LUCRETIUS, VENUS, CYBELE, LOVE, THE GODS*

Hermann Diels once compared Lucretius' invocation to Venus to a splendid portal through which the reader enters his *De Rerum Natura*. In fact it is that – a splendid entry hall[1]. Lucretius' evocation of the empire of Venus over the entire world is a compelling inducement to his reader to enter his poem *de rerum natura*, by which he means the 'birth' of things in spring. Venus' empire over gods and humans is presented as an empire over the four elements of the Greek world, not the three elements of the Roman *orbis terrarum*. Her suasion over animals in springtime is like the power or charm that Lucretius hopes will attract his reader to his poem. In the sphere of the Roman world, Venus is asked to subdue Mars and bring peace to the Romans, to Lucretius as he composes his poem, and to his reader as he reads. Lucretius prays for peace (*placidam... pacem*, 1.40). This peace rather than any pleasure is perhaps the most attractive promise of his invocation and entreaty to the goddess. *Pax* rather than the *voluptas* that unites gods and humans in the empire of Venus expresses the moral mission of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, as becomes apparent from his definition of true piety: the ability to contemplate everything and *anything* with a mind that has been restored to calm (*placata posse omnia mente tueri*, 5.1203).

This prospect of a mind that his found its repose lies far in the distance. Diels' "glänzende Vorhalle". It is a cryptoporticus that leads finally to the plague that destroyed Athens, the highest pinnacle of human civilization (5.1448-57 followed by 6.1-6). The reader's experience of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* is a history that begins with an invocation to Roman Venus

* The original title of this essay was *Lucrezio, Venere, Cibele, l'eco, l'amore, gli dèi*. The Italian is more impressive than the English title of this essay. It was appropriate to the lecture I gave in Palermo during the conference on *Lucrezio*, *il suono*, *la lingua*, 27-28 October 2005.

[1] In a lecture of 1877 reprinted in *Hermann Diels*: *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, ed. Walter Burkert, Darmstadt 1969, 312-39 (the phrase comes from p. 313). This brief treatment of the philosophical rhetoric of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* comes as a summation of my studies of Lucretian *psychagogia*, reproduced in chapters 7-10 of *Paradosis & Survival*: *Three Chapters in the History of Epicurean Philosophy,* Ann Arbor 1998. This collection appeared the same year as Alain Gigandet's *Fama Deum*: *Lucrèce et les raison du mythe* (Paris 1998). Particularly relevant to my argument in this essay are his chapters on Cybele (9) and the echo (7). I do not focus on Lucretius' use of myth; rather I concentrate on his *psychagogia* and the submerged theology of the *De Rerum Natura* that begins with his invocation to Venus and ends with his description of the plague in Athens. I focus attention to his gradually emerging treatment of Roman religion – something that involves what we would call myth. Lucretius' treatment of myth was treated by Monica R. Gale in *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*, Cambridge and New York 1994. She has also treated two of my problems of reading Lucretius in *Lucretius and the Didactic Epic*, London 2001 (in chapters 4, *Venus and the Plague* and chapter 5, *Fear of Gods and Fear of Death*), London 2001.

and ends as the restraints of conventional religion are abolished (6.1276-7)[2]. The poem that opened with *Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divumque voluptas* (1.1) ends abruptly with the line describing the Athenians as they brawl over funeral pyres of their dead. Its last line is *rixantes potius quam corpora desererentur* (6.1286). There is an art that brings us from Venus to this scene of desolation and the abandonment of religion. The divine patron of this art is at first Roman Venus, but it is finally the Greek Muse Calliope, the *callida Musa* Lucretius invokes at the beginning of the end of the poem (6.92-5). At this stage of the poem Calliope can offer humans only *requies*, respite and calm (6.94). Like Venus, Calliope can still offer the gods pleasure. If we follow the implications of Lucretius' epithet *callida* and return to the first five books of the poem we will discover the most important didactic strategy of the poet of the *De Rerum Natura*: Lucretius' cunning method of asserting his philosophical mission by obliquely and gradually revealing the origins of the common conceptions of the gods held both by his contemporaries and evident in "the teaching of the learned poets of ancient Greece" (2.600). It is a subterranean stream that finally surfaces only at the end of book 6.

