

LUCRETIUS CARUS, TITUS. ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA*

ADA PALMER
(*University of Chicago*)

The *Addenda* follow the order of the original article (CTC 2.349–65) and consist of a) additional material for the *Fortuna*, Bibliography and commentaries, b) vernacular translations of the seventeenth century. New information on copyists, owners and annotators is included within the *Fortuna*, following the original structure.

FORTUNA

p. 349a4. Add:

A theory, now discredited, was much discussed in the fifteenth century that the surviving six-book poem was actually the middle or end of a twenty-one-book work. This confusion arose from a passage in M.T. Varro (*De Lingua Latina*

* The author is grateful for the support and assistance of David Butterfield, Alison Brown, James Hankins and Michael Reeve. She owes much to the support given to her by the Villa I Tatti Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, and the Melbern G. Glasscock Humanities Center at Texas A&M University. Gracious help was also provided by librarians at many institutions, including the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Biblioteca Nazionale and Biblioteca Berenson, Florence; Biblioteca Nazionale, Rome; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City; Biblioteca Marciana, Venice; Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan; Biblioteca Comunale A. Mai, Bergamo; Biblioteca Estense, Modena; Biblioteca Malatestiana, Cesena; Biblioteca Comunale Passerini-Landi, Piacenza; Biblioteca Capitolare, Padua; Biblioteca dell'Accademia Rubiconia dei Filopatridi, Savignano sul Rubicone; Biblioteca Nazionale, Naples; Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève and Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, Basel; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna; Cambridge University Library; Bodleian Library, Oxford; Harvard University's Widener and Houghton Libraries, Cambridge, Mass.; Cushing Memorial Library & Archives, College Station, Tex.; and especially the British Library, London. She wishes to extend cordial thanks to David Norbrook, the Oxford University Centre for Early Modern Studies and the staff, speakers, and delegates at the conference on the Early Modern Lucretius held at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 16–17 May 2012, which showcased a stimulating array of works in progress which will soon become valuable additions to Lucretius scholarship. The author is grateful as well to Brian Copenhaver, Virginia Brown, Craig Kallendorf, Alan C. Kors, Stephen Greenblatt, Carl Engle-Laird, Matt Granoff, Lauren Schiller and Doug and Laura Palmer for encouragement and assistance of various kinds.

5.3) which attributes twenty-one books to an author who, in the manuscripts, is named as “Lucretius,” but this has been read by Gifanius and later editors as a scribal distortion of “Lucilius”: “A qua bipertita divisione Lucilius suorum unius et viginti librorum initium fecit hoc: Aetheris et terrae genitabile quaerere tempus.”

p. 349a12. Add:

The claim, made by Borgia and others, that Cicero edited the poem originates from Jerome (*Chronicon*): “Olympiade CLXXI anno secundo Titus Lucretius poeta nascitur, qui postea amatorio poculo in furorem versus, cum aliquot libros per intervalla insaniae conscripsisset, quos postea emendavit Cicero, propria se manu interfecit, anno aetatis quadragesimo tertio.” The tendency of Renaissance commentators to assume substantial authorial interventions on Cicero’s part is attributable to changes in the reading of *emendare*, which in classical Latin often referred specifically to the preparation of a posthumous publication, but in humanist Latin referred to the broader task of editing or polishing a work.¹

p. 349a12. Add:

Borgia’s *Vita* was prepared while he studied with Pontano in 1502–3.² Most of the otherwise unknown information in the *Vita*, including its account of Lucretius’ intimacy with T. Pom. Atticus, Cicero, M. Brutus and C. Cassius, can indeed be attributed to Borgia’s assumptions about the ancient world. The puzzling exception is his list of supposed Roman Epicureans, which includes many obvious candidates but also several obscure names whose presence on the list remains unexplained. More credible Suetonian evidence for the life of Lucretius may survive in Donatus (*Vita Virgilio* 6) who gives Lucretius’ death date as the day Virgil assumed the *toga virilis*.

p. 350a5. Add:

Cornelius Nepos (*Atticus* 12.4) calls Lucius Julius Calidus the most elegant poet since the deaths of Lucretius and Catullus. Anonymous eighth-century testimony claims that M.V. Probus commented on Lucretius as well as Virgil and Horace (*Grammatici latini* 7.534, lines 5–6). Tacitus (*Dialogus* 23.2) mocked those who preferred Lucilius to Horace and Lucretius to Virgil, establishing that, by the end of the first century, the poem was a model of unfashionable Latin.

1 S. Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Rome, 1973), 214–15, 249–65.

2 It survives, along with his notes, likely produced with Pontano in preparation for an intended edition, in Borgia’s copy of the 1495 edition, London, British Library, I.A. 23564.

Serenus Sammonicus (*De medicina praecepta* 606) cited Lucretius book 4 as a source on female infertility.

p. 350a17. Add:

These *capitula* are mainly in Latin, but some appear in Greek or, in other copies, transliterated Greek.³ Greek marginal annotation is also very common in Lucretius manuscripts, often providing original Greek vocabulary in places where Lucretius uses transliterated Greek or unusual Latin substitutes.

p. 350b12. Add:

Stattius' *Silvae* 2.7.76, "Et docti furor arduus Lucretii," was cited by Renaissance scholars to support Jerome's account of Lucretius' madness, while modern scholars have suggested that Stattius may be Jerome's source. In the fourth century, Lucretius was also cited by Charisius, Diomedes Grammaticus, Marius Victorinus, Audax, and by Servius, whose summary of Lucretius' position on vacuum (*Eclogues* 6.31) is referenced in Borgia's *Vita*.

p. 351b24.

Since the temporal scope of this project has now expanded, vernacular translations through the seventeenth century are treated in a new section below.

p. 351b32. Add:

The closest descendants of Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 35.30 are now considered to be Laurenziana, Plut. 35.25, 35.26, 35.27, 35.28, 35.32; Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Cod. lat. XII 69; and possibly Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 170.⁴ Machiavelli's Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ross. 884 is now considered to descend from the 1495 edition, and incorporates a set of widely discussed emendations by Michael Marullus which circulated after his untimely death and continued to be sought after by scholars and boasted of by editors throughout the sixteenth century.⁵ Manuscripts whose annotations are sufficiently extensive and analytical to make them valuable to those interested in the commentary tradition are treated below.

3 On the *capitula* see D.J. Butterfield, *The Early Textual History of Lucretius' De Rerum Natura* (Cambridge, 2013).

4 M.D. Reeve, "Lucretius from the 1460s to the 17th Century: Seven Questions of Attribution," *Aevum* 80 (2006) 165–84, at 166–67.

5 A. Brown, *The Return of Lucretius to Renaissance Florence* (Cambridge, Mass., 2010), 113–22 (Appendix).

p. 352a2. Add:

It is now agreed that Gifanius did not use the *Oblongus*, since no knowledge of its readings is evident in either of his editions.

p. 352a24. Add:

M. Ferguson Smith and D. Butterfield have recently argued, on the basis of auction records, that a supposed 1496 Brescia edition is not a ghost.⁶

p. 352a25. Add:

Aldus printed a letter treating Lucretius, along with corrections to his 1500 edition, in his 1502 volume of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius.

p. 352b3. Add:

The total number of credited editions printed from 1471/73 to 1600 is now thirty (thirty-one counting the possible 1496 edition). The 1596 Lyons edition attested in Baudrier 5.283 must be considered a ghost, since the only copy Baudrier cites (Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 8 Y 273 1377) is in fact the 1606 edition, and no other copy can be found. While small in contrast with the hundreds of editions of Virgil, thirty is still a remarkably large number of editions for such a difficult and controversial text. The gap of sixteen years between the 1515 edition and that of 1531 divides Lucretius' early publication history into two phases. All eight editions of the early phase, from 1471/73 to 1515, were Italian, but after the 1531 Basel edition France dominated new editions. After 1515, Lucretius was not printed again in Italy until 1647, and only twice in the entire seventeenth century.

p. 352b25. Add:

Lucretius featured as a source and an example in the lectures of Marcello Adriani in Florence at the end of the fifteenth century, though Adriani seems never to have lectured directly on the poet.⁷ Petrus Nannius and his successor Cornelius Valerius taught the *De rerum natura* itself at Louvain in the mid-sixteenth century. Nannius' 1542 *Somnium in librum secundum Lucretii praefatio* describes his students' struggles with Lucretius' difficult Latin, and complains of the absence of a good classroom edition. Nannius then describes a dream in which he sees the ghost of Virgil convicted of plagiarism for stealing lines from the *De rerum natura*.⁸

6 M. Ferguson Smith and D. Butterfield, "Not a Ghost: The 1496 Brescia Edition of Lucretius," *Aevum* 84 (2010) 683–93.

7 Brown, *Return of Lucretius*, 42–67.

8 D. Sacré, "Nannius's *Somnia*," in R. De Smet, ed., *La satire humaniste. Actes du Colloque international des 31 mars, 1er et 2 avril 1993*, Travaux de l'Institut interuniversitaire pour

p. 352b47. Add:

Another major strike against Lucretius and Epicurus in pre-modern eyes was their rejection of providence, which undermined the traditional proof of the existence of God from design, and other elements of belief. Ficino rebuts Lucretian attacks on providence in his *Philebus* commentary and the *Platonic Theology*.⁹ In 1595 Laurent Pollot included denial of providence as one of the major categories of atheism in his *Dialogues contre la pluralité des religions et l'athéisme* (La Rochelle, 1595), fol. 97r.¹⁰

p. 353a18. Add:

The short *Vita* printed by Petrus Candidus in his 1512 edition did not exactly reproduce Crinitus' original. Instead, selected words were replaced with synonyms in an obvious attempt to disguise its debt to Crinitus, and the final sentences were omitted. Candidus appended a page of excerpts from ancient authors who mention Lucretius, including Quintilian, Ovid, Statius, and M.T. Varro. The Crinitus *Vita* in its original form was first reprinted in the Basel edition of 1531, but even here the editor appended an excerpt from Pius' *Vita*. A second very short treatment of Lucretius' life, comparable to Crinitus', appeared in Lilio Gregorio Giraldi's *Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem* (Basel, 1545), and was reprinted in abridged form in the 1576 Lambin pocket edition of the *De rerum natura*.

p. 353b8. Add:

While the Lucretian passages used by Montaigne in his *Essais* treat primarily moral subjects, Montaigne's extensive annotations, discovered in his personal copy of the 1563 edition (now Cambridge, Univ. Lib., Montaigne.1.4.4), contain numerous notes on atomism, physics, sensation, and cognition.¹¹ Montaigne overtly states his preference for book 3. His interest in the poem, and the forms of skeptical argumentation employed in Epicurean attacks on *religio*, establish Lucretius alongside Sextus Empiricus as a key transmitter of ancient skepticism to the father of modern skepticism.

l'étude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme 11 (Louvain, 1994), 77–93.

- 9 J. Hankins, "Monstrous Melancholy: Ficino and the Physiological Causes of Atheism," in S. Clucas, P.J. Forshaw, and V. Rees, eds., *Laus platonici philosophi: Marsilio Ficino and His Influence*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 198 (Leiden and Boston, 2011), 25–43. Published in Italian as "'Malinconia mostruosa': Ficino e le cause fisiologiche dell'ateismo," *Rinascimento* 47 (2007) 3–23.
- 10 Cf. A.C. Kors, *Atheism in France, 1650–1729*, vol. 1, *The Orthodox Sources of Disbelief* (Princeton, 1990), 28.
- 11 M.A. Screech, *Montaigne's Annotated Copy of Lucretius: A Transcription and Study of the Manuscript, Notes and Pen-Marks*, *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 325 (Geneva, 1998).

p. 353b14. Add:

The absence of mature Lucretian ideas in Valla's *De Voluptate* is conspicuous. Valla quotes several Lucretian lines which are known to have circulated independently as excerpts, as well as one line, 2.172, for which no evidence of independent circulation survives.¹² This has been discussed as possible evidence that Valla had access to the complete poem, but if so he certainly had not digested it in any detail when he wrote *De Voluptate*.

p. 353b33. Add:

The manuscript Piacenza, Biblioteca Comunale Passerini-Landi, Cod. 33 (1507) adds scientific illustrations to the poem, illustrating the *ostomachion* of Archimedes (2.778–83, fol. 51r), shapes of atoms (4.647–72, fol. 100r), and some of his discussions of cosmology and astronomy (5.691–771, fols. 132r–136r), including wind diagrams clearly based on those common in manuscripts of Isidore of Seville's *De natura rerum*.¹³

p. 354a7. Add:

Raphael Franci's 1504 *In Lucretium Paraphrasis* was printed in Bologna and dedicated to Tommaso Soderini, later the dedicatee of the 1512 Juntine edition. The introduction proclaims the author's intent to treat books 1–3 and to focus on the issue of the immortality of the soul, but in fact Franci covers only book 1. Ianus Mellerus Palmerius, working in Bruges, published in 1580 a volume entitled *Spicilegiorum Ian. Melleri Palmerii commentarius primus, quibus pleraque Sallustii, Lucretii, Plauti, Terentii, Propertii, Petronii Arbitri, tum fragmenta apud Marcellum: multa Cornelij Taciti: quaedam etiam Catulli, & aliorum scriptorum, alias conclamata, tentantur primum aut impari ausu atque successu tentata iam ante, cum diis volentibus emaculantur*. A letter at the end of the book promises a second volume, intended to contain, among other items, a treatment of book 5. No trace of this second volume can be found. A digital copy is accessible through Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum (MDZ), BSB.

p. 354a32. Add:

To Fleischmann's list of figures influenced by Lucretius may be added Bartolomeo Scalla, whose works are peppered with positive repetitions of Epicurean moral thought, and more critical comments on Epicurean denial of divinity.

12 G.D. Hadzsits, *Lucretius and His Influence* (New York, 1935), 257; M.D. Reeve, "Lucretius in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance: Transmission and Scholarship," in S. Gillespie and P. Hardie, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius* (Cambridge, 2007), 205–13; Reeve, "The Italian Tradition of Lucretius Revisited," *Aevum* 79 (2005) 115–64, at 163.

13 See B. Obrist, "Wind Diagrams and Medieval Cosmology," *Speculum* 72 (1997) 33–84.

Scalla's interest in Lucretius likely derives from his association with Ficino and the Medici circle.¹⁴ Reeve has identified a Lucretian passage in Leonardo Bruni's 1438 *Iliad* translation,¹⁵ and confirmed interest in the text by Poliziano and Filelfo.¹⁶ The conjunction of Poggio, Niccolò Niccoli, Bruni, Ficino, Scalla, Poliziano, Adriani, Machiavelli, Donato Giannotti, and others easily establishes Florence as a center of Lucretian activity in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Rome and Naples were also centers, evidenced by manuscript production. The circle of Pomponio Leto was certainly the Roman centerpiece, while strong Lucretian influences have been traced in Neapolitan poetry, especially from Lorenzo Bonincontri on,¹⁷ and Naples was the key source of the manuscripts now in Spain possessed by the House of Anjou.¹⁸ Padua may be counted another center, where two bishops owned manuscripts, and Girolamo Fracastoro embraced atomism, using Lucretian accounts of disease and decay in developing his pioneering arguments for a contagion model of disease. After Fracastoro, the idea of tiny, moving particles as elements of disease, sometimes termed "atoms," would remain common in medical discourse well into the Enlightenment. Lucretius' descriptions of medical subjects, including epilepsy, drunkenness, numbness, aging, disease, and fertility, and his account of the Athenian plague, are frequently hand-annotated in Renaissance manuscripts and printed copies. A hand transcription of Lucretius' account of the plague appears in a manuscript miscellany of Latin and Greek medical texts belonging to another key figure in Padua's intellectual circle, Galileo's mentor Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, G 67 inf).

p. 354a47. Add:

Frachetta's¹⁹ vernacular treatment, dedicated to his patron Cardinal Luigi D'Este, sets out the project of the *Spositione* in its descriptive subtitle: "Nella quale si disamina la dottrina di Epicuro, & si mostra in che sia conforme col vero, & con gl'insegnamenti d'Aristotile; & in che differente." In it, Frachetta sets out to revive and clarify those arguments of Epicurus he considers valid, but also elaborates the text's "errors" so exhaustively that fully one quarter of

14 Brown, *Return of Lucretius*, 16–41.

15 M.D. Reeve, "The Italian Tradition of Lucretius," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 23 (1980) 27–48, at 163.

16 Reeve, "The Italian Tradition of Lucretius," 42 n. 10.

17 Explored in C.P. Goddard, "Epicureanism and the Poetry of Lucretius in the Renaissance" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1991); cf. Reeve, "The Italian Tradition of Lucretius Revisited," 163.

18 For details, see A.J. Traver Vera, "Lucrecio en España" (PhD diss., University of Extremadura, Cáceres, 2009).

19 Both the forms "Frachetta" and "Franchetta" were used, but "Frachetta" appears on the title page of the volume.

the volume's index is dedicated to differentiating various *Errori di Lucretio*.²⁰ The elements of the poem praised by Frachetta are primarily those treating natural philosophy. Frachetta uses the invocation of Venus at the beginning of the poem to argue that Lucretius did not deny prayer as thoroughly as Epicurus did, taking up a technique used by Lambin in his 1570 *Vita*, where he ascribed the more unchristian elements of the poem to Epicurus in order to paint Lucretius as more orthodox.²¹

p. 354b6. Add:

Further interest in the invocation of Venus survives in Pomponio Leto's *Vita* of Lucretius, preserved in manuscript form in a copy of the 1486 Verona edition of Lucretius preserved in Utrecht.²² The brief text concludes with a lengthy analysis of Lucretius' opening image, which has been used as evidence to suggest that the *Vita* was, in fact, intended as the beginning of a commentary or set of lectures.

p. 354b13. Add:

Machiavelli's personal copy (Vatican City, BAV, Ross. 884) is entirely in his own hand, probably copied not long before 1500. His text derives largely from the 1495 edition, incorporating some unidentified readings and some of Marullo.²³ Machiavelli's manuscript, which also contains his transcription of Terence's *Eunuchus*, contains little annotation, but what annotation there is concentrates on book 2, and on atomistic subjects, including the swerve.

