

REVIEW ARTICLE

A NEW EDITION OF LUCILIUS*

DIANA C. WHITE

The completion in 1905 of F. Marx's edition of Lucilius generated a good deal of discussion and criticism of that important but shadowy figure in Roman literature. There were the reviews of A. E. Housman and F. Leo. There was W. M. Lindsay's work on Nonius Marcellus, begun before Marx completed his edition, but inadequately appreciated in it. The single most distinguished contribution was C. Cichorius' *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin, 1908). In the years since then, there have been further studies by N. Terzaghi, M. Puelma Piwonka, J. Heurgon, E. H. Warmington, and I. Mariotti, and numerous articles, including those by Krenkel himself in preparation for his edition ("Zur literarischen Kritik bei Lucilius," *Wiss. Zschr. der Univ. Rostock*, VII [1957-58] [Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 2]; "*Idem in eodem* bei Nonius," *Wiss. Zschr. der Univ. Rostock*, XII [1963] [Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 2]; "Luciliana" in *Miscellanea Critica*, II [Leipzig, 1965]). Thus, the prospect of a new Lucilius edition, which would take into account the scholarship since Marx, was an exciting one. Krenkel's edition, despite its lavish format, is, however, disappointing.

The introduction covers the origin and development of satire, the life and literary production of Lucilius, the transmission of the text (with a special discussion of the role of Nonius Marcellus), bibliography, and testimonia. If there is little that is new in this section, there is also little to quibble with. K. holds a judicious course through the tangle of ancient testimonia on the origin of *satura*, opting finally, with Knoche and others, for a derivation from the language of cooking (p. 12). The investigations of A. B. West

("Lucilian Genealogy," *AJP*, XLIX [1928], 240 ff.) are accepted, producing a somewhat fuller family tree than the one Cichorius had proposed, in which the essential detail is still that the poet was the great-uncle of Pompeius Magnus (p. 19).

The poet's birthdate is once again discussed, although one argument, first advanced by Cichorius and repeated by K. without giving his predecessor credit, does not carry conviction. K. maintains that, if Lucilius had been born in 180 and had begun writing only after his service in the Numantine War, Horace could not say of him (*Sat.* 2. 1. 32 ff.), "quo fit ut omnis / votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella / vita senis." If Lucilius began writing at almost age fifty, K. argues, the portion of his life during which he wrote could not be called *omnis vita* (p. 20). Surely, though, Horace means to emphasize not that Lucilius' poetic activity occupied his mature years (from age thirty-six on, if 167 be accepted as his birthdate, as K. urges), but that Lucilius included in his poems a wealth of personal observation and intimate detail, so that his life, in all its variety, could be discerned there. That is the point of "ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim / credebat libris (*Sat.* 2. 1. 30 f.), with the implied comparison of *arcana* and *omnis vita*.

Many of the other details of Lucilius' life K. derives from the satires themselves. A good deal of this information is necessarily circular, depending on and in turn reinforcing K.'s interpretations of the fragments. K. tends to allow these opinions, as they are repeated, to acquire a bogus independent authority.

K.'s discussion of the meters of the satires, the three collections into which they fall, and the dates of composition, where discernible,

* *Lucilius: "Satiren."* Lateinisch und deutsch von WERNER KRENKEL. 2 vols. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1970. Pp. 1-341 + frontispiece; i + 344-773. 8 pls. + 1 map. Fl. 120.

is derivative, but brief and to the point. In the discussion of Lucilius' *Nachleben* (pp. 28 ff.), it is salutary to see the criticism of Lucilius by Horace described in literary terms. Marx's suggestion (pp. xx, li) that it was political—the Pompeian Cicero a devotee, the Caesarean Horace a critic—has caused mischief.

The testimonia are full and sensibly arranged by topic, so that they can be read with or without the introduction. K. includes many that Marx did not, usually from Lucilius himself, and omits nothing significant. It is perhaps ill-considered to have given them only in German: it is courageous of K. to commit himself to a translation in so many difficult cases, but the reader, if he has reference to the testimonia in the first place, probably wants to check the original language.

The final item, before the fragments themselves, is a section entitled "Somnia." Here K. gives summaries of the contents of each of the books and of individual satires discerned within books. The summaries are diffidently presented in an attempt to forestall criticism that they are fancies: "Sie versuchen, einzelne Punkte, d. h. die Fragmente, durch Linien zu verbinden, und diese zu einer Skizze zu ordnen: Lucilius sind sie nicht . . ." (p. 63). But in fact they have often exerted such an influence on the arrangement and interpretation of the fragments that K. might better speak of a "Skizze" into which the "einzelne Punkte" are made to fit.

