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...
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 Virgili 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.

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

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

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

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.

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

---

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*. 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.

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. 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.

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. 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*.

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. Mellerii 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 disi voluntibus 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.


Scalla’s interest in Lucretius likely derives from his association with Ficino and the Medici circle.\textsuperscript{14} Reeve has identified a Lucretian passage in Leonardo Bruni’s 1438 \textit{Iliad} translation,\textsuperscript{15} and confirmed interest in the text by Poliziano and Filelfo.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{17} and Naples was the key source of the manuscripts now in Spain possessed by the House of Anjou.\textsuperscript{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’s\textsuperscript{19} vernacular treatment, dedicated to his patron Cardinal Luigi D’Este, sets out the project of the \textit{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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Brown, \textit{Return of Lucretius}, 16–41.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Reeve, “The Italian Tradition of Lucretius,” 42 n. 10.
\item \textsuperscript{18} For details, see A.J. Traver Vera, “Lucrecio en España” (PhD diss., University of Extremadura, Cáceres, 2009).
\item \textsuperscript{19} Both the forms “Frachetta” and “Franchetta” were used, but “Frachetta” appears on the title page of the volume.
\end{itemize}
the volume's index is dedicated to differentiating various Errori di Lucretio. 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.  

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. 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. 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. Florence,

20 G. Frachetta, Spositione (Venice, 1589), fols. ††v to ††v4r.
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. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3276 contains notes attributed to Antonius Panormita (Bec- cadelli), 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

attributed to Pius) in Cambridge, Mass., Houghton Library, Inc 5271 (1495); 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.
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.  

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. In a more radical vein, Rochester translated Lucretius’ articulation of the infamous Epicurean argument that the gods do not heed prayer (2.44–49). 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. Cavendish’s writings demonstrate how seventeenth-century intellectuals, finding their world destabilized by the discoveries of Hooke, Boyle, and Galileo, turned

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 class. As in the case of William Petty’s treatise on the order of nature, produced in the same period and intellectual sphere, 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.

The premier genuine atomist of the seventeenth century is Pierre Gassendi. 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. 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

---

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


\(^{41}\) 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.


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.

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.
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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.
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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.