

## Nine Lucretian Emendations<sup>1</sup>

DAVID BUTTERFIELD

*Christ's College, Cambridge*

1, 238-243:

denique res omnis eadem uis causaque uolgo  
conficeret, nisi materies aeterna teneret,  
inter se nexus minus aut magis indupedita; 240  
tactus enim leti satis esset causa profecto;  
quippe ubi nulla forent aeterno corpore, quorum  
contextum uis deberet dissoluere quaeque.

240 *NEXUS* *OQG*: *NEXU* *QI*: *NEXAS* LAMBINUS (ET HAVET SUO MARTE)

In this passage Lucretius develops his argument that nothing can be reduced to nothing, for otherwise all things could be destroyed by the same minimal force. The difficulty in this passage lies not with 240 (where the transmitted text is defensible as an internal accusative) but with *uis... quaeque* in 243. I follow Giussani, Ernout, Bailey and others in regarding 242-243 as an assertion explaining 241: just a

<sup>1</sup> I wish to make clear at the outset that I am of the firm resolve that the Italic manuscripts of Lucretius are dependent upon our ninth-century witnesses (*OQGVU*) and therefore can only serve as repertories of Renaissance conjectures.

simple touch could destroy an atomic compound, since it would consist of no atoms of eternal matter, which on the contrary require a specific force to be broken apart (*quippe ubi* therefore operates as a unit, as often elsewhere)<sup>2</sup>. However, if the phrase in 243 is to be taken as “each force”, that is “every force”, then this assertion is immediately undermined by 244-247, in which it is asserted that in reality compounds abide *dum satis acris / uis obeat pro textura quouisque reperta* (246-247). Commentators have therefore sought to render *uis... quaeque* as shorthand for “a force sufficient to break down each (specific) atomic *contextus*”<sup>3</sup>. Yet this is an undeniably harsh brachylogy. Bailey’s confession<sup>4</sup> is certainly merited: “it must be admitted that *uis quaeque* ‘the force appropriate to each thing’ is a strained expression”. At the close of his lengthy note he observes “[o]n the whole I believe [this] to be what Lucretius meant, but he might have made the meaning clearer in revision”. I myself would prefer to posit verbal corruption than to accept that this expression is the work of a sub-par Lucretius.

The difficulty of 243 can be resolved, I think, by emending *quaeque* to the far more general *quaedam*, thereby covering the full spectrum of forces which different atomic textures require to break them<sup>5</sup>: “whose texture a given force must dissolve”. Sufficient clarity is given to the phrase by the succeeding 246-247 (quoted above). Corruption at the close of the line is notoriously common in Lucretius as well as in other poetic traditions and, if the final syllable of *quaedam* was lost, *quaeque* would have been an easy but mistaken correction for a reader or scribe to make<sup>6</sup>.

1, 449-452:

nam quaequomque cluent, aut his coniuncta duabus  
rebus ea inuenies aut horum euenta uidebis. 450

<sup>2</sup> 1, 167; 1, 182; 1, 617; 1, 990; 3, 190; 3, 430; 4, 434; 4, 664; 4, 771; 4, 925; 5, 1158; 6, 854.

<sup>3</sup> A. ERNOUT, *Lucretius / De Rerum Natura. Commentaire exégétique et critique*, I (Paris 1926) comm. *ad loc.*: “une force appropriée à chacune d’elles”.

<sup>4</sup> C. BAILEY, *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, II (Oxford 1947) comm. *ad loc.*

<sup>5</sup> The collocation *uis quaedam* is also used by Lucretius at 2, 964 of an unspecified force causing bodily pain.

<sup>6</sup> For instances of textual loss at verse-end in Lucretius (where there can be no dispute that corruption has occurred) we may compare: 1, 748; 1, 752; 1, 1068-1075; 2, 331; 2, 428; 2, 1115; 3, 159; 3, 538; 3, 596; 3, 705; 3, 1061; 4, 612; 5, 586.

coniunctumst id quod nusquam sine peritiali  
discidio potis est seiungi seque gregari.

