

## THE TEXT OF LUCRETIUS 2.1174

nec tenet omnia paulatim tabescere et ire  
ad scopulum spatio aetatis defessa uetusto.<sup>1</sup>

1174

*scopulum* OQ<sup>bc</sup> (-llum) V *copulum* Q<sup>ac</sup> *capulum* Vossius

The phrase *ire ad scopulum* has long been the victim of a conspiracy of silence. The *caput coniurationis*, one might say, is an editorial prejudice against the transmitted text born of a rather misguided enthusiasm for Vossius' conjecture *capulum*. That conjecture has been a reliable fixture in the modern Lucretian vulgate since Havercamp first printed it in his text of the *de rerum natura* (Leiden, 1725).<sup>2</sup> Before the publication of Havercamp's edition, however, scholars had not balked at the transmitted text, rightly glossing it as a nautical metaphor for 'ruin, destruction': in the words of Lambinus (Paris, 1565), 'ad interitum: translatum a navi, quae infligitur scopulo'. But after the appearance of Havercamp's edition editors and commentators strangely refused to give due consideration to the reading of the manuscripts, ignoring it for no better reason than a presumption of error. I propose, therefore, in the following discussion to expose the fallacious reasoning that undergirds such a presumption and to vindicate *ire ad scopulum*.

Defenders of *ad capulum* have consistently followed two lines of argument. First there is the palaeographical argument according to which *scopulum* is easily explained as a corruption of *capulum* precipitated through the interaction of two causes: graphical similarity and substitution of the more common word (*scopulus*) for the rarer (*capulus*).<sup>3</sup> The probability of this scenario, we are told, is enhanced by the fact that the scribe of Q originally wrote *copulum* and then altered it to *scopulum* by the addition of a suprascript *s*. Viewed in this way the evidence gives a specious plausibility to the alteration of *capulum* into *scopulum*. Then there is the stylistic argument according to which *ad capulum* is poetically more consonant with the reference to gradual decline and aging: *omnia paulatim tabescere... spatio aetatis defessa uetusto*. Since all things suffer decline and death, it is sound logic and good poetry that 'all things should go to the grave' rather than end up sundered on the sea cliffs.<sup>4</sup> Thus Vossius' conjecture recommends itself not only by its palaeographical neatness but also by its putative stylistic elegance.

<sup>1</sup> For the text of these lines in O, Q and V consult the facsimiles in É. Chatelain's *La paléographie des classiques latins* (Paris, 1884–1900): O(LVII), Q(LVIII), V(LX).

<sup>2</sup> Vossius' conjecture was first published in the *Variae Lectiones* of the Tonson edition (London, 1712), p. 263 folio, p. 344 quarto. The primary meaning of *capulus* is 'handle', especially of a sword: it can also mean 'bier' or 'coffin'. The interpretation of *ire ad capulum* as 'to go to the grave' carries with it the assumption that the word can be used metonymically (concrete object for abstract concept). More on this point will follow.

<sup>3</sup> Wakefield (London, 1798–9) writes 'unde librarii facilius efficerent dictionem pervagatam *scopulum* quam rariorem et elegantissimam, *capulum* dico.' It should be noted that Havercamp and Wakefield mistakenly believed that *copulum* was the reading of O and Q: they were misled by false reports of the MSS. readings given in the Tonson edition (above n. 2). *Capulus* is *rarius* only in the sense that in literary texts it does not occur frequently with the meaning 'bier'. The fact that it was used as a scholastic gloss on *feretrum* (a point which will be discussed presently) indicates that it was not obscure in meaning.

<sup>4</sup> Wakefield's comment is representative of the editorial prejudice against *ad scopulum*: 'metaphora navis, *ad scopulum* appropinquantis et fracturam subiturae, eleganti utcumque ingenio per se conveniat, minus congruit indoli sermonis, quo locus integer constantissime coloratus est, vocabula scilicet, *paulatim tabescere, spatio vetusto, defessa aetatis*, cum notatione vetuli, ita gradatim marcentis et senescentis ut in dies faucibus sepulcri immergendus ire videtur, amicissime conspirant.

Each of these arguments is vitiated by a false premise. The reading of Q before correction, *copulum*, cannot be adduced as evidence of an original *capulum* and the metaphorical expression *ire ad capulum* ('to go to the grave') is without parallel. In addition the whole discussion of the text of 2.1174 has long been prejudiced in favour of Vossius' conjecture by the *a priori* assumption that *ad scopulum* is corrupt.

