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

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).
3 See e.g. 5.692 (concudit), 706 (inlumen); 6.149 (propiter), 349 (transsulat), 537 (imperventis).
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 conjectures, 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 Memmiada G.C.  
Lambinus.

1.412 haustis Büchner, Valenti  
Lambinus (1563-1564 ed. only) and, according to Havercamp, Codex Bodleianus Auct. F.I.13.

1.555 in sumnum G.C.  
Pascal.

1.566 constant G.C.  
Lambinus, who reads *constant*, notes: “sic legendum, et ita scriptum est in quattuor libris manusciptis: quibuscum faciunt aliquot typis impressi... quod annotavi, ne quis semidoctus putet repennonendum cum constant”.

1.619 minimumque Diels  
Pius.

1.739 tripode G.C.  
ed. Aldina (1500).

1.963 fatendumst G.C.  
ed. Juntina.

1.1013 Indication of lacuna: Marullus  
Attributed by Lambinus to “quidam vir doctus”.

1.1076 motis G.C.  
Lambinus.

1.1102 volucrum G.C.  
Lambinus.

1.1106 omnes G.C.  
Gifanius.

2.86 conflixere 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.
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2.268 *connixa* Gifanius
Considered it a “scriptura probabilis”, found it “in quibusdam libris manuscriptis”.

2.291 *devincta* G.C.
Ascribed to certain mss. by Lambinus.

2.300 *consuerunt* G.C.
Bockemüller.

2.356 *linquit* A. Allen
Q corr.

2.422 *tibi res* Martin
J.P. Postgate, “Journ. Phil.” 24, 1896, 134; *res* already suggested by Brieger, as Postgate points out.

2.462 *dentatum* Martin
L. Grasberger.

2.477 *quam* Munro
J. Roos, *Dissertatio critica continens annotationem ad Lucreti poëmatum libros tres priores* (Groningen 1847) 35.

2.529 *ostendi ut* G.C.
*ostendi* (without *ut*) Brieger.

2.830 *ultra* G.C.
Marginal correction in Q.

2.922 *aliam* G.C.
Wakefield, tentatively.

2.926 *quod figimus* G.C.
Creech.

2.928 *terra* Martin

3.154 *itaque et pallorem* G.C.
Lambinus: “sic restitui secutus cod. manusc.”.

3.474 “*cum omnibus edd. deleo*” (G.C.)
3.474-475 retained by Diels, as lines which Lucr. wrote, but forgot to delete. “quidam doctus” (Lambinus).

3.553 *liquuntur* Isaac Voss
Lachmann.

3.702 *dispertitus* Pius
Wakefield, tentatively: *contage e or ex* ed. Veneta.

3.734 *contagi e* G.C.
O corr.

3.742 *cervis* ed. Veronensis
Lambinus.

3.775 *inmortalis* Q corr.

3.794 *quoniam in nostro* G.C.

3.856 *multimodis* Lachmann
B, British Library Harl. 2694.

3.910 *sei* G.C.
Diels.

3.922 *adigit G.C.*

3.935 *si grata fuit* Naugerus
Pius: “alii. Nam si grata fuit”.

3.962 *iam annis* Traina
Krokiewicz.

4.81 *ibi clausa G.C.*
*clausa (ita cl.)* already conjectured by Brieger.

4.166 *omnis* Cartault
Isaac Voss.

4.345-346 (= 320-321 in OQ)
*ater / aer G.C.*
M.F. Smith⁷, tentatively.

⁷ G.C. includes my Loeb edition in his index and not infrequently records my readings,
4.352 *conlecta* G.C. Gifanius.
4.418 *atque avium* G.C. Munro, tentatively.
4.437 *fractas* G.C. Falsely alleged by Havercamp to be the reading of OQ; adopted by Wakefield – “absurde”, as Lachmann says.
4.471 *minuam* Martin Palmerius (see Havercamp II 78).
4.637 *alis* G.C. M.F. Smith, tentatively.
4.795 *cum sentimus* Munro Naugerus.
4.1089 *pluria* G.C. ed. Aldina (1500).
4.1209 (1208) *semen* Munro ed. Aldina (1500).
4.1225 *e* G.C. British Library Add. 11912, according to Wakefield.
5.44 *tunc* Lambinus Cod. Bodl. Auct. F.I.13, British Library Harl. 2612 and 2694 according to Wakefield; Marullus, according to Gifanius.
5.182 *hominum dis* Wakefield Said by Havercamp to be the reading of OQ (a mistake) and Cod. Bodl. Auct. F.I.13.
5.241 *nativo mortalibus* G.C. Naugerus, to whom G.C. wrongly ascribes *nativo ac mortalibus*.
5.287 *nativo et mortalibus* Avancius in ed. Aldina (1500) Avancius at the end of his *Catullus* (in his *Lucretius* he has *nativo immortali-
bus*).
5.372 *possint* G.C. ed. Veronensis; I suspect that ed. Brixiensis reads the same, but I have not been able to check.
5.429 *coniecta* Martin Lambinus (notes).

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 1692\(^2\)). 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 necutrunque Diels ed. Aldina (1500) (necutrunque).
et utrinque 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, 48 \(^8\).
6.199 fremitum G.C. Wakefield (notes).
6.216 ingratis Diels Lambinus.
6.223 saepe Isaac Voss Cipellarius (see above, under 6.131).
6.605 substracta G.C. British Library Harl. 2554, according to Wakefield.

\(^8\) 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.
II. contemplator enim, cum montibus adsimulata nubila portabunt venti transversa per auras, aut ubi per magnos montis cumulata videbis insuper esse alis alia atque urgere superne in statione locata sepultis undique ventis: tum poteris magnas moles cognoscere eorum speluncasque velut saxis pendentibus structas 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 semina convolvunt e nubibus atque ita cognunt 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*; 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 6.199-200, when he writes *huc atque illuc ventus fremittum et murmura mittit, dehinc quaerens 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: *magnō indignantur murmure clausi / nubibus, in caveisque ferarum more minantur*. Lucretius is very fond of making onomatopoeic use of *m* and *um* when he is de-
scribing rumbling, roaring, or growling sounds: see, for example, 1.68-69 *quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec muniti / murmure compressit caelum*; 1.275-276 *ita perfurit acri / cum fremitu saevitque minaci murmure ventus*; 1.722-723 *hic Aetnaea minantur / murmura flammarum rursum se colligere iras*; 2.1101 *tum fulmina mittat*; 3.296-297 *leonum / pectora qui fremitu rumpunt plerumque gementes*; 4.545-546 *cum tuba depressor graviter sub murmure mugit / et reboat raucom retro cita barbara bombum*; 5.1063-1064 *iritata canum cum primum magna Molossum / mollia ricta fremunt*; 5.1193 *murmura magna minarum*; 5.1221 *magnum percurrent 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.
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