So Lucretius outlines the distinction between properties (*coniuncta*) and accidents (*euenta*). To my knowledge, no textual suspicion has fallen upon 452-453, save for the alteration of *nusquam* to the more natural *numquam*, as conjectured in certain Italic manuscripts (LPABI), and the predictable corruption of *peritiali* to the markedly more common *perniciali* (the pre-Lachmannian vulgate). Given, however, the use of the bare ablative *discidio* at 1, 249 and 6, 293, the common permutation of adjacent consonants in the Lucretian tradition and the common Latin collocation of *numquam/nusquam* with *nisi* (cf., in Lucretius, 4, 1205 *numquam nisi*), is it not possible that *sine* is a simple corruption of the rhetorically more forceful *nisi*?<sup>7</sup> The error, if it has occurred, could have been a mere scribal banalisation<sup>8</sup>.

1, 885-892:

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| consimili ratione herbas quoque saepe decebat    | 885 |
| et latices dulcis guttas similique sapore        |     |
| mittere, lanigeras quali sunt ubere lactis;      |     |
| scilicet, et glebis terrarum saepe friatis       |     |
| herbarum genera et fruges frondesque uideri      |     |
| dispertita inter terram latitare minute,         | 890 |
| postremo in lignis cinerem fumumque uideri,      |     |
| quom praefracta forent, ignisque latere minutos. |     |

<sup>7</sup> I am not convinced by the passing suggestion of Stephen HINDS ("Language at the breaking point, Lucretius 1.452", *CQ* 37 (1987) 450-453, at 453 n. 6) that *sine* in 451 is meant to serve as a "quiet pointer towards the 'correct' interpretation of the *se* in *segregari* [452]", which he believes Lucretius treated as analogous to *sine*.

<sup>8</sup> *nisi* was attractively suggested by W. Christ for *sine* at 2, 936, although it is better followed by P.E. Goebel's *conciliatum* (*conciliatu* mss) than Christ's *concutiatur*. The same alteration of *sine* (*corpore*) to *nisi* (*corpora*) was made by Housman shortly before the present passage at 1, 443 (see J. DIGGLE & F.R.D. GOODYEAR (edd.), *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*, II (Cambridge 1972) 424). He needlessly suggests spelling the word *nise*, resorting to three Latin inscriptions for the sole evidence of its existence. Yet if a scribe wrongly transmuted the *s* and *n* of *sine* in reading his exemplar or in writing the verse, the corruption to *nisi* would have occurred most probably in a single step. His emendation (let alone its orthography) has not appealed to subsequent editors. Although it was first published in 1897, the suggestion was perhaps made a number of years earlier, for it is found in the margins of his copy of Volume 1 of Munro's Lucretius (Cambridge 1873), which is preserved at St John's College, Oxford (Housman Cabinet 1). I hope soon to publish an assessment of Housman's overall contribution to the study of Lucretius, drawing primarily upon his unpublished marginalia and Cambridge lecture notes.

886 *LATICES* OQG: *LATICIS* F: *SALICES BRUNO SIMILIQUE* O:  
*SIMILEQUE* QG: *SIMILESQUE* QI 887 *LANIGERIAE* OQG (CORR. O1Q1):  
*LANIGERO PIUS QUALI* QG: *QUALIS* O: *QUALES OI SUNT* OQG:  
*DANT POSTGATE (QUALIS LECTO) UBERE* OQG: *UBERA LAMBINUS*  
 890 *DISPERTITA* OQG: *DISPERTITAE* ORTH 890-891 OM. QG