Let us consider the palaeographical argument. Q<sup>ac</sup>'s *copulum* ought to be recognized for what it is, a demonstrable error for *scopulum*, as Merrill pointed out.<sup>5</sup> The omission of *s* before *c* is a common enough error in O and Q (and the *schedae*). A perusal of Merrill's collection of instances where *s* is omitted before *c* or is omitted at the beginning of a word establishes beyond a doubt the much greater probability that *scopulum* was inadvertently altered into *copulum*.<sup>6</sup> In addition the agreement of O and V in reading *scopulum* is in itself conclusive proof that the nearest common ancestor from which they are descended contained *scopulum*. The *copulum* of Q<sup>ac</sup> interpreted as a vestige of an original reading *capulum* is an illusion.<sup>7</sup>

As for the stylistic argument, let us consider first the claims of the transmitted text which have too often been quashed by those of its rival.<sup>8</sup> The tropic use of *scopulus* (and *saxum*), meaning 'ruin, destruction', is well attested in Latin prose and poetry from Plautus onwards.<sup>9</sup> The metaphor is of course a nautical one in which the ruin

<sup>5</sup> 'Criticism of the text of Lucretius with suggestions for its improvement: Part I, Books I–III', *UCPCP* 3 (1916), 1–46, p. 28.

<sup>6</sup> 'Corruption in the manuscripts of Lucretius', *UCPCP* 2 (1914), 237–53, p. 250: (the correct reading is given to the left of the bracket), 1.103 desciscere] diciscere Q<sup>ac</sup>; 1.984 spatium] catium Q; 3.214 ad speciem] ad peciem V; 3.336 uiscera] uicera O<sup>ac</sup>V; 3.719 uiscere] uicere OQ; 3.1018 conscia] concia Q<sup>ac</sup>; 4.811 noscere] nocere OQ; 5.1234 fascis] facis O<sup>ac</sup>; 6.393 conscius] concius O<sup>ac</sup>Q; 6.736 descendere (Lambinus)] decedere OQ; 6.793 spumas (Lambinus)] pumos OQU; 6.820 spatium] patium OQ<sup>ac</sup>U; 6.1041 sumpsit] umpsit O<sup>ac</sup>U.

<sup>7</sup> The following statement of F. Olivier is without foundation: 'le *copulum* de Q\* [i.e. before correction] est devenu *scopulum* dans OQ<sup>1</sup> [i.e. after correction] et *scopullum* dans V'; 'En relisant Lucrèce', *MH* 10 (1953), 39–67, p. 50. In the presentation of the MSS. evidence editors usually contrive to mislead the reader into inferring that *copulum* of Q<sup>ac</sup> provides manuscript support for *capulum*. A notable exception is K. Müller (Zürich, 1975).

<sup>8</sup> The most important contribution to the defence of *ad scopulum* is T. DeGraf's 'A Note on Lucretius 2.1174', *CW* 37 (1943–4), 135–6. She rightly points out that the *scopulus*-metaphor has ample precedent in Cicero's writings and that the poet's choice of this metaphor can be explained with reference to Epicurean physics, viz. the destruction of material objects by atomic bombardment (see above). K. Büchner delivered a rather ineffectual defence of *ad scopulum* in 'Präludien zu einer Lukrezausgabe', *Hermes* 84 (1956), 198–233, pp. 212–13 = *Studien zur römischen Literatur: I, Lukrez und Vorklassik* (Wiesbaden, 1964), pp. 136–7. Most recently B. Segura Ramos ('Ad Luc. d.r.n. II.1173–1174', *Faventia* 4 (1982), 97–9) has suggested that *Georgics* 1.201–3 (boat and oarsman pulled downstream by the current) is an allusion to and development of the *scopulus*-metaphor in Lucretius 2.1174, since the larger context of the Vergilian passage mentions deterioration as a natural and universal condition: *sic omnia fatis/peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri* (199–200). The author concludes that it is practically certain that Vergil read *ad scopulum*. Against this argument it should be noted that here Vergil is unquestionably indebted to Lucretius 5.206–17 (the constant battle of cultivation, with a nautical image introduced at 222), and not to the end of Book 2. Moreover *Georgics* 1.199–200 bears a stronger resemblance to Lucretius 2.508–9, *cedere item retro possent in deteriores/omnia sic partis, ut diximus in meliores* (with customary Vergilian alteration of sense and context) than to 2.1173, *omnia paulatim tabescere*. The author does, however, rightly stress that *ire ad capulum* = 'to go to the grave' is unparalleled. I see nothing to recommend Salmasius' interpretation, revived by Bergk (*Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.* 83 (1861), p. 500 = *Kl. Schr.* (Halle, 1884), i. 274), that *scopulus* = *meta*, *parvus scopus*: he quotes Suetonius' *Life of Domitian* 19, 'nonnumquam in pueri procul stantis praebentisque pro scopulo dispansam dextrae manus palmam, sagittas tanta arte direxit.' See *OLD* s.v. *scopulus*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Most informative on this point are Forcellini's *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, A. Otto's *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890, repr. Hildesheim,