We are brought to understand, without at first really remarking, that the gods, as they are commonly conceived to be, are dangerous to our peace of mind. They are not figments of our imagination; rather they are the accretions we have added to our fundamental conception of divinity. They are the false and disturbing conjectures human beings add to their real experience. Lucretius' object then is double: to disabuse us of our false conceptions of the gods and to assert the moral truth of the Epicurean conception of the gods and true piety. As far as Venus is concerned, Lucretius' latent and ambiguous project can be traced from the invocation that begins the poem to the final mention of the goddess in book 5 (1017)[3]. As the argument of the *De Rerum Natura* develops, one can say, with Lucretius, *it ver et Venus* (5.737). Venus departs from the poem.

In his description of the seemingly perpetual progression of the seasons of the year he names Venus, Flora, and then Ceres; Bacchus he calls *Euhius Euan*; finally he comes to winter and Volturnus (5.737-47). Lucretius' deep and dangerous philosophical argument only becomes explicit in his genealogy of our conception of the gods later in book 5 (1161-1240). This argument first surfaces in his 'digression' on the cult of the Magna Mater or Cybele in book 2 (600-60); then in his treatment of the acoustic phenomenon of the echo (4.568-94). It continues in his treatment of delusions of love, a

[2] That *religio* can be connected etymologically with *religare* is evident in 1.931-2 (*artis / religionum animum nodis exsolvere pergo,* repeated in 4.6-7).

[3] Something I first treated in my *The Eclipse of Venus* in *Lucretius and Epicurus*, Ithaca-London 1983, 226-33.

seemingly digressive theme that returns us to the Venus of the proem and the wound that Mars suffers enchanted by Venus (*aeterno… vulnere amoris*, 1.34). This is again a manner of speaking. The *simulacrum* of the beloved inflicts a wound on the lover that provokes the emission of semen (4.1037-1208). The etymology Lucretius suggests for *amor* is simply humor: *Haec Venus est nobis; hinc autemst nomen amoris* (4.1057; cf. 4.1278-87). Finally, we arrive at Lucretius' explanation of the all too human origins of the universal belief in the gods (5.1161-1240).

There are grim prospects Lucretius' Roman reader must face once he has entered the portal of his poem: the teaching that the fundamental realities of his Roman world with its eternal elements of earth, water, and heaven – elements that he had been taught were divine – come to be seen as perishable, as are the *moenia* and the *machina mundi* of the world (5.91-109). The Epicurean universe is not the closed Roman world; it is infinite and it might inspire in a Roman the dread Pascal formulated so poignantly: "le silence de ces espaces infinis m'effraye" (*Pensées* 91 in the Bibliothèque de la Pléade). In Rome the *mundus* was the small trench excavated near the Comitium, so Plutarch reports, by the Etruscan priests Romulus summoned to Rome[4]. Lucretius' reader comes to understand that the gods of Roman cult are figments that humans impose on their real experience; and that the microcosm of the human being is destructible, as is the world he briefly inhabits. Ennius might write eternal verses (1.121) and Lucretius can describe the leaves of his poet's crown as perennial (1.118), but only death, infinite space and atoms infinite in number are eternal (3.1091). As he closes in on his argument that the world that he and his reader inhabit will one day perish, he can speak of the eternal lamp of the world (*aeternam... lampada mundi*, 5.405), but this is a manner of speaking. Jupiter, Phaethon, and an eternal world are all poetic fictions[5].

Prayer, sacrifice, and funerary inscriptions recalling dead relatives (*Dis Manibus*) and the sacrifices of the Parentalia, Feralia, and Caritalia are all futile gestures. *Manes* are neither the faintly divine spirits of Romans surviving death nor their terrifying apparitions, if offended by the living. Ennius was deceived by his dream vision of Homer into believing in an afterlife (1.102-26). Lucretius will explain what *simulacra* truly are in book 4 of the *De Rerum Natura*. They are not the εἴδωλα of Homer, meaning the apparitions of the dead mentioned in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; they can be explained

[4] *Romulus* 11. This trench might have been situated on the Palatine. The text of Plutarch is not included among the references in Lawrence Richardson jr, *A new Topographical Dictionary of ancient Rome*, Baltimore-London 1992, 259-60.