It is one of the misfortunes of the editor of Lucilius that he must also concern himself with the *De compendiosa doctrina* of Nonius Marcellus, for in that tangled dictionary-cum-encyclopedia are preserved most of the fragments of Lucilius. Lindsay showed¹ that Nonius had forty-one sources (thirty-four texts, seven somewhat more doubtful glossaries) for his dictionary, and that he went through these sources, in an unvarying and mechanical way, culling the main illustrations for each of his lemmata and the subsidiary examples that fill out most of the entries. Lindsay thus proved what earlier scholars had surmised, that the order of most of the fragments in Nonius represents the order in which they stood in their

original texts, although it is all but impossible to guess how much intervening material has been lost. This discovery about order is a reed, however slender, on which the editor of fragmentary texts can lean; it supplies a limited but objective criterion for the arrangement of fragments.

In the case of Lucilius, the situation is further complicated. Nonius had two texts of the satires: (1) Books 1–20, quoted always as "Lucilius (in) Satyrarum libro x" and (2) Books 26–30, quoted always simply as "Lucilius (in) libro x." The citations from the first collection are normal. The 26–30 collection, however, is cited by Nonius in reverse order, i.e., lines from Book 30 are followed by lines from Book 29, etc. The hypothesis is that Nonius, or some assistant, read this particular roll and neglected to wind it back, so that when Nonius came to use it for the dictionary, he found Book 30 at the beginning and Book 26 at the end. The problem then is, did Nonius read the individual books from the end to the beginning as well, or did he turn back to the opening of Book 30, read that to its conclusion, then turn to the opening of Book 29, etc.? (A further refinement: in the books that contained multiple satires, did he read the individual satires from beginning to end but the books as a whole from end to beginning?) Marx concluded that Nonius read consistently backward, and he thought that the original Lucilian order of the fragments in Books 26–30 could be retrieved by reversing their order in Nonius. But his arguments failed to convince his successors, and the debate has continued in each new treatment of Lucilius.

K.'s long discussion of Nonius (pp. 31–39) raises hopes that the question may be settled. Indeed, his conclusion, that although book numbers run backward, citations within a book run forward, has common sense to commend it. Even if Nonius only skimmed his text for illustrations of particular archaic words, unusual metaphors, and the like, it would be easier to skim forward than backward. But when K. offers us proofs of his arguments, they are specious. Worse, they are specious because he has not understood the importance of Lindsay's work or would not take the time to use it properly.

Given the mechanical use of the forty-one sources, always in the same order, it is possible, by examining the surrounding quotations, to determine the source of a particular quotation. If it is part of a series of quotations from the text of an

1. W. M. Lindsay, *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin* (Oxford, 1901); *idem*, "De citationibus apud Nonium Marcellum," *Philologus*, LXIV (1905), 438 ff.

author, we can determine its relative position in that text. If it comes, however, from a glossary, from a marginal note in another text (or, as W. Strzelecki prefers,² from an unidentified grammatical work that supplied Nonius with his basic plan and some illustrations), or from a (later) insertion by a zealous reader, then we can draw no conclusions about its original location. It is thus of prime importance to determine the nature of the series in which a quotation stands and not to conflate one series with another.

In trying to find a situation parallel to the retrograde Lucilius citations, K. ignores this criterion, substituting for it a looser one: "[bei der Zitatenfolge bei Nonius] wurden nur Abstände zwischen den Zitaten bis zu etwa drei Seiten in der Nonius-Ausgabe von Lindsay als einigermaßen sicher [for the constitution of a series] angenommen" (p. 37). But it often happens that, over several Lindsay pages, we pass through two, three, or even more series. Nor does K. abide by his own standard, giving as components in a series items separated by as many as 17, 20, even 53 Lindsay pages.

As a result, his examples do not show what he hopes to prove. His Plautus examples (pp. 35–36) demonstrate that Nonius normally cites lines in their original order. Better examples might have been chosen (e.g., the first Plautus series in Book 1), for K. shows nine lemmata illustrated from a four-line passage (*Epid.* 230–33), with occasional overlappings and one retrograde citation. Such a concentration is not usual or representative. Nevertheless, the point, that quotations usually show the order in the original texts, is clear enough.

Next K. turns to citations from the *Tusculan Disputations*, Nonius' thirty-ninth source (p. 36). These, he says, furnish an example of backward book citations with quotations within a book running forward. Even on K.'s own showing, however, they offer one example of quotations within a book running forward and one example of them running backward, i.e., they prove nothing. On closer inspection, it develops that the examples are not part of a Cicero series at all: the first example comes from the text of the *Tusculans*; the second is from a marginal note in Nonius' first Varro source; the third is from the *Tusculans*; the fourth is from an undetermined source, not the Cicero text (it stands alone in the midst of a Terence series); the fifth and sixth stand in a

series of quotations from the second Lucilius collection and appear to be accidentally omitted items written in a margin, and inserted therefrom into the wrong place and perhaps in reversed order.