of a person or thing is envisaged as a *naufragium* and *scopulus* represents the means of destruction. Furthermore Cicero expressly recommends the metaphorical use of *scopulus* (*de orat.* 3.163):

‘Syrtim’ patrimonii ‘scopulum’ libentius dixerim, ‘Charybdim’ bonorum ‘uoraginem’ potius. facilius enim ad ea, quae uisa quam ad illa, quae audita sunt, mentis oculi feruntur.

On the evidence of his own writings Cicero practised what he preached:

*pro Cael.* 51, sed quoniam emersisse iam e uadis et *scopulos* praeteruicta uidetur esse oratio mea; *in Pis.* frg. 4 (Clark), quem enim iste in *scopulum* non incidit, quod in telum non inruit? *in Pis.* 41, tunc etiam atque adeo uos, geminae uoragines *scopulique* rei publicae; *pro C. Rab. perd.* 25, nec tuas umquam ratis ad eos *scopulos* appulisses ad quos Sex. Titi adflicta nauem; *pro Sex. Rosc.* 79, ubi *scopulum* offendis eius modi; *Phil.* 12.19 qui ex naufragio luculenti patrimonii ad haec Antoniana saxa proiectus est; *Consolatio* frg. IX. 9 (Mueller), non nasci longe optimum nec in hos *scopulos* incidere uitae; *de orat.* 2.154, timide tamquam ad aliquem libidinis *scopulum* sic tuam mentem ad philosophiam appulisti.

Examples could be multiplied: let the evidence of a contemporary author suffice.<sup>10</sup> The phrase *ire ad scopulum*, when interpreted in the light of these Ciceronian parallels, should elicit from the reader neither boggling perplexity nor emendations. Lucretius’ meaning is clear and forcefully expressed: in the translation of M. F. Smith (Cambridge, MA and London, 1982<sup>2</sup>), ‘all things decay and go to the reef of destruction, outworn by the ancient lapse of days’.<sup>11</sup>

Although the *scopulus*-metaphor itself is well attested and its meaning is clear, its contextual propriety at the end of Book 2 may still strike the reader as dubious. Perhaps confidence will be restored by three considerations. First, since at the end of Book 2 the poet is describing the inevitable collapse of the *mundus*, his use of a metaphorical expression which means ‘to be headed for ruin or destruction’ is not at all surprising, especially when that expression enjoys the status of a proverbial saying.<sup>12</sup> Lucretius does not have to describe a storm at sea in order to write *omnia ire ad scopulum*. Second, the metaphorical *naufragium* experienced by all things composed of atoms well accords with Epicurus’ notion of death as a διάλυσις (*discidium*): death/dissolution is not annihilation, a one-way path to the grave; it is rather a sundering of concatenated atoms, a necessary stage in the recycling of *primordia rerum*.

huc accedit uti quicque in sua corpora rursum  
dissoluat natura neque ad nihilum interemat res. (1.215–16)<sup>13</sup>

1962), pp. 313–14 and Lewis and Short’s *A Latin Dictionary*. Cf. also E. Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery* (Toronto, 1972), p. 23 n. 13. Note also the metaphorical use of *naufragium* (*naufragus*), *uadum*, *fretus*, and *gurgis*.