[5] *scilicet ut veteres Graium cecinere poetae*, 5.405; cf. 2.600 and 655-60.

by Epicurus' theory of vision both waking and in sleep[6]. Dream visions encourage the unsettling and haunting belief in the survival of the soul.

In the most famous of the *Odes* of the self-proclaimed Epicurean Horace (*Carmina* 4.7) the shades of the dead seem to survive the dissolution of the body and leave a shadow of doubt as to the afterlife. The seasons seem eternal; they stand in stark contrast with the human condition (14-16)[7]:

nos ubi decidimus
quo pius Aeneas, quo dives Tullus et Ancus,
pulvis et umbra sumus.

In the Aeneid *pater Aeneas* can invoke the constancy of the eternal return of the natural world and its seasons to assure Dido of the eternal praise her hospitality to the Trojans will gain her (1.607-10).[8]

in freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbrae
lustrabunt convexa, polus dum sidera pascet,
semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt,
quae me cumque vocant terrae.

Cybele (2.600-60)

The 'eclipse' of Venus is foreshadowed at the very conclusion of Lucretius' invocation to a goddess who has so many claims on the veneration of a Roman. The last thing he prays for is *placidam… pacem* for Romans, Memmius, and for himself (1.29-43). If we stopped here we would be left with the serene image rendered so beautifully in Botticelli's *Mars and Venus* (in the National Gallery, London) or Jacques-Louis *David's impertinent Mars* disarmed by Venus and the three Graces (1824, Royal Museun of Fine Arts, Belgium). But we do not. There is a disconcerting sequel to the invo-

[6] In Homer the word εἴδωλα describes the apparitions of the dead to the living (especially in *Odyssey* 11.476, βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων). Before Lucretius the Epicurean Catius had translated the Epicurean term εἴδωλα by *spectra*, something mocked by Cicero; his correspondent Gaius Cassius joined him in deriding it (*Fam*. 15.16.11 and 15.19.1).

[7] Horace's evocation of the progression of the seasons reminds of Lucretius, but his moon is "quick to repair its celestial losses" (*Odes* 4.7.1-13) and is immortal, as is the moon of Leopardi's *Canto notturno di un pastore errante dell'Asia*. Ovid in his description of the Arcadians can claim that they lived heir brutish lives before the moon came into being (*Fasti* 2.5-289-302). In the Hesiodic mode of the cosmogony that begins the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid can describe the evolution of the four elements of the Greek world into the stable masses of this world (1.5-88), but in his description of the Megalensia and its origins he can speak of the perpetually revolving axel of heaven (*Fasti* 4.179). Catullus evokes the constant setting and rising of the sun in contrast with the human condition: *nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux*, / *nox est perpetua dormienda* (*Carmina* 5.4-6).

[8] In invoking the shadows cast over mountain valleys Virgil's Aeneas is recalling the end of *Eclogue* 1 (*maiores… cadunt altis de montibus umbrae*).

cation to Venus in the theology of lines 44-49 (a translation of Epicurus' Κυρία Δόξα 1). These lines have seemed to many readers, and especially the editors who would remove them from Lucretius' text, a blatant contradiction of the accepted motives for appealing to a divinity. But, if these lines are restored to the text, we realize that Lucretius has made a striking contrast between his traditional invocation to Venus and his Epicurean theology. There is, indeed, a problem in the defective text of line 50, but the supplement [*animumque sagacem*] suits the sequel *semotum a curis adhibe veram ad rationem*. This transition serves two functions: it abruptly marks the transition from the traditional religious conception of Venus to the new philosophy that will both explain and replace traditional religion. It prepares Lucretius' reader for his evocation of the meaning Greek poets discern in the rites of Cybele, the Magna Mater, where the five line formulation of Κυρία Δόξα 1 is repeated (2.646-51) at the conclusion of Lucretius evocation of the poetic 'allegoresis' of the rites of Cybele. The poetic and learned explanation of the symbolism of these rites veers far from the truth (*longe sunt tamen a vera ratione repulsa*, 645). T. S. Eliot would have concluded: "That was a way of putting it – not very satisfactory; A periphrastic study in a worn-out poetical fashion…" (*Four Quartets*, East Coker II).