The final set of examples from Plautus (pp. 36–37) is little better. Nonius' second Plautus collection, his thirtieth source, contained the A-plays, *Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, and *Aulularia*, in that order. The quotations here, in order, are *Aul.* 590, *Asin.* 158, *Amph.* 262, and *Asin.* 725. K. remarks (p. 37), "Die Komödien sind in ihrer Folge rückläufig zitiert, die beiden Verse aus der *Asinaria* hingegen fortlaufend." Actually, we have three citations moving backward, then a leap forward; the *Amphitruo* quotation inserted between the two *Asinaria* lines makes it difficult to speak of them, without qualification, as "fortlaufend." Add to that the fact that *Asin.* 158 is quoted in the proper sequence at two other places in Nonius (247. 15M and 381. 37M) and may well be inserted from one of those places to this. And consider that either *Aul.* 590 or *Amph.* 262 might have come from a marginal note in the text of the other. In short, this set of examples, too, cannot be taken at face value to prove K.'s thesis.

It should be added that there may well be no examples that would prove K.'s thesis. In going through the whole of Nonius, analyzing it according to Lindsay's sources, I find no consistent backward citations, of books or lines within books, excepting the Lucilius 26–30 collection.³ To be sure, there is in Book 1 a series of quotations (16. 32M ff.) from Pomponius, Nonius' sixth source, in which quotations from individual plays appear to be retrograde. That is probably not the result of Nonius' procedure but of Ribbeck's arrangement of the lines, in which he was guided only by the sense he perceived in them. Unsatisfactory as it seems, we must be prepared to accept that the Lucilius situation is unique and that whatever critical principle we choose as a guide cannot be proven correct.

From these examples intended to elucidate Nonian procedure, K. goes on to a bewildering array of tables and diagrams, culminating on page 39 in a mystifying collection of numbers skewed with solid and dotted lines. The presentation is so unclear that there may well be a valid critical technique lurking in it, but some of the assertions raise grave doubts.

K. begins by assigning various series of Lucilius

2. W. Strzelecki, "Zur Entstehung der *Compendiosa Doctrina* des Nonius," *Eos*, XXXIV (1932–33), 113 ff.

3. So F. della Corte, "La Poesia di Varrone Reatino recostituita," *Memorie della Reale Accademia delle Scienze*

di Torino, Serie II, Tomo LXIX (1939), 1 ff. The anomaly of the backward citations may be an indication that Nonius had codices rather than rolls for most of his texts, so that the problem of re-rolling did not usually arise.

quotations in Nonius to three separate satires in Book 27. He ought to have made clear, in this section devoted to objective criteria for arranging the fragments, that the assigning of them to individual satires is entirely subjective. More serious, however, is another methodological problem about Nonius. K. forms series (pp. 37–38) that consist indifferently of “added” quotations and “main” quotations. Yet the same value cannot be assigned to the two types of quotations, as we can see in a hypothetical reconstruction of Nonius’ procedure at its simplest. He enters a lemma and a “main” quotation illustrating it from his Plautus I collection, his second source. Then he looks through the remaining thirty-nine sources, or lists from them, for “added” illustrations. He finds several which he enters, in order, one perhaps from his Varro I collection, his fifteenth source,

another from his Terence collection, his twenty-third. Then he returns to his Plautus list for his next lemma and repeats the procedure just described to find added quotations. If two or more quotations from the same source occur within a single lemma (a rare event), then the order in which they stood originally is discernible. But there is no reason to think that an added Terence quotation in one lemma must necessarily stand earlier in its play than an added Terence quotation in a later lemma. The process of finding extra quotations is carried out each time, in however cursory a fashion, independently.⁴ The only stipulations are that Nonius does not check lists he has already finished using for main lemmata and that he uses his lists always in the same order. Thus, in the series attributed to Book 27, Satire 1, we find (p. 37):

413. 4L=270. 4M an added quotation, Lucilius XXVII in a Terence (23) series.
 416. 30L=271. 30M an added quotation, Lucilius XXVII in a probable Terence (23) series. Not necessarily later than Lucilius quotation above.
 422. 14L=275. 14M Lucilius XXVII main in a Lucilius II (25) series.
 422. 20L=275. 20M Lucilius XXVII main in a Lucilius II (25) series.
 422. 22L=275. 22M Lucilius XXVI<I> main in Lucilius II (25) series. All three quotations in order, probably forward running.
 439. 34L=284. 34M an added quotation, Lucilius XXVII, in a probable Vergil (22) series. No relationship to other quotations discernible.