<sup>10</sup> Additional parallels: Plautus, *Merc.* 197, *Mos.* 677; *Incerti auctoris* (Ribbeck) *TRF*<sup>2</sup> p. 255, 139–40 [with these three passages compare *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* ed. E. L. von Leutsch, F. G. Schneidewin (Göttingae, 1839–51, repr. Hildesheim, 1958), i. 65, no. 29]; Terence, *Phor.* 689, *qui te ad scopulum e tranquillo auferat* [a poorly attested variant for the unanimous testimony of the MSS. *quod quidem recte curatum uelis*]; Livy 38.10.6; Ovid, *ex Pont.* 4.14, 21–2; *Trist.* 2.15–16; Val. Max. 3.7.9; *Anth. Lat.* 1.407, 1–2 (Riese) = 403 (Shackleton Bailey); *Paneg. Lat.* 4.27.2. From the Ciceronian passages and those quoted above it is clear that *scopulus* can be used by itself, as in 2.1174, with a verb of motion to mean ‘headed for destruction’ or it can be modified by a dependent genitive indicating what is destroyed (*scopuli rei publicae*) or a genitive defining the source of ruin (*scopulus libidinis*).

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps it would not be amiss to quote Simonides 522 (Page *PMG*): πάντα γὰρ μίαν ἰκνεῖται δασπλήτη Χάρυβδιν, / αἱ μεγάλαι τ’ ἀρεταὶ καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος.

<sup>12</sup> See Otto, *Sprichwörter* (above, n. 9).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. 1.219–20, 2.215–20, 244–9; Epicurus, *Letter to Herodotus* 41, 73 and *Principal Doctrines* II.

Death/dissolution understood as a *discidium* provides an answer to the objection made on stylistic grounds that the sudden impact of a *naufragium* is incompatible with gradual decay: for death/dissolution is the final sundering, the culmination of the process of decay, in which the individual atoms are freed from whatever organized structure held them. Moreover, as DeGraf pointed out,<sup>14</sup> one should bear in mind that two processes are involved in the destruction of material objects: a thing's atomic structure is broken down by a barrage of external blows (*ictus, plaga*) that loosen its fastenings (*nexus*) [cf. 1.215–24, 244–9, 2.944–53]; at the same time a thing's atomic structure succumbs to a process of internal decomposition when it can no longer take in more atoms than it loses. The action of both processes is summarized at 2.1139–43:

iure igitur pereunt, cum rarefacta fluendo  
sunt et cum externis succumbunt omnia plagis,  
quandoquidem grandi cibus aeuo denique defit,  
nec tuditantia rem cessant extrinsecus ullam  
corpora conficere et plagis infesta domare.

In Epicurus' system decay (*tabescere*) and wrack (*ire ad scopulum*) are the two forces at work to perpetuate the recycling of *primordia rerum*.<sup>15</sup>

The third and final consideration is the poet's own reference to the 'great sea of matter' (*materiai tanto in pelago* 2.550) and his comparison of the random movement of *primordia* in the void to the far-flung debris of shipwrecks spewed out by the waves (2.552–7):

sed quasi naufragiis magnis multisque coortis  
disiectare solet magnum mare transtra cauernas  
antennas proram malos tonsasque natantis  
per terrarum omnis oras fluitantia aplustra  
ut uideantur et indicium mortalibus edant...

If atoms can be described as riding on the waves like flotsam, then the *scopulus*-metaphor is nothing but an extension of the same imaginative conception in which the breaking up of a thing's atomic structure is depicted as a *naufragium*. And perhaps, one may note, it is more than coincidence that a book which begins with a nautical metaphor (*suaue mari magno turbantibus aequora uentis/ e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem*) also closes with one.

The *scopulus*-metaphor is poetically and philosophically apt: on a poetic level it graphically depicts, in a manner consistent with Lucretius' use of observable phenomena to illustrate the unobservable, what happens when things are broken down and resolved into their constituent atoms; on a philosophical level it reaffirms the Epicurean doctrine that all things are not consigned to the finality of the grave but like a ship thrown on the rocks are sundered into *primordia rerum*.

Against the solid literary and textual evidence in favour of *ad scopulum* one must set the dubious case of *ad capulum*. The attractiveness of Vossius' conjecture, apart from palaeographical considerations, lies in the familiarity of the modern translation 'to go to the grave'. But however agreeably this translation may answer to the reader's expectation, it cannot be accepted as a correct rendering of the Latin words

<sup>14</sup> DeGraf (above n. 8), pp. 135–6.