The long passage recalling a now lost Greek poetic interpretation of the symbolism of the cult of Cybele connects tenuously with its context. Lucretius' argument had been that the earth (*tellus* not Roman Tellus) contains within itself the vast variety of seeds that engenders the variety of the visible world (2.581-99). This is the unique passage in Lucretius where we are presented with a Greek poetic and philosophical interpretation of the symbolism of cult. It becomes more intelligible as it connects with his treatment of the echo, the delusions of love, and finally the origins of our conceptions of the gods in that it introduces the fundamental Epicurean explanation of human error. The Epicureans were perhaps unique among ancient philosophers in asserting not only the criteria for truth but in exploring the mechanism of error.

Our dream experience and our conception of the gods are real (if not true): τά τε μαινομένων φαντάσματα καὶ [τὰ] κατ᾽ ὄναρ ἀληθῆ, κινεῖ γάρ. τὸ μὴ ὂν οὐ κινεῖ (*ad Hdt*. 32); θεοὶ μὲν γάρ εἰσιν. ἐναργὴς δέ ἐστιν αὐτῶν ἡ γνῶσις (*ad Men*. 123). Error arises from adding conjecture to our real experience. One of the terms that describe this error in Greek is προσδοξαζόμενα τῆς διανοίας (*ad Hdt*. 50, 62; *On Nature* [34] 31.24 Arrighetti), that is, the addition of our mistaken opinions to our real experience[9]. For

[9] We find a similar term in Demetrios of Laconia's treatise on the shape of god, if δῆλον δ᾽ ὡς μ[ορφὴν τ]ὴν [ἀνθρώ]π[ο]υ συ[νάπ]τ[ωμεν τῷ θεῷ is a plausible supplement in column

Lucretius, the phenomenon is the same when it comes to religion, the echo, the idealization of the beloved by the lover, and our conceptions of the gods. In this short 'digression' on the cult of Cybele – a digression that finally leads to Lucretius' discussion of Roman cult and popular conceptions of the gods – we discover the verbs that describe the human habit of what I would call "attribution": *adiunxere* (2.604); *cinxere* (609); *dant comites* (611); *attribuunt* (614)[10]. In a perverse sense that Voltaire would have relished, the gods of Roman cult and belief are the creatures of their human votaries. Lucretius' language here and in his 'digression' on the woodland gods humans divine from the acoustic phenomenon of the echo prepares us to consider the possibility that religion and cult are the product of the human tendency to attribute all too human qualities to what is, after all, silent[11]. Or the divine to what is all too human. The Magna Mater is silent in the tumult and noise that surround her, as is the deep silence of the night as it is shattered by the echo of human voices.

The Echo (4.568-594)

Lucretius' treatment of the echo seems a digression, but it is another example of his gradual and oblique treatment of origin of the error of popular beliefs concerning the gods. In terms of Epicurean doctrine there is nothing to be gained by this digression. Remarkably, Lucretius begins by speaking of *himself* and others calling out to companions who have become lost in the mountains with their valleys shrouded in shadow and the echoes produced

XV of PHerc. 1055, as I think it is; see my *The Philosophical Writings of Demetrius of Laconia* in *Greek & Roman Philosophy 100 BC- 200 AD*, ed. R. Sorabji and R. W. Sharples, London 2007, I 208-210.

[10] In his long engagement with the allegorical theology of Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum* in book 7 of his *De Civitate Dei* St. Augustine preserves an account of the cult of Cybele that comes close to that of Lucretius. Something like Varro's account might, indeed, be reflected in Lucretius' treatment of the cult of Cybele, a cult that became notorious as it was transferred to Rome in 204 BC. Our knowledge of these books of Varro's *Antiquitates* comes from books 4-7 of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, both in his summary of its argument (in 6.3-7) and in some direct quotations. The *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum* are edited by Burkart Cardauns, 2 vols. Mainz 1976. If Varro's *Antiquitates Divinae* was published in 47 BC, Lucretius could not have known it, only the tradition of the kind of interpretation it preserves. Ovid describes the Megalensia in *Fasti* 4.179-372. Kirk Summers has given an account of the purely Roman context of Lucretius' description of the rites of Cybele in *Lucretius' Roman Cybele*, in *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults* in *Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren*, ed. Eugene N. Lane, Leiden 1996, 337-65. He also focuses on Lucretius' placing the Epicurean tradition of piety in a purely Roman context, *Lucretius and the Epicurean Tradition of Piety*, "CP" 90, 1995, 32-58.