Questionable as this series and the others constructed in the same manner are, K. then elaborates further: “Hierbei kommt es durch Doppelzitate zu Verzahnungen der Reihen” (p. 38). That is, if the same quotation appears in two of his putative series, a new, interlaced series consisting of the two former ones is possible. Once again, closer scrutiny shows this method to be treacherous. First, the double quotations are of value in linking two series only if it can be proven that they are both part of Nonius’ own composition, and that one is not an insertion by a later reader. Nonius’ text, which served many a medieval monastery as its Latin dictionary, has suffered from interpolations of this sort. Second, even if a repeated quotation can be shown in both of its occurrences to

have come from Nonius himself and from his mechanical method of compilation, it will not serve as a sound basis for interlacing two entire series. Consider the series on page 38 (words in brackets mine):

- | | |
|----|-------------------------------|
| | 413,4 [added] |
| 1. | 125,10 [main]=610,31 [added] |
| | 125,18 [main] |
| | 678,6 [added] |
| 2. | 416,30 [added]=678,10 [added] |
| | 422,14 [main] |
| | 422,20 [main] |
| 3. | 355,38 [main] |
| | 356,13 [added]=422,22 [main] |
| | 356,22 [added] |

4. Linday’s refinement (*Nonius Marcellus’ Dictionary*, pp. 4, 81) is perhaps right, but it does not alter the essential procedure described here. The same procedure holds true for Book 4, which resembles a modern dictionary with composite entries. We must only adjust our terminology slightly. There a lemma may consist of several definitions of a single word, each illustrated with quotations. One or more of these (often a contrasting pair from the same or neighboring sources) can be regarded as “main.” Then, as Nonius looks for “extra” quotations, he puts them either under the “main” definition which they illustrate or under their own headings, if they

offer a new definition. In finding and distributing his “extra” quotations where they belong throughout the lemma, Nonius preserves the order in which he used the sources within a single heading, but not over the entire lemma. Similarly, he preserves the order of several quotations from the same original text within a single heading, but not when the quotations are distributed over several headings. In short, one cannot generalize about the order of “extra” quotations across lemmata, in the case of simple lemmata, or across headings, in the case of compound lemmata.

The brackets beside each entry will indicate the dubious nature of the relationships, as argued above. But, holding that doubt in abeyance, assume 416. 30L=678. 10L to be an original double quotation. 678. 6L must be earlier, on K.'s hypothesis, than 416. 30L and 678. 10L. But we know nothing at all of its relationship to 125. 18L, or of the relationship of 125. 10L=610. 31L, 125. 18L, and 678. 6L to 413. 4L. Similarly, 422. 22L tells us nothing about the proper place of 355. 38L: it could belong at any point in the series earlier than 422. 22L. It would take an expert in probability to say how many combinations and permutations of these numbers are possible. In all of this making of tables, K. has forgotten an important *caveat*: the discovery of series can give us the sequence of the lines, but it cannot tell us how close or distant they were in the original. And even if all the lines indicated by the table come from one satire (the assumption that they do rests on subjective grounds), we have no idea how long one satire by Lucilius was.

When we come at last to the final table (p. 39), with its dotted and solid lines, it is shown to be the culminating presentation of various techniques that do not really work. K. has arranged the fragments of the satires so that there is only one violation of his principle that citations within a book run forward, but that is a testament to luck and intuition more than to the methods he has devised for using Nonius. We feel the same doubt that seems to overtake K. only at the end of his investigations: "Dass hierbei dem Irrtum Tür und Tor offensteht, ist zu beklagen, meines Erachtens aber vor dem Auffinden wenigstens eines kompletten Satirenbuches des Lucilius nicht zu ändern. Dennoch scheint mir selbst ein ziemlich anfechtbares Prinzip noch immer besser zu sein, als dem blinden Zufall das Feld zu überlassen" (p. 38).⁵

I have dwelt on the Nonius discussion at some length because it is so important methodologically and because K.'s treatment of it promotes unease. But it is, after all, on his handling of the fragments themselves, and on his ability to spot the difficulties and elucidate them, that the success of K.'s edition depends. With that in mind, let us look first at some of the fragments of Book 1, then at the edition in general. Both investigations will suggest that there are critical shortcomings that most seriously affect the edition's usefulness.

5. K.'s whole discussion of Nonius is difficult enough without unnecessary confusions: if what we are promised (pp. 31–34) is five pages of the Lindsay edition, we should be

2K: 'quis leget haec?' min tu istud ais? nemo hercule. 'nemo?'

