adduced above reveal an underexplored facet of the earliest reception of Sappho's poetry in the Athenian male-oriented society of the fifth century—that is, at the time when our vase was produced? The Bochum vase certainly gives us access to the very first perception about Sappho in association with, and in pursuit of, female companions.

DIMITRIOS YATROMANOLAKIS
Harvard University

ETYMOLOGICAL WORDPLAY AND POETIC SUCCESSION IN LUCRETIUS

ignoratur enim quae sit natura animai,
nata sit an contra nascentibus insinuetur,
et simul intereat nobiscum morte dirempta
an tenebras Orci visat vastasque lacunas
an pecudes alias divinitus insinuet se,
Ennius ut noster cecinit qui primus amoeno
detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret.
(Lucr. 1.112–19)

For they do not understand the nature of the soul, whether it is born or smuggled into us at birth; and whether it perishes with us, destroyed by death, or goes to the shades of Orcus and its huge chasms, or worms its way into other animals by divine agency, as our own Ennius sang, who first brought down from pleasant Helicon a garland of everlasting leaves, to bring him bright renown amongst the peoples of Italy.

Critics have observed that these lines—in which Lucretius simultaneously acknowledges a poetic debt to Ennius and distances himself from the earlier poet's eschatological beliefs—contain a pun: the reference in line 118 to the poet's "garland of everlasting leaves" suggests an etymological link between Ennius' name and the adjective *perennis*.[1] But the possibility that the passage contains a further, implicit reference to another of Lucretius' poetic models has not (to my knowledge) been previously observed. Ennius' *corona*—the mark of his poetic distinction—is both "everlasting" (*perenni fronde*) and destined to bring him "bright fame" (*quae clara clueret*). The two phrases taken together suggest the name of Empedocles, literally "eternally renowned."[2]

I would like to dedicate this paper to the memory of Don Fowler, *cuius ego ingressa vestigia rationes persequor.* I am also indebted to Gordon Campbell, Robert Maltby, Damien Nelis, Jim O'Hara, David Scourfield, David Sedley, and *CP*'s anonymous readers for comments on earlier drafts.

1. P. Friedländer, "Pattern of Sound and Atomic Theory in Lucretius," *AJP* 62 (1941): 16–34, at 20; J. M. Snyder, *Puns and Poetry in Lucretius' "De Rerum Natura"* (Amsterdam, 1980), 31, 107. Cf. Denis Feeney ("*Mea tempora:* Patterning of Time in the *Metamorphoses*," in *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's "Metamorphoses" and Its Reception,* ed. P. R. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds [Cambridge, 1999], 13–30), who suggests (at n. 17) that the pun may go back to Ennius himself.

2. I.e., ἔμπεδος ("steadfast," "lasting") + κλέος ("fame," "glory"). Puns on the name-element -κλης are common: cf., for example, the Homeric Cleopatra, wife of Meleager in Phoenix's exemplary tale in *Iliad* 9, the elements of whose name reverse those of Patroclus, her counterpart in the main narrative. Note also that Lucretius himself glosses the closely related element -κλειτος by *clarus* in 1.638–39, *Heraclitus . . . clarus ob obscuram linguam.*

Though puns on personal names are a distinctive feature of Lucretius' poem, this passage is exceptional in that Empedocles' name is not explicitly mentioned;[3] the supposition that the *doctus lector* might nevertheless be expected to see a reference here to the earlier philosopher-poet can, however, be supported in several ways. First, the second element in Empedocles' name is in fact etymologically related to the Latin *clueo,* an unusual—though characteristically Lucretian—verb, which is given particular emphasis here by the jingle *clara clueret.*[4] Secondly, Lucretius goes on in lines 124–26 to allude to the dream narrated by Ennius at the beginning of the *Annales* (frags. 2–10 Skutsch), in which the spirit of Homer appeared to him and expounded the theory of reincarnation (apparently revealing in the process that his own soul had now taken up residence in the body of his interlocutor). The epithet that Lucretius attaches to Homer, *semper florens* (124), is virtually synonymous with the phrase *perenni fronde,* and also connotes the idea of fame embodied in *clara clueret.* Thus, both Ennius and Homer are endowed with the quality indicated by Empedocles' name. Thirdly, there is a strong possibility that Empedocles himself punned on his own name: the opening line of frag. 77 juxtaposes the unique compound adjectives ἐμπεδόφυλλος and ἐμπεδόκαρπος, and (while the context here is not overtly metapoetic) it is hard to resist the idea that an etymological play is hinted at.[5] The two compound adjectives, moreover, are near equivalents of the Lucretian phrases *perenni fronde* and *semper florens* respectively. Finally, and most significantly, the context in Lucretius is highly Empedoclean: allusions to the *Peri Phuseos* have been detected in Book 1's opening hymn to Venus, the eulogy of Epicurus at 62–79, and the account of the sacrifice of Iphigenia in 80–101; Empedocles himself also subscribed to the doctrine of metempsychosis, which is the immediate subject under discussion in 116–26.[6]