Several other Renaissance manuscripts of Lucretius preserve sufficiently extensive annotation to be of particular interest to those working on the commentary tradition. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, IV E 51, copied in 1458, contains extensive corrections and topical annotation attributed alternately to Pomponio Leto or an unknown member of his circle. Of several derivatives of the Neapolitanus, Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F.VIII.14, produced circa 1470 and containing an ownership note of Bonifacius Amorbach dated 1513, also contains extensive annotation, only some of which matches the Neapolitanus.²⁴ Florence,

20 G. Frachetta, *Spositione* (Venice, 1589), fols. +++v to +++4r.

21 *T. Lucretii Cari de rerum natura: Libri VI* (Paris, 1570), fol. e1r; G. Solaro, *Lucrezio: Biografia umanistica* (Bari, 2000), 85.

22 Utrecht, Universiteitsbibl., Litt. lat. X Fol. 82 rar, reprinted as Solaro, ed., *Giulio Pomponio Leto. Lucrezio*, Città antica 19 (Palermo, 1993); see H. Dixon, "Pomponio Leto's Notes on Lucretius (Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, X Fol. 82 Rariora)," *Aevum* 85 (2011) 191–216. The volume contains annotations by Leto, Sebastiano Priuli, Francesco Cerreto, and at least one other.

23 Brown, *Return of Lucretius*, 113–22 (Appendix).

24 On the attribution of these annotations see Reeve, "Lucretius from the 1460s to the 17th Century," 166–67.

Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 35.32 contains philosophical and topical notes associated with Marcello Adriani.²⁵ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3276 contains notes attributed to Antonius Panormita (Beccadelli), and others formerly ascribed to Johannes Aurispa. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 35.29 contains notes attributed to Poliziano. Annotation in Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 35.31 and some of that in Cambridge, University Library, Nn.2.40 is attributed to one Noyanus/Noianus, possibly Francesco Vidal de Noya (1430s–1492), who studied in Paris, served as tutor to Ferdinand, worked in Italy from the 1470s on, and was bishop of Cefalu from 1485.

The poem's desirability as an addition to elite libraries is established by the expensive decoration found on thirty of the fifty-four surviving Renaissance manuscripts. Many frontispieces bear the arms or ownership notes of powerful patrons, including two bishops of Padua, Jacopo Zeno (Padua, Bibl. Capitolare, C.76) and Petrus Barocius (C.75); popes Sixtus IV (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 1569) and Pius II (Milan, Bibl. Ambrosiana, E 125 sup.); three members of the House of Aragon (Cambridge, Univ. Lib., Nn.2.40) including copies produced for Andrea Matteo III Aquaviva (Vatican City, BAV, Barb. lat. 154) and Ferdinand I (València, Bibl. Universitaria, 733); the copy produced for John Tiptoft Earl of Worcester (Oxford, Bod. Lib., Auct. F.1.13); one copy with Pazzi arms (location unknown, formerly collection of Major J.R. Abbey, 3236); and the several Medici copies in Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Other known owners include Piero Vettori (Munich, BSB, Clm 816a), Francesco Marescalchi of Ferrara (Paris, BNF, lat. 10306), Fulvio Orsini (Vatican City, BAV, Vat. lat. 3275) and Francesco Sassetti, whose copy (Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 35.28) was transcribed by Bartolomeo Fonzio. Another, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 35.26 contains the note *Nicolaus Riccius scripsit*. London, British Library, Harl. 2694 was transcribed by Clemens Salernitanus, and London, British Library, Add. 11912 by Gianrinaldo Mennio. Two manuscripts were transcribed by Giovanni Sulpizio Verolano in 1466, (Vatican City, BAV, Ottob. lat. 1954 and Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, W.383 [De Ricci 434]), of which the latter contains the anonymous poem which later accompanied the *editio secunda*. The Piacenza manuscript, mentioned above (Piacenza, Bibl. Comunale Passerini-Landi, Cod. 33), was transcribed by Bernardinus Cipellarius Buxetanus, who may or may not have also been the illustrator.

Print copies containing notable hand annotations include the notes and *Vita* of Girolamo Borgia in London, British Library, I.A. 23564 (1495); notes attributed to Avancius in preparing his 1500 edition (and others more dubiously

25 Brown, *Return of Lucretius*, 41–67.

attributed to Pius) in Cambridge, Mass., Houghton Library, Inc 5271 (1495);²⁶ notes written by Gifanius in preparing his second edition preserved in a copy of his first, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bywater P.6.14 (1565); notes of Aldus Manutius the younger in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, R.I.IV.561 (1570); notes of Isaac Casaubon in Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, 755 H 9 (1576); notes in a copy once owned by Donato Giannotti in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. 2 R 4.50, fol. 6r; notes attributed to Pomponio Leto in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, M YC 397, V95 (1495); the notes and *Vita* of Pomponio Leto in Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Litt. lat. X fol. 82 rar; and Montaigne's annotations in his copy of the 1563 Lambin (Cambridge, Univ. Lib., Montaigne.1.4.4); the last two of these have been transcribed and published.²⁷

p. 354b20. Add:

Lucretius is also presented as a *vates*, and his madness as poetic frenzy, in the *Vita* of Johannes Baptista Pius in his edition of 1511.

p. 355a41. Add:

Lucretius did indeed endure fierce criticism throughout the early modern period, yet, except for the 1517 ban on teaching the poem, which was limited to Florence and her dominions, the *De rerum natura* was never formally restricted in its circulation. In a much-cited letter written by Commissioner General of the Inquisition Michele Ghislieri in preparing the 1557 revision of the *Index*, Ghislieri named Lucian and Lucretius as examples of authors who might be inappropriately stifled by an overly broad *Index* but were, in his view, not dangerous because everyone knew to read them as fables.²⁸ Educated, Latin-reading audiences who wanted the poem for its moral and poetic content were consistently granted access, and editors from Avancius to Lambinus argued that the learned reader would enjoy the language while remaining immune to Epicurean "errors." The poem's radical potential is clear to modern eyes in retrospect, and the connections historians have drawn between Lucretius and such radical figures as

26 See Reeve, "Lucretius from the 1460s to the 17th Century", 171–74.

27 The former as Solaro, ed., *Giulio Pomponio Leto. Lucrezio*, Città antica 19 (Palermo, 1993); the latter as Screech (1998).

28 P. Paschini, "Letterati ed indice nella riforma cattolica in Italia," in *Cinquecento romano e riforma cattolica. Scritti raccolti in occasione dell'ottantesimo compleanno dell'autore, Lateranum*, n.s., 24 (1958) 239–73, at 239; L. Pastor, *Histoire des papes depuis la fin du moyen âge*, vol. 14 (Paris, 1931), 223 n. 3, and J.M. de Bujanda, with R. Davignon and E. Stanek, *Index des livres interdits*, vol. 8, *Index de Rome. 1557, 1559, 1564. Les premiers index romains et l'index du Concile de Trente* (Sherbrooke, 1990), 32 n. 14; V. Prosperi, *Di soavi licor gli orli del vaso: La fortuna di Lucrezio dall'umanesimo alla controriforma* (Turin, 2004), ch. 2, "Venere, la Vergine e la voluttà: i codici della ricezione di Lucrezio nel Cinquecento," 97–179.

Machiavelli make it clearer. Yet the poem's beauty, its similarity to Virgil, and the persuasive skill with which humanists from Petrarch on argued for the virtuous orthodoxy of the classical corpus and its compatibility with Christianity all made the orthodox powers of the Renaissance comfortable leaving the poem in learned hands. A Latin-reading humanist was assumed to know how to read a classic correctly, and how to sort out truth (i.e., orthodoxy) from falsehood. This confidence allowed Lucretius' arguments against the afterlife, prayer, and providence to be safely printed by respected presses thirty times by 1600. It was not until the 1717 printing of Marchetti's Italian translation threatened to make the poem's content accessible to a less learned vernacular audience that Lucretius was finally added to the *Index*, three centuries after Poggio brought him back to Italy.²⁹

Lucretius' reception after 1600 can be characterized as a period of permeation without conversion. Case studies have demonstrated the presence of Lucretian images and concepts in the works of many seventeenth-century figures. The most attention has gone to exposing Lucretian poetic language in the English poets: Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, and, later, Pope and Shelley. The scientific works of figures such as Bacon, Newton, Leibniz, and Locke employ terms and questions drawn from Lucretian physical theory, especially in treating units of matter and the question of vacuum. Lucretius also served as a model of the genre of didactic poetry, as when the Cambridge Platonist Henry More compared himself to Lucretius as a "Philosophicall poet," and borrowed imagery from the *De rerum natura* as he set his distinctly un-Epicurean philosophy into verse.³⁰ In a more radical vein, Rochester translated Lucretius' articulation of the infamous Epicurean argument that the gods do not heed prayer (2.44–49).³¹ While Rochester's own philosophical views are demonstrably not Epicurean, Lucretian questions are conspicuous within his arsenal of heterodoxies. Yet none of these figures can be called true Epicureans, or even atomists. Rather, their works demonstrate familiarity with the *De rerum natura* without conversion to its overall system.

Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, considered atomism very seriously for many years, finding its models of randomness within Nature valuable, particularly in her examinations of the merits of the active and passive life.³² Cavendish's writings demonstrate how seventeenth-century intellectuals, finding their world destabilized by the discoveries of Hooke, Boyle, and Galileo, turned

29 C. Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (London, 1962), 196.

30 G. Passannante, *The Lucretian Renaissance: Philology and the Afterlife of Tradition* (Chicago and London, 2011), 186–97.

31 R. Wilcoxon, "Rochester's Philosophical Premises: A Case for Consistency," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8 (1974/75) 183–201.

32 A. Battigelli, *Margaret Cavendish and the Exiles of the Mind* (Lexington, 1998).

to Lucretius and ancient atomism for alternative but still time-tested terms and models which might let them face new problems by fitting them into old conversations. This new desire for old terms demonstrates too why such an orthodox figure as the devout puritan Lucy Hutchinson, in between authoring religious tracts for the improvement of her children, chose to translate the *De rerum natura*. Finding its theology abhorrent, she nevertheless desired to understand for herself the atomism which was ubiquitous in the salons and correspondences of the mid-seventeenth-century literary class³³. As in the case of William Petty's treatise on the order of nature, produced in the same period and intellectual sphere,³⁴ the conversations on atomism encountered by Lucy Hutchinson are cases of Lucretian ideas circulating as hypotheticals to be debated or sources to be looted for their few valuable uses, rather than as a rival system to be seriously considered as a whole. Seventeenth-century salons contained Epicureanism without Epicureans and atomism without atomists, much as atheism without atheists had for centuries been a vital player in European thought in the form of the fictitious unbelievers who served as interlocutors in dialogues written by orthodox authors.³⁵

The premier genuine atomist of the seventeenth century is Pierre Gassendi.³⁶ He attempted to systematically clarify and defend Epicureanism, presenting its physics as a serious alternative to Aristotelianism. Yet he would not have been recognized as an Epicurean by Lucretius. Gassendi's Christian Epicureanism accepted providence, the immortal soul, and a Christian Supreme Being. While he still set pleasure as man's highest good, he defined it as a suspiciously Platonic harmony of mind and body, and displaced absolute happiness into the afterlife. One Lucretian element Gassendi did pick up was his distinct form of philosophical skepticism, termed "constructive skepticism" or "mitigated skepticism" by Popkin.³⁷ Lucretius attacks belief in divine participation in Nature by presenting multiple rival explanations for each natural phenomenon, without any claim that any specific explanation is true, in order to convince the reader that there are alternatives to the divine explanation, and thus that divine presence in Nature is not therefore proved true by default. This form of skepticism, shared by Gassendi's intimate and widely-connected friend Marin Mersenne, is closely bound

33 H. de Quehen, ed., *Lucy Hutchinson's Translation of Lucretius: "De rerum natura"* (London, 1996), 1–20 (Introduction), esp. 4–12.

34 R. Lewis, *William Petty on the Order of Nature: An Unpublished Manuscript Treatise, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 399* (Tempe, Ariz., 2012).

35 Kors, *Atheism in France* vol. 1.

36 A. LoLordo, *Pierre Gassendi and the Birth of Early Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2007).

37 R.H. Popkin, "Constructive or Mitigated Scepticism," ch. 7 in *A History of Scepticism: From Savonarola to Bayle*, rev. and expanded ed. (Oxford, 2003); Palmer, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2014), chs. 1, 5.

to the development of the scientific method. Much as in Montaigne's case, not Epicureanism but a new kind of philosophical skepticism was born when the *De rerum natura* entered the tumultuous decades around 1600.

Montaigne and Gassendi again demonstrate how, while the complete system articulated by Lucretius, with its atomic swerve, did not find converts among the new philosophers, isolated concepts, traveling independently from one another, were central to scientific and moral discourse. It is in this same atomized form that Lucretius went on to exert his well-established influence on such Enlightenment radicals as Voltaire, who praised his portrait of the atrocities perpetrated in the name of organized religion, and the great materialists, Holbach, Diderot, La Mettrie, and Sade.³⁸ Milton's use of the word *atom* was no more strictly Epicurean than is ours today, but, then as now, the term was indispensable.

VERNACULAR TRANSLATIONS

The first vernacular version of Lucretius was a prose translation printed alongside the Latin by Michel de Marolles.³⁹ It was published in 1650, revised in 1659, and enjoyed a broad reception, especially in England, where its influence is detectible in most of the earliest English translations.⁴⁰ A second anonymous French version, this time in verse and borrowing much from Marolles, including his life of the poet, was published by J. Langlois in Paris in 1677. A third, again in prose, translated by the Baron de Coutoures, appeared in Paris in 1685, and was reprinted in 1692, 1695, 1708, and 1742.

English translations began in the 1650s. Lucy Hutchinson, author and biographer of her husband Colonel John Hutchinson, who was among the MPs who signed the death warrant of Charles I, also undertook her verse translation in the 1650s. She did not publish her translation, but gave the manuscript (now London, BL, Add. 19333) to the first Earl of Anglesey. Her stated purpose in translating the poem was to understand firsthand things she heard discussed often, but she was herself a devout Puritan, and her writings indicate that she developed an increasing dislike of the poet over the course of her labors.⁴¹ Her version is closely followed by an anonymous prose translation datable to 1660, preserved

38 See A.C. Kors, *Atheism in France*, vol. 3, *Epicureans and Atheists* (forthcoming).

39 On earlier fragmentary translations and other details see Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (1962), IV, esp. 149–50.

40 L. Cottagnies, "Le 'renouveau' de l'épicurisme en Angleterre au milieu du dix-septième siècle de Walter Charleton à Margaret Cavendish—Une histoire franco-britannique," *Études Épistémè* 14 (2008), *Science et littérature*, 123–73; Cottagnies, "Michel de Marolles's 1650 Translation of Lucretius and Its Reception in England," (Oxford: forthcoming).

41 De Quehen, ed., *Lucy Hutchinson's Translation of Lucretius*, 1–20 (Introduction), esp. 4–12.

only in manuscript (Oxford, Bod. Lib., Rawl. D.314), for which dozens of possible authors have been proposed, none convincingly.⁴²

The first English translation printed was that of author and diarist John Evelyn, whose translation into heroic couplets of book 1 appeared, along with the Latin, in London, 1656, under the title *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus "De rerum natura" Interpreted and Made English Verse*. The volume is rife with printer's errors, and contains a commentary (*Animadversions*) printed from Evelyn's notes, but, as the printer's introduction states, without the author's knowledge or consent. Evelyn claims in later writings that he published no further volumes partly because his abominable treatment by the printer, and the subsequent cold reception of the work, made him unwilling to take the project further; he commented separately that he also felt himself unequal to matching the elegance of the original poem.⁴³ The British Library retains the manuscript of his translations of books 3–6 (London, BL, Add. 78354) and his commentaries on the same, though no trace remains of book 2.

The first complete English edition was the much-praised verse translation of Thomas Creech, published in 1682 and frequently reprinted. Creech's suicide at Oxford in 1700, supposedly motivated by love, and peculiarly parallel to the story of Lucretius' suicide, was discussed in popular tracts of the same year.⁴⁴ A 1714 reprint of his translation contains as an addition "a compleat System of the Epicurean Philosophy," consisting of Creech's notes from his own Latin copy translated and reflected upon by an anonymous editor, likely John Digby, whose *Epicurus' Morals* had appeared in 1712.⁴⁵ In 1685, John Dryden published five translated selections from Lucretius in his poetic miscellany *Sylvae*, including the arguments against fear of death from book 3 and the famous treatment of love in book 4. Creech's translation remained popular, and was printed together with Dryden's in 1700 and after.⁴⁶

42 See R. Barbour, "Anonymous Lucretius," *Bodleian Library Record* 23 (2010) 105–11; D. Butterfield has also worked to trace this manuscript and its attribution history.

43 M.M. Repetzki, *John Evelyn's Translation of Titus Lucretius Carus "De rerum natura": An Old-Spelling Critical Edition* (Frankfurt a.M., 2000), xi–cxviii (preface), esp. xi–xii, l–lii, xci–xcvi.

44 *A Step to Oxford: Or, a Mad Essay on the Reverend Mr. Tho. Creech's Hanging Himself, (As 'tis Said) for Love. With the Character of his Mistress. In a Letter to a Person of Quality* (London, 1700) and *Daphnis: Or, a Pastoral Elegy upon the Unfortunate and Much-Lamented Death of Mr. Thomas Creech* (London, 1700) (variously attributed to John Froud or to John Oldmixon).

45 Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (1962), 171.

46 *Lucretius. His Six Books of Epicurean Philosophy: And Manilius his Five Books, Containing a System of the Ancient Astronomy and Astrology. Together with the Philosophy of the Stoicks. Both Translated into English Verse with Notes, by Mr. Tho. Creech. To Which Is Added the Several Parts of Lucretius, English'd by Mr. Dryden* (London, 1700).