I should prefer to assume, with Marx, that the scholiast to Persius ("hunc versum de Lucili primo transtulit, et bene vitae vitia increpans ab admiratione incipit") refers to Persius 1. 1: "O curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!" These exclamations express both astonishment (*ab admiratione*) and a critical outlook on human folly (*vitae vitia increpans*). Furthermore, "O curas hominum!" etc. is a self-contained line. "Quis leget haec," etc. is part of a continuing dialogue, in which it would be strange if only one line, as the scholiast says (*hunc versum*), were borrowed from Lucilius.

Even if K. is right, however, it will not be for the reason that he gives. He argues that the scholion in most manuscripts stands next to line 2 ("quis leget haec," etc.), but the position of the scholion is no evidence. The Juvenal scholia are often two or three lines out of position, and the Persius scholia are no better. More telling arguments have been offered by D. Henss, "Ist das Luciliusfragment 9 (Marx) echt?" *Philologus*, XCVIII (1954), 159 ff., which K. should cite.

3–4K (51–52M): porro quacumque it cui-cumque ut diximus ante / obstitit primo, hoc minuendi <Gaius> refert res.

<Gaius> is K.'s emendation; he imagines that "ein Gegner wirft ihm [Lucilius] Klatsch-sucht als Motiv seiner Satirenschreiberei vor" (p. 63). Marx and K. both cite Iuv. 6. 412, "quocumque in trivio, cuicumque est obvia narrat," about a gossip, assertive woman; it does resemble these lines. It does not justify <Gaius>. Other problems in these lines abound. What is the construction of *hoc minuendi*? To what does *hoc* refer? Can *minuo* mean "bekritteln"? Where is the *ablativus pro genetivo*, or something that could be mistakenly so construed, for which Nonius quotes these lines? On all of these, save the last, K. is silent: "Da das Zitat verderbt ist, given it in Latin and as Lindsay wrote it; Nonius should be cited by Mercier, not Lindsay, pages; and misprints (e.g., Nonius 556, p. 37) should be avoided.

kann man nicht sagen, was Nonius als Ablativ vorfand oder annahm."

5K (2M): *inritata canes quam homo quam planius dicit*

K. should probably print, with Marx, *irritata*, since there is a pun on *irritare* and *hirritus cenum* (Marx, comm. *ad loc.*).

6K (4M): *consilium summis hominum de rebus habebant*

K. quotes the relevant testimonium for this line (although he blurs the distinction between Servius and Servius *auctus*). He postpones until line 33, however, a further important testimonium, Servius *ad Aen.* 10. 104: "*totus hic locus de primo Lucilii translatus est, ubi inducuntur dii habere concilium et agere primo de interitu Lupi cuiusdam ducis in re publica, postea sententias dicere; sed hoc quia indignum erat heroo carmine mutavit.*" The description of the contents of the satire belongs at 6K, at what must be very nearly its first line. The reason that K. has chosen to put the long Servius quotation and the Vergil passage to which it refers (*Aen.* 10. 96–104) at 33 is clear only when we turn to the "Somnia" (p. 64): "Allgemeines Durcheinander. Jupiter als Vorsitz greift ein (33). Man antwortet ihm, alle Schuld liege bei dem Senate," etc. Thus the Vergil passage is to be used as a model for reconstructing the Lucilius. But the vagueness of Servius "*totus hic locus*" and "*hoc quia indignum erat heroo carmine mutavit*" leaves it very much open to question what *Aen.* 10. 96–104 reveals about Lucilius. K.'s suggestion of parallelism in situation is not consistent even with his own arrangement of the lines; for in Vergil, Jupiter's speech ends the *concilium*, as one should expect, but in Lucilius, as K. reconstructs him, the debate, or at least divine dialogue, continues after Jupiter's speech.

7K (53M): *serpere uti gangraena mala atque herpestica posset*

K. notes, "*ἐρπηστική, impetigo*; vgl. Frg. 1076." Turning to 1076, we see *deinde petigo* (better, the tmesis *deque petigo*), but nothing about *herpestica*. In his translation, K. writes: "dass der schreckliche, zersetzende Knochenfrass schleichend kommen konnte." Passing over the lack of agreement between note and

translation, however, the reader wonders why K. has not canvassed the following possibilities. (1) F. Dousa's *mala* for the MSS *malo* seems too facile; Mueller's *malum* is the likeliest conjecture. (2) If *malum* be accepted, then *herpestica* must be a noun (or, less likely, an adjective, with its substantive immediately following in the next line). (3) With *malum, uti* must be construed as introducing a simile, with *posset* dependent on something else; even with the text as K. has it, such a construction is preferable to *uti . . . posset* as a purpose or result clause. Lucilius is punning on *serpere* and *herpestica*. The simile enhances the pun; the purpose or result clause spoils it.