[11] The meaning of silence of the Magna Mater (*muta* in 2.624) is well brought out by D. J. Stewart, *The Silence of Magna Mater*, "HSCP" 74, 1970, 75-84.

by their calls (4.572-9). The sound of these echoes in the wilderness prompts the people living nearby to conclude that their source is divine. They speak of satyrs, woodland Nymphs, and of Pan himself who in Greek tradition haunts the countryside at noon[12]. The tumult and music of this *plebs superum*[13] breaks the deep silence of the night (4.583). This passage represents a stage in the progress of the rhetorical theme that I am now tracing, but it does not invite the philosophical vocabulary Lucretius employs in his description of the cult of Cybele, the infatuation of love, or his account of how in the beginnings of civilization humans developed an erroneous conception of the gods. The origin of rustic beliefs in these woodland divinities is based on the sound of human voices echoing in the mountains. Interpretation of these voices produces satyrs, Nymphs, and Pan – all chimeras of the human imagination.

Virgil understood this passage as he took Aeneas to the Palatine hill and the site of primitive Rome where the still rural population of a city that was to become golden detected Jupiter in the thunderstorms that swept the city (*Aeneid* 8.306-69, especially 348-53). For Lucretius, there is another source contributing to the belief in these divinities. It seems to be unique in Lucretius: it springs from the terrible dread humans have of living in solitude without the remote company of the gods (4.590-592). Later, at the proper time, we will learn that the gods provide a refuge for weak mortals (*perfugium*, 5.1186).

The Delusions of Love (4.1037-1287)

Venus returns to the poem as Lucretius shifts his exposition of Epicurean philosophy from the external perceptions of sight and sound to the inner perceptions of the mind awake and in sleep. The external world and the internal world of the Epicurean are created by *simulacra*. *Simulacra* is an ambiguous word in Lucretius. It first describes both the dream visions that lead us to believe that the dead survive and can appear to us in some form (*quaedam simulacra modis pallentia miris*, 1.123) and then the films that are the medium both of vision and our internal perceptions[14]. In Latin the word also describes the images of the gods made by human hand. In this passage on sexual desire and the delusions of the lover, Lucretius has moved from explaining the mechanism of dream visions to the phenomenon of sexual de-

[12] As is evident at the end of Plato's *Phaedrus* when taken in the full context of the dialogue (379B-C) and Theocritus *Idyll* 1.15-18.

[13] As Ovid calls them in *Ibis* 79.

[14] The most striking illustration of *simulacra* (and *umbrae*) as images or wraiths of the dead is that of Virgil, *Georgics* 4.472 (in the context of his description of the Underworld, 467-80). The discussion of *simulacra* as the medium of vision is announced in Lucr. 4.33-45.

sire on the part of both male and female. *Simulacra* are no longer the dreams of Ennius in the proem: they come to possess a philosophical meaning. The *eidola* of Homer are transformed into the *eidola* of Epicurus. Venus, named some twenty times in this passage, is no longer the fostering mother of the Roman descendants of Aeneas. She is both metonymy (as are the divine names Ceres and Bacchus) and the Roman expression for sex and the women who provoke sexual desire. As the Latin proverb has it: *sine Cerere et Baccho friget Venus*.

What is of special interest in this passage is its context: Lucretius has now arrived at the end of his treatment of *simulacra*, both external and internal to our minds and both illusions and delusions. This entire passage comes at the end of Lucretius' discussion of the role of *simulacra* (εἴδωλα) in dream visions and wet dreams. "Venus" deceives lovers, who are more than willing to be deluded, by deceptive appearances: *Venus simulacris ludit amantis* (4.1181). The women from whom these images stream are no longer present to us but are transformed in our imaginations by the sexual desire that they provoke. The imagination and longing for perfection of the lover take over. The victims of the beloved's charm are led to attribute qualities to the women who are the objects of their love – or lust – graces they do not and cannot possess (4.1153-4):

> *plerumque cupidini caeci*
> *et tribuunt ea quae non sunt his commoda vere*.

