cupressu nor the attractions of *cyparisso* may be absolutely compelling, there is simply no positive reason to retain the paradosis other than habit.

University of Leeds BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000513

TWO TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN CICERO'S *PHILOSOPHICA*

(1) deinde ibidem homo acutus, cum illud occurreret, si omnia deorsus e regione ferrentur et, ut dixi, ad lineam, numquam fore ut atomus altera alteram posset attingere †itaque† attulit rem commenticiam: declinare dixit atomum perpaulum …

(*Fin.* 1.19)

The above is Reynolds's text. *itaque* has puzzled editors since Paulus Manutius, there being no preceding main verb to coordinate with *attulit*. Some would posit a lacuna, either before *itaque* (Reid) or after it (Usener). Reynolds cites Simplicius on Aristotle, *Physics* 216a17 (quoted by Reid ad loc.) and Lucretius 2.221-4. But the parallel at *Nat. D.* 1.69 suggests that this is essentially the information Cicero thought appropriate for his argument (and/or found in his doxographical source):

uelut Epicurus cum uideret si atomi ferrentur in locum inferiorem suopte pondere nihil fore in nostra potestate quod esset earum motus certus et necessarius, inuenit quo modo necessitatem effugeret, quod uidelicet Democritum fugerat: ait atomum cum pondere et grauitate directo deorsus feratur declinare paululum.

Vahlen, who cited *Nat. D.* 1.69 in this connection, suggested that our text presents an anacoluthon, Cicero proceeding as if he had written not *deinde ibidem homo acutus, cum illud occurreret* but rather *deinde ibidem homini acuto occurrit*. In this he is followed by Moreschini, who prints the transmitted text with a dash before *itaque*.

that in all likelihood Catullus wrote *Sarapin* (cf. the similar split between *Serapin* and *Sarapin* at Mart. 9.29.6). More generally, A.E. Housman, 'Greek nouns in Latin poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal', *Journal of Philology* 31 (1910), 236–66 provides ample evidence of Greek forms being ousted by Latin ones in the course of transmission. While the majority of Housman's examples concern case endings, the pair *Hecuba – Hecabe* is similar to *cupressus – cyparissus*: as he points out (261), in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Seneca's tragedies and the *Ilias Latina*, the Latin form has systematically replaced the Greek one even when the latter is required by the metre. Housman ([this note], 266) also notes an exception that confirms the rule: at Juv. 7.11 the much rarer Latin word *tripedes* has in most manuscripts given place to the more familiar Greek word *tripodes*. Although in our case the available editions report no variants for forms of *cyparissus* at *G.* 2.84, *Aen*. 3.680 or Val. Fl. 7.405 (the only contexts in classical Latin poetry), such a variation is attested in Vida's *Christiad* at 1.621 *coniferis cyparissis*, where a manuscript predating the first edition, possibly the dedication copy, reads *cupressis* (which, given *Aen.* 3.680 *coniferae cyparissi*, can hardly be the original reading): see J. Hankins, 'Variants of the first redaction', in J. Gardner (ed.), *Marco Girolamo Vida: Christiad* (Cambridge, MA, 2009), 385–90, at 385. Finally, R. Bentley, 'Emendationes Bentleii in Ovidium', *CJ* 19 (1819), 168–77, at 175 may be right in conjecturing *cyparissifero* for *cupressifero* at Ov. *Her*. 9.87 on the basis of *cuperisifero* read by manuscript 598 at Trinity College, Cambridge; if he is right, then also at Ov. *Fast*. 5.87 *cyparissiferae* should be read for *cupressiferae*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To strengthen his case, Vahlen cites *Balb.* 32, where the subject *quaedam foedera* leads the sentence, with examples then specified (*ut Cenomanorum* etc.); Cicero continues not with *in quibus exceptum est* but with *quorum in foederibus exceptum est*.[1] But on Vahlen's interpretation these two passages present very different kinds of anacolutha. It is easy to assume intervening nouns being given prominence by making them the antecedent of the relative, with colour and specificity thereby added, much harder to suppose that Cicero had in mind deleting the *cum*-clause, changing its verb to the main verb and the subject of the sentence to a dative following that verb, especially when Cicero had successfully implemented the same structure of subject/*cum*-clause/verb at *Nat. D.* 1.69.[2]

Perhaps what Cicero wrote was not *itaque* but *ilico* 'on the spot, without further ado', suggesting rash action on Epicurus' part and in keeping with the criticism implied in the following *rem commenticiam*; cf. *Quinct.* 48 (criticizing Naevius' procedure): *ilicone ad praetorem ire conuenit?* The corruption would have been relatively simple: *i* followed by a letter with raised *hasta*, easily taken for *t*, then *ic*, in some scripts easily read as *a*; then a rounded letter. A hasty scribe copying a philosophical text could all too easily fall into *itaque*.

