.e. the emendations of Bernays and K. Büchner, for which see n. 12 below] produzieren zugleich einen sprachlichen Anstoss, der auch ein sachlicher ist: *doloris* (Gen.) *corpora* scheint mir nicht tragbar zu sein; *corpora* kann hier nur terminologisch als 'Atome' verstanden werden; wie sind aber 'Schmerzatom' im epikureischen System unterzubringen?" (*Textstudien zu Lukrez*, Munich 1974, 29-30).

⁸ 5.369 *aut aliam quamvis cladem importare pericli*, a passage which I emend in a forthcoming article (in "PCPS" 2009).

⁹ Diels' supplement (Berlin 1923), however, as C. Bailey (comm. *ad loc.*, II, Oxford 1947) rightly noted, is too convoluted to convince: *est, et squalida quae sunt causa admixta doloris* / *corpora*.

¹⁰ For other examples of such enjambement of forms of *esse* in Lucretius, cf. 1.862 (*esse*),

required in the subsequent text (the ellipse of even *sunt* here being unduly harsh). But what sort of conjunction is required? Since there stands an undeniable contrast between the smooth elements and the rough, an adversative particle seems highly probable. Marullus suggested *at* but *tamen*¹¹ or J. Martin's *sed* are more common mid-sentence adversatives.

Fourthly, *admixa* could well have been supported with either a dative or a prepositional construction. Lucretian usage suggests that he favoured the dative but the matter is hardly conclusive: of the six other instances where Lucretius employs *admixtus*, three take a dative (1.369, 382, 655), two *in* + abl. (1.569, 5.365) and one is used absolutely (4.1085).

Finally, I record my belief that it would be mistaken to introduce a causal clause in direct parallel with *quod fluvidus est* of 466. So close a parallel expression would result in a sentence structure no longer geared to explaining the *prima facie* surprising presence of bitterness in seawater, since the passage would run: "for, being fluid, it consists of smooth and round bodies, but/and, being bitter, it consists of some such bodies". Crucially, that seawater is bitter is the *explanandum* not an *explanans*¹².

With these strictures laid down, it is clear that I cannot commend Bernays' suggestion, however widely accepted: the first criterion is left unsatisfied by his leaving the genitive *doloris* unmodified, and the occurrence of *quom squalida constent* in 469 speaks against the appearance of the self-same adjective in 467 (as opposed to a close synonym). Even less appealing are the suggestions of Lachmann, which do not qualify *doloris* / *corpora* at all and add the vague and scarcely intelligible *aliunde* or *de terra*¹³. The suggestion of Munro¹⁴ attempts to resolve the difficulty of *doloris* by introducing a verb that governs it as an accusative plural: not only would the introduction of a transitive verb unbalance this half of the line but it also exhibits strange method, removing the difficulty by altering the extant text¹⁵

961 (*esse*), 2.499 (*esse*), 5.667 (*esse*), 1210 (*sit*), 6.44 (*esse*), 270 (*sunt*), 632 (*est*) and 983 (*esse*).

¹¹ Commonly used in first position by Lucretius: 1.578, 621; 2.279, 673, 742; 3.308, 407, 706, 761; 4.106, 502; 5.206, 479, 518; 6.591, 613, 1206, 1216.

¹² For this reason primarily I cannot accept Büchner's supplement (Wiesbaden 1966): *est, quod amarus item, sunt illi* [sc. *sudori maris*] *admixa doloris / corpora*.

¹³ Equally improbable is a third suggestion that Lachmann appended to the end of his note, i.e. *est, et sensibus sunt aliunde admixta dolori / corpora*: alongside the ambiguity of *aliunde*, *sensibus* is otiose in view of *laedere sensus* in 470 and the pair of datives creates a needlessly awkward construction.

¹⁴ A. Brieger (Leipzig 1899²), Bailey (in his *OCT* texts (Oxford 1900, 1922²) before supporting Bernays' conjecture in his commentary, n. 9) and I. Dionigi (Milan 1994) have accepted this change.

¹⁵ Munro believed that *doloris* was a possible form of the accusative plural for Lucretius

rather than by conjecturing an appropriate supplement. More problematically, his supplement also lacks the necessary information concerning the shape of these bitter *corpora*¹⁶.