The first Italian version was the elegant but very loose blank verse translation, with lengthy original insertions, completed in 1669 by the mathematician Alessandro Marchetti.⁴⁷ Despite Marchetti's promise to mark all "errors" (i.e., heterodoxies) in the text with marginal asterisks, he was denied permission to publish it in by Duke Cosimo III, at the urging of the Duke's confessor, in 1670.⁴⁸ Marchetti's version nonetheless circulated widely in manuscript form. Manuscript copies are common in all major collections of Renaissance Italian manuscripts, and were possessed by Voltaire, Holbach, and Leibniz. The title page of the first printed edition of 1717 claims that it was printed in London, but it contains no publisher's name, and is likely a clandestine Italian product.⁴⁹

De Wit's facing page Dutch version, also prose, was first printed in Amsterdam in 1701, and has the distinction of being the first illustrated version printed.⁵⁰ German translations did not appear before those of Mayr (prose, 1784) and Meineke (verse with Latin, 1795), and other vernaculars not until the nineteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

pp. 355b–356b. Add:

I. THOUGHT AND WRITING OF LUCRETIUS⁵¹

K.A. Algra, M.H. Koenen, and P.H. Schrijvers, eds., *Lucretius and His Intellectual Background: Proceedings of the Colloquium, Amsterdam, 26–28 June 1996* (Amsterdam, 1997); C. Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus: A Study* (Oxford, 1928); B. Beer, *Lukrez und Philodem: Poetische Argumentation und poetologischer Diskurs*, Schwabe epicurea 1 (Basel, 2009); M. Beretta and F. Citti, eds., *Lucrezio, la natura e la scienza* (Florence, 2008); M. Bollack, *La raison de Lucrèce: Constitution d'une poétique philosophique avec un essai d'interprétation de la critique lucrétienne* (Paris, 1978); P. Boyancé, *Lucrèce et l'épicurisme* (Paris, 1963); D.J. Butterfield, "Sigmatic Echthlipsis in Lucretius," *Hermes* 136 (2008) 188–205; D. Clay,

47 D. Aricò, *Della Natura delle Cose di Lucrezio*, trans. A. Marchetti (Rome, 2003).

48 Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (1962), 194–95.

49 My thanks to N. Davidson for this observation. On later Italian translators, see A. Magnoni, "Traduttori italiani di Lucrezio (1800–1902)," *Eikasmos* 16 (2005) 419–70.

50 Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (1962), 238–40.

51 This is not the place for a comprehensive bibliography of all work on Lucretius. For broader but still well-focused select bibliographies see those of M. Erler in H. Flashar, ed., *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. 4, *Die Hellenistische Philosophie* (Basel, 1994), 383–490; and of D. Sedley, "Lucretius," in E.N. Zalta, ed., *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2008 Edition), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/lucretius/>. Here I supply a few key sources plus a selection of more recent publications.

Lucretius and Epicurus (Ithaca, N.Y. and London, 1983); H. Donohue, *The Song of the Swan: Lucretius and the Influence of Callimachus* (Lanham, Md., 1993); D.R. Dudley, ed., *Lucretius* (New York, 1965); A. Ernout and L. Robin, *Lucrece, "De rerum natura."* *Commentaire exégétique et critique, précédé d'une introduction sur l'art de Lucrece et d'une traduction des "Lettres" et "Pensées" d'Épicure*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1925–28); M.R. Gale, *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius* (Cambridge, 1994); Gale, ed., *Lucretius*, Oxford Readings in Classical Studies (New York, 2007); O. Gigon, with D.J. Furley, E. Bréguet, R. Godel, and W. Spoerri, *Lucrece: Huit exposés suivis de discussions*, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 24 (Geneva, 1978); S. Gillespie and P. Hardie, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius* (Cambridge, 2007); D.F. Kennedy, *Rethinking Reality: Lucretius and the Textualization of Nature* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2002); E.D. Kollmann, "Lucretius' Criticism of the Early Greek Philosophers," *Studi classici* 13 (1971) 79–93; *Lucrezio: L'atomo e la parola, Colloquio Lucreziano*, Bologna 26 gennaio 1989 (Bologna, 1990); D. Marković, *The Rhetoric of Explanation in Lucretius' "De rerum natura"*, Mnemosyne supplement 294 (Leiden and Boston, 2008); A. Monet, ed., *Le jardin romain: Épicurisme et poésie à Rome: Mélanges offerts à Mayotte Bollack* (Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2003); M.C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton, 1994); E.A. Schmidt, *Clinamen: Eine Studie zum dynamischen Atomismus der Antike*, Schriften der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 42 (Heidelberg, 2007); P.H. Schrijvers, *Lucrece et les sciences de la vie*, Mnemosyne supplement 186 (Leiden, 1999); D. Sedley, *Creationism and Its Critics in Antiquity*, Sather Classical Lectures 66 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 2007); Sedley, *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* (Cambridge, 1998); C. Segal, *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety: Poetry and Philosophy in "De rerum natura"* (Princeton, 1990); M. Serres, *The Birth of Physics*, trans. J. Hawkes, ed. with introduction and notes by D. Webb (Manchester, 2000), originally published as *La naissance de la physique dans le texte de Lucrece. Fleuves et turbulences* (Paris, 1977); C.C.W. Taylor, "Democritus and Lucretius on Death and Dying," in A. Brancacci and P.-M. Morel, eds., *Democritus: Science, the Arts, and the Care of the Soul: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Democritus (Paris, 18–20 September 2003)* (Leiden and Boston, 2007), 77–86; J. Warren, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism* (Cambridge, 2009); Warren, *Facing Death: Epicurus and His Critics* (Oxford, 2004); D. West, *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh, 1969).

II. TEXTUAL TRADITION AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

K. Büchner, "Lukrez," in M. Meier, F. Hindermann, and A. Schindler, *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, vol. 1 (Zurich, 1961), 386–89; D.J. Butterfield, *The Early Textual History of Lucretius'*

"*De rerum natura*" (Cambridge, forthcoming 2013); G.F. Cini, "La posizione degli 'Italici' nello stemma lucreziano," *Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Toscana di scienze e lettere La Colombaria* 41 (1976) 115–69; A. Dalzell, "A Bibliography of Work on Lucretius, 1945–1972," *The Classical World* 66 (1973) 389–427, continued in *The Classical World* 67 (1973) 65–112; A. de la Mare, "New Research on Humanistic Scribes in Florence," in A. Garzelli, ed., *Miniatura fiorentina del Rinascimento 1440–1525: Un primo censimento*, vol. 1, *Inventari e cataloghi toscani* 18 (Florence, 1985), 393–600; E. Flores, *Le scoperte di Poggio e il testo di Lucrezio* (Naples, 1980); C. Gordon, *A Bibliography of Lucretius* (London, 1962; 2nd ed., Winchester, Hampshire, 1985) (notable additions to the 1962 edition are E.J. Kenney's introduction and the reprint of R. Mynors' review of the first edition, originally published in *Book Collector* 12 [1963] 224–27); J. Hankins and A. Palmer, *The Recovery of Ancient Philosophy in the Renaissance: A Brief Guide*, *Quaderni di Rinascimento* 44 (Florence, 2008); C. Hosius, "Zur italienischen Überlieferung des Lucrez," *Rheinisches Museum* 69 (1914) 109–22; S.A. Ives, "The Exemplar of Two Renaissance Editors of Lucretius," *Rare Books: Notes on the History of Old Books and Manuscripts*, vol. 2 (1942), 3–7, no. 23; W.A. Merrill, *The Italian Manuscripts of Lucretius*, 2 vols., University of California Publications in Classical Philology 9 (Berkeley, 1926–29); K. Müller, "De codicum Lucretii italicorum origine," *Museum Helveticum* 30 (1973) 166–78; M. Paolucci, "Di alcuni nuovi codici italiani di Lucrezio," *Aevum* 28 (1954) 10–20; O. Pecere and M.D. Reeve, eds., *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance: Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 16–22 October 1993* (Spoleto, 1995); M.D. Reeve, "Lucretius from the 1460s to the 17th Century: Seven Questions of Attribution," *Aevum* 80 (2006) 165–84; Reeve, "The Italian Tradition of Lucretius Revisited," *Aevum* 79 (2005) 115–64; Reeve, "The Italian Tradition of Lucretius," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 23 (1980) 27–48; L.D. Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 218–22; M.F. Smith and D. Butterfield, "Not a Ghost: The 1496 Brescia Edition of Lucretius," *Aevum* 84 (2010) 683–93; W.E. Leonard, "General Introduction, Lucretius: The Man, the Poet and the Times" (pp. 1–92) and S.B. Smith, "Introduction to the Commentary," (pp. 93–186) in W.E. Leonard and S.B. Smith, eds., *T. Lucreti Cari "De rerum natura" libri sex* (Madison, Wis., 1942), esp. 80–128; Á.J. Traver Vera, "Lucrecio en España" (PhD diss., University of Extremadura, Cáceres, 2009); Traver Vera, "Revaluación del manuscrito lucreciano Caesarugustanus 11–36," *Exemplaria classica: journal of classical philology* 15 (2011) 113–21.