What significance would such an etymological play have in this context? The most obvious function of an implicit allusion to Empedocles at this point would be to link him into the explicit line of succession drawn from Homer to Ennius: Lucretius suggests that both are in some sense Empedoclean poets. The context itself implies that all three are linked by a shared belief in reincarnation; but Lucretius might also be

3. Cf. 1.638–39 (discussed in the previous note), 1.32 (*mortalis . . . Mavors*), 3.1034 (*Scipiadas* glossed by *fulmen* = σκηπτός), 3.1042 (*Epicurus . . . decurso*), 6.93–94 (*callida musa Calliope*); for discussion, see Snyder, *Puns and Poetry* (n. 1 above), 107–8 and 117–19. A parallel instance of wordplay involving an author present only by allusion and not mentioned by name can be found in Virgil, if the reader is willing to accept M. Haslam's tentative suggestion that *sol* at *Georgics* 1.438 alludes to *Soli,* the birthplace of Aratus ("Hidden Signs: Aratus, *Diosemiai* 46ff., Vergil, *Georgics* 1.424ff.," *HSCP* 94 [1992]: 199–204, at 203–4).

4. For the etymology, see A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*[4] (Paris, 1959), s.v. *clueo.* The verb is a favorite with Plautus and Lucretius, otherwise rare (a search of the PHI CD-ROM [version 5.3, 1991] turned up 42 citations, of which 27 are accounted for by these two writers).

5. Both M. R. Wright (*Empedocles: The Extant Fragments* [New Haven and London, 1981], ad loc.) and D. N. Sedley (*Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* [Cambridge, 1998], p. 25, n. 91) suggest the possibility that Empedocles is playing on the etymology of his own name here. Richard Hunter (*The "Argonautica" of Apollonius: Literary Studies* [Cambridge, 1993], p. 163 and n. 41) detects a similar pun in Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.499, where Orpheus employs the phrase ἔμπεδον αἰὲν in a highly Empedoclean context (he has just described the separation of the elements by the agency of νεῖκος). (I would like to thank my colleague Damien Nelis for drawing my attention to this reference.)

6. See D. J. Furley, "Variations on Themes from Empedocles in Lucretius' Proem," *BICS* 17 (1970): 55–64; D. Clay, *Lucretius and Epicurus* (Ithaca and London, 1983), 87–93; M. R. Gale, *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius* (Cambridge, 1994), 67–73; Sedley, *Lucretius* (n. 5 above), 15–34.

seen as indicating an unbroken line of *poetic* succession, from Homer, through Empedocles and Ennius, to his own poem.[7]

The passage in Book 1 can thus be seen to form part of a series of passages punctuating the first half of the poem in which Lucretius implicitly reflects on the issue of poetic succession. In 1.716–33, Empedocles is mentioned by name. Just as in the case of Ennius, Lucretius combines warm praise for his predecessor's poetry (*carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius / vociferantur et exponunt praeclara reperta, / ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus,* 731–33) with the rejection of his philosophical views (*principiis tamen in rerum fecere ruinas / et graviter magni magno cecidere ibi casu,* 740–41); and, once again, the poet puns on a name, this time his own *cognomen* Carus.[8] After a brief catalogue of the natural wonders of Sicily, Lucretius concludes that the island's most impressive product is Empedocles himself: *nil tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se / nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur* (729–30). Thus, just as Ennius is linked with Empedocles by etymological play on the latter's name, so Empedocles is linked in turn with Lucretius himself. Ennius (and Homer) are Empedoclean poets; Empedocles is a Lucretian poet.

The catalogue of the heroic dead in 3.1025–44 contains a further reference to Homer, the greatest of the poets (*adde Heliconiadum comites; quorum unus Homerus / sceptra potitus,* 1037–38). This time, however, poetry is subordinated to philosophy: the climactic figures in the catalogue are Democritus and Epicurus, "who in his genius surpassed the whole human race and eclipsed them all, as the rising sun eclipses the stars" (1043–44). Again, a kind of transference is operating here: as Ennius is praised by means of a metaphor alluding to the etymology of Empedocles' name, and Empedocles by means of an adjective suggesting Lucretius' own *cognomen,* Epicurus' superiority to the rest of the human race is expressed in terms that had previously been applied (in an epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum) to Homer.[9] The implication here is perhaps that the whole poetic tradition underlying Lucretius' work is secondary to the philosophical inspiration offered by Epicurus himself.

