old servant women to chatter and to be repetitive (e.g., *Mostell.* 224 f. and 247; also *Bacch.* 513 and 519*b* for repetition by an *adulescens*), but that the writer deliberately so characterized is very doubtful. One must exercise caution when faced with repetitions of this kind, but I believe we are dealing with some sort of Plautine expansion. At least three possibilities present themselves: (1) 68 was followed in the original by 74; (2) 67 by 74; (3) *queo comminisci* in 69 by *neque quicquam* in 76. The last of these possibilities seems to me most likely. Is it not eminently possible that 69–73 inclusive represent elaboration—on the lines laid down by Fraenkel—by the Roman poet? *Claudus sutor* in 73 is just the kind of thing Plautus might have introduced into the text. The idea of being "thrown out ten times a day" in 69–70 could have been prompted by 38 and 44; the *intemperiae* was perhaps suggested by the *mala res* and *insania* mentioned in 68. Not content with being allusive, Plautus gives concrete examples.

Without 69–73, Staphyla's speech is rather short, but similarly short speeches between an exit and re-entry can be paralleled: cf., e.g., Ter. *Heaut.* 502–507, 559–61. Another objection is that, although the hiatus is eliminated, we are left with the spondaic *quicquam*. But Hingst (*De spondeis et anapaestis in antepaenultimo pede versuum generis duplicis Latinorum* [Diss. Leipzig, 1904], p. 24) concluded that when the spondaic word forms part of a closely connected group of words (cf., e.g., Ter. *Heaut.* 788: *atqui quam maxime*; *Trin.* 527: *etsi scelestus est*) the heavy word ending is permissible. (See also Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 324.)

One cannot be dogmatic, but I suspect Plautine elaboration in 69–73, taking the repeated *queo comminisci* as the *indicium Fraenkelianum*.

IV

A similar elaboration may be detectable between lines 90 and 104. In the repeated *iam ego hic ero* it seems likely that we have the *indicium Fraenkelianum*. With the second *iam ego hic ero* Plautus is picking up the original again. What lies between these two points contributes little which is new, merely emphasizing the order that Staphyla must open the door to no one. The vivid examples of Euclio's stingy attitudes—expressed as four witticisms—in 91 ff. could well be Plautine, though none of the things mentioned is specifically Roman. It would be characteristic of Plautus to see here a chance for the kind of elaboration in which he specialized: cf., e.g., *Pseud.* 170–241. The general idea is, "Don't let anyone in on any account": Plautus sees in this a chance for some humorous particular examples. One might compare the cook scene at 280 ff., where the general idea of stinginess is a starting point for a string of fantastic particular examples of Euclio's stingy behavior. (For an analysis of the Plautine element in this scene, see E. Burck's article in *WS*, LXIX [1956], 265–77, and F. Klingner's in *SIFC*, XXVIII [1956], 157 ff.)

But again, one cannot be dogmatic. I believe that 90–104 are Plautine, but it is possible that the repeated orders (see later at 274) are Menandrean, and serve to characterize Euclio's neurotic fear of losing the gold. Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, Act II, scene v, offers some striking similarities of repetition in a situation which is basically the same as that in *Aulularia* I. ii. There the repetition serves to underline Shylock's extreme reluctance to leave his house, and his obsession with the possibility of theft.

C. STACE

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL

LUCRETIUS 1. 983

"Effugiumque fugae prolatet copia semper": Bailey renders, "And room for flight ever prolongs the chance of flight." Munro and Diels translate the clause in much the same way. This interpretation goes back at least to Lambinus. Lachmann, Ernout–Robin, and Bailey do not discuss the meaning of this clause in their commentaries; Merrill

only says that *prolatare* in the sense "extend" is found in Tacitus and Columella (here he agrees with Lewis and Short). Slightly different interpretations are given by Leonard and Smith ("And the chance for ⟨further⟩ flight prolongs forever the ⟨missile's⟩ flight") and Pascal,[1] who paraphrases, "La possibilità di fuggire ad un limite ulteriore spinga sempre al di là la scappatoia che tu vuoi cercare." Only Giussani takes a completely different line: "La continua possibilità della fuga ti allontanerà sempre lo sfuggire (all'infinità del tutto)."