IIA. BIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION

L. Canfora, *Vita di Lucrezio* (Palermo, 1993); R. Fabbri, "La 'vita borgiana' di Lucrezio nel quadro delle biografie umanistiche," *Lettere italiane* 36 (1984)

348–66; L. Holford-Strevens, “Horror vacui in Lucretian Biography,” *Leeds International Classical Studies* 1.1 (2002) 1–23; J. Masson, “New Data Presumably from Suetonius’ ‘Life of Lucretius,’” *Classical Review* 10 (1896) 323–24; Masson, “New Details from Suetonius’s Life of Lucretius,” *Journal of Philology* 23 (1895) 220–37; C. Radinger, “Reste der Lucretiusbiographie des Sueton,” *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 39 (1894) 1244–48; E. Stampini, *Il suicidio di Lucrezio (a proposito di una pubblicazione recente)* (Messina, 1896); W. Schmid, “Lukrez und der Wandel seines Bildes. Betrachtungen zur 2000. Wiederkehr von Lukrezens Todestag,” *Antike und Abendland* 2 (1946) 193–219; G. Solaro, *Lucrezio: Biografie umanistiche*, *Paradosis* 3 (Bari, 2000); L.P. Wilkinson, “Lucretius and the Love-Philtre,” *Classical Review* 63 (1949) 47–48; K. Ziegler, “Der Tod des Lucretius,” *Hermes* 71 (1936) 421–40.

III. INFLUENCE

A. General

M. von Albrecht, *Lukrez in der europäischen Kultur* (Ludwigshafen am Rhein, 2005); F. Del Lucchese, V. Morfino, and G. Mormino, eds., *Lucrezio e la modernità: I secoli XV– XVII. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Università di Milano-Bicocca, 13–14 dicembre 2007* (Naples, 2011); W.B. Fleischmann, *Lucretius and English Literature, 1680–1740* (Paris, 1964); M.R. Gale, *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The “Georgics,” Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition* (Cambridge, 2000); P. Hardie, *Lucretian Receptions: History, the Sublime, Knowledge* (Cambridge, 2009); W.R. Johnson, *Lucretius and the Modern World* (London, 2000); H. Jones, *The Epicurean Tradition* (London and New York, 1989); R.P. Jungkuntz, “Christian Approval of Epicureanism,” *Church History* 31 (1962) 279–93; T.J. Madigan and D.B. Suits, eds., *Lucretius: His Continuing Influence and Contemporary Relevance. Papers from a Conference Held in March 2009 at St. John Fisher College, Rochester, N.Y.* (Rochester, N.Y., 2011); J. Masson, *Lucretius: Epicurean and Poet*, 2 vols. (New York, 1907–9); J. Miller and B. Inwood, eds., *Hellenistic and Early Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2003); D. Norbrook, S. Harrison and P. Hardie, eds., *The Afterlives of Lucretius: Proceedings of a conference held May 16–17 2012 by the Oxford University Center for Early Modern Studies* (Oxford, forthcoming); M. Osler, ed., *Atoms, Pneuma and Tranquility: Epicurean and Stoic Themes in European Thought* (Cambridge, 1991); P. Okołowski, *Materia i wartości: Neolukrecjanizm Stanisława Lema* (Warsaw, 2010); M.R. Pagnoni, “Prime note sulla tradizione medievale ed umanistica di Epicuro,” *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia*, 3rd ser., 4 (1974) 1443–77; L. Piazza, *Lucrezio: Il “De rerum natura” e la cultura occidentale* (Naples, 2009); R. Poignault, ed., *Présence de Lucrèce: Actes du colloque tenu à Tours (3–5 décembre 1998)* (Tours, 1999); J. Pollock, *Déclinaisons: Le naturalisme poétique de Lucrèce à Lacan* (Paris, 2010); W. Schmid, *Epicuro e l’epicureismo cristiano*, ed. I. Ronca, *Antichità classica e cristiana* 24 (Brescia,

1984); G. Solaro, "Note sulla fortuna di Lucrezio," *Res publica litterarum* 22 (1999) 153–59; K. Summers, "Lucretius and the Epicurean Tradition of Piety," *Classical Philology* 90 (1995) 32–57; C. Wilson, *Epicureanism at the Origins of Modernity* (Oxford and New York, 2008).

B. Late Ancient and Medieval

F. Gabotto, "L'Epicureismo italiano negli ultimi secoli del medio-evo," *Rivista di filosofia scientifica* 8 (1889) 552–63; C. Grellard and A. Robert, eds., *Atomism in Late Medieval Philosophy and Theology*, History of Science and Medicine Library 8, Medieval and Early Modern Science 9 (Leiden and Boston, 2009); J. Penwill, "Does God Care? Lactantius v. Epicurus in the *De Ira Dei*," *Sophia* 43 (2004) 23–43; A. Pieri, *Lucrezio in Macrobio: Adattamenti al testo virgiliano*, Biblioteca di cultura contemporanea 126 (Messina and Florence, 1977); K. Robertson, "Medieval Materialism: A Manifesto," *Exemplaria* 22 (2010) 99–118.

C. Renaissance: General

M. Beretta, "Did Lucretius' Atomism Play any Role in Early Modern Chemistry," in J.R. Bertomeu-Sánchez, D. Thorburn Burns and B. Van Tiggelen, eds., *Neighbors and Territories: the Evolving Identity of Chemistry: Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on the History of Chemistry* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 2008), 237–48; A. Brown, *The Return of Lucretius to Renaissance Florence* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 2010); Brown, "Lucretius and the Epicureans in the Social and Political Context of Renaissance Florence," *I Tatti Studies* 9 (2001) 11–62; E. Garin, "Ricerche sull'epicureismo del Quattrocento," in *Epicurea in memoriam Hectoris Bignone. Miscellanea philologica* (Genoa, 1959), 217–31; C.P. Goddard, "Epicureanism and the Poetry of Lucretius in the Renaissance" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1991); J. Goldberg, *The Seeds of Things: Theorizing Sexuality and Materiality in Renaissance Representations* (New York, 2009); S. Greenblatt, *The Swerve: How the World Became Modern* (New York, 2011); J. Hankins, "Religion and the Modernity of Renaissance Humanism," in A. Mazzocco, ed., *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism* (Leiden and Boston, 2006), 137–53; W.L. Hine, "Inertia and Scientific Law in Sixteenth-Century Commentaries on Lucretius," *Renaissance Quarterly* 48 (1995) 728–41; R.H. Kargon, *Atomism in England from Harriot to Newton* (Oxford, 1966); J. Kraye, "The Revival of Hellenistic Philosophies," in J. Hankins, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2007), 97–112; J. Masson, "Marullus's Text of Lucretius," *Classical Review* 11 (1897) 307; M. Paladini, *Lucrezio e l'epicureismo tra riforma e controriforma* (Naples, 2011); A. Palmer, *Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 2014); Palmer, "The Use and Defense of the Classical Canon in Pomponio Leto's Biography of Lucretius," with text and translation, in *Vitae*

Pomponiana. Biografie di autori antichi nell'Umanesimo romano. Lives of Classical Authors in Fifteenth-Century Roman Humanism: Proceedings of a conference hosted by the Danish Academy in Rome and the American Academy in Rome, 23–24 April, 2013, G. Abbamonte, M. Pade and F. Stok, eds., *Renaissanceforum* 9 (2014); Palmer, “Reading Lucretius in the Renaissance,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 73 (2012) 395–416; G. Passannante, *The Lucretian Renaissance: Philology and the Afterlife of Tradition* (Chicago and London, 2011); Passannante, “The Art of Reading Earthquakes: On Harvey’s Wit, Ramus’s Method, and the Renaissance of Lucretius,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 61 (2008) 792–832; V. Prosperi, *Di soavi licori gli orli del vaso: La fortuna di Lucrezio dall’umanesimo alla controriforma* (Turin, 2004); *La renaissance de Lucrèce*, Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 27 (Paris, 2010); G. Sarton, *Appreciation of Ancient and Medieval Science during the Renaissance (1450–1600)* (Philadelphia, Pa., 1955); G. Solaro, “Venere doma Marte’ A proposito di uno sconosciuto corso universitario su Lucrezio di Pomponio Leto” in R. Schnur, J.F. Alcina, J. Dillon, W. Ludwig, C. Nativel, M. de Nichilo, and S. Ryle, eds., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis: Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Bari, 29 August –3 September 1994*, *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies* 184 (Tempe, Ariz., 1998), 557–64; Á.J. Traver Vera, “Anotaciones a Lucrecio 3.444–358: nacimiento, madurez, vejez y muerte psicósomática del hombre,” *Habis* 30 (1999) 143–51; Traver Vera, “El himno a Epicuro de Lucrecio, ‘De rerum natura’ III 1–30: tres ejemplos de recepción clásica,” in J.E.M. Fernández, ed., *Estudios de literatura comparada: norte y sur, la sátira, transferencia y reception de géneros y formas textuales* (Leon, 2002), 743–58.