Lucretius here attacks Anaxagoras' notorious theory of *homoeomeria* on the grounds that, if it were true, we would observe traces of all things in all things, for the illustration of which he imagines the examples of plants and water giving forth drops of milk like sheep's, clods of earth containing herbage, wood containing smoke and ashes. However, the text of 887 is notoriously difficult: the subject of *sunt* must be either *lanigerae* (the corrected reading of OQ) or *guttae* supplied from the previous line. The transmitted *quali*, which can be retained as an ablative of quality, most naturally understands *sapore* of 886. It should be dissociated from *ubere*: the latter can hardly be taken (*pace* the commentators) as equivalent to *sapore uberis*; on the other hand, there is no obvious reason why Lucretius would compare the *sapor* of the liquid from plants with the *uber* ("udder") of sheep; finally, *ubere*, it hardly needs saying, is not *ubertate*. Accordingly, the transmitted *ubere* is left awkwardly alone and must be taken either as a bare locative ablative or an ablative of accompaniment. The resultant translation of the relative clause, "of which taste are sheep in/with their udder of milk", is undeniably harsh.

Markedly more attractive is Pius' emendation of *ubere* to the expected plural *ubera* (cf. *ubera lactis* 2, 370 (repeated at Tib. 1, 3, 46) and *ubera mammarum... lactantia* 5, 885), which stands as the natural subject of *sunt*. *lanigerae*, however, is left as an improbable genitive or dative singular, and Pius' *lanigero* leaves the awkward singular unaltered by merely changing gender. Significantly more natural would be Lucretius' use of the word in the plural, referring to *oues* in general (compare his use of *squamigeri* (1, 372; 1, 378), *pennipotentes* (2, 878; 5, 789), *balantes* (6, 1132), etc.<sup>9</sup>). I therefore suggest that he wrote *lanigerum* (or possibly the possessive dative *lanigeris*), which alteration provides a relative clause of lucid syntax: *lanigerum quali [sapore] sunt ubera lactis*, "of the same taste as sheep's udders of milk".

<sup>9</sup> At 5, 1442 I believe that *ueliuolis* was used substantivally: see D.J. BUTTERFIELD, "Emendations on the fifth book of Lucretius", *MD* 60 (2008) 177-189, at 188-189.

As regards 890, owing to the rarity of adverbial *minute* (used elsewhere by Lucretius only at 6, 353, of the small constituent parts of a thunderbolt<sup>10</sup>), the frequency of adjectival *minutus* (17 times elsewhere in the poem, including two lines below at 892) and the almost ubiquitous spelling of diphthongal *ae* as *e*, is it impossible that *minute* is in reality *minutae* and that, as Emil Orth<sup>11</sup> suggested fifty years ago, *dispertita* stands for *dispertitae*, which gender would more naturally follow *fruges frondesque*?<sup>12</sup> The parallelism in verse

<sup>10</sup> Even in this particular instance, Bockemüller's emendation to *minuta*, though generally ignored, seems attractive (cf. n. 12 below).

<sup>11</sup> Emil Orth (primarily based in Saarbrücken but also linked in his early career with Berlin and Bad Krozingen) was a German classical scholar of varied interests but remarkable for the number of critical suggestions he made upon the text of Lucretius. He had links with the aged Hermann Diels in Berlin, overseeing proofs of the Latin text of his posthumous Lucretian edition (Berlin 1923-4) and sending him his own conjectures in advance. Shortly before or during World War II he appears to have moved to the Salamanca region of Spain. From there he published over the next decade a string of Lucretian emendations in the Latin periodical of Barbastro, *Palaestra Latina*. In the mid-1950s many of these ideas were repeated, refined or rejected in a series of articles in *Helmantica* and *Emerita*. Finally, in 1961 he produced an edition of Lucretius with a parallel German translation and a select critical apparatus (primarily containing his own emendations). This edition must have had an extremely small print run as it is already extremely scarce. I am grateful to Dr G. Galán Vioque of Huelva for making copies of the relevant pages of *Palaestra Latina* available to me, to Prof. Martin Ferguson Smith for first providing me with copies of Orth's *Helmantica* articles, and to the venerable institution of *Ebay* for allowing me to purchase a copy of Orth's Lucretian edition. Excluding his earlier work Orth primarily published his scholarship in Latin. His non-Lucretian books include translations of Demetrius (1923), Nemesius of Emesa (1925), Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* (1935), Galen (1938), Proclus (1938), a book on Cicero's knowledge of medicine (1925), a study of the Greek term *logios* (1926) and two studies upon Photius (1928, 1929). Beyond the fact that he died in 1962, and that he is described in the only review of his Lucretian edition as "un sabio errante, que ha llegado hasta nuestro país en sus viajes" (A. TAVOR, *Emerita* 31 (1963) 152), any further particulars about the man would be greatly welcomed.

