

LUCILIUS, FRAGMENT 3 (MARX)

CHARLES E. MURGIA

University of California, Berkeley

Marx prints the text of Lucilius 3 as follows:

. . . locus de primo Lucilii translatus est, ubi inducuntur
dii habere concilium et agere primo de interitu Lupi
cuiusdam iudicis inprobi, postea sententias dicere.¹

The fragment is taken from Servius on *Aen.* 10.104, which survives in two traditions,² that of Servius Auctus (known as **DS**) and represented by codex F, and the **Γ** tradition of Servius (found in all extant codices here except F). I will print on the left the version transmitted by F, on the right that of **Γ**, with an apparatus provided to the latter text.

DS

ACCIPITE ERGO ANIMIS totus
hic locus de primo Lucili translatus
est libro, ubi indicuntur dii habere
concilium et agere primo de interitu
Lupi cuiusdam ducis, postea senten-
tias dicere.

Γ

ACCIPITE ERGO ANIMIS totus
hic locus de primo Lucilii translatus
est, ubi inducuntur di habere
concilium et agere primo de interitu
Lupi cuiusdam in republica, postea
sententias dicere.

in republica] in re p. **Γ** in rebus **τ** ducis **F** ducis in re p. *PbY* inducis rep. *N* iudicis rei *W*
iudicis inprobi *Marx*.³

¹ Fridericus Marx (ed.), *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1904) 1 frag. 3. Vol. 2 (hereafter cited as Marx 2) contains Marx's commentary on his text.

² See my description of the tradition of Servius in "Critical Notes on the Text of Servius' Commentary on *Aen.* III-V," *HSCP* 72 (1968) 311 ff. It is particularly to be noted that, although in most sections of Servius three ancient traditions survive (**DS**, **Δ**, and **Γ**), in this section **Δ** is missing. We therefore can reduce the number of variants to two, the reading of **DS** and of **Γ**: each tradition is equally capable of transmitting the correct reading, but any reading not attributable to one of the traditions must be either error or conjecture.

³ In setting up this apparatus, I use the conventions which I expect to follow in editing vol. V of the Harvard Edition of Servius. **Γ** signifies here all codices of its tradition except those otherwise cited. The convention **Γ** is used only for readings which can

It should be noted that *in republica* is transmitted only by **Γ**, *ducis* only by **DS** (represented by F). The two are found conflated in some manuscripts of the γ family⁴ (PbY) which transmit a **Γ** tradition contaminated from **DS**. WN form a group (σ) which shares this same source of contamination. However, the interpolation *ducis* became misplaced in σ between *in* and *rep.* (misplacement being a constant fate of interpolations). The resulting *inducis rep.* (of N) was "emended" in W to *iudicis rei*, a reading which was adopted by Fabricius, and in part by Maswic, who read *iudicis in republica*.

Believing the change to be a reasoned conjecture for *ducis*, Marx printed *iudicis* and conjectured *inprobi* for *in rep.* (or *in reb.*). The more commonly printed reading is *ducis in re publica*, which is the reading usually found in Italian codices (which are regularly of the γ or, sometimes, σ family) and so was the reading adopted in the earliest printed editions of Servius.

Ducis in republica is read by Thilo, who is followed by the most recent editors of Lucilius, N. Terzaghi (frag. 7) and E. H. Warmington (*vel 'iudicis,'* Warmington, p. 4). As we have seen, the reading was the result of either chance contamination or editorial choice in the ninth century.

reliably be established as the transmitted reading of the **Γ** tradition. **F** is printed in bold-face to indicate that the reading which it contains is the other variant worthy of consideration. Readings attributed to other manuscripts or groups should be regarded as errors, or conjectures, or conflated readings.

The codices employed here are *Caroliruhensis* 116 and *Escorialensis* T.II.17 (A and E, both of the second half of the ninth century) which share the reading of **Γ**; *Laurentianus plut.* 45, *cod.* 14 (Q) and *Parisinus Lat.* 7959 (Pa), which belong to the τ family (this family originates from an edition made in Tours in the early ninth century); *Parisinus Lat.* 16236 (Pb, *saec.* X/XI) and *Tridentinus* 3385 (Y, *saec.* IX²), which belong to a branch of the γ family which is contaminated from Servius Auctus (E is a relatively pure member of this family); *Neapolitanus fondo Vindobonensis* 5 (N, *saec.* X) and *Guelferbytanus* 2091 (W, *saec.* XIII), which belong to a family (σ) that shares PbY's source of contamination from Servius Auctus. I cite these codices from my own collations. Thilo used A (and S, which is a copy of A), RLH (which belong to the τ family), and M (closely related to PbY, but inferior to them). Of the codices cited, A and E are the most honest witnesses.