D. Renaissance: Influence on Specific Figures

P.S. Allen, “Linacre and Latimer in Italy,” *English Historical Review* 18 (1903) 514–17; Z. Barański, “Boccaccio and Epicurus,” in J. Kraye and L. Lepschy, eds., *Caro Vitto: Essays in Memory of Vittore Branca*, *The Italianist* 27, Special Supplement 2 (London, 2007), 10–27; M. Barsi, ed., *L’énigme de la chronique de Pierre Belon. Avec édition critique du manuscrit Arsenal 4561* (Milan, 2001); S. Bertelli, “Noterelle machiavelliane: Ancora su Lucrezio e Machiavelli,” *Rivista storica italiana* 76 (1964) 774–92; M. Campanelli, “Una *praelectio* lucreziana di Pomponio Leto,” *RR. Roma nel Rinascimento* (1993) 17–24; S.J. Campbell, “Giorgione’s *Tempest*, *Studiolo* Culture, and the Renaissance Lucretius,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 56 (2003) 299–332; D. Canfora, “Una presenza lucreziana in Petrarca?” *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia di Bari* 37/38 (1994/95) 319–29; J.M.S. Cotton, “Ex Libris Politiani,” *Modern Language Review* 29 (1934) 326–30; B. Croce, *Michele Marullo Tarcaniota, le elegie per la patria perduta ed altri suoi carmi. Biografia, testi e traduzioni con due ritratti del Marullo* (Bari, 1938); M.C. Davies, “Cosma Raimondi’s Defense of Epicurus,” *Rinascimento* 27 (1987) 123–39; M. Deufert, “Lukrez und Marullus. Ein kurzer Blick in die Werkstatt eines humanistischen Interpolators,”

Rheinisches Museum 142 (1999) 210–23; Deufert, “Die Lukrezemendationen des Francesco Bernardino Cipelli,” *Hermes* 126 (1998) 370–79; H. Dixon, “Pomponio Leto’s Notes on Lucretius (Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, X Fol. 82 *Rariora*),” *Aevum* 85 (2011) 191–216; C.E. Finch, “Machiavelli’s Copy of Lucretius,” *Classical Journal* 56 (1960/61) 29–32; F. Gabotto, “L’epicureismo di Marsilio Ficino,” *Rivista di filosofia scientifica* 10 (1891) 428–42; G. Gasparotto, “Lucrezio fonte diretta del Boccaccio?,” *Atti e memorie dell’Accademia patavina di scienze, lettere ed arti* 81 (1968/69) 5–34; C.P. Goddard, “Pontano’s Use of the Didactic Genre: Rhetoric, Irony and the Manipulation of Lucretius in *Urania*,” *Renaissance Studies* 5 (1991) 250–62; Goddard, “Lucretius and Lucretian Science in the Works of Fracastoro,” *Res publica litterarum* 16 (1993) 185–92; E. Greenlaw, “Spenser and Lucretius,” *Studies in Philology* 17 (1920) 439–64; J. Hankins, “Ficino’s Critique of Lucretius: The Rebirth of Platonic Theology in Renaissance Italy,” in J. Hankins and F. Meroi, eds., *The Rebirth of Platonic Theology: Proceedings of a Conference held at The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies (Villa I Tatti) and the Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento (Florence, 26–27 April) for Michael J. B. Allen* (Florence, 2013); Hankins, “Monstrous Melancholy: Ficino and the Psychological Causes of Atheism,” in S. Clucas, P.J. Forshaw, and V. Rees, eds., *Laus platonici philosophi: Marsilio Ficino and His Influence*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 198 (Leiden, 2011), 25–43, published in Italian as “Malinconia mostruosa: Ficino e le cause fisiologiche dell’ateismo,” *Rinascimento* 47 (2007) 3–23; I.A. Kelter, “Reading the Book of God as the Book of Nature: The Case of the Louvain Humanist Cornelius Valerius (1512–78),” in K. Killeen and P.J. Forshaw, eds., *The Word and the World: Biblical Exegesis and Early Modern Science* (Basingstoke, 2007), 174–87; E. Lane-Spollen, *Under the Guise of Spring: the Message Hidden in Botticelli’s Primavera* (London, 2014); P. Maurette, “De rerum textura: Lucretius, Fracastoro, and the Sense of Touch,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 45.2 (2014); A. Legtos, “Montaigne, annotateur de Lucrèce; dix notes ‘contre la religion,’” in *La renaissance de Lucrèce*, Cahiers V.L. Saulnier 27 (Paris, 2010), 141–46; W.G. Moore, “Lucretius and Montaigne,” in *The Classical Line: Essays in Honor of Henri Peyre*, Yale French Studies 38 (New Haven, 1967), 109–14; J.M. Najemy, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Machiavelli* (Cambridge, 2010); Najemy, *Between Friends: Discourses of Power and Desire in the Machiavelli-Vettori Letters of 1513–1515* (Princeton, 1993); M. Paladini, “Parrasio e Lucrezio,” *Vichiana* 4.2 (2000) 95–118; Paladini, “Tre codici lucreziani e Pomponio Leto copista,” *Annali dell’Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli, Sezione filologico-letteraria* 17 (1995) 251–93; L.A. Panizza, “Lorenzo Valla’s *De Vero Falsoque Bono*, Lactantius and Oratorical Scepticism,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 41 (1978) 76–107; A. Polet, *Une gloire de l’humanisme belge, Petrus Nannius, 1500–1557* (Louvain, 1936); D. Sacré, “Nannius’s *Somnia*,” in R. De Smet, ed., *La satire humaniste. Actes du Colloque international des 31 mars, 1er et 2 avril 1993*, Travaux de

l'Institut interuniversitaire pour l'étude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme 11 (Louvain, 1994), 77–93; B.L. Ullman, ed., *Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum illustrium Latinae linguae libri XVIII* (Rome, 1928).

E. Seventeenth-Century Translations and Translators

N. Austin, "Translation as Baptism: Dryden's Lucretius," *Arion* 7 (1968) 576–602; R. Barbour, "Anonymous Lucretius," *Bodleian Library Record* 23 (2010) 105–11; Barbour, "Between Atoms and the Spirit: Lucy Hutchinson's Translation of Lucretius," in B. Baines and G.W. Williams, eds., *Renaissance Papers. 51st Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Renaissance Conference* (Raleigh, NC, April 8–9 1994) (Columbia, S.C., 1994), 1–16; Barbour, "Lucy Hutchinson, Atomism and the Atheist Dog," in L. Hunter and S. Hutton, eds., *Women, Science and Medicine 1500–1700: Mothers and Sisters of the Royal Society* (Stroud, 1997), 122–37; L. Cottagnies, "Le 'renouveau' de l'épicurisme en Angleterre au milieu du dix-septième siècle de Walter Charleton à Margaret Cavendish—Une histoire franco-britannique," *Études Épistémè* 14 (2008), *Science et littérature*, 123–73; Cottagnies, "Michel de Marolles's 1650 Translation of Lucretius and Its Reception in England," forthcoming; H. de Quehen, "Ease and Flow in Lucy Hutchinson's Lucretius," *Studies in Philology* 93 (1996) 288–303; R.C. Dix, "Wordsworth and Lucretius: The Psychological Impact of Creech's Translation," *English Language Notes* 39.4 (June 2002) 25–33; M. Gallagher, "Dryden's Translation of Lucretius," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 28 (1964) 19–29; J. Goldberg, "Lucy Hutchinson Writing Matter," *English Literary History* 73 (2006) 275–301; P. Hammond, "Dryden, Milton, and Lucretius," *The Seventeenth Century* 16 (2001) 158–76; Hammond, "The Integrity of Dryden's Lucretius," *Modern Language Review* 78 (1983) 1–23; E.N. Hooker, "Dryden and the Atoms of Epicurus," *English Literary History* 24 (1957) 177–90; D. Hopkins, "'Pre-Augustan' Lucretius? Lucy Hutchinson's *De rerum natura*," *Arion* 5 (1998) 124–33; H.J. Real, *Untersuchungen zur Lukrez-Übersetzung von Thomas Creech*, *Linguistica et litteraria* 9 (Berlin, Bad Homburg, and Zurich, 1970); M. Saccenti, *Lucrezio in Toscana: Studio su Alessandro Marchetti*, *Biblioteca di Lettere italiane* 5 (Florence, 1966).

F. Reception After 1600⁵²

A. Battigelli, *Margaret Cavendish and the Exiles of the Mind* (Lexington, Ky., 1998); L. Boschiero, "Natural Philosophizing inside the Late Seventeenth-Century Tuscan Court," *British Journal for the History of Science* 35 (2002) 383–410;

52 Rather than attempting a comprehensive bibliography of the burgeoning array of treatments of Lucretius' reception from 1600–1800, for which the literature on Gassendi alone is vast, this list provides a selection of representative works touching those figures and topics which have received recent attention.

