

to enter into his often attractive arguments for this attribution because I believe it can be proved to be highly improbable.

In his account, or exegesis, of Aristotle's *Categories* Eudorus introduced an important innovation (Simplicius, *In Cat.* 206.10ff. Kalbfleisch = Eudorus Fr. 17 Mazzarelli),<sup>11</sup> i.e. the sequence (substance /) quality / quantity: the *ποῖόν* before the *ποσόν*. Aristotle himself, in the list of the ten categories at *Cat.* 4.1b26–7, has quantity before quality.<sup>12</sup> In the detailed exposition at *Categories* chs. 5–8 quality even comes last. The Eudoran sequence is found at e.g. ps.-Archytas, *Cat.* 22.14 and 23.21f. Szlezák,<sup>13</sup> Philo, *Decal.* 30,<sup>14</sup> Arius Didymus *ap.* Stob. (*Ecl. eth.*) 2.42.2–4 Wachsmuth, Theodorus of Gadara *ap.* *Quintil.* 3.6.36, and Martianus Capella 4.340. Porphyry, explaining Aristotle's text, has the sequence quantity / quality, e.g. *In Cat.* 86.14ff., 100.11ff. Busse (where an argument for the Aristotelian order is provided), but *ibid.* 87.24–5 has quality before quantity. Arius Didymus, *loc. cit.*, is speaking in his own right; having finished his discussion of Philo of Larissa he is about to start on Eudorus.

Anonymus *In Theaetetum* occasionally uses the Aristotelian categories in the course of his sometimes laboured exegesis. See esp. col. 68.1–24 Diels-Schubart: substance, quantity, quality, relative.<sup>15</sup> It is worthy of note that in order to produce a sequence which corresponds to what is in Aristotle, *Categories* ch. 4, Anonymus has to cite the items in Plato's text from which he extracts each separate category in an order different from that in which they occur at *Th.* 152d. Anonymus practises sleight-of-hand in order to produce the order he prefers, that is to say the original Aristotelian sequence. Consequently, it is virtually precluded that Eudorus wrote the anonymous commentary.

University of Utrecht

JAAP MANSFELD

<sup>11</sup> C. Mazzarelli, 'Raccolta e interpretazione delle testimonianze e dei frammenti del medioplatonico Eudoro di Alessandria', Pt. I, *Riv. Filos. Neosc.* 77 (1985), pp. 197ff. – Pt. II, *ibid.*, pp. 535ff. On Eudorus and other Platonists on the categories see H. Dörrie, 'Der Platoniker Eudoros von Alexandria', in *Id.*, *Platonica minora* (Munich, 1976), pp. 300f. Cf. also Dillon, *op. cit.* (n. 9), pp. 134f.

<sup>12</sup> But note that elsewhere, in less full listings of the categories, he rather often has *ποῖόν* before *ποσόν*; see the table in K. Oehler, *Aristoteles, Kategorien*. Aristoteles: Werke in deutscher Übersetzung, Bd. I 1<sup>2</sup> (Berlin and Darmstadt, 1986), pp. 352ff. Eudorus may have appealed to such passages.

<sup>13</sup> See T. A. Szlezák, *Pseudo-Archytas: Über die Kategorien*, *Peripatoi* 4 (Berlin and New York, 1973), *ad loc.* Simplicius, *In Cat.* 206.8ff. points out the parallel between Eudorus and (ps.-)Archytas.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. W. Theiler, 'Philo von Alexandria und der Beginn des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus', in *Parusia. Festschr. J. Hirschberger* (Frankfurt a. M., 1965), pp. 204f., repr. in *Id.*, *Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur* (Berlin, 1970), pp. 489f.

<sup>15</sup> See P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, II: *Der Aristotelismus im I. und II. Jh. n. Chr.*, *Peripatoi* 6 (Berlin and New York, 1983), pp. 485ff.

