

University of Wisconsin-Madison

LUCILIUS AND HIS NOSE (PLINY, *N.H.*, PRAEF. 7)

_ _ _ _ _ <ab indoctissimis>
nec doctissimis <legi me>; Mán<iúm Manil>iúm
Pérsiúm<ue> haec légere nólo, Iúniúm Congúm uoló.

Whatever one thinks of these supplements, it is clear that this passage, as transmitted in the MSS. of Pliny, is very lacunose; even allowing for the possibility that Cicero was deliberately excerpting phrases rather than transcribing complete verses, it is obvious that at a minimum the isolated 'nec doctissimis' requires some supplement to yield grammar and sense. Since it is virtually certain that Lucilius' verse was not turned into gibberish by Cicero, nor Cicero's quotation of Lucilius by Pliny, the lacunae in the preserved text doubtless arose from scribal omissions during the process of the transmission of the *N.H.* from antiquity to the Carolingian era, the date of the earliest extant MSS. which preserve the preface (the best and oldest MSS. do not).³ This example clearly illustrates 'the general truth, that where no

² W. Krenkel [ed.], *Lucilius, Satiren*, ii (Leiden, 1970), pp. 344–5.

³ L. Jan and C. Mayhoff [edd.], *C. Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII*, i (Leipzig, 1906), p. 3, cite as witnesses to this part of the preface E = Paris. Lat. 6795 (s. IX/X), a = Vindobonensis 234 (s. XII), d = Paris. Lat. 6797 (s. XII^{3/4}), and e = Paris. Lat. 6796A (s. XIII), 'a faithful copy of E', in the words of L. D. Reynolds in his article 'The Elder Pliny' in *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 307–16, from whom I have taken these dates. See B. Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des Auteurs Classiques Latins aux XI^e et XII^e Siècles*, ii (Paris, 1985), pp. 243–73, for the particulars of several other MSS. (Munk Olsen's nos. 4, 12, 23, 29, 36, 38, 52, and 65), none

really good manuscript of Pliny is available we have a very indifferent text'.⁴

Now that we have examined how Pliny's quotation from Lucilius was mangled in the process of scribal copying of the *Naturalis Historia*, let us proceed to his next sentence, which in modern editions is printed thus:

quod si hoc Lucilius, qui primus condidit stili nasum, dicendum sibi putauit, Cicero mutuandum, praesertim cum de re publica scriberet, quanto nos causatius ab aliquo iudice defendimus?

One of the clearest indications that 'qui primus condidit stili nasum', quite literally, 'who first founded the nose of style', is not correct, is that no translator can bring himself to translate the phrase, but instead all resort to paraphrase: thus Philemon Holland's circumlocutory 'who was the first that durst controule the writings of others, and tooke upon him to scoffe at their imperfections'.⁵ J. Bostock's more concise 'who first introduced the satirical style',⁶ É. Littré's 'qui créa le style satirique',⁷ H. Rackham's 'the originator of critical sniffing',⁸ J. Beaujeu's 'le créateur du style satirique',⁹ W. Krenkel's 'der als erster ein Stilgefühl entwickelt hat',¹⁰ G. Winkler's 'der den satirischen Stil erst begründete',¹¹ and A. Roncoroni's 'il fondatore della satira'.¹² This passage has also been discussed by writers on the origin and history of satire at least since the time of Casaubon,¹³ but nobody, so far as I can tell, has ever offered a plausible explanation of how the necessary sense is to be extracted from such an abrupt phrase as 'qui primus condidit stili nasum'. The most elaborate attempt to elucidate *nasum* was made in antiquity by some scholiast, who wrote in his margin against the lemma *nasum* the scholium 'quasi abusione et uituperationem. primus enim satyricum carmen scripsit in quo utique uituperatio unius cuiusque continetur. Nasum autem dixit quod uituperationis signum uel maxime declarandum', which then intruded into the text of the archetype of the extant MSS. Eade.¹⁴ Now although in Latin *nasum* could mean, as in Greek *μυκτήρ* certainly can, 'disdain' or 'contempt',¹⁵ neither the ancient scholiast nor any subsequent scholar has even attempted to explain what 'stili nasum', quite literally 'a disdain of style', would mean in this context, or how from 'stili nasum' one could extract the meaning 'a disdainful style', which would at least make sense in itself,

earlier than s. XI, which preserve this passage. R = Florence, Bibl. Ricc. 488 (s. IX²) also preserves the prefatory epistle, but unfortunately only from section 27 onward. It is even more unfortunate that none of the five s. V–VI MSS. (M, N, O, P, Pal.Chat.) nor any of the many other s. VIII–IX MSS. are available for the preface.

⁴ In the words of L. D. Reynolds, op. cit., p. 308.

