

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.¹ 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*,² but this does not provide the reference we need to the age of those concerned. Lambinus' *pusi* has had some support from modern editors,³ but one may well share Bailey's doubts as to whether the word, known only from a facetious epigram quoted by Varro,⁴ 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'.⁵ The corruption could have arisen from the misreading of *a* as *u*, of which there are several examples in the manuscripts of Lucretius.⁶

Cholsey, Oxon.

M. L. CLARKE

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

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

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

⁴ Varro, *L.L.* 7. 28.

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

⁶ *discedunt* (O) for *discedant*, 2. 833; *conueniunt* (O and Q) for *conueniant*, 4. 1259; *substructa* (O and Q) for *substracta*, 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

of those who have tried to emend the passage concentrate on *longus*, and are reluctant to relinquish *spe*: this is largely due to the parallel with Aristotle's account of the character of old men in *Rhetoric* 2. 13. 1389b 13ff., in which (1390a4) they are said to be, among other things, *δυσέλπιδες*. It seems to me that this parallel should not be pressed too far. There is much in Aristotle that is not in Horace, and nothing to suggest close and detailed dependence. The parallel can only be relevant if *spe longus* can be turned into a reasonable Latin equivalent for *δύσελπις*. Otherwise there is no good reason to suppose that *spe* is any less likely to be corrupt than *longus*.

My suggestion is *splenosus*. The word does not occur elsewhere (neither does *dilator*); but *-osus* is still a productive suffix at this time. Horace himself invented *plagosus* and *beluosus*. There are many words with this suffix that are derived from names of parts of the body or diseases and affections thereof, often corresponding to (and no doubt in some cases invented to translate) Greek words in *-ώδης* and *-ικός*: see A. Ernout, *Les adjectifs latins en -ōsus et en -ulentus* (Paris, 1949). Some of these words are found only in late or technical writers, but some are very respectable and classical: note especially *cerebrosus* in Lucilius and *stomachosus* in Cicero. The purer and older Latin *lien*, 'spleen', gives *lienosus*: it would be natural, as *lien* was replaced in ordinary usage by *splen*, for the adjective to follow suit. The Greek equivalent is *σπληνώδης*, which occurs in a literal and medical sense in the Hippocratic writings (*Aph.* 6. 43, etc.).

To us 'splenetic' means 'bad-tempered', but it does not seem to have meant quite the same thing to the ancients. In ancient medicine, the spleen is regarded as one of the seats of *μελαγχολία*, though there is little indication of what effect an over-active spleen is supposed to have on temperament. In popular usage, the spleen seems to be associated with anxiety rather than irritability or melancholy: see Aristophanes *Thesm.* 3, *πρὶν τὸν σπλῆνα κομιδῇ μ' ἐκβαλεῖν*, and Plautus *Casina* 414, 'prae metu ubi sim nescio. | perii! cor lienosum, opinor, habeo, iam dudum salit, | de labore pectus tundit'. If this were the meaning of *splenosus*, it would fit in well with *dilator* and *pavidusque futuri* (Bentley's conjecture, surely right, for *avidusque*).

As regards palaeography, *splenosus* is nearer to *spe longus* than most other conjectures that I have seen, and the fact that the word is rather unfamiliar would render corruption likely.

After I had made this conjecture, I saw that Shackleton Bailey (*Profile of Horace*, p. 102) had recently tried *spe mancus*. This is no doubt better than other attempts involving *spe*; but I think it requires some more pertinent justification than his quotation of *ingenio debilis*. The ablative *ingenio* is an ablative of the part affected, as in *debilis pede*; but *spes* is not a part of the personality; it is a quality in which the old man is lacking. Can one be 'crippled in' something that one does not have? One should incidentally avoid thinking that *mancus* was intended to mean 'lacking', like its derivatives in the Romance languages ('il manque d'espoir', etc.). I am not myself convinced by *spe mancus*, and keep my suggestion in the competition.

Merton College, Oxford

J. G. F. POWELL

A CRUX CRITICORUM (ET INTERPRETUM) IN SENECA THE ELDER'S *CONTROVERSIAE* (2. 4. 12)

The *argumentum* of *contr.* 2. 4 reads as follows (quoted from my own provisional text, which I hope will be published in some years):

Abdicavit quidam filium. Abdicatus se contulit ad meretricem. Ex illa sustulit filium. Aeger ad