The context of the reference to Homer in Book 3 also has interesting resonances with the context of Lucretius' praise of Ennius in Book 1. The controversy alluded to in 1.112–19 has now been resolved (see especially 3.741–83, where the doctrine of

7. Modern studies of the four poets have tended to suggest a similar line of succession: for Homeric echoes in Empedocles, see J. Bollack, *Empédocle,* vol. 1 (Paris, 1965), 277–327; for Empedoclean echoes in Ennius, see P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's "Aeneid": Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 79–83 (with further bibliography at n. 118); for Homeric, Empedoclean, and Ennian echoes in Lucretius, see C. Murley, "Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura,* Viewed as Epic," *TAPA* 78 (1947): 336–46; G. B. Conte, "Ὕψος e diatriba nello stile di Lucrezio," *Maia* 18 (1966): 338–68; R. G. Mayer, "The Epic of Lucretius," *PLLS* 6 (1990): 35–43; Gale, *Myth and Poetry* (n. 6 above), 59–74 and 106–14; Sedley, *Lucretius,* 1–34. Several recent studies have tended to suggest that Empedocles' impact on both Alexandrian and Roman poetry was greater than has traditionally been supposed: see especially P. R. Hardie, "The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15: Empedoclean *Epos*," *CQ* 45 (1995): 204–14, and D. P. Nelis, "Apollonius Rhodius and the Traditions of Latin Epic Poetry," in *Hellenistica Groningana,* vol. 4, ed. A. Harder et al. (forthcoming).

8. Cf. E. D. Kollman, "Lucretius' Criticism of the Early Greek Philosophers," *StudClas* 13 (1971): pp. 79–93, at n. 46; Gale, *Myth and Poetry,* 59. It should perhaps be noted that there is no ancient authority for the *cognomen,* which is first recorded in the subscriptions of the ninth-century manuscripts O, U, and V; I can see no compelling reason to doubt its authenticity, however.

9. *Anth. Pal.* 9.24; cf. E. J. Kenney, *Lucretius: "De Rerum Natura" Book III* (Cambridge, 1971), ad loc., and (for the probability that Lucretius was familiar with the poets of Meleager's *Garland*) "*Doctus Lucretius*," *Mnemosyne,* 4th ser., 23 (1970): 381–88. The significance of the allusion to Leonidas (and other literary echoes in the "catalogue") is well discussed by C. P. Segal (*Lucretius on Death and Anxiety: Poetry and Philosophy in "De Rerum Natura"* [Princeton, 1990], 175–80).

metempsychosis comes under attack): despite Ennius' own claims, Homer (and Empedocles and Ennius, and even Epicurus) are really dead. What survives, however, is poetry, or the posthumous glory conferred by *divina reperta* (6.7, of Epicurus). Ennius was wrong in one sense, but right in another: Homer's poetry is *semper florens,* even though its creator is dead; and the "garland" of Ennius' own poetry has also proved to be *perennis*. This theme is of some importance for Lucretius' own project: one of the avowed aims of the *De Rerum Natura* is to preserve and spread the fame of Epicurus' "golden words," which are "most worthy of eternal life" (3.13). That eternal life can be conferred on them, Lucretius suggests, by the power of poetry.[10]

The notion that Epicurus himself is the poet's true inspiration, and the poetic tradition represented by Homer, Empedocles, and Ennius only of secondary importance, receives further support from one last etymological play. At the very beginning of the poem, Lucretius appeals to Venus to aid him in the composition of the work. Unusually, the patron deity is asked to provide neither information nor inspiration: rather, she is to act as the poet's *socia* (1.24). The Latin word translates neatly into the Greek name of Lucretius' mentor, Ἐπίκουρος.[11]

The series of allusive etymologies that I have identified can thus be interpreted as a playful means of expressing something fundamental to Lucretius' conception of his own project: this is a poem in the tradition of natural-philosophical epic inaugurated by Homer[12] and continued (to a greater or lesser extent) by Empedocles and Ennius; but at the same time, the philosophical message derived directly from the "divine" words of Epicurus is primary.

It might be objected that Lucretius has chosen such a subtle and obscure way of indicating this line of succession that few readers would have noticed it; this may well be true, but the subtlety itself arguably points to another strand in Lucretius' poetic heritage. A fourth poet indirectly alluded to in the proem to Book 1 is Callimachus, whose praise of Aratus' σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη lies (as I have pointed out elsewhere) behind Lucretius' reference to wakeful nights in 1.142.[13] It has been suggested that the pervasive use of etymology in *De Rerum Natura* should be connected with Epicurean

10. For Lucretius' emphasis on the power of poetry to preserve the memory of past events, see further P. H. Schrijvers, Horror ac divina voluptas: *Études sur la poétique et la poésie de Lucrèce* (Amsterdam, 1970), 79–81; Segal, *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety* (n. 9 above), 180–86; Gale, *Myth and Poetry,* 151–52.