It is the erotic imagination that transforms the Roman *nigra* to the Greek *melichrus* (4.1160). At the beginning of Book 5 Lucretius will remind his reader of the folly of attributing to the gods qualities they cannot possess (5.164-5):

> *cetera de genere hoc* adfingere *et* addere, *Memmi,*
> *desiperest*.

The Genealogy of the Gods (5.1161-1240)

Finally, we return to the theme begun with the invocation to Venus in the proem of Book 1: Lucretius' explanation of how in an early stage of their development all nations came to a conception of the gods. Here the subterranean stream whose course we have been tracing wells up. Venus disappears from the poem after she is last named in 5.1017. We have now come to that stage of human development that follows the fall of kings and the establishment political communities and communal justice. Lucretius evokes as a deterrent to injustice the stern watchfulness of the gods (5.1156). But this is a 'manner of speaking'. Lucretius' genealogy of the gods such as they are worshipped in Rome is brief and no digression. There are real sources for the common belief in the power, immortality, and prosperity of the gods and the

control they exercise over the heavens and earth and over mankind. Although kings have been trampled down, the gods have replaced them as tyrants. There are faint echoes of Euripides' *Sisyphos* in this passage (especially 5.1194-5) that still need to be assessed[15]. But Lucretius' final point is to illustrate for a last time the human tendency to over interpret their real experience: both waking and in sleep humans perceive *simulacra* of beautiful, powerful, and anthropomorphic divinities and grant them eternal life, immortality, and power. In the verbs *tribuebant* and *dabant* (5.1172 and 1175) Lucretius returns us to the language he chose to describe the over interpretation of the cult of Cybele (5.1172-5). The deliberate echoes from one passage to the other are audible:

> *his igitur sensum* tribuebant *propterea* quod
> *membra movere videbantur vocesque superbas*
> *mittere pro facie praeclara et viribus amplis.*
> *aeternamque* dabant *vitam...*

There are other features of human experience that prompted early mankind to invent the gods in their own image and likeness. One is the regular motion of the heavens and the procession of the seasons that induced humans to believe that this order was divine. Then there was the terror inspired by thunder and lightning, terrible storms at sea, and earthquakes. These frightening phenomena once drove humans (and the Romans especially) to conceive of the terrible wrath of the gods and to discover acts of worship to appease them and, in Roman terms, ask for the "peace of the gods" (*pax deorum*). It is no wonder that in his Roman context Lucretius asserts that *pax* and placation of the soul are the ethical objectives of his physiology. It is significant, I think, that, when he speaks of humans seeking to appease the gods, Lucretius turns to the archaic Latin phrase *divom pacem* (5.1229 in Munro's text).

The objective of Lucretius' *callida Musa*, Calliope, is, I think, ethical: it is to bring us to view everything and *anything* with a mind that has found its peace. Roman religion has no power over this mind of the Epicurean philosopher. Lucretius aim in writing the *De Rerum Natura* is expressed as clearly as it can be by the phrase *placata posse omnia mente tueri* (5.1203). This should, perhaps, be our motto as readers of Lucretius. But how shall we describe his method as a philosophical poet? As he treats of the gods and the thoughts and acts of his contemporaries, he is a gentle author: he destroys

[15] This fragment was attributed to Critias and figures as 88 B 25 in Diels-Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Both Albrecht Diehle (*Das Satyrspiel 'Sisyphos'*, "Hermes" 105, 1977, 28-41) and Charles Kahn (*Greek Religion and Philosophy in the Sisyphos Fragment*, "Phronesis" 42, 1997, 247-62) attribute this speech (from Sextus Empiricus) to Euripides, as would I.

these extraneous conceptions gradually and in what seem digressions or passages irrelevant to his main objective. How to describe his method: indirection, obliquity, Greek *emphasis*? Quintilian's "thematic anticipation" (*sustentatio*) would seem to fit (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.11): *Saepe enim praeparat disimulat insidiatur orator; itaque in prima parte actionis dicit quae sunt in summa profutura; itaque suo loco minus placent, adhuc nobis quare dicta sunt ignorantibus, ideoque erunt cognitis omnibus repetenda*.

A phrase from Martial occurs. It describes a bee caught in amber: *Et latet et lucet* (*Epigrams* 4.32.1).

Duke University, Durham NC (USA) DISKIN CLAY