<sup>12</sup> *a* and *e* (often =*ae*) are commonly confused in the manuscript tradition of Lucretius. For the error of *a* for *e*, cf.: 1, 141 (QG); 1, 269 (QG); 1, 403 (QG); 1, 626; 1, 982 (Q); 1, 1058 (QG); 2, 27; 2, 376 (QG); 2, 452; 2, 535; 2, 559 (Q); 2, 678 (O); 2, 781; 3, 39; 3, 81 (QV); 3, 431; 3, 766 (Q); 4, 479 (Q); 5, 718 (O); 5, 1019 (Q); 5, 1142; 5, 1374 (Q); 5, 1392; 6, 86; 6, 254 (O); 6, 269; 6, 297 (O); 6, 324; 6, 403 (Q); 6, 639; 6, 764; 6, 897; 6, 908 (O); 6, 940 (O); 6, 1076. For the reverse error of *e* for *a*, cf.: 1, 475 (O); 2, 234; 2, 397 (QG); 2, 501; 2, 654 (Q); 2, 694 (O); 2, 724; 2, 758 (QU); 2, 895 (QV); 2, 964 (Q); 2, 1082 (Q); 3, 63 (Q); 3, 94 (s.v.1.); 3, 98 (Q); 3, 103 (Q); 3, 253 (QV); 3, 300 (QV); 3, 304 (Q); 3, 481 (QV); 3, 539 (Q); 3, 544; 3, 620; 3, 723 (O); 3, 736; 3, 760; 3, 826; 3, 849 (Q); 3, 958; 4, 72; 4, 429 (Q); 4, 498; 4, 590; 4, 659; 4, 844 (Q); 4, 1090 (Q); 4, 1141; 4, 1182; 4, 1270 (O); 5, 131; 5, 580; 5, 648; 5, 938 (O); 5, 977; 5, 1184 (Q); 5, 1221; 5, 1126; 6, 72; 6, 118; 6, 123 (O); 6, 483 (Q); 6, 767; 6, 808 (Q); 6, 900; 6, 991; 6, 1124; 6, 1148; 6, 1171; 6, 1199; 6, 1261.

closure in 889-892 is now yet more striking: *uideri – minutae – uideri – minutos*<sup>13</sup>.

1, 1074-1076:

omnis enim locus ac spatium, quod in<ane uocamus>  
per medium, per non medium, concedere <debet> 1075  
aeque ponderibus, motus quaquamque feruntur.