<sup>15</sup> If one is bothered by *paulatim*, one need only recall that the process of decay may extend over a long period of time but once a material object is overcome by internal decomposition and external bombardment (i.e. fully exhausted, *defessa*), the actual destruction of the object occurs quickly. For example, the world itself has long been in a state of decline as evidenced by the failing fertility of the earth (2.1150–67), but at some point in the future it will suffer complete destruction: 'sic igitur magni quoque circum moenia mundi/ expugnata dabunt labem putrisque ruinas' (1144–5).

until one has demonstrated that *ire ad capulum* can carry the same figurative meaning as the expression 'to go to the grave'. It is quite possible that *ire ad capulum* means nothing more than 'to approach a bier/coffin'. Those scholars who have accepted Vossius' conjecture agree, whether they avow it or not, that the metonymic use of *capulus* for 'death/destruction' (i.e. concrete for abstract) is perfectly normal. Yet this assumption, so necessary to the defence of *ad capulum*, has been allowed to go unquestioned.

Leaving aside the most common meaning of *capulus* (hilt of a sword), we find that the preponderance of evidence points to *capulus* = bier.<sup>16</sup> According to *Paulus ex Fest.* (p. 53 Lind.), 'capulum et manubrium uocatur, et id quo mortui efferuntur, utrumque a capiendo dictum.' The words *id quo mortui efferuntur* clearly signify bier. Both in Servius (*Aen.* 6.222, 11.64) and in *scholia ad Stat. Theb.* 6.55 *capulus* is used to gloss *feretrum*. Nonius, however, gives a different definition. Omitting any mention of the meaning 'bier', he defines *capulus* thus (p. 7 Lind.): 'capulum dicitur quicquid aliam rem intra se capit. nam sarcophagum, id est sepulcrum, capulum dici ueteres volunt, quod corpora capiat.'<sup>17</sup> To illustrate this meaning of the word Nonius adduces the following quotations which have been uncritically accepted as evidence that supports a figurative use of *capulus*: Plautus, *Asin.* 892, 'perii misera, ut osculatur carnufex, capuli decus'; *Miles* 627–8, 'itane tibi ego uideor oppido Acherunticus? tam capularis?'; Novius (Ribbeck, *CRF*<sup>2</sup>) 75–6, 'dum istos inuitabis suffragatores, pater,/ prius in capulo quam in curuli sella suspendes natis'; Lucilius (Marx) 60–1, 'quom illico uidissent Hortensius Postumiusque/ ceteri item in capulo hunc non esse aliumque cubare'; Varro, *Sat. Men.* (Astbury) 222, 'propter cunam capulum positum/ nutrix tradit pollicitori.'

That *capulus* means 'coffin' in each of these passages is open to question: *capulus* = bier is equally possible, if not preferable.<sup>18</sup> The *scholia ad Stat. Theb.* (6.55) explains the Plautine *capularis* as *dignus feretro*, not *dignus sepulcro*. In the two lines quoted from Novius the *pater* would more fittingly have his buttocks hoisted on a bier rather than a coffin and in the Varro fragment it is probably a bier that is being handed over to the undertaker. There is no undisputed example of *capulus* = 'coffin' until Apuleius (*Met.* 4.18, 10.12).<sup>19</sup> In any case one thing is certain: the Republican authors quoted above use *capulus* in the very concrete sense of a receptacle for the body, whether it be a bier or a coffin. There is nothing in Nonius' definition of the word or in his list of quotations to corroborate the figurative use of *capulus* in the

<sup>16</sup> See *ThLL* s.v.

<sup>17</sup> Bailey [Oxford, 1950 (vol. 2, p. 983)] is mistaken when he says 'Paul.-Festus and Nonius explain *capulum* as *sarcophagum, id est sepulcrum*'.

<sup>18</sup> One gathers from Munro's note (London, 1886<sup>4</sup>) that he felt that in the passages quoted by Nonius *capulus* means 'bier' and that only in Apuleius (*Met.* 4.18, 10.12) does it unquestionably mean 'coffin'. Bailey too recognized that '[*capulus*] appears literally to mean "a bier" ... and that meaning is really inappropriate here'. See also the comments of F. Olivier (above, n. 7), p. 50 and Segura Ramos (above, n. 8), pp. 97–8.