### THREE NOTES ON LUCRETIUS

#### I

2.515:

denique ab ignibus ad gelidas †hiemisque† pruinas.

hiemisque OQ: *hiemum usque* Munro: *iter usque* Lachmann

To Munro's conjecture, which has been accepted by Diels (1923), S. B. Smith (1942), Bailey (1947), Büchner (1956), Martin (1959), and M. F. Smith (1982), there is a

serious, possibly a fatal, objection: the genitive plural of *hiems* is a grammarians' figment and never occurs<sup>1</sup> in classical Latin (*TLL* s.v. 2773.84); while Lachmann's conjecture is palaeographically improbable. Read *ad gelidas rigidasque pruinas*; *rigidas* was omitted by haplography, a fecund source of corruption,<sup>2</sup> and *hiemis* then supplied from the context to repair the metre. Cf. 2.431 *denique iam calidos ignis gelidamque pruinam*, 2.521 *hinc flammis illinc rigidis infesta pruinis*, and, for the collocation of the two adjectives, 2.858 *nec frigus neque item calidum tepidumque uaporem*.<sup>3</sup>

## II

3.531–2:

scinditur †atque animo haec† quoniam natura, nec uno  
tempore sincera existit, mortalis habendast.

*atque animo haec* OQV: *atque animae* Lambinus: *atque animae haec* Bailey (1921): *atque animi hoc* Diels: *itque animae hoc* Munro: *itque animae haec* Bailey (1947): †*atque†animae* Müller (1975)<sup>4</sup>

Lucretius never postpones *atque*,<sup>5</sup> nor does he elide (except in one place<sup>6</sup>) the genitive singular ending *-ae*, in which he still heard, apparently, something of the original diphthong. Read *scinditur haec animae quoniam natura*; and for the word-order cf. 4.26 *atque animi quoniam docui natura*. The transposition of adjacent words is a feature of the textual transmission of Lucretius: 2.359 *crebra reuisit* Q<sup>1</sup>: *reuisit crebra* OQV, 2.1002 *res ut* Marullus: *ut res* OQV, 3.249 *sanguis tum* Pontanus: *tum sanguis* OQV, 3.332 *fiunt consorti* Marullus: *consorti fiunt* OQV, 3.564 *ipse oculus Itali: oculus ipse* OQV, 3.691 *per uenas uiscera* O<sup>1</sup>Q<sup>1</sup>: *uiscera per uenas* OQ, 3.999 *sufferre laborem* Q<sup>1</sup>: *laborem sufferre* OQ, 3.1073 *temporis aeterni* Pontanus: *aeterni temporis* O<sup>1</sup>Q, 4.752 *quoniam docui* Lambinus: *docui quoniam* OQ, 4.756 *atque oculi Itali: oculi atque* OQ, 5.182 *diuis hominum* Munro: *hominum diuis* OQ, 5.272 *secta semel* Q<sup>1</sup>: *semel secta semel* OQ, 6.616 *magnam sol partem* Pontanus: *sol magnam partem* OQ, 6.941 *mixtum corpus Itali: corpus mixtum* OQ, 6.1078 *auro res* Faber: *res auro* OQU. With the transposition of *haec animae* to *animae (animo) haec* – a transposition subliminally impelled by the urge to move *haec* closer to *natura*? – the line became unmetrical; whereupon *atque* was inserted by a reader who had noticed the recurrent juxtaposition of *atque* and *anima*, *animus*: 2.1047 *atque animi*, 3.36 *atque animae*, 3.131 *atque animae*, 3.136 *nunc animum atque animam*, 3.212 *indepta atque animi*, 3.275 *atque anima*, 3.329 *sic animi atque animae*, 3.334 *corporis atque animi*, 3.351 *atque animum*, 3.372 *corporis atque animi*, 3.416 *hoc anima atque animus*, 3.422 *atque animam*, 3.565 *sic anima atque animus*, 3.579 *atque animam quoniam*, 3.705 *sic anima atque animus*, 3.796 *sorsum anima atque animus*, 3.846 *corporis atque animae*, 3.1052 *atque animi*.

<sup>1</sup> The non-occurrence of a form of a word in common use over a period of several centuries can hardly be fortuitous; *hiemum* should not, therefore, be foisted on Lucretius.

<sup>2</sup> See my note on Pers. 1.111, N.F. Lain, *HSCP* 90 (1986), 157f. Cf., e.g., Lucr. 6.490 *magnis nimbis* Lachmann: *magnis montis* OQ; that is, *nimbis* was omitted by haplography and *montis* then inserted (sense and grammar notwithstanding) because of the familiar phrase, 1.201 *magnos...montis*, 1.897 *magnis...montibus*, 4.138 *magni montes*, 5.41 *montes magnos*, 5.824 *magnis...montibus*, 5.946 *montibus e magnis*, 5.1244 *montibus in magnis*, 6.191 *magnos montis*, 6.786 *magnis...montibus*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also 5.640 *gelidumque rigorem*, Plin. *NH* 2.34 *gelidae ac rigentis...naturae*.

