

## LUCRETIUS III 962

(nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia mitte)  
aequo animoque agedum + magnis + concede: necessest.

“Il tarlo del tempo”, as Bignone – *Atene e Roma* XXXV (1933), 212–3 – so eloquently puts it, has taken its fill of this striking passage, leaving the well-known crux to whet the appetites of hungry scholars. In

that article, which is noted in Bailey's Addenda, but which others have either missed or ignored, Bignone argues quite convincingly for *manis* (= *bonis*); however, he succeeds only in showing that the word itself is possible and would not be out of place in the surroundings. The sense leaves much to be desired and we find ourselves asking with Lachmann for something "paulo vehementius"<sup>1</sup>). There is surely no need to list the numerous other suggestions which may be found in most editions (or in the collection by J.P. Vallot in *Miscellanea Critica*, ed. J. Irmischer, II (1965) 365 ff.), and most of which are either palaeographically improbable, clumsy, weak or pointless.

Most scholars have been convinced that a dative is required here, but *concede* can perfectly well stand absolutely, and it seems to me that more appropriate to the haranguing tone of the whole section, II. 931-962, would be a vocative (cf. 933, *mortalis*; 939, *stulte* - this line begins, incidentally, *aequo animoque* ... - and 955, *baratre*), and I therefore suggest that Lucretius wrote:

aequo animoque agedum, *segnis*, concede: necessesit.

If the initial 's' of *segnis* were lost, then 'm' would come from *agedum*, and *megnīs* to *magnīs* would follow easily. *Segnis* is a fitting epithet for the old man and gives good contrast with *agedum* - "get a move on, you who are reluctant to depart" - and the line now gives a firm, even vehement, conclusion to the harangue<sup>2</sup>).

Worcester College, Oxford

D. J. Lilley

---

1) cf. also III 954 "... inclamet magis et voce increpat acri."

2) For the thought, see also III 1045:

"tu vero *dubitabis* et indignabere abire?"