11. When I first proposed this interpretation of Lucretius' invocation (*Myth and Poetry,* 137), I was unaware of an intriguing parallel that has come to light in the new fragment of Simonides first published by P. J. Parsons in *POxy* 59 (1992): 4–50. In v. 21, Simonides, like Lucretius, calls on the Muse to act as his ἐπίκουρος; J. J. O'Hara, "Venus or the Muse as 'Ally'" (Lucr. 1.24, Simon. Frag. Eleg. 11.20–22W)," *CP* 93 (1998): 69–74, draws attention to the parallel, and points out that the context in Simonides—as in Lucretius—seems to concern "the role of poets like Homer in memorializing great deeds" (pp. 73–74).

12. From an early date, critics of an allegorizing bent saw Homer as an authority on philosophical and scientific matters, and his characters (particularly the gods) as symbols of physical elements and processes, or of ethical values: an extreme example is the "allegorist" Heraclitus (1st century C.E.?), who argues that Plato and Epicurus "stole" their ideas from The Poet. On the allegorical tradition, see especially F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque* (Paris, 1956) and J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie: Les Origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes* (Paris, 1958). Several recent studies—following in the wake of Philip Hardie's groundbreaking *Virgil's "Aeneid": Cosmos and Imperium* (n. 7 above)—have posited links of various kinds between allegorizing criticism and passages of self-conscious reflection on poetic succession of the kind discussed here: see especially J. G. Farrell, *Vergil's "Georgics" and the Traditions of Ancient Epic* (New York, 1991), esp. 157–72; L. Morgan, *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's "Georgics"* (Cambridge, 1999); and the articles by Hardie and Nelis cited in n. 7 above.

13. Callim. *Epigr.* 27.3–4; cf. Gale, *Myth and Poetry,* p. 107, n. 41. On Lucretius and Callimacheanism, cf. also E. J. Kenney, "*Doctus Lucretius*" (n. 9 above), and R. D. Brown, "Lucretius and Callimachus," *ICS* 7 (1982): 77–97.

linguistic theory; but an equally (or perhaps more) plausible connection might be made with the prominence of etymological play in Alexandrian and neoteric poetry. A reader alert to such metapoetic subtleties as the acrostic on the word λεπτός at Aratus *Phaenomena* 783–87 (or the still more subtle "signature" that has been detected in Virgil's version of Aratus, at *Georgics* 1.429–33) would surely have had no difficulty in appreciating the chain of etymologies that I have described.[14]

MONICA R. GALE
Trinity College, Dublin

14. For the Alexandrian interest in etymology, see J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 21–42: notably, both Callimachus and Aratus himself pun on the latter's name (see O'Hara, *True Names,* 36 and 247, with further bibliography). The Aratean acrostic was first identified by J. M. Jacques (cf. D. A. Kidd, *Aratus: "Phaenomena"* [Cambridge, 1997], ad 783), and the Virgilian imitation (*pu-, ve-, ma-,* i.e., the first two letters of each of Virgil's *tria nomina,* in reverse order at the beginning of lines 433, 431, and 429) by E. L. Brown, Numeri Vergiliani: *Studies in "Eclogues" and "Georgics"* Coll. Latomus 63 (Brussels, 1963), 96–114. (Brown supports his identification of the acrostic with a barrage of circumstantial evidence too complex to summarize here; his strongest arguments are the presence of the phrase *is certissimus auctor* in 432 and of the word *virgineum*—suggesting both Virgil's name and his nickname *Parthenias*—in 430. The latter point, involving as it does a further etymological wordplay, is particularly germane to the present context.) Cf. also Haslam, "Hidden Signs" (n. 3 above). On Lucretian wordplay in general, see Friedländer, "Pattern of Sound" (n. 1 above); Snyder, *Puns and Poetry;* R. Maltby, "Etymologizing and the Structure of Argument in Lucretius I" (paper delivered to the Leeds International Latin Seminar in October 1999, currently unpublished). Friedländer's theory that Lucretius' apparent interest in etymology reflects Epicurean linguistic theory is contested by D. A. West, "Farewell Atomology," review of Snyder, *Puns and Poetry, CR* 32 (1981): 25–27; and A. Dalzell, "Language and Atomic Theory in Lucretius," *Hermathena* 143 (1987): 19–28.