13K (14M): — ◡ ◡ — ◡ ◡ — 'miracula' ciēt elephantas

Marx read *tylyphantas*, a Doric nominative meaning "cushion weaver" (K. seems to have misunderstood Marx's suggestion, taking it as the accusative of *τυλφάνται*, "cushions"). Neither *tylyphantas* nor *elephantas* (ivory objects) solves the line, in which the main problem is *ciēt*. K.'s translation, "'Wunder' nennt sie Elfenbeindinge," overlooks three difficulties: *ciēo* is not the equivalent of *nennen*; the scansion *ciēt*, normal for Plautus, is not normal for Lucilius; and the singular verb is peculiar, despite K.'s effort to conceal the oddity by using "sie" in place of an unspecified collective noun.

16–17K (15–16M): porro 'clinopodas' lychnosque ut diximus semnos / ante 'pedes lecti' atque 'lucernas'
— ◡ ◡ — ◡

These lines are fraught with difficulties, all of which K. ignores. He comments, "Zur Interpunktion, vgl. M. Puelma-Piwonka: Lucilius und Kallimachos, 30 Anm. 4." But the punctuation is Marx's, not Puelma's. What Puelma's note 4 says is that *ut diximus semnos ante* = *ὡς ἄρτι σεμνῶς εἵπομεν*, and that, if the contrast is between grecizing expressions now in use and the older, more stolid Latin ones, we should expect *dicebamus*. Puelma would construe the sentence thus: "porro 'clinopodas lychnosque', ut diximus semnos / ante, pedes lecti atque lucernas <dicere oportet>." Yet, having cited Puelma,

K. translates, "sodann 'Klinopoden' und 'Lüster', wo wir früher—(sogar) in gravitatischen Situationen—(nur) 'Füsse vom Bettgestell' und 'Lampen' sagten." "«Sogar» in gravitatischen Situationen" is exactly wrong for *semnos*. In this case, K. understands neither Lucilius nor his modern commentators.

27K (23M): Servius auctus ad Vergilii Aeneidos librum 3,119: "... nam et apud Lucilium Apollo 'pulcher' dici non vult."

30K (32M): stulte saltatum te inter venisse cinaedos

On the first of these lines, K. comments, "Daneben war wohl auch eine Anspielung auf den Gegner des Lucilius, den *consul suffectus* des Jahres 130 v. Chr., Appius Claudius Pulcher, beabsichtigt" (cf. Marx *ad v.* 24). On the second, he notes, "... auch Appius Claudius Pulcher war als Salier (Macr. Sat. 3, 14, 14) ein bekannter Tänzer." The idea that the satire on the death of Lupus could have contained other political allusions, perhaps to an Appius Claudius Pulcher, has its attractions. But K. has done his best to disfigure it with imprecisions. The Appius Claudius Pulcher who was one of the Salii (*RE*, number 295; see Broughton, *MRR*, I, 436, 473, 501; II, 547) was also Scipio Aemilianus' great political opponent and Lupus' predecessor as *princeps senatus*. He died in 131 or 130. Thus an allusion to him in the context of the *concilium* could be pointed and topical. The *consul suffectus* of 130, however, is another man, perhaps a cousin of the *princeps* (*RE*, number 11; Broughton, I, 492, 502; II, 547). The only evidence that he was Lucilius' enemy is the tentative identification of him as the speaker and Lucilius as the person spoken about in the anecdote about the *Lex Thoria* (variously dated to 119 or 114) told at Cicero *De oratore* 2. 284. K. has turned this tenuous connection into certainty, cast it back to the date of composition of *Satire* 1, and failed to distinguish the two men clearly.

Further, K. should at least report the view of L. Mueller, adopted by Otto (*Sprichwörter*, p. 83) that 30 is proverbial: "*apparet tangi eum qui minore usu rerum peritissimis se immiscuerit* ... Plaut. Mil. glor. 668 *Tum ad saltandum non*

cinaedus malacus aequae est atque ego." If the line is proverbial, it is difficult to see any allusion to Appius Claudius Pulcher.