1074 *INANE UOCAMUS REST. L: IN O: OM. QG 1075 DEBET*

WAKEFIELD: *OM. OQG: OPORTET F: OPUS EST C 1076 AEQUE*

MARULLUS (ET DRÍRJR): *AEQUIS OQG MOTUS OQG: MOTU LOHMANN*

(ET REID SUO MARTE): *MOTIS UIR QUIDAM CIT. AP. LAMBINUM*<sup>14</sup>

(ET GARCÍA CALVO SUO MARTE): *MOTA GIFANIUS (1595)*

The supplements of L and Wakefield to the deficient closes of verses 1074 and 1075 can be deemed secure, as can the correction of the anticipatory error *aequis* in 1076, commonly attributed to Marullus. In this textually problematic passage I wish to object to the typically stative *quaquamque*, “wherever”, in lieu of the expected sense of ‘to wherever’. Owing to the common confusion of *a* and *o*, it strikes me as highly plausible that Lucretius originally wrote *quoquamque*. For the collocation of adverbial *quo* and *ferri*, we may compare 2, 226; 4, 424; 5, 1281; 6, 67. It transpires that *quocumque* was already conjectured by Lohmann<sup>15</sup>. Since, however, he also emended *motus* to *motu* (as did J.S. Reid independently), his *quocumque* was evidently adjectival not adverbial. It is true that *motus ferri* is a somewhat odd expression but “to wherever their courses are carried” is sufficiently intelligible for us to leave the remainder of the transmitted text unchanged. By contrast, the ablative *motu*, whether modified by *quoquamque* or no, would be a curiously weak and undeniably otiose element in the clause.

<sup>13</sup> *minutae* is found in the *ed. Veronensis* (P. Fridenperger, 1486) but, since it follows *dispertita*, this lection is presumably nothing more than a misspelling of the adverb owing to the pervasive confusion of *ae* and *e*. Wakefield observed, with uncharacteristic tact, “non repudiassem *minuta*, sed nihil ausim sine auctoribus demutare” (*T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, I (London 1796) comm. *ad loc.*). If the neuter *dispertita* is to be preserved, I would support this emendation.

<sup>14</sup> The emendation presumably lurks in certain more obscure *Itali*.

<sup>15</sup> W. LOHMANN, *Quaestionum Lucretianarum capita duo* (Braunschweig 1882) 27.

2, 806-809:

caudaque pauonis, larga quom luce repletast,  
 consimili mutat ratione obuersa colores;  
 qui quoniam quodam gignuntur luminis ictu,  
 scire licet, sine eo fieri non posse putandumst.

806 *LARGA* Q1: *LARGO* OQ 809 *POSSE* VQ1: *POSSET* OQ

Thus Lucretius explains the varied luminescence of a peacock's tail. Yet the appearance of parenthetical *scire licet* in 809 is slightly jarring. This original, uncompounded pairing of words is employed fifteen times elsewhere by Lucretius, always at line beginning but regularly followed by the accusative and infinitive construction or (as at 2, 797) an indirect question<sup>16</sup>. On the contrary, *scilicet*, used 35 times throughout the poem, is always followed by a finite verb, save for when it occurs within an accusative and infinitive construction already introduced (1, 888; 2, 469; 3, 765). Owing to the presence of *putandumst* at the close of 809, which clearly governs the rest of the verse, I am inclined to follow Lambinus in believing that *scire licet* is here an incorrect scribal expansion of *scilicet*; no doubt the occurrence of *scire licet* a few lines above at 797 aided this error.

Lambinus himself suggested *id* as the supplementary syllable before *sine*, for which he compared 4, 773 *scilicet id certa fieri ratione necessust*. Although his conjecture could be correct (notwithstanding the inelegance of the juxtaposition *id sine eo*), since the real subject that “cannot come into being without it [=the collision of light]” are the colours of the tail, I suggest that *hos* (a form used elsewhere by Lucretius at 4, 1186 and 6, 816) has been lost *metri causa*, once *scilicet* was expanded to a phrase of choriambic scansion. It is of course possible that the semantically weak (*h*)*os* was instead first lost by scribal oversight before *sine* and then *scilicet* was duly expanded to repair the scansion of the verse.

<sup>16</sup> At 1, 860 the following verse has been lost but the accusatives *uenas et sanguen et ossa* in the same line guarantee the presence of this construction; at 3, 866 *esse* can be understood as the infinitive dependent upon *scire licet* rather than *timendum*.