It should be clear that *effugium* is not synonymous with either *fuga* or *copia fugae*. The difference is brought out by a passage in which Lucretius plays on the same contrast between the verbal forms (3. 1068 f.): "hoc se quisque modo fugit, at quem scilicet, ut fit, / effugere haud potis est, ingratis haeret et odit."

Effugium means "escape," and the point of Lucretius' argument is not that the ever-extended opportunity of flight prolongs the missile's flight, but that it precludes escape from the hypothetical limits of the universe. He makes the same point directly at 2. 304 f.: "nam neque, quo possit genus ullum materiai / effugere ex omni, quicquam est extra."

This will affect our view of *prolatet*. *Prolatare* can mean "extend," in a spatial or temporal sense. Examples of the first are Tac. *Hist.* 2. 78, *domum exstruere seu prolatare agros*; Col. 1. 5, etc.; and perhaps Sall. *Hist.* 4. 70 *imperii prolatandi cupidus*. An example of the second is Tac. *Ann.* 11. 37, *prolatare vitam*. But *prolatare* can also mean "put off" or "delay," as in Sall. *Cat.* 43. 3, *dubitando et dies prolatando*; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6. 42. The word is used absolutely at Sall. *Hist.* 1. 55. 7, *agundum est . . . non prolatandum;* Cic. *Cat.* 4. 6; Livy 21. 5. 1, etc. It can

also take the thing deferred as object, as at Sall. *Hist.* 1. 77. 16, *prolatandis seditionibus*, 4. 69. 12, *pretio in dies bellum prolatans*, 4. 69. 23, *pernicie nostra tuam prolatare*. This must be the meaning Lucretius intended here. "The possibility of flight will ever put off escape" makes a neat oxymoron to round off his argument.

We have now established the meaning of the phrase. But what is its reference? Whose escape are we talking about? Most obviously, the missile's (this has been assumed as a working hypothesis in the last paragraph). But in two of the three other places where *effugium* occurs in Lucretius' poem, at 1. 975 and 3. 524, it is used metaphorically to mean "escape from my (i.e., Lucretius') conclusion." The first of these instances is in the sentence introducing the argument of which line 983 is the conclusion, and it is unlikely that Lucretius did not intend its force to carry over the intervening seven lines. On this view the meaning of line 983 would be, "And the possibility of (the missile's) flight will ever put off your (i.e., Lucretius' imaginary opponent's) escape (from my conclusion that the world is infinite)"; this is almost the same as Giussani's interpretation, the only difference being that the temporal sense of *prolatet* is made explicit.[2] Against this interpretation it could be argued that the word-play in this paragraph depends on *effugium* having a different meaning in lines 975 and 983; but if it is metaphorical in both, we have a shift from the literal meaning of *fuga* to the metaphorical one of *effugium* in line 983, so there is no real loss in this respect. More seriously, the oxymoron of line 983 becomes less precise if *fuga* and *effugium* are not used with reference to the same subject. As compensation we have the parting dig at the imaginary opponent, which accords well with the dia-

1. In his edition of Book 1 (Rome, 1928). Details of the other commentaries referred to in this note are given in C. Bailey, *Lucretius: De rerum natura* (Oxford, 1947), III, 1782 f. The views of commentators who published before 1800 are quoted from the variorum notes in Valpy's Delphin Classics (London, 1823) or, in the case of Bentley, from the appendix of the Pickering reprint of Creech's edition (London, 1835).

2. The word-play would be similar to that in Milton's *Comus* 156 ff.:

> lest the place
> and my quaint habits breed astonishment
> and put the damsel to suspicious flight,
> which must not be, for that's against my course.

tribe character of the whole section (revealed by the second-person address to the imaginary opponent and the rhetorical question in line 973) and with Lucretius' practice elsewhere, e.g., 1. 704 ~ 692, 918, etc.