⁵ P. Holland, *The Historie of the World, Commonly called The Naturall Historie of C. Plinius Secundus*, i (London, 1601), [no pagination].

⁶ J. Bostock, *The Natural History of Pliny*, i (London, 1855), p. 3.

⁷ É. Littré, *Histoire Naturelle de Plin*, i (Paris, 1855), p. 2.

⁸ H. Rackham, *Pliny, Natural History*, i (London, 1938), p. 7.

⁹ J. Beaujeu, *Plin L'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre I* (Paris, 1950), p. 49.

¹⁰ W. Krenkel, op. cit., i. 61.

¹¹ R. König and G. Winkler, *C. Plinius Secundus d. Ä., Naturkunde*, i (Munich, 1973), p. 11.

¹² *Plinii Naturalis Historia*, i (Pisa, 1984), p. 28.

¹³ I. Casaubon, *De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi & Romanorum Satira* (Paris, 1605), p. 276.

¹⁴ See the *apparatus* in Jan and Mayhoff's edition, op. cit., ad loc.

¹⁵ See Liddell and Scott, s.vv. *μυκτήρ*, *μυκτηρίζω*, *μυκτήρισμα*, *μυκτηρισμός*, *μυκτηριστής*. Although in the *OLD* no passage is listed where 'nasus' means 'disdain' (rather than 'wit', as at Seneca, *Suas.* 1.6, and Martial 1.41.18 and 12.88.1), the fact that 'nasutus' and its adverb 'nasute' mean 'disdainful(ly)' at Phaedrus 4.7.1 and Martial 13.2.1 (which are not properly recorded in the *OLD*) proves that 'nasum' did have 'disdain' as one of its meanings in Silver Latin. It would be natural to see this as a Graecism.

although one would still be left with the task of interpreting 'condidit...nasum'. In some ways, the clearest perception of these difficulties is to be found in the note in the 1827 edition by Alexandre and Lemaire: '*Styli nasum*. Id est, satyram, procax et nasutum dicendi genus. Durissima metaphora, quam ab antiquo poeta desumptam haud invitus crediderim'.¹⁶ But before I would willingly believe that some anonymous 'antiquus poeta', or even Lucilius himself, was responsible for such abruptness, or rather incoherence, I would want to consider another possibility.

Now this is not the only place in the *Naturalis Historia* where we find in the manuscripts an abrupt reference to a *stilus*. At *N.H.* 34.139 we find 'in foedere, quod expulsi regibus populo Romano dedit Porsina, nominatim comprehensum inuenimus, ne ferro nisi in agri cultu uteretur. et tum stilo <osseo> scribere institutum uetustissimi auctores prodiderunt', where the supplement was made by Mayhoff,¹⁷ who, taking a tip from Urlichs,¹⁸ compared Isidore, *Etym.* 6.9.1-2 'Graeci autem et Tusci primum ferro in ceris scripserunt; postea Romani iusserunt ne graphium ferreum quis haberet. unde et apud scribas dicebatur: "ceram ferro ne caedito". postea institutum ut in cera *ossibus scriberent*, sicut indicat Atta in satura dicens:

...uertamus uomerem
in cera mucronique aremus *osseo*.'

Presumably the omission was occasioned by the scribe's eye slipping from the final *o* of 'stilo' to that of 'osseo'.

Let us now return to praef. 7. Lucilius' claim to fame is well known: he was the Roman 'who first wrote verse of a satirical/sarcastic/scornful style'. Since this is what Pliny meant, I suspect it is also what he wrote: 'Lucilius, qui primus condidit stili na<uti uer>sum', where I have italicised the cause of the omission, the slipping of the scribe's eye from one *su* to the next, in close analogy to the slip posited in Cichorius' generally accepted restoration 'Man<ium Manil>ium' in the passage of Lucilius quoted in Pliny's previous sentence. For similar expressions involving *condere*, cf. *N.H.* 5.112 'Miletus...nec fraudanda ciue Cadmo, qui primus prorsam orationem condere instituit' and *N.H.* 7.205 'prorsam orationem condere Pherecydes Syrius instituit Cyri regis aetate'. The usage of the collective singular *uersus* to denote the genre is of course very common; from a large number of instances I cite Catullus 6.16-17, Cicero, *Orator* 152, Horace, *Serm.* 1.10.70-1, Propertius 1.7.19, 1.9.11, 2.13.7, 2.34.93, 4.1.57, and Juvenal 1.79-80. Pliny's characterization of Lucilius may well have been influenced by Horace's famous passage *Serm.* 2.1.69-70