## 3, 1076-1079:

denique tanto opere in dubiis trepidare periculis  
 quae mala nos subigit uitai tanta cupido?  
 certa quidem finis uitae mortalibus adstat  
 nec deuitari letum pote quin obeamus.

## 1078 CERTA QUIDEM AVANCIUS: CERTE EQUIDEM OQ

I am in no doubt that Avancius' correction of the unlucretian *equidem* in 1078 is correct. My suspicion rather turns upon *adstat* at the close of the same line. The verb *adstare* is used only once elsewhere by Lucretius, in the literal, physical sense of Agamemnon's standing by Iphigenia as she is sacrificed (1, 89). Given the common confusion of *a* and *o*<sup>17</sup>, as well as of *b* and *d*<sup>18</sup>, is it possible that Lucretius expressed the conceit in an even more powerful fashion by writing *obstat*, a verb he used ten times elsewhere<sup>19</sup>? Not only is a fixed endpoint of life present for humans but it stands as a fixed obstacle for them. The assonant jingle of a given prepositional compound in two adjacent verses (*obstat... obeamus*) is not unlucretian.

## 4, 718-721:

quom tamen haec nostras acies nil laedere possint,  
 aut quia non penetrant aut quod penetrantibus illis  
 exitus ex oculis liber datur, in remorando 720  
 laedere ne possint ex ulla lumina parte.

<sup>17</sup> For the error of *o* for *a*, cf.: 1, 449; 1, 458; 1, 611; 1, 1008; 2, 123 (O); 2, 152; 2, 452 (Q); 2, 783; 2, 803; 2, 806; 3, 335; 3, 346; 3, 585 (QV); 4, 62 (Q); 4, 460 (Q); 5, 584; 6, 13; 6, 322; 6, 667; 6, 719; 6, 736; 6, 793; 6, 806; 6, 820. For the reverse error of *a* for *o*, cf.: 1, 1025 (Q); 2, 486; 2, 491; 2, 503; 2, 530 (Q<sup>1</sup>); 2, 954; 2, 1139 (QV); 3, 33 (Q); 4, 107 (O); 4, 118; 4, 1240 (Q); 5, 239 (O); 5, 756; 5, 1065; 5, 1111 (Q); 6, 28; 6, 205; 6, 227 (O); 6, 641; 6, 1069; 6, 1109.

<sup>18</sup> *d* for *b*: 2, 891; 3, 644; 4, 378; 5, 1003; 5, 1097; 6, 71; 6, 621. For the reverse error, *b* for *d*, cf.: 1, 286 (O); 1, 668 (QG); 1, 682 (QG); 1, 995 (QG); 4, 468 (Q); 4, 537 (Q); 4, 834 (Q); 5, 122; 5, 1110; 6, 878 (QU).

<sup>19</sup> Unlike *adstare*, *obstare* is relatively common in Lucretius in both literal (1, 289; 1, 337; 1, 973; 2, 88; 2, 794; 4, 1150; 5, 754) and more metaphorical (1, 780; 2, 280; 2, 784; 3, 26) senses.



