

## LUCRETIUS 4. 1026

puri saepe lacum propter si ac dolia curta  
 somno deuincti credunt se extollere uestem,  
 totius umorem saccatum corpori fundunt,  
 cum Babylonica magnifico splendore rigantur.  
 tum quibus aetatis freta primitus insinuat  
 semen...

1030

*puri* in 1026 can hardly be right. Bed-wetting is normally confined to children, and *tum quibus*... in 1030 presupposes the mention of an earlier stage of life in the previous sentence.<sup>1</sup> And what does *puri* mean? Munro and Bailey translated it as 'cleanly people' (or 'persons'), though Munro himself pointed out that the Latin for this was *mundi* rather than *puri*, and in any case there is no reason to suppose that in ancient Rome cleanly people were addicted to bed-wetting. Giussani, followed by Merrill and by Leonard and Smith, tried to give the required sense by supposing that *puri* meant 'innocents' and hence 'children', an expedient which is very far from convincing. Emendation seems called for. M. F. Smith in the 1982 edition of the Loeb Lucretius adopts Avancius' *multi*,<sup>2</sup> but this does not provide the reference we need to the age of those concerned. Lambinus' *pusi* has had some support from modern editors,<sup>3</sup> but one may well share Bailey's doubts as to whether the word, known only from a facetious epigram quoted by Varro,<sup>4</sup> is one that Lucretius would have used. The same applies to Lambinus' other suggestion, *pupi*. K. Müller prints *saepe lacum pueri*, which Munro put forward not as an emendation but in answer to those who believed that *puri* was a contraction of *pueri* ('why should not Lucr. have written *Saepe lacum pueri*?'). But a better solution would be to read *parui* for *puri*. This gives the required sense with only a small change. The substantival use of *parui* for 'children' is well attested; there are a number of examples in *De Finibus*, and Lucretius himself has *a paruis* for 'from childhood'.<sup>5</sup> The corruption could have arisen from the misreading of *a* as *u*, of which there are several examples in the manuscripts of Lucretius.<sup>6</sup>

Cholsey, Oxon.

M. L. CLARKE

<sup>1</sup> Bailey denies that there is a contrast between two ages, but none the less (rightly in my opinion) translates *tum* as 'later on'.

<sup>2</sup> See also his 'Notes on Lucretius' in *Sileno*, special issue in honour of Professor Adelmo Barigazzi (forthcoming).

<sup>3</sup> It was adopted by Brieger (who attributed it to Bergk) and is regarded as possible by Giussani and Ernout.

<sup>4</sup> Varro, *L.L.* 7. 28.

<sup>5</sup> Cic. *Fin.* 2. 32 (twice); 3. 16, 17; 5. 31, 42, 43; Lucr. 5. 977.

<sup>6</sup> *discedunt* (O) for *discedant*, 2. 833; *conueniunt* (O and Q) for *conueniant*, 4. 1259; *substructa* (O and Q) for *subtracta*, 6. 605; *eum* (O) for *eam*, 6. 1064. There are also examples of the reverse confusion, *a* for *u*. See Bailey's edition i. 38.

A FURTHER ATTEMPT ON 'SPE LONGUS', HORACE *A.P.* 172

...vel quod res omnes timide gelideque ministrat,  
 dilator,† spe longus, iners <p>avidusque futuri,  
 difficilis, querulus...

I agree with Brink, and other editors referred to by him *ad loc.*, that *spe longus* in Horace's description of the typical old man's character cannot be made to give sense. For earlier attempts at emendation, see Brink's note (p. 239 of his commentary). Most