Almost enough ground has now been cleared to offer a new supplement in 467. We are told in 465-466 that seawater, being fluid (a fact presented as a given), is made out of atoms that are *levia* and *rutunda*, knowledge which Lucretius has already presented to us at 451-452. What must follow is mention of those particular elements within seawater that explain how it can appear *amara* to human senses.

Further light can be shed upon the lost words of 467 by recourse to 468-470:

*nec tamen haec retineri hamata necessumst:
scilicet esse globosa tamen, quom squalida constant,
provolvi simul ut possint et laedere sensus.*

These lines serve to round up the argument before a final proof of the mixture of *aspera* and *levia corpora* in sea water is given at 471-477. Given that *haec* in 468¹⁷ evidently refers to the *admixa corpora* of 467-468 (rather than the *corpora* of the seawater as a whole, including the *levia* and *rutunda corpora*), verses 468-470 should provide additional detail to that contained in 467: we here learn that these atoms (i) are not hooked together (*hamata*), (ii) are evidently rounded (*globosa*), although (iii) they are rough (*squalida*)¹⁸. One would expect, therefore, that the lost adjective qualifying *corpora* in 467 should proffer information which is not explicitly given in these subsequent lines and which opposes *levia* and *rutunda* of 466. There is only one serious candidate: *aspera*¹⁹. For the use of *aspera* in connection with the

but such orthography is highly unlikely outside *i-stem* nouns (but Bailey (n. 14) was the first to print *dolores*). Further, Lucretius would more naturally use singular *dolorem*.

¹⁶ I cannot therefore commend the variants of this *tentamen Munronis* offered by W. Everett (*squalida dant aliis* etc.) and W. Richter (*quae faciant sunt his* etc.), which are both excessively weak and involve ambiguous datives. K. Müller (Zurich 1975), who believed 467 to be the contraction of two verses, went further and introduced three verbs: *est, et amarum in eo quod sentis esse saporem / squalida multa adsunt faciuntque admixta dolores / corpora*; it is hard to think of a more prosaic supplement.

¹⁷ Although this pronoun is omitted in Q, its presence in O restores it with certainty to the archetype.

¹⁸ *squalidus*, an adjective which only occurs once elsewhere in the poem (5.956, where it qualifies the limbs of primitive man and means “dirty”, “unkempt”), is inherently unspecific. Its meaning here presumably approximates to “coarse”, “rough”.

¹⁹ *amara*, introduced in the conjectures of Büchner (n. 12) and Müller (n. 16), must therefore be rejected since it does not directly concern the shape of the *corpora*. I have only found the suggestion of reading *aspera* in Martin’s Teubner (Leipzig 1963⁵, first edition 1934); curiously, however, he declared in his initial apparatus “sed levibus aspera sunt temptavi” but instead printed “sed levibus <sunt hamata>” (apparently also his own conjecture) in the text of his various editions. A. García Calvo (Zamora 1997) is the only editor I know to have

atoms of seawater, we need only look below to 471-472 (*et quo mixta putes magis aspera levibus esse / principiis*) and 477 (*aspera quom magis in terris haerescere possint*)²⁰. Further, two verses from earlier in the argument (404-405) provide an explanation for the clause that closes 468: *at contra quae amara atque aspera quomque videntur / haec magis hamatis inter se nexa teneri*. It is because of this earlier association of *amara* and *aspera* with *corpora hamata* that Lucretius immediately provides his qualification in 468 (*nec tamen haec retineri hamata necessumst*): the following distich (469-470) emphasises that, in the present case, the atoms of seawater *are* able to move freely, notwithstanding their roughness, and to harm the senses. *squalida* in 469 therefore serves as a more colourful explanation of *aspera* rather than bald repetition²¹.

What of the remaining material required for the supplement? We have already said that a verb is wanted, the simple copula *sunt* being most probable. Another likely addition is a dative (or prepositional phrase) dependent upon *admixta*, the referent of which is more naturally the plural *levia* and *rutunda corpora* rather than the *sudor maris* itself; we therefore expect to find (*in*) *his / illis*²². Finally, an epithet qualifying *doloris* is needed: this adjective could emphasise the quality of the pain (e.g. *acerbi*, *acuti*, *duri*) or its extent (e.g. *multi*, *magni*, *tanti*). Of these, it seems most natural that Lucretius should emphasise the bitterness of the pain that these atoms of brine bring; rather than repeat *amari* from 464, he perhaps wrote *acerbi* (which also appears in 472)²³.