721 *ILLIS* QI ITALI MULTI: *ILUS* OQ: *IBUS* MUNRO TEMPT.  
(QUOD BAILEY APPR.): *HIBUS* MERRILL: *INTUS* JESSEN

Lucretius allowed himself to use the dative *ollis* nine times; the only other form of this archaic pronoun is the homomorphous ablative plural *ollis*, attested at 6, 687 in the phrase *ab ollis*. In all but two instances (4, 177; 5, 1390) *ollis* occurs at the close of the verse. The later form *illis* is only twice attested in the dative (4, 1255; 5, 1035) but in its thirteen other occurrences it is ablative<sup>20</sup>, employed alone (3, 294; 6, 1219) or in the phrases *ex illis* (1, 61; 1, 554; 1, 630; 1, 773; 2, 612; 2, 820), *in illis* (2, 533; 3, 644; 5, 84; 6, 60) or *de illis* (3, 853). Since datival *ollis* is a favourite at the end of the Lucretian verse, whereas the markedly rarer datival *illis* occurs either in the first foot (5, 1035) or straddling the fourth and fifth (4, 1255)<sup>21</sup>. I wish to suggest that the bizarre transmitted form at the close of 4, 719, namely *ilus*<sup>22</sup>, is a corruption not of *illis*, as almost all scholars have maintained, but of *ollis*. I set little weight by the vague comment of Munro that *illis* “seems to me to sound better with *penetrantibus* than *illis*”<sup>23</sup>: the transmitted and unchallenged collocation *ollis tranantibus* at 4, 177 can hardly be said to be very different in sound<sup>24</sup>. If *li* were mistaken as *u* (an error possible in majuscule and minuscule alike), *olus* could well have led to the nonsense transmitted *ilus* (perhaps aided by the name of Laomedon’s father, necessarily familiar to all in later antiquity and the middle ages by his presence in the first book of the *Aeneids* (268)).

<sup>20</sup> I disregard the instance at 4, 290, in which the case of *illis* cannot be discerned because of the loss of preceding verse(s). For my suggestion at 4, 104 in lieu of Lachmann’s datival *illis*, see D.J. BUTTERFIELD, “Six Lucretian Emendations”, *Hyperboreus* 14 (2008) 1-7, at 2-4.

<sup>21</sup> In both of these passages, especially the latter, it cannot be ruled out that *ollis* has been corrupted into the far commoner *illis*.

<sup>22</sup> Misreported as *ilud* in Martin’s fourth and fifth Teubner editions (1957, 1963), the last of which is currently taken as the standard complete text of Lucretius.

<sup>23</sup> H.A.J. MUNRO, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, II (Cambridge 1886<sup>4</sup>) comm. *ad loc.*

<sup>24</sup> The archaic form *ibus*, as suggested in passing by Munro, I have dismissed as unlucretian elsewhere: see D.J. BUTTERFIELD, “*Lucretiana quaedam*”, *Phil.* 152 (2008) 111-127, at 112-113. Merrill’s *hibus*, only attested in Plautus (*Curc.* 506) and a Varroian discussion (*L. L.* 8, 73, 1) serves as a good specimen of his editorial perversity. Jessen’s *intus*, though an intelligent idea, unfortunately removes the desired deictic pronoun.

As my final suggestion upon the text of Lucretius, it does not seem to me improbable that his careful use of *ollis* was restricted by the poet to the bare dative. Accordingly, I conjecture that *ab ollis* at 6, 687 is a corruption, contrary to the typical banalisation, of *ab illis*, which would stand most naturally alongside the instances of *ex illis*, *in illis* and *de illis* recorded above. The simple confusion of *i* and *o* is by no means unknown<sup>25</sup>.

#### SUMARIO

Se ofrecen nueve correcciones al texto de Lucrecio. En cinco casos se discute un problema textual reconocido al menos por un editor previo (1, 887; 1, 890; 1, 1076; 2, 809; 4, 719); en los restantes cuatro casos, se sugieren conjeturas donde no se había sospechado previamente la paradosis (1, 243; 1, 451; 3, 1076; 6, 687).

#### ABSTRACT

Nine emendations are offered upon the text of Lucretius. In five instances a textual problem acknowledged by at least one previous editor is discussed (1, 887; 1, 890; 1, 1076; 2, 809; 4, 719); in the remaining four cases, conjectures are suggested where the paradosis has not previously been suspected (1, 243; 1, 451; 3, 1076; 6, 687).

<sup>25</sup> *o* for *i*: 2, 87 (Q); 2, 347; 4, 344; 4, 662; 4, 798; 5, 930 (O); 5, 1244; 6, 1; 6, 808. *i* for *o*: 2, 466 (O); 3, 985; 5, 113 (Q); at 3, 271 QV present *illos* for *ollis*.