31K (11M): *†infamam honestam† turpemque odisse popinam*

K. has no light to shed on this corrupt fragment, but duty bids him say something: "Ein Gott (Romulus?) preist die 'gute, alte Zeit' und spricht damit einen Gedanken des Scipio Aemilianus aus (Gell. 4, 20, 10), den dieser in seiner Zensur 142 v. Chr. geäußert hatte: Rückkehr zu den alten Sitten." K.'s interpretation of the fragment is neither original nor compelling. Marx (*ad loc.*) wrote, in explanation of an emended text, "*clamat deus apud maiores honestum fuisse odisse famam turpem turpemque popinam: nunc in lustris et ganeis nobilissimum quemque diem perdere*." The Gellius citation that K. adds is useless padding. Nothing in it suggests any connection with this line, and Scipio's advocacy of the "good, old days" was neither unique nor tellingly programmatic. One wonders if K., in his search for parallels not adduced by other editors, is forced to such superfluity. Similarly at 44–47K (40–42M) K. quotes Sulpicia 18 f. As a verbal parallel, it is not illuminating; if K. sees some other similarity between the Lucilius passage and the difficult and problem-ridden satire of Sulpicia, he should specify what it is.

In the edition as a whole, K. is uncertain when to accept an emendation and when to reject one. Thus at 682K (611M), the MSS offer "*porro amici est bene praecipere tueri bene praedicare*," which is corrupt. Mercier's emendation is both neat and salubrious: "*porro amici est bene praecipere, Tusci bene praedicere*." But K. prefers to follow Terzaghi in printing a text that is only slightly closer to the transmission: "*porro amici est bene praecipere et veri bene praedicere*." This is a mélange of conjectures: *et* is Terzaghi's, *veri* is Cichorius', and *praedicere* is Mercier's. If the line refers to the function of a *verus amicus*, as Cichorius thought (p. 116), the position of *veri* is most odd. The *et*, which removes the asyndeton, only makes *veri* the more difficult. And if *praedicere* is used absolutely, as the parallelism with *bene praecipere* suggests, it must mean "predict," not "advise."

On the other hand, at 350K (356M), K. unjustly suspects the transmitted text, *hoc lictoribus tradam*, and prints Palmer's *lectoribus*. K. acknowledges Suess's elegant defense (*Hermes*, LXII [1927], 342 ff.) only in a note. Lucilius is not formulating rules and mnemonic devices only to say, "This I will leave to my readers"; he is punning, Suess argues, with *lictoribus tradere* on the two senses of *corrumpere*: (1) "aliquem ad iudicium trahere, punire," and (2) "syllabam brevem reddere vel vocalem." The MSS reading, which is also the *lectio difficilior*, should be retained.

Nor are metrics K.'s strength, though they are an essential tool for the editing of fragments. Sometimes K. is curiously specific, as at 39K (46M), $\underline{\text{ }} \cup \cup \text{v} \text{u} \text{l} \text{t} \text{u} \text{r} \text{i} \text{u} \text{s} \cup \cup \underline{\text{ }} \cup \cup \underline{\text{ }} \cup \cup \underline{\text{ }} \cup$. At 920K (cf. 806–7M), a fragment that is corrupt, K. accepts Lindsay's emendation, but offers a scansion that would horrify Lindsay: "éx homíne <cúpídó> cupído et stúlto númquam tóllitúr." 539K (538M) will not scan at all as K. prints it; his appeal to Stowasser's "colloquial shortenings" is desperate. And at 1068, in a note to the fragment, K. writes, "Ennius bei Cic. orat. 51,171: *Nos ausi reserare* ist vielleicht zu ergänzen durch *claustra Musarum*." Even allowing a loose interpretation of *ergänzen*, this is impossible: *claustra Musarum* will not go into hexameter verse.

K.'s faulty knowledge of matters metrical and linguistic betrays him most when he strikes out on his own. *Deúm* at 820K (899M) may be an aberration. But at 930K (941M), K. introduces *ac* before a vowel by conjecture; at 782K (777M), the text as K. restores it does not construe and contains *aedis*, genitive singular, in the sense of "house." At 716–17K (709–10M), K. conjectures an impossible *en dic* and supports it by quoting Plautus *Men.* 143, "Dic mi, en tu . . ." What the Plautus line really reads is, "Dic mihi, en umquam tu," and *enumquam* is also the reading of Terence *Phorm.* 329, which K. compares but does not quote.

In reviewing earlier Lucilius literature, K. has remarked (*Gnomon*, XXXIII [1961], 786, n. 4), "Eine Übersetzung ist noch immer der einfachste Kommentar." Some such sentiment

must have dictated his choice of format, in which commentary as distinct from translation is minimal. But translation must be accurate and literal if it is to illuminate the fragments, and K.'s translations are neither. At 345–47K (352–54M), "nos tamen unum / hoc faciemus et uno eodemque ut dicimus pacto / scribe-mus," K. writes, "Wir aber vereinfachen das und werden genauso schreiben, wie wir sprechen." The translation obscures the difficulty that a commentary might have indicated: Lucilius is arguing that the different sounds of *ā* and *ǣ* should not be represented orthographically, as Accius had advocated; he does not deny, however, that the sounds are distinguished in speech. Therefore, *ut dicimus* must be parenthetical, not connected with *uno eodemque . . . pacto*; I. Dousa's *diximus* is attractive.