Probably neither interpretation should be rejected outright. The ambiguity looks deliberate. The word-play in this passage takes place at several levels, sound (*fuga–effugium*) as well as meaning and reference. Lines 980–83 are, as Bailey has pointed out (p. 763), an amplification of the only Greek version of this argument known to us, that of Archytas (47 A 24 D.–K.); perhaps the expansion was partly motivated by the opportunity for word-play which it offered.

One last point. D. West, *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh, 1969), p. 48, makes much of the idea that the picture of a

spear thrown beyond the boundary of the universe was suggested by the Roman custom of declaring war by hurling a spear over the enemy's frontier; this explanation is attributed to Bentley by Munro, on the authority of Wakefield (I can find no mention of it in the 1823 or 1835 editions). However, the authorities who report this custom refer to the weapon used by the fetial as a *hasta* (Livy 1. 32. 12; cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* 9. 53), while Lucretius uses the more general word *telum*; the original legionary *hasta* was not primarily meant for throwing.[3] This does not suggest that the *fetialis hasta* was uppermost in Lucretius' mind when he wrote these lines.

H. B. GOTTSCHALK

LEEDS UNIVERSITY

---

3. For the difference between *hasta, pilum, hasta amentata*, etc., see Klingmüller, *s.v.* "Hasta," *RE*, VII (1912), 2502, and Fiebiger, *ibid.*, 2504 f. If West is right in asserting that *contortum* in line 971 implies the use of the *amentum*, this would

tend to confirm my point. The question may seem pedantic, but as West himself rightly insists, it is to its concreteness and precision of detail that Lucretius' imagery owes much of its vividness.

DESULTOR AMORIS IN *AMORES* 1. 3

The metaphor of the promiscuous lover as a *desultor amoris* (*Am.* 1. 3. 15) is one of the most striking in Ovid's *Amores*, and it is therefore of some interest to students of Ovid's style to assess its originality. As the commentators have noted (Paul Brandt *ad loc.*; A. E. Housman *ad* Manil. 5. 85), the *desultor* image can be traced back to Homer (*Il.* 15. 679), who compares Ajax, as he leaps from one Greek ship to another to keep off the Trojan attackers, to a trick-rider (ἀνὴρ ἵπποισι κελητίζειν ἐὺ εἰδώς) entertaining the crowds on the roadside by leaping from horse to horse. But there is no need to suppose that Ovid had Homer in mind rather than the Roman circus-riders described, for example, by Livy (44. 9. 4 = 169 B.C.) and Varro (*Rust.* 2. 7. 15). It is clear from these passages that the *desultores* were established in the Roman circus by the earlier second century B.C., and that for the Romans the word *desultor* was a technical term needing no further explanation or qualification.

Transferred uses of the word *desultor* in

and before Ovid's time are rare. Livy (23. 29. 5) describes Numidian cavalry at the battle of Dertosa (215 B.C.) leaping from tired horses to fresh ones *desultorum in modum*, but this is a fairly easy transfer from one kind of horseman to another. Cicero (*Mur.* 57) speaks of Postumus changing his candidature from the praetorship to the consulship *quasi desultorius* (sc. *equus*) *in quadrigarum curriculum*; here the transfer is more striking, but the point is rather different: Cicero speaks not of the leaping of a rider from one horse to another, but of the intrusion of an (inferior) *desultorius equus* into a four-horse chariot race. In comparison with these two similes Ovid's metaphorical use of the image stands out; it can be matched only by Messalla's reference (Sen. *Suas.* 1. 7) to the political trimmer Dellius as a *desultor bellorum ciuilium*. In view of Ovid's known connection with the circle of Messalla (*Pont.* 1. 7. 27–28, etc.) it seems likely that these two *desultor* metaphors are not unrelated, and this raises the question which prompted the other.