The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

New Data Presumably from Suetonius' *Life of Lucretius*

John Masson

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 07 / October 1896, pp 323 - 324

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204496, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204496

How to cite this article:

John Masson (1896). New Data Presumably from Suetonius' *Life of Lucretius*. The Classical Review, 10, pp 323-324 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204496

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in π . In five cases only does π agree with NH, i. 17. 5, 8; i. 16. 6, 9; v. 21. 3, while in eleven it agrees with the other MSS. of the Σ group against NH, viz. i. 9. 1, 17. 10; ii. 1. 2, 16. 2, 21. 1 and 4; iii. 4. 7. 1, 12. 1, 15. 7; iv. 1. 2. The remaining cases are:

i. 16. 1. *quaeris ex me: quaeris ad me* N, *qu. a me* π H.

ii. 16. 2. *se leges: si leges* π , *si legis* NH.

iv. 1, 8. *vehementer te requirimus: vehementer terere* π , *vehementer terrere* H, *vehementer terrei si te requirimus* N.

A point of interest is the possible relationship of NH π to the Ambrosian excerpts E, which, as Lehmann points out, are also characterized by *lacunae*, occasionally corresponding with those in H [and π]. Thus vi. 1. 1, 2 the words *nec okovopíav . . . paulo secus* are omitted alike by EH π , a coincidence which can hardly be due to accident.

I was precluded by lack of time from making more than a cursory examination of the Paris MS. As, owing to other occupations, I have no hope of being able to collate

it, I judge it best to indicate its existence and commend it to the attention of some more leisured scholar. I do not predict any striking results, but it is certain that an examination of it will throw considerable light upon the family history and alliances of the Σ group. A comparison of NH π should enable us to reconstitute with some certainty the common archetype, whether this was the *codex Pistoriensis* or some other MS. The existence of these three MSS., all of them defective as well as closely allied, seems to show beyond question that there was in Italy in the fourteenth century a *decurtatus* or mutilated MS., independent of M, and honeycombed by *lacunae*. I would further suggest that other MSS. which end with M at xvi. 16 B, may deserve some further inspection in the earlier books before they are set aside as useless, since these, as is the case with π , may have been copied from a different and mutilated archetype. The criticism of the *Letters to Atticus* is so fascinating a subject and so many difficulties remain unsolved that some further examination of this and the kindred MSS. is not likely to prove unrewarded.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

NEW DATA PRESUMABLY FROM Suetonius' *LIFE OF LUCRETIVS*.

IN *Mnemosyne* (1895, part ii.), Dr. Woltjer discusses at considerable length the new data from Borgius' preface to a complete but still unprinted edition of Lucretius containing Pontanus' text. It has always seemed to me that these data, which a number of scholars believe were originally abridged from Suetonius, have probably passed through a number of hands, before they reached the form in which Borgius laid his hands upon them in the preface to some MS. of Lucretius. Supposing these data to be derived from Suetonius, this need not be inconsistent with the fact that they come down to us mixed up with matter from another and later source. Probably indeed Borgius's use of the word *colligere* (*J. of Phil.* 1895, p. 222) implies that he gathered his information from more sources than one. Certainly Woltjer has made it probable that the clause *matre natus divitiis sterili* was derived by Borgius (or Pontanus) from his recollection of a

line of Serenus Sammonicus, who, dealing with sterility, says:—

hoc poterit magni quartus monstrare
Lucreti

i.e. the fourth book of Lucretius where the subject is treated. Very acutely Woltjer suggests that some scholar either made the emendation *partus* for *quartus* or made the change by a lapse of memory. Another critic, writing later in the *Berliner Philol. Wochens.* (20 April, 1895), says that the *editio princeps* of Serenus is reported to contain the reading *partus*. For this very clever suggestion Dr. Woltjer deserves credit. Again, as to the degree of probability that the date given by Borgius for the birth of Lucretius is derived from Suetonius rather than inferred by Borgius from Jerome's well-known data, this depends largely on the weight which Borgius' new data as a whole carry. On

this point scholars like Dr. J. S. Reid and Dr. Radinger differ from Dr. Woltjer.