<sup>4</sup> For other conjectures see Merrill (1907) *ad loc.*

<sup>5</sup> See E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1916), pp. 402f.

<sup>6</sup> 1.139 *propter egestatem linguae et rerum nouitatem*. Catullus was the first to elide *-ae* freely, 7.3 *Libyssae harenae*, 68.90 *Asiae Europaeque*; see F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1912), pp. 356f.

From line 510 onwards, Lucretius discusses the *animus*;<sup>7</sup> then, in 526, turns to the *anima*, which he does not, however, name until 531, with, appropriately, a slight emphasis: *haec animae ... natura*.<sup>8</sup>

## III

5.1302–4

inde boues Lucae turrito corpore, taetras,  
anguimanus, belli docuerunt uulnera Poeni  
sufferre et magnas Martis turbare cateruas.

*taetras* Lachmann: *tetros* OQ

5.1339–40

ut nunc saepe boues Lucae ferro male mactae  
diffugiunt, fera facta suis cum multa dedere.

At the battle of Heraclea in 280 B.C., the Romans were overwhelmed by Pyrrhus' elephants, which they called, having no domestic name for such monsters, 'Lucanian oxen', *Lucae boues*, after the huge oxen of the region. Despite its appearance, *Luca* is masculine and formed like *Messala*; see M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich, 1977), p. 324. But Varro supposed that *Luca* was feminine, *LL* 7.39 *apud Naeuium* (Bell. Poen. fr. 60 Strz.) '*atque prius pariet / lucusta Lucam bouem*.' *Luca bos elephants*; *cur ita sit dicta, duobus modis inueni scriptum. nam et in Cornelii commentario erat ab Libycis Lucas, et in Virgilii ab Lucanis Lucas, ab eo quod nostri, cum maximam quadripedem quam ipsi haberent uocarent bouem et in Lucanis Pyrrhi bello primum uidissent apud hostis elephantos ... Lucanam bouem quod putabant, Lucam bouem appellassent*; and this error has been perpetuated in the text of Lucretius. Cf. K. Meister, *Lateinisch-griechische Eigennamen* (Leipzig, 1916) p. 44: '*Luca Lucas bos* kann nur eine Maskulinform sein. Dann *bos* ist in der älteren Sprache überhaupt und insbesondere bei Plautus, der viele Belege hat, niemals weiblichen Geschlechtes<sup>9</sup> ... Auf maskulinische Auffassung führt auch die Lucrez-überlieferung, denn es ist nicht wahrscheinlich dass jemand "*boves Lucas ... tetras*" in "*tetros*" geändert haben sollte, während sich an der andern Stelle die Korruptel "*boves Lucae ... tactae*"<sup>10</sup> leicht begreift. Vielleicht ist *boves Lucas ... tetros* eine Reminiszenz an Ennius A. 607 (611 Sk.) *tetros elephants*.'<sup>11</sup> It may be of some additional importance that the picturesque adjective *anguimanus* occurs twice in Lucretius (and nowhere else in classical Latin), in 2.537 *anguimanus elephants* and here, where it must also be masculine plural. Lachmann, and other editors before Meister explained the phrase in 1916, understandably considered *Luca bos* feminine, as had Varro; and yet every editor since 1916 continues to regard these metaphorical bulls as cows, retaining *taetras* and *mactae*<sup>12</sup> in the text.

Harvard University

WENDELL CLAUSEN

<sup>7</sup> Hence, perhaps, the corruption *animo*; cf. 521 *animus*.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. R. Heinze (1897) *ad loc.*: 'endlich ist ein Hinweis auf den vorher geschilderten Vorgang erwünscht, wozu das überlieferte *haec* ganz geeignet ist.'

<sup>9</sup> See *TLL* s.v. 2141.44. In fact, *bos* feminine is not securely attested before Varro, *LL* 6.15, since the text of Plaut. *Truc.* 277 is uncertain (Meister 44 n. 1).

<sup>10</sup> Bockemüller's conjecture (1873).

<sup>11</sup> It is characteristic that Ennius should have preferred the Greek word.

<sup>12</sup> Diels adopts his own conjecture *inactae*.