

LUCRETIIUS 2.203<sup>1)</sup>

---

sic igitur quoque debent flammae posse per auras

The absence of a normal caesura has led all the editors to accept the reading of Avancius in the first Aldine,

sic igitur debent flammae quoque posse per auras.

The parallel adduced to support this is

sic igitur debent uenti quoque flamina ferri 1.290

From Paulson's index I have collected the other passages in Lucretius where *quoque* and *debe(n)t* occur close together. In ten of these *debe(n)t* follows *quoque*, e. g.

quapropter ... motus quoque surpere debent 2.313-4

sic ... mutari res quoque debent 2.1019-22

quare dissolui quoque debent posse per artus 3.758<sup>2)</sup>

Twice only *debe(n)t* precedes *quoque* and each time with reason.

In 1.290 quoted above, *debent uenti quoque flamina* gives the required sense, "blasts of wind too (in addition to currents of water)," whereas *uenti quoque debent flamina* might suggest "blasts of wind too (in addition to blasts of water)," which is not sense. In 3. 861-2

debet enim, misere si forte aegreque futurumst,

ipse quoque esse in eo tum tempore,

where the intrusive subordinate clause makes the passage different in structure from all the others, *debet* here only refers to future time and its early placing may be thought to lend it emphasis for that.

Be that as it may, Lucretian usage demands on 2.203

sic igitur flammae quoque debent posse per auras.

Edinburgh University

David A. West

1) Mr. T. E. Kinsey of Glasgow University corrected an earlier version of this note.

2) Others at 1. 591, 2. 981, 4. 63, 85, 5. 153-4, 5. 571, 6. 317.