But I believe that the criticism attributed to Cicero is one which, from its intrinsic interest, is likely to have come to us in fairly accurate form, even if it should be somewhat abridged. Woltjer takes a very different view of this, he says:—

‘Quod praeterea dicit Borgius Ciceronem monuisse Lucretium ut in translationibus servaret verecundiam, ex quibus duo potissimum loci ab eo relati esse dicuntur, *Neptuni* scilicet *lacunas* et *caeli cavernas*, id tam certe et tanta cum fiducia dicitur ut vix dubitare quis audeat. Attamen locutio quae est *Neptuni lacunas* apud Lucretium non exstat; *salsas*—*lacunas* 3, 1031, *salsis*—*lacunis* 5, 794 scriptum legitur. Ciceronem autem reprehendisse translationem *caeli cavernas* 4, 171, quis credet, cum Cicero ipse scripserit *late caeli lustrare cavernas* Arat. 252?’

‘Haec jam sufficiant ut demonstretur omnia quae in praefatione illa Borgiana necnon in iis, quae ego ex commentario Pomponii Laeti exscripsi, nova videantur, mera esse humanistarum commenta.’

Cicero is said to have found fault with an expression, *Neptunni lacunas*, which does not occur in Lucretius’ poem.¹ This, Dr. Woltjer seems to think, confirms his view that Cicero’s criticism is ‘the mere invention of a humanist,’ that is to say, Dr. Woltjer holds that the forger of such a statement would choose to support it by inventing words which are not to be found in Lucretius’ poem, as we have it. To me and to other scholars this seems very unlikely indeed. Of the second instance, *caeli cavernas*, he says: ‘Who could believe that Cicero could have blamed this, since he himself uses the very same phrase in his translation from Aratus?’ Alas, such

¹ As to the use of *Neptunus* for *mare*, Lucretius at ii. 652 ff. makes special allowance for this use of language, and he himself at vi. 1076 has the phrase *Neptuni fluctu*.

inconsistencies are not quite so rare as Dr. Woltjer seems to think. Moreover, so busy a man and so voluminous a writer as Cicero may very well have forgotten some of his own juvenile verses. If we turn to the passage of *De Oratore* (quoted by me in *Journal of Philology*, 1895, p. 223, note 6), we shall find Cicero blaming the expression of Ennius, *caeli fornices*, because there can be no resemblance between a globe and an arch. Dr. Woltjer might equally well maintain, that Cicero could not possibly have found fault with Ennius’ *caeli fornices*, because he himself sins in a precisely similar way in his juvenile *caeli cavernas*.

Why did Pontanus not name the source from which these new data are drawn? In the same way that the scribes who copied the lives of Horace and Lucan, prefixed to different MSS. of these authors, do not state where they found them; simply because these lives were prefixed to the MSS. which they copied and with no name attached. Yet these lives are now universally admitted to be written by Suetonius.

As to the curious matter which Dr. Woltjer found on the fly-leaf of a copy of the Verona edition, these data, if they ever originated from Suetonius, have been so monstrously garbled as to deprive them of all value. The legend as to the potion and Lucretius’ love for Astericos seems like two traditions regarding different persons jumbled together and indeed flatly contradicts Jerome. It is almost needless to say that no parallel can be drawn between data such as these, derived from such a source, and information embodied in the preface to an edition of Lucretius containing the text of a noted scholar and student of MSS. like Pontanus, a preface which was written by his secretary, (also a distinguished man of letters) and was apparently revised by Pontanus himself.

JOHN MASSON.

Dundee.

NOTE ON PLATO’S *REPUBLIC*, VII. 519 A.

τοῦτο μέντοι, ἣν δ’ ἐγὼ, τὸ τῆς τοιαύτης φύσεως εἰ ἐκ παιδὸς εὐθὺς κοπτόμενον περιεκόπη τὰς τῆς γενέσεως συγγενεῖς (τὰ... συγγενῇ, most recent editions) ὥσπερ μολυβδίδας, αἱ δὲ...κάτω στρέφονται τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ὁψιν κ.τ.λ.

Stallbaum (1859) translated: *Haec atque talis natura si statim a pueritia ab iis purgata ac circumcisa esset, quae ortui (humanae naturae) adhaerent, etc.* Jowett (first edition) translated: ‘But what if there had been a circumcision of such natures in the