Since the introduction of *e levibus atque rutundi<s>* in 467 is the result of sheer scribal inaccuracy, there is no need for our supplement to bear any similarity in its *ductus litterarum* to these words²⁴. I conjecture *est*, <*tamen*

supported Martin's rejected conjecture.

²⁰ Lucretius uses *asper* elsewhere to describe materials at the sensible level: 4.147 (of the rough surface of rocks) and 6.134 (of the ragged edges of clouds blown by a strong wind).

²¹ We should here compare the association of *aspera* with their *materiae squalor* at 2.424-425: *at contra quaequomque molesta atque aspera constat, / non aliquo sine materiae squalore repertast*.

²² K. Winckelmann's introduction of a relative pronoun inappropriately banishes the emphatic part of Lucretius' argument to a subordinate clause, amongst its other problems: *corporibus constat, quibus sunt admixta doloris / corpora* (*Beiträge zur Kritik des Lucretius*, Salzwedel 1857, 12).

²³ For *acerbus dolor*, a common collocation in prose, cf., e.g. the usage of Cicero (*Cael.* 59.4, *Ver.* 2.2.163, 2.4.47, *Tusc.* 5.121, *Fam.* 14.1.1) and the medical writers Celsus (2.7.8) and Quintus Serenus (19.351, 21.380).

²⁴ I therefore disagree with F. Bockemüller's assertion about the line (comm. *ad loc.*, I, Stade 1873): "eine Verwechslung mit 458 ist augenscheinlich, am wahrscheinlichsten ist dabei die Annahme, dass die ursprünglichen Worte ähnlich waren". His resultant conjecture,

aspera acerbi his sunt> admixta doloris / corpora, “but mixed in with these are rough bodies of [i.e. that bring] bitter pain”²⁵. Although there is no scope for certainty here (particularly about the adjective modifying *doloris*), I believe that this suggestion follows the correct form of Lucretius’ ejected words²⁶. Any conjecture upon 467 is necessarily to be relegated to the apparatus with the text humbly obelised; nonetheless, imposing the criteria laid out above could help to separate the conjectural wheat from the chaff.

5.585-591 (595):

- 585 *postremo quosquomque vides hinc aetheris ignes,*
quandoquidem quosquomque in terris cernimus <ignes>,
dum tremor <est> clarus, dum cernitur ardor eorum,
perparvom quiddam interdum mutare videntur
 589 *alterum utram in partem filum, quo longius absunt,*
 594 *scire licet perquam pauxillo posse minores*
 595 *esse vel exigua maiores parte brevisque.*

586 *ignes* post *cernimus* add. Marullus : *flammae* Lachmann : *horum* FC : *illos* AB : *esse* cod. Mus. Brit.²⁷ 587 *est* suppl. FC et al. : *et* cod. Mus. Brit. (et Diels insciens) 594-595 post 589 pos. Marullus

About the supplement to the metrically deficient 587 there can be little doubt that *est* is correct. Yet the other popular supplement of the Quattrocento, Marullus’ *ignes* in 586, though accepted by almost every editor of the last half-millennium, can hardly be said to be equally convincing. But only Lachmann has objected to this vulgate text, declaring (comm. *ad loc.*, n. 7) that *ignes* is added “repetitione inepta”. In its place, he conjectured genitival *flammae*, dependent upon *tremor* in the following line, thereby committing two stylistic errors at once: firstly, Lucretius does not punctuate at the diaeresis following the fifth foot unless the closing word (or word group) is self-evidently not involved in the clause that precedes²⁸; secondly, there is no

est, e levibus aequae sunt etc., has found no support.