<sup>19</sup> Both Lachmann (Berlin, 1850) and Munro quote Statius' *Theb.* 3.362 in the following form: *dum capulo nondum manus excidit*. This is the reading of all the MSS. with the exception of the P(uteaneus) [Parisinus 8051]. Later editors returned to the reading of P: *nunc, socer, haec dum non manus excidit*; O. Mueller (Leipzig, 1870), H. W. Garrod (Oxford, 1906), A. Klotz, T. C. Klinnert (Leipzig, 1973), D. E. Hill (Leiden, 1983). The reading of P is also preferred by H. Snijder, *P. Papinius Statius, Thebaid, A Commentary on Book III* (Amsterdam, 1968). *Capulo* is probably a conjecture introduced under the influence of *dum funera portant* in the previous line because the meaning of *haec manus excidit* was not understood, as Klotz suggests *apud appar*. P's text becomes very hard to explain if one assumes that the text of the other MSS. is genuine. And even if *capulo* is the genuine text, Statius is likely to have used it, as does his master Vergil, with the meaning *manubrium*, as Hill suggests in his apparatus.

sense 'destruction', 'ruin'. In this connection it is worth noting that synonyms of *capulus*, namely *feretrum* and *lectus (funebri)* are not used figuratively: *ire ad feretrum/ ad lectum (funebrem)* mean nothing more than 'to approach the bier'.

If for the moment we assume with Nonius that from the time of Plautus down to Varro *capulus* meant 'sarcophagum, id est sepulcrum' and that taken in this sense the word could be used metonymically for 'ruin', 'destruction', we are in a position to test that assumption by comparing the metonymic use of *sepulcrum*. In Catullus, 96.1, 'si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumue sepulcris' and in Ovid, *Fasti* 2.562, 'habent alias maesta sepulcra faces', the plural *sepulcra* clearly means 'the dead' and not 'destruction'.<sup>20</sup> As a term of comic abuse *sepulcrum* means something like 'living corpse': Plautus, *Pseud.* 412, 'ex hoc sepulcro uetere uiginti minas ecfodiam'; Laberius 166 (Ribbeck *CRF*<sup>2</sup>), 'sepulcri similis nil nisi nomen retineo'.<sup>21</sup> In all of these passages a common type of metonymy is employed in which the container signifies the contents, e.g. *curia* = *senatus*.<sup>22</sup> We may therefore safely infer that *capulus*, employed in a figurative sense, would be most naturally taken to mean the deceased on the *capulus*. There is no solid evidence that will support the contention that *ire ad capulum* can have the same meaning as the figurative expression 'to go to the grave'.<sup>23</sup>

Finally, even if one remains unconvinced by all of the objections made thus far, one still has to confront the argument, discussed earlier, that such a statement strikes a false note in the world of Epicurean physics, where all things do not in fact 'go to the grave' but decay and are broken down into their constituent atoms. The image of matter's decease and interment runs counter to the Epicurean notion of death as *διάλυσις*, the breaking up of a thing's atomic structure.

University of Pennsylvania

MARK POSSANZA

<sup>20</sup> I understand *si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra* (Prop. 1.22.3) to mean 'Perusia, grave of our countrymen' (Camps' translation (Cambridge, 1961)). Cf. Lucretius 5.259, Catullus 68.89, Horace, *Sat.* 1.8.10, Livy 31.29.11, *Alcestis Barcinonensis* 71, 81 (ed. M. Marcovich (Leiden, 1988)): in all of these passages *sepulcrum* has its literal meaning. I see no reason to follow J. Svennung who gives *sepulcrum* in Catullus 68.89 the added meaning 'Verderben' (*Catullus Bildersprache* (Lund, 1945), p. 114). *Bustum* can be used metaphorically to mean 'destruction', a natural extension of its proper function in the funeral ritual. A bier, on the other hand, is rather benign by comparison.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. in Greek the use of *τύμβος* and *τυμβογέρον*.

<sup>22</sup> *Ad Her.* 4.43, Cicero, *de orat.* 3.167 and Quintilian 8.6.24.

<sup>23</sup> 'But not all acceptable Latin is attested', as C. O. Brink has reminded us; *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 100. In this instance, however, we are dealing with an anomaly introduced into the text by conjecture.

I want to thank my colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania, especially Professor Joseph Farrell, for their thoughtful questions which helped me to clarify my views on several points.