point) the existence of tree-mammal hybrids;[8] Empedocles is also generally agreed to be Lucian's target at *Ver. Hist.* 1.22,[9] which further endorses the idea that his zoogony admitted tree-mammal hybrids.

I therefore propose that, rather than (or, perhaps, in addition to) referring to a specific mythological being or beings, Lucretius' reference to tree-mammal hybrids at 2.702–3 is designed to engage with and discredit a now lost passage of Empedocles, who raised the possibility of such hybrids. This fits well with Lucretius' argumentative and poetic strategy throughout his treatment of atomic shape,[10] and furnishes us with an origin for his otherwise mysterious tree-men.

EMMA WOOLERTON
emmawoolerton@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838809990607

[8] Whilst Arist. *Ph.* 2.8.199b10–13 would seem to imply that Empedocles did not propose plant-plant hybrids (*πότερον οὖν καὶ ἐν τοῖς φυτοῖς ἐγίγνετο, ὥσπερ τὰ βουγενῆ ἀνδρόπρωρα, οὕτω καὶ ἀμπελογενῆ ἐλαιόπρωρα, ἢ οὔ; ἄτοπον γάρ· ἀλλὰ μὴν ἔδει γε, εἴπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ζῴοις*), that in itself does not necessarily indicate that Empedocles did not propose plant-human hybrids.

[9] Cf. A. Georgiadou and D.H.J. Larmour, *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories*: *Interpretation and Commentary. Mnemosyne* Suppl. 179 (1998), 127.

[10] Cf. Sedley's argument for a recognizable Empedoclean 'fingerprint' on passages of the *DRN* containing multiple compound adjectives (Sedley [n. 7], 6–11); *semiferas* (2.702) and *omniparentis* (2.706) suggest such a 'fingerprint' here.

VIRGIL, *ECLOGUES* 4.28–9

> At simul heroum laudes et facta parentis
> iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere uirtus,
> molli paulatim flauescet campus arista
> incultisque rubens pendebit sentibus uua
> et durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella. 30

There is a recognized difficulty in line 28: we expect the advance towards the Golden Age to be described in terms of various marvels but, as Clausen remarks, there is 'nothing marvellous about a field gradually turning yellow with grain'.[1] Like many others, he suggests Virgil's meaning to be that 'the field has not been cultivated, like the briars in the next line'; but it is very awkward to supply retrospectively the notion of 'uncultivated' from line 29. In fact the latter line is itself not free from difficulty: since thorn bushes are proverbially uncultivated (Lucr. 5.206–7 *quod superest arui, tamen id natura sua ui | sentibus obducat*), *incultis* is redundant.

[1] W. Clausen, *Virgil: Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994), 136. In his commentary R. Coleman renders *campus* as 'any flat land' (*Vergil: Eclogues* [Cambridge, 1977], 138) but the difficulty with this interpretation is that *campus* is regularly used of agricultural land (*TLL* 3.213.28 ff., where indeed our passage is listed).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990619 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There would be no difficulty at all if Virgil had written:

> incultus molli flauescet campus arista
> paulatimque rubens pendebit sentibus uua
>
> uncultivated fields will yellowen with silky crops
> and, gradually, reddening clusters of grapes will hang
> from thorn bushes.

The loss of one golden line (29) is compensated for by the gain of another (28), we no longer have the Golden Age anomalously represented by a normal seasonal event, and the redundancy of *incultis* is removed. The hypothesized error must have occurred very early, since the lines are quoted by Lactantius (*Div. inst.* 7.24.11) in the form in which we have them; and it is admittedly difficult to see how the error could have arisen, unless the combination *paulatim … pendebit* was faulted by someone who did not realize that the adverb refers to the onset of a process. But scholars have found difficulty with the traditional ordering of the immediately preceding lines,[2] and E. Courtney has pressed the case for a similar transposition at *Aen.* 7.179–80.[3]

University of Virginia A.J. WOODMAN
ajw6n@virginia.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838809990619

[2] J.F. Mountford and A.Y. Campbell, 'Virgil, *Ecl.* IV, 23', *CR* 52 (1938), 54–6, with references.

[3] E. Courtney, 'The formation of the text of Virgil', *BICS* 28 (1981), 22; he points out that at *G.* 2.145–6 one of the Virgilian manuscripts (P) has a similar error to the one which I am hypothesizing here, although that error (for which see Geymonat's edition) is admittedly much easier because of the homoeoarchon of *hinc*. I am most grateful to Professor Courtney for drawing my attention to the parallel.

VIRGIL'S ACQUISITIVE BEES

In Mem. J. Butrica

In *Georgics* 4.158–83, Virgil describes his bees' division of labour and likens it to that of the Cyclopes as they fashion Jupiter's thunderbolts. The simile concludes:

> Non aliter, si parua licet componere magnis,
> Cecropias innatus apes amor urget habendi 177
> munere quamque suo.

Faultless though they stand in our manuscripts, lines 177–8 have raised questions of syntactical coherence and relevancy which together may cause us to ask whether Virgil actually said that *amor habendi*, 'love of having', drives or motivates the Cecropian bees.[1]

[1] A longer version of this note was accepted for presentation at the May 2007 Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of Canada, in St John's, Newfoundland, in a special session of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838809990619 Published online by Cambridge University Press