²⁵ I see no problem in introducing another instance of adversative *tamen*: that the passage also presents instances at 459, 461, 468 and 469 merely highlights the extent to which Lucretius was carefully structuring his argument by the use of multiple contrasting elements alongside his positive statements. If another *tamen* is thought to be a step too far, one could adopt Martin’s *sed* and rearrange thus: *est, sed in his sunt aspera acerbi admixta doloris / corpora*, a rhythm with good Lucretian parallels.

²⁶ *acuti* could perhaps replace *acerbi*; of course, any of the spondaic adjectives suggested in passing could be included easily, by writing either *est, tamen aspera sunt XX his* or *est, tamen aspera in his sunt XX*.

²⁷ That is, the third British Museum manuscript (Σ) reported by G. Wakefield (Glasgow 1813²).

²⁸ Here genitive *flammae* could be taken as dependent upon *quosquomque* [sc. *ignes*], like

other parallel for sigmatic ecthipsis of a finite verbal form in the poem²⁹. Although Lachmann's emendation cannot convince, he could have given further weight to his criticism of *ignes* in 486, a repetition that struggles to find a Lucretian parallel. For of the sixteen transmitted instances of adjacent hexameters' ending with the same word in the same inflected form, three are definitely errors of scribal anticipation or repetition (1.1022-1023, 2.1168-1169, 6.15-16) and two are different forms of the ablative (1.719-720 *undis* is ablative of accompaniment, *ab undis* ablative of separation³⁰; 3.577-578 *in aevo* is locative ablative, *aevo* is ablative of separation). Of the remaining eleven, two are qualificatory, with the latter instance repeating the former in order to explain it (3.429-430, 6.684-685), three are rhetorically emphatic (1.66-67, 835-836, 3.702-703) and two involve wholly different referents (1.793-794, the former *ante* referring to general anterior time, the latter to a preceding section of *DRN* when read sequentially, like *supra*; 4.315-316, the former being causal *quod*, the latter *propterea quod*). Four instances of exact repetition at verse-end remain:

1. *nam vacuum tum fit quod non fuit ante*
et repletur item vacuum quod constitit ante (1.393-394).
2. [sc. *Tellus habet corpora prima*]
unde etiam fluvios frondes et pabula laeta
montivago generi possit praebere ferarum.
quare Magna deum Mater Materque ferarum
et nostri genetrix haec dicta est corporis una (2.596-599).
3. *non modo enim ratio ruat omnis, vita quoque ipsa*
concidat extemplo, nisi credere sensibus ausis
praecipitesque locos vitare et cetera quae sint
in genere hoc fugienda, sequi contraria quae sint (4.507-510).
4. *et tamen omnino quod tantis viribus auctos*
non temere ulla vi convinci posse putabant.

aetheris in the preceding line, however awkward the resultant expression. For enlightening discussion of this canon in Lucretius, see G.B. Townend, *Some Problems of Punctuation in the Latin Hexameter*, "CQ" 19, 1969, 330-344.

²⁹ For discussion of the limitations of the prosodic device in *DRN*, see D.J. Butterfield, *Sigmatic ecthipsis in Lucretius*, "Hermes" 136, 2008, 188-205.

³⁰ I should record that numerous scholars have sought to remove the latter instance by emendation and they may be right-minded in doing so. Yet although a considerable crop of conjectures has been offered, I have found none that particularly appeals; if emendation really is required, the most natural supplement would be an adjective qualifying *oras* in 721. Perhaps read *udas* (cf. Hor. C. 1.32.7-8 *iactatam religarat udo / litore navim* and Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.68 *forte diem Triviae dum litore ducimus udo*)?

*fortunisque ideo longe praestare putabant,
quod mortis timor haud quemquam vexaret eorum* (5.1177-80).

It is clear that in the first instance the repetition of *ante* was quite unavoidable; regardless, *quod non fuit ante* and *quod constitit ante* form a neat antithetical pair of verse endings. In the second passage, the latter *ferarum* appears within the latter title bestowed upon Mother Earth and naturally follows as the conclusion to the epexegetic verses that precede; the repetition of *Mater* in 595 is no less striking. In the last instance, commentators have sought to explain the repetition of *putabant* as a striking example of Lucretius' distancing himself from the views of misguided, god-fearing primitive man³¹. Consequently, I believe that the third instance, 4.509-510, is the sole genuine example of identical repetition at verse end to which no obvious poetic purpose on Lucretius' part can be attributed. It is certainly striking that only one such instance can be found in a work of over 7,000 lines (and indeed, had Lucretius lived to polish the poem, he might well have removed it). This fact, I would maintain, advises strongly against our imposing a similarly unmotivated repetition upon the work by verbal conjecture³²; the repetition of *ignes* at 5.585-586³³, both instances governed by a verb of sight and qualified by *quosquomque*, would be even more otiose than that at 4.509-510 and must therefore be rejected as unlucretian³⁴.

