CONJECTURES ON THE TEXT OF LUCRETIUS

Ι

iam triplex animi est igitur natura reperta; nec tamen haec sat sunt ad sensum cuncta

creandum.

nil horum quoniam recipit mens posse creare sensiferos motus †quaedam quae mente volutat† [3. 237-40].¹

Perhaps what Lucretius had in mind as inexplicable in terms of windy, airy, and fiery atoms alone was not so much "sensation and cogitation" as "sensation and volition." The verses that immediately follow are devoted to sensiferos motus; but in 299-322 interest is centered on character and temperament as expressed in voluntary action and choice. Reception and initiation of motion are frequently coupled by Lucretius (for example, dent motus accipiantque occurs at 1. 819, 910; 2. 762, 885, 1009); and initiation of movement goes rather better with volition than with cognition or reflection. It is possible to secure this meaning with little or no more disruption of the text than other conjectures require, by reading: et quos dat mente (menti') voluntas, though the local ablative may seem strained, and the genitive otiose.

Less disruptive would be: quae datque e (in) mente voluntas. Lucretius is not afraid of a postponed -que; for example:

- 2. 394 hamatis inter se perque plicatis
- 2. 1050 f. uti docui, res ipsaque per se / vociferatur
- 3. 662 ipsam seque retro partem petere ore priorem
- 4. 273 multa facitque foris ex aedibus ut videantur
- 6. 1007f. in vacuum prolapsa cadunt coniuncta, fit utque / anulus ipse sequatur
- 6. 1085 f. ut cava conveniant plenis haec illius illa/huiusque inter se
- 6. 1102 intempestivis pluviisque et solibus icta,

to which may be added, with whatever allowance may be required for a sometimes postulated preceding lacuna:

- 4. 824 errorem vitareque praemetuenter
- 6. 955 morbida visque simul.

1. The text cited is that of Bailey (Oxford, 1947), except that in 3, 240 the reading used is that of O, and in 3, 531, of OQ.

None of these exactly parallels the proposed quae datque, but they may be allowed to contribute to its plausibility. Omission of e after -que, or of in before mente is easily understood. quos datque might seem more syntactically expectable; but it demands more change of the manuscript reading; and quae might have been preferred, to distinguish the clause as additive rather than merely adjective.

71

scinditur atque animo haec quoniam natura [3. 531].

Animae is an essential change, and the postponed atque is improbable, as Bailey argues in his note on the passage. Lachmann proposed usque adeo; this has not been found acceptable. Usque commonly appears in Lucretius in conjunction with adeo, but not invariably. It appears alone, in the sense of "continuously," in 2.530, 3.1080, 4.374, 5. 508. We might then read:

scinditur usque animae haec quoniam natura

taking usque as referring to the gradual loss of vital sense depicted in 526-30, and making an effective contrast with uno tempore sincera existit.

Ш

et vulgo faciunt id lutea russaque vela et ferrugina, cum magnis intenta theatris per malos volgata trabesque trementia flutant. namque ibi consessum caveai subter et omnem scaenai speciem †patrum matrumque deorum† inficiunt coguntque suo fluitare colore [4. 75–80].

New suggestions for this passage are probably read more in the expectation of amusement than of instruction; but one may still nourish a mild hope of hitting on an acceptable emendation in 79. I suggest:

scaenai speciem patulam manantia deorsum.

Patulam is appropriate to the long Roman stage, and to Lucretius' liking for pictorial

detail; manantia goes well with inficiunt and with fluitare; its reference is not difficult after the firmly established neuter plurals of 75-77, and the trementia of 77, occupying the same place in the line. Lucretius uses the verb fourteen times, in a variety of contexts.

IV

praeterea magna ex parti mare montis ad eius radices frangit fluctus aestumque resorbet. ex hoc usque mari speluncae montis ad altas perveniunt subter fauces. hac ire fatendumst

et penetrare mari penitus res cogit aperto atque efflare foras ideoque extollere flammam saxaque subiectare et harenae tollere nimbos

[6.'694–700].

The exceptional force and fury of Etna, and its ejection of rocks and clouds of sand, are in large part explained by the force of the sea that lashes its roots. It seems therefore appropriate to read in 698:

et penetrare maris penitus vis cogit aperti.

The penetration is deep because it has behind it the full force of the open sea. *Penitus* is perhaps shared between the mountain and the sea; far within the mountain, and from far out at sea; but this may be overly subtle. It still seems best to assume a lacuna after 697.

L. A. MACKAY

KENSINGTON, CALIFORNIA

THE SALE OF SACRIFICIAL MEAT

In the Vita Aesopi the following passage occurs: $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\dot{\omega}\nu$ [sc. Aesop] $\dot{\delta}$ 0 ν $\dot{\epsilon}$ 1s $\dot{\tau}\dot{\delta}\nu$ μάκελλον τῶν τεθυμένων χοιριδίων τὰς γλώσσας ἢγόρασεν.¹ In Planudes' Vita Aesopi,² the same story is related, but Planudes has omitted the detail that the tongues were from sacrificial pigs. Apparently, Planudes did not see any point in mentioning the sacrificial nature of the pigs and thus omitted that detail. Why, then, did the author of the Vita specify that the tongues were from sacrificial pigs? That is the problem of this paper. And in the light of the following passages, the whole question of the sale of sacrificial meat may have some interesting implications for the passage in the Vita Aesopi.

So far as I know, the text quoted above has never been cited in the debate over a passage of Pliny's famous letter to Trajan concerning the Christians (10. 96. 10). Sherwin-White³ accepts Körte's⁴ emendation: "... passimque venire victimarum <carnem> cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor in-

veniebatur." Of course, the Aesop passage is in harmony with Körte's emendation. However, the Aesop passage should have been cited, since it may be the case that only in this passage do we have an identifiable person entering a butcher shop and buying sacrificial meat. Moreover, the Aesop passage would be an additional small testimonium for W. Schmid's 5 emendation of passim to prosicium or prosiciem, if tongues may be considered prosicies.

Another interesting passage in this connection is found in St. Paul: I Corinthians 10:25 and 28. Apparently, a Christian, on entering a butcher shop, would not know which of the meats were sacrificial and which were not. It would be necessary, one supposes, for someone to inform him. How, then, did Aesop know that he was buying the tongues of sacrificial pigs?

If the author of the Vita Aesopi was a lower-class Egyptian of the first century after Christ, as B. E. Perry maintains, it is tempting to search for some recondite

^{1.} B. E. Perry, Aesopica (Urbana, 1952) p. 52, § 51. A similar passage occurs in § 54. Also in the W Vita, pp. 90 and 91, the same passage occurs with a few changes which will be discussed later.

^{2.} A. Eberhard, Fabulae Romanenses Graece conscriptae (Leipzig, 1872), pp. 259-62.

^{3.} The Letters of Pliny (Oxford, 1966), pp. 709-10.

^{4. &}quot;Zu Plinius' Brief über die Christen," Hermes, LXIII (1928), 481-84.

 [&]quot;Ein verkannter Ausdruck der Opfersprache in Plinius' Christenbrief," VChr., VII (1953), 75-78.

^{6.} Op. cit., p. 2: "Neque de ipsa vitae forma primitiva, quod maioris refert, iam dubitare possis quin sit in Aegypto ab auctore aliquo de plebe Nilotica parum litterato ..." Ibid., p. 5: "... quem [sc. auctorem] vixisse probabile est saeculo p. C. n. primo ..." But see the same author's Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop (Haverford, 1936), p. 26: "... the most that one may say with certainty is that