M. Čapek, "The Conflict between the Absolutist and the Relational Theory of Time before Newton," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987) 595–608; G.K. Chalmers, "The Lodestone and the Understanding of Matter in Seventeenth Century England," *Philosophy of Science* 4 (1937) 75–95; I.B. Cohen, "'Quantum in se est': Newton's Concept of Inertia in Relation to Descartes and Lucretius," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 19 (1964) 131–55; S. Ellenzweig, "The Faith of Unbelief: Rochester's 'Satyre,' Deism, and Religious Freethinking in Seventeenth-Century England," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005) 27–45; B. Fabian, "Pope and Lucretius: Observations on 'An Essay on Man,'" *Modern Language Review* 74 (1979) 524–37; D.K. Glidden, "Hellenistic Background for Gassendi's Theory of Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 49 (1988) 405–24; M.R. Goodrum, "Atomism, Atheism, and the Spontaneous Generation of Human Beings: The Debate over a Natural Origin of the First Humans in Seventeenth-Century Britain," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63 (2002) 207–24; P. Hardie, "The Presence of Lucretius in *Paradise Lost*," *Milton Quarterly* 29 (1995) 13–24; C.T. Harrison, "The Ancient Atomists and English Literature of the Seventeenth Century," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 45 (1934) 1–79; A.C. Kors, *Atheism in France*, vol. 3, *Epicureans and Atheists* (forthcoming); R. Kroll, *Restoration Drama and 'The Circle of Commerce': Tragicomedy, Politics, and Trade in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 2007); J. Leonard, "Milton, Lucretius, and 'the Void Profound of Unessential Night,'" in K.A. Pruitt and C.W. Durham, eds., *Living Texts: Interpreting Milton* (Selinsgrove and London, 2000) 198–217; L.C. Martin, "Shakespeare, Lucretius, and the Commonplaces," *Review of English Studies* 21 (1945) 174–82; C. Meinel, "Early Seventeenth-Century Atomism: Theory, Epistemology, and the Insufficiency of Experiment," *Isis* 79 (1988) 68–103; D. Quint, "Fear of Falling: Icarus, Phaethon, and Lucretius in *Paradise Lost*," *Renaissance Quarterly* 57 (2004) 847–81; E.L.E. Rees, *Margaret Cavendish: Gender, Genre, Exile* (Manchester and New York, 2003); C.K. Smith, "French Philosophy and English Politics in Interregnum Poetry," in R.M. Smuts, ed., *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1996), 177–209; A. Snider, "Atoms and Seeds: Aphra Behn's Lucretius," *Clio* 33 (2003) 1–24; M.A. Vicario, *Shelley's Intellectual System and Its Epicurean Background* (New York and London, 2007); Á.J. Traver Vera, "Dos ejemplos de recepción clásica: Lucrecio 2, 1–23 en fray Luis y en Lord Byron," *Anuario de estudios filológicos* 22 (1999) 459–74; R. Wilcox, "Rochester's Philosophical Premises: A Case for Consistency," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8 (1974/75) 183–201; G. Williamson, "Mutability, Decay, and Seventeenth-Century Melancholy," *English Literary History* 2 (1935) 121–50.

IV. SELECTED MODERN LATIN EDITIONS

Titi Lucreti Cari "De rerum natura" libri sex, ed. C. Bailey, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1947; rev. ed., 1950) (with prolegomena, critical apparatus, translation, and commentary); *T. Lucreti Cari "De rerum natura"*, ed. K. Büchner (Wiesbaden, 1966); *De rerum natura*, ed. D. Butterfield (Oxford, forthcoming); *Tito Lucrezio Caro. "La natura delle cose"*, ed. I. Dionigi (with commentary), trans. L. Canali, intro. by G.B. Conte (Milan, 2000); *De la nature*, ed. A. Ernout (Paris, 1920; rev. ed., 1964–66) (with translation); *Titus Lucretius Carus, "De rerum natura"*, ed. E. Flores, 3 vols. (Naples, 2002–9) (with introduction and translation); *De rerum natura*, ed. F. Giancotti (Milan, 1994) (with translation); *De rerum natura*, ed. E. Orth (Salamanca, 1961); *De rerum natura*, ed. J. Martin (Leipzig, 1934, rev. ed., 1963); *De rerum natura*, ed. K. Müller (Zurich, 1975); *On the Nature of Things*, trans. W.H.D. Rouse, rev. by M.F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1975; rev. ed., 1992); *De la naturaleza*, ed. E. Valentí, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1961) (with translation).

In addition, several editions listed in the original article remain valuable, particularly Munro (1893), Merrill (1907 and 1917), Diels (1923), and Leonard and Smith (1942).

V. SELECTED MODERN LATIN SELECTIONS

P.M. Brown, ed., "*De rerum natura*" III (Warminster, 1997) (with introduction, translation, and commentary); R.D. Brown, *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on "De rerum natura" IV, 1030–1287* (Leiden, 1987) (with prolegomena, text, and translation); G. Campbell, *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution: A Commentary on "De rerum natura," Book Five, Lines 772–1104* (Oxford, 2003); C.D.N. Costa, ed., *Lucretius, "De rerum natura" V* (Oxford, 1984) (with introduction and commentary); D. Fowler, *Lucretius on Atomic Motion. A Commentary on "De rerum natura" Book Two, Lines 1–332* (Oxford, 2002); M.R. Gale, ed., *Lucretius, "De rerum natura" V* (Oxford, 2009) (with introduction, translation, and commentary); J. Godwin, ed., *Lucretius, "De rerum natura" VI* (Warminster, 1991) (with translation and commentary); Godwin, ed., "*De rerum natura*" IV (Warminster, 1986) (with translation and commentary); E.J. Kenney, ed., "*De rerum natura*" Book III (Cambridge, 1971) (with commentary); A.A. Long and D.N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1987); P. Nizan, ed., *Démocrite, Epicure, Lucrèce. Les matérialistes de l'antiquité. Textes choisis* (Paris, 1991); L. Piazzzi, ed., *Lucrezio, Le leggi dell'universo ("La natura," Libro I)* (Venice, 2011) (with translation and commentary); Piazzzi, *Lucrezio e i Presocratici: Un commento a "De rerum natura" 1, 635–920* (Pisa, 2005); C. Salemme, ed., *Infinito Lucreziano: "De rerum natura" 1, 951–1117*, Studi latini 78 (Naples, 2011) (critical text with translation and commentary); Salemme, ed., *Lucrezio e la formazione*

del mondo: “*De rerum natura*” 5, 416–508, *Studi latini* 73 (Naples, 2010) (critical text with translation and commentary); Salemme, ed., *Le possibilità del reale: Lucrezio, “De rerum natura”* 6, 96–534, *Studi latini* 67 (Naples, 2009) (critical text with translation and commentary); B.P. Wallach, *Lucretius and the Diatribe against the Fear of Death: “De rerum natura” III* 830–1094, *Mnemosyne supplement* 40 (Leiden, 1976).

VI. MODERN EDITIONS OF PRE-MODERN TRANSLATIONS OR ANNOTATIONS

D. Aricò, ed., “*Della natura delle cose*” di Lucrezio, trans. Alessandro Marchetti (Rome, 2003); R. Barbour, D. Norbrook, and C. Zerbino, eds., *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*, vol. 1, *The Translation of Lucretius* (Oxford, 2012); H. de Quehen, ed., *Lucy Hutchinson’s Translation of Lucretius: “De rerum natura”* (London, 1996); W.H. Drummond, trans., *The First Book of T. Lucretius Carus: “Of the Nature of Things.” Translated into English Verse* (Cambridge, 2000) (transcribed from the edition of 1808, issued in the Literature Online database); M.M. Repetzki, *John Evelyn’s Translation of Titus Lucretius Carus “De rerum natura”: An Old-Spelling Critical Edition*, *Münsteraner Monographien zur englischen Literatur* 22 (Frankfurt a.M., 2000); M. Saccenti, ed., “*Della natura delle cose*” di Lucrezio, trans. Alessandro Marchetti, *Il Lapazio* 9 (Modena, 1992); M.A. Screech, *Montaigne’s Annotated Copy of Lucretius: A Transcription and Study of the Manuscript, Notes and Pen-Marks*, *Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 325 (Geneva, 1998); G. Solaro, ed., *Giulio Pomponio Leto. Lucrezio* (Palermo, 1993).

COMMENTARIES

2. Dionysius Lambinus

p. 362b10. Add:

Bibliography:

L.C. Stevens, “Denis Lambin: Humanist, Courtier, Philologist, and *Lecteur Royal*,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962) 234–41; T. Tsakiropoulou-Summers, “Lambin’s Edition of Lucretius: Using Plato and Aristotle in Defense of *De rerum natura*,” *Classical and Modern Literature* 21 (2001) 45–70.

3. Obertus Gifanius

p. 364b8.

Scholars have traditionally come down on Lambin’s side in the question of Gifanius’ alleged plagiarism. However heavy Gifanius’ debt to Lambin, he did make a contribution to students’ comprehension, at least, by pairing the

De rerum natura for the first time with useful supplementary texts, namely relevant selections from Cicero, the writings of Epicurus preserved by Diogenes Laertius, and Thucydides' account of the Athenian plague. D. Butterfield has argued that Gifanius' annotations in a copy of his 1565 edition (Oxford, Bodleian Lib., Bywater P.6.14), presumably made in preparation for the second edition, show clear evidence of original, if tardy, scholarly efforts. One of Lambin's complaints against Gifanius was that the latter had not consulted any manuscripts, relying entirely on others' printed texts. Gifanius' hand annotations include comparison with manuscripts, suggesting a trip to Venice in which Gifanius strove to answer this charge.