We must look elsewhere for a suggestion. Since the loss of the final element of 5.586 is almost certainly due to physical damage in the tradition³⁵,

³¹ Cf. esp. M. Gale, *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*, Cambridge 1994, 131 n. 8, who records these verbs alongside *tribuebant* (5.1172), *dabant* (5.1175), *tradere* and *facere* (5.1186) as a Lucretian accumulation "to distance himself from the views he is reporting"; for the close repetition of *putabant*, she aptly compares the appearance of *putarunt* at the close of 1.705 and 708. It was therefore somewhat misguided for P.E. Goebel (*Observationes Lucretianae et criticae et exegeticae*, Bonn 1854, 17) to include this among others in his list of Lucretian repetitions "sine consilio aut elegantia" or for Merrill to complain (comm. *ad loc.*: n. 2) that it is a "careless repetition".

³² This fact must likewise stand against the conjectures of Lachmann at 4.101 and Bentley at 6.281.

³³ A. Cartault. *Notes critiques sur Lucrèce*, "RPh" 29, 1905, 33-35, at 34, argued that 594-595 should be moved to after 585, a suggestion that Diels (n. 9) and Martin (n. 19) followed; nonetheless, as Bailey rightly observed, the place of *quandoquidem* in the midst of a main clause also occurs in the immediately preceding passage (5.581-583) and Marullus' transposition instead allows the argument to unfold *more Lucretiano*.

³⁴ Munro, normally so sure in his sense of Lucretian style, is therefore wrong to state (app. crit. *ad loc.*: n. 7), "similar repetitions are very common in Lucr[etius]". I must equally reject his suggestion in the same note that "*ignes* of 485 caused its [i.e. *ignes* in 486] omission", which I do not understand.

³⁵ Textual loss at the end of a verse is particularly frequent in the Lucretian tradition: cf. 1.748, 752, 1068-1075; 2.331, 428, 1115; 3.159, 538, 596, 705, 1061; 4.612.

palaeography has no bearing on the matter. Further, since 586 has so similar a structure to 585, there is no need to provide a noun with *quosquomque* in the latter line, *ignes* being instantly understood. A humble but by no means improbable suggestion is *ipsi*, which closes Lucretian hexameters in its various forms over one hundred times³⁶. Although *ipsi* would here provide appropriate emphasis of humans' own observance of terrestrial fires³⁷, it should be noted that *cernimus ipsi* happens to close 3.365 without any real emphatic force³⁸. Perhaps the remarkably tenacious devotion to *ignes* in 586 now merits reconsideration?

Christ's College, Cambridge

DAVID J. BUTTERFIELD

³⁶ I reckon the figure to be 103, although it can be increased by various conjectures; for the suggestion to read *ipsis* at the close of 6.1108, with the deletion of 1109 as an interpolation, see D.J. Butterfield, *The poetic treatment of atque from Catullus to Juvenal*, "Mnemosyne" 61, 2008, 386-413.

³⁷ For the emphatic use of *ipsi* with a first person plural verb, cf. 2.746-747, 4.465 and 817.

³⁸ It transpires that the only other conjecture upon the passage that I can find, beyond Marullus' *ignes*, F's *horum* and Lachmann's *flammae*, is E. Orth's *ipsis* (suggested in his review of the first edition of Martin's Teubner, "PhW" 56, 1936, 35-47, at 42). Although this conjecture could be right, in the thirteen other instances where Lucretius employs *in terris* it serves almost as a single adverbial unit and is never qualified by an adjective. Nevertheless, Orth later supported another (less successful) conjecture of his, namely *aestus*, a suggestion which need not trouble us.