At 708K (730M), "cum mei me adeunt servuli, non 'dominam' ego appellem 'meam'?" K. translates, "wenn meine eigenen jungen Sklaven sich fragend an mich wenden, soll ich nicht freundlich erwidern: 'An meine Herrin <wendet euch!>'?" This is an unjustifiably embroidered version, produced, not from the Latin text itself, but from K.'s conviction that parallel situations are found at Tibullus 1. 5. 29 and Ovid *Amores* 2. 17. 23.

When commentary is offered, it is often superfluous or misleading. At 625K (632M), the expression *aliquid aliqua*, which causes no difficulty, is paralleled from Plautus. There follow two quotations, one by E. Kästner, one by H. M. Enzenberger, on the doomed hope of satirists in general to reform mankind. However interesting these quotations are, one must begrudge them space. Or at 318K (313M), a fragment about a horse galloping, we find, "Lucilius war ein Pferdeliebhaber; vgl. *Frg.* 470 and 511–13; *Veg. mulom.* 4, 6: *Curribus Cappadocum gloriosa nobilitas. Hispanorum par vel proxima in circo creditur palma. nec inferiores prope Sicilia exhibet circo, quamvis Africa Hispani sanguinis velocissimos praestare consueverit*; Strabo 3 p. 163." Marx's note *ad loc.* offers this and more (in Marx's encyclopedic fashion), but with a purpose: to demonstrate Lucilius' use of the language of a horseman and his knowledge of horseflesh. K.'s

note makes no such points; it merely illustrates energy misapplied.

More serious, however, are the instances in which K.'s comments are questionable or wrong. In Book 26, for example, we learn first (597K=658M) that "Marx dachte an einen Parasiten als Sprecher, Warmington an Lucilius selbst, ich möchte an einen Literaten denken." Fair enough, though unprovable. Then at 600-1K (660-61M), a difficult and corrupt fragment, we see a further refinement: "Da ich glaube, dass der Unterredner ein Literat und Angehöriger des *collegium poetarum* ist, das in der *aedes Camenarum* (= *Musarum*) tagte (Krenkel: Kritik, 272), fasse ich *album* im Sinne von 'Mitgliedsliste' . . . Der Angesprochene bekleidet dort eine führende Stellung, und er scheint es zu sein, *cui sua committunt mortali claustra Camenae* (Frg. 1068)." Thus the *collegium poetarum* and Accius as its head are brought in here and in Book 30, their influence spreading by almost spontaneous generation. Nor does it stop here. 602K (655M), "depugnabunt pro te ipsi et morientur ac se ultro efferent," K. interprets: "Ein Bezug auf den etwas überspannten Vortsitzenden . . . des straff organisierten *collegium*

poetarum scheint nicht ausgeschlossen zu sein."

The *collegium poetarum* is appealed to again in interpreting 603K (687M) and 623K (608M).

Such arguments are pernicious. One must remember that the point of departure, the transforming of the "Literat" into a member—nay, the leader—of the *collegium poetarum*, was fantasy; let that be forgotten and the whole hypothesis, merely by its extent and repetition, acquires authority. Then it is only a matter of time before general books for wider audiences begin describing Lucilius' satires as directed against the *collegium poetarum*.⁶

Some mechanical details. It would have been helpful had K. indicated, with asterisks or some other devices, those fragments that are conjecturally attributed to Lucilius or to a particular book. The indexes are disappointingly selective. One contains proper names; the other, "Sachen und Wörter," is far from complete as an *index verborum* and is especially vague about grammar and metrics. It will still be possible to use Marx's index in most cases, but only after elaborate consultation of the concordances K. has provided.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

6. Cf. J. Heurgon's approving review of these ideas in their maiden appearance, *REL*, XXXVI (1958), 301 f. Something similar has happened already on the subject of parody in Lucilius, and there too K. has played a considerable part, notably in his "Zur literarischen Kritik bei Lucilius." The assumption is made that every instance of parody of epic or tragic diction is critical and that the criticism is coherent and

organized. Closer examination suggests (1) that the instances that are clearly critical tend to be *ad hoc*, not part of a consistent stance, and (2) that much of what has been generally understood as critical is introduced rather for tonal variety or humorous effect. (In the same spirit, the *Batrachomyomachia* is parody of epic but not serious literary criticism of the genre.)