...cum est Lucilius ausus
primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem,

where *Lucilius* → *Lucilius*, *primus* → *primus*, *ausus*...*componere* → *condidit*, *carmina* → *uersum*, *in hunc operis*...*morem* → *stili nasuti*. For other passages where *nasutus* (or its adverb *nasute*) means 'disdainful', 'scornful', see Phaedrus 4.7.1-2 'tu qui nasute scripta destringis mea, [et hoc iocorum legere fastidis genus' and Martial 13.2.1 'nasutus sis usque licet'.¹⁹ Elsewhere *stilus* accepts a wide variety of adjectives: Cicero, *Brutus* 167 'Attico stilo', Valerius Maximus 8.13. ext. 4 'Romani stili', Pliny the Younger, *Epist.* 3.18.10 'laetioris stili', *Epist.* 7.9.7 'pugnacem...et quasi

¹⁶ C. Alexandre and N. E. Lemaire, *Caii Plinii Secundi Historiae Naturalis Libri XXXVII*, i (Paris, 1827), p. 10, *ad loc.*

¹⁷ See Jan and Mayhoff, *op. cit.*, v (Leipzig, 1897), p. 213, *ad loc.*

¹⁸ K. L. von Urlichs, *Die Quellenregister zu Plinius letzten Büchern* (Würzburg, 1878), p. 11.

¹⁹ As observed above in n. 15, this meaning is not recorded in the *OLD*, yet another of its many deficiencies (cf. F. R. D. Goodyear's review at *PACA* 17 (1983), 124-36).

bellatorium stilum', Aulus Gellius 3.3.13 'stilum Plautinum', Pomponius Porphyrio (ad Horat. *Carm.* 2.1.9–10) 'tragico stilo', (ad Horat. *Epist.* 2.1.164) 'Latinum stilum', Terentianus Maurus 282 'siccioris... stili', Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Diu. Claudius* 8.1 'poeticus stilus', *Quadrigae Tyrannorum* 15.10 'stilo maiore', *Carus et Carinus et Numerianus* 11.1 'Tulliano... stilo', Servius (ad Vergil. *Ecl.* 1.10) 'rustico stilo', (ad *Ecl.* 10.50) 'Theocritio stilo', (ad *Ecl.* 10.71) 'tenuissimo stilo', (ad *Aen.* 1, praef.) 'stilus grandiloquus', (ad *Aen.* 4.1) 'comicus stilus', (ad *Aen.* 8.493) 'historicus stilus'.

Thus we have seen that the emendation 'Lucilius, qui primus condidit stili na<suti uer>sum' restores both sense and syntax, and is very much in accordance with the usage of Silver Latin authors generally and of Pliny in particular. If I have made any error in proposing this restoration, which does not involve the alteration of a single letter of the preserved text and posits a lacuna due to a *saut du même au même* of a type generally believed to have occurred in the preceding sentence, it is in sticking too close to manuscripts which we know are very corrupt.²⁰

University of Delaware

J. D. MORGAN

²⁰ I should like to thank Ian Rutherford, Richard Tarrant, and Richard Thomas for their reactions to my supplement, as well as the lynx-eyed reader for *CQ*, who noticed that H. Fuchs, in the König–Winkler edition (supra n. 11), p. 383, anticipated me in suspecting the transmitted text, although Fuchs' own supplement 'qui primus condidit <humilioris> stili nasum' is not plausible.

PROPERTIUS 1.9.30

Some time ago I noted that the generally accepted emendations *a! fuge* (1.9.30), and *a! ducere* (1.11.5) are suspect (*CPh* 75 (1980), 71–2). In his recent Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass. 1990), Goold in the latter passage restores the MSS. reading *adducere*; in the former, *quisquis es assiduas aufuge blanditias*, he prints Tappe's *tu fuge* for MSS. *aufuge*.¹ The best solution, it seems to me, is one which the modern editions, *Propertiana* included, are of a mind to ignore: Markland's *heu fuge*.

This expression is used twice by Virgil (*Aen.* 2.289; 3.44), and, together with a 'whoever you are' formula, by Valerius Flaccus (*Arg.* 4.140). *Aufuge* might easily have been an aural error for *heu fuge* in which case *tu* simply compounds that error.

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

¹ *Aufugio* seems to be used only intransitively. In addition to the passages adduced by Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge, 1956), p. 28, I note also Petronius 81.3 *effugi iudicium*] *effugi lp*²: *aufugi rtp*¹.

ON ELEGIAC EN

Propertius uses this particle at 1.1.21

en agedum dominae mentem convertite nostrae.

The recent editors, Luck (Zürich, 1964), Hanslik (Leipzig, 1979), and Goold (Cambridge, Mass., 1990), allow into the text these emended instances of *en*:¹

¹ I have also taken into account the editions of Barber (Oxford, 1960), Camps (Cambridge, 1961–7), Richardson (Oklahoma, 1977), and Fedeli (Stuttgart, 1984).