(2) Epicurus autem, qui res occultas et penitus abditas non modo uideat animo sed etiam sic tractet ut manu, docet eam esse uim et naturam deorum, ut (a) primum non sensu sed mente cernatur, nec soliditate quadam nec ad numerum, ut ea quae ille propter firmitatem στερέμνια appellat, sed imaginibus similitudine et transitione perceptis, (b) cum infinita simillimarum imaginum species ex innumerabilibus indiuiduis existat et a deis adfluat, cum maximis uoluptatibus in eas imagines mentem intentam infixamque nostram intellegentiam capere quae sit et beata natura et aeterna.

(*Nat. D.* 1.49)

———

a deis *Davies*: adeos *uel* ad deos *codd.*

Pease ad loc. has described this sentence as 'the most difficult and disputed in the whole work, if not in all the works of Cicero …'; it is also of capital importance for understanding Epicurean theology. Many points have been recently clarified, however, by the illuminating discussion of Essler, to which the reader is referred for detail.[3] The transmitted text is printed above except that Davies's *a deis* is substituted for the transmitted *adeos/ad deos*.[4] Essler disappoints, however, in his handling of the overall structure of the text. Noting that scholars have faulted the transmitted text because *primum* appears to lack coordination with a following point, Essler points out that elsewhere *-que* is used as a coordinator and proposes to find the missing *-que* in *nec*.[5] The problem is that *nec* here is coordinated with another *nec*, both attaching items that explain how mental perception (*mente cernatur*) works or, rather, does not work. Hence for the prior *nec* also to correlate with *primum* muddles the clear balanced structure one expects in a Ciceronian period.

[1] I. Vahlen, *Opuscula academica* (Leipzig, 1907–8), 2.344-7.

[2] Cf. J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 730, noting that Cicero sometimes allows anacolutha to stand in his *philosophica* to give prominence to a key idea; this would, however, not apply to our passage.

[3] H. Essler, *Glückselig und unsterblich. Epikureische Theologie bei Cicero und Philodem* (Basle, 2011), 67–108.

[4] Accepted by Essler (n. 3), 93–7.

[5] Essler (n. 3), 76–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A better solution is cited by Essler himself, who quotes Beate Beer as noting the presence of *tum* instead of the first *cum* in a part of the transmission, an easy mistake.[6] If this is right, we have a parallel construction, with *primum*, as expected, taken up by the following *tum*,[7] with the mode of reception (a) balanced against the origin and flow of the images (b). It is worth noting that *tum* appears instead of the second *cum* in C and B^1. This reading is sometimes adopted but still would require attaching Schoemann's *-que* to the preceding *cum* in order to achieve coordination with *primum*, a result that can be achieved more economically by replacing the prior *cum* with *tum*.[8] The variations *cum/tum* in this passage suggest that scribes were confronted by both forms in the transmission but confused as to the correct insertion point for *tum*.[9]

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000707

TYRTAEUS IN VIRGIL'S FIRST ECLOGUE*

The first eclogue opens with an exposition, put in the mouth of Meliboeus (1.1–5):

> Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
> siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena;
> nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua.
> nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
> formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.

These five lines receive two and a half pages in Coleman's commentary, five in Clausen's, six in the recent commentary by Cucchiarelli, and eighteen in Paraskeviotis's unpublished thesis on the *Eclogues*' sources.[1] Yet on the central line and a half (3–4a), in which Meliboeus speaks about himself rather than Tityrus, only

[6] Essler (n. 3), 76. The tradition of the 'Leiden corpus', to which *Nat. D.* belongs, has been studied in detail by P.L. Schmidt, *Die Überlieferung von Ciceros Schrift 'De legibus' im Mittelalter und Renaissance* (Munich, 1974); cf. also J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Ciceronis De re publica, De legibus, Cato maior de senectute, Laelius de amicitia* (Oxford, 2006), xxxii-xlviii. Beer's reading is not cited in Ax's apparatus; one will have to await details of her discovery (a humanist conjecture?).

[7] Essler (n. 3), 76 n. 41, citing *Dom.* 8, *Fin.* 4.72, *Att.* 12.18a.2, *QFr.* 1.2.2.

[8] This possibility is rejected by Essler (n. 3), 104 on grounds that a temporal sequence is not wanted since the images flow continuously. But *cum ... tum* can be read as setting the points in parallel ('not only … but also'); cf. R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Teil: Satzlehre* (Hannover, 1966 [reprint of 1962^4]), 2.350-2.

[9] This treatment replaces text and interpretation at A.R. Dyck (ed.), *Cicero, De Natura Deorum Book I* (Cambridge, 2003), 35 (where *cumque* is to be replaced by *tum* in §49) and 125. I would like to thank the journal's anonymous reader for a helpful suggestion.

* I should like to thank *CQ*'s anonymous reviewer and *CQ*'s editor for their comments and suggestions.

[1] R. Coleman, *Vergil Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977), 71–3; W. Clausen, *Virgil Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994), 33–9; A. Cucchiarelli, *Publio Virgilio Marone: Le Bucoliche* (Roma, 2012), 136–42; G. Paraskeviotis, 'Vergil's use of Greek and Roman sources in the *Eclogues*' (Diss., University of Leeds, 2009), 18–35.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000707 Published online by Cambridge University Press