In referring to Servius, I cite from the *Editio Harvardiana* (abbreviated *Harv.*) where published, otherwise from Thilo's edition, with page and line of Thilo added in parentheses after citation of book and line of Virgil.

⁴ Cf. Murgia (above, note 2) for a description of this family. That the reading *ducis* of PbY and related members of this family (as M) is derived by contamination from **DS** is made clear by the absence of the reading in E, the purest member of this family.

Let us consider first the **DS** tradition. *Ducis* in F falls into the same category as *libro* (line 14, Thilo). The Compiler⁵ of Servius Auctus, who has an abhorrence of ellipses and any other ambiguous expression, is constantly found supplying nouns and others words which he conceives to be understood. *Ducis* can readily be dismissed as the interpolation of the Compiler, who, feeling the need of a noun with *cuiusdam*, simply invented one.⁶ Marx's objections to *ducis* were well taken therefore (2, p. 5), but the remedy is to omit the word with **Γ**, rather than to emend it.⁷ Marx believed that the codices which omitted *ducis* did so because a scribe could not understand it. But though *Lupi cuiusdam ducis in republica* (or *in rebus*, which Marx believed to be the transmitted reading) is awkward Latin, *Lupi cuiusdam in republica* is even more awkward. The omission in **Γ** cannot be by conscious choice. The most reasonable explanation of why **Γ** lacks the word is that the archetype never possessed the word.

⁵ I use the word Compiler (with a capital C) to signify the mediaeval scholar who first conflated Servius with another ancient commentary to produce Servius Auctus. In the process of making the conflation, the Compiler also made certain additions, rearrangements, and other changes of his own.

⁶ It is possible, but not necessary, that the Compiler knew a scholium such as Pseudacron on Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.67 (cited below, note 14). Such single word insertions in **DS** are usually the inventions of the Compiler. A good example where we can show that the Compiler has interpolated a noun is Servius at *Aen.* 4, 215.5, where as I have elsewhere argued (*op. cit.* above, note 2, p. 331), the correct reading is *sustulit alii pactam* (for the expression, cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.55, *filiam eius alii pactam rapuerat*). The archetype, however, read *pactum*, whence the Compiler, generating a neuter noun for it to modify, wrote *sustulit alii matrimonium pactum*. Some other examples of nouns generated by the Compiler in the neighboring pages may be seen at *Aen.* 10.58, *Pergama*, 10.93, *Alexandri*, 10.213, *naves*.

⁷ I do not, like Marx, base my objections to *ducis* on sense. I believe that one can make sense of almost anything if one has to, a fact to which scholarship provides ample witness. *Lupus* has been identified with L. Cornelius Lentulus *Lupus*: so Münzer, *RE* 4 (1894) 1386–87. It is clear from the fragments of Lucilius alone that he was a prominent Roman citizen whom Lucilius satirized. In fragment 785 he is represented as a judge; W's error *iudicis* therefore is historically accurate, even though not what Servius said. Pseudacron at Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.67 declares that *Lupus* was a *princeps senatus* (the person who gave his *sententia* first in the Senate). I am not sure how much we can trust this scholium. Those who believe *ducis* to be correct take *ducis* to be an equivalent of *principis*: see note 14 below.

My objections to *ducis* are first transcriptional—it does not seem to be the transmitted reading—and second stylistic. The reading in Petrarch's codex reflects someone's appreciation of the stylistic problem: the scribe (not Petrarch) reads *de interitu ducis cuiusdam*, with *Lupi* omitted. We might have expected something like *de interitu ducis cuiusdam*, *Lupi nomine*, but *Lupi cuiusdam ducis* is bad Latin.

Next we note that **DS** lacks **Γ**'s *in re publica*. Marx, judging from the fact that codex F lacked the phrase, decided that the transmitted reading was *in rebus* and that F had omitted it because it was unintelligible. In fact, the distribution of readings in the manuscripts ensures that the reading transmitted to **Γ** was *in re p.*; the abbreviation of *re publica*, common in the archetype, was frequently corrupted by the scribes: hence τ 's reading *in reb.* The absence of the phrase in F could be explained in any of three ways: because it was omitted as unintelligible, because it fell out at the insertion of *ducis*,⁸ or because it was never in the tradition. Whatever the explanation, we must consider whether it belongs.

Now that we have recognized that *ducis* is an interpolation, the awkwardness of *in republica* is even clearer.⁹ Whatever faults Servius had, he did not write awkward Latin; the worst of which he was guilty was jargon. The phrase *in republica* seems so inappropriate that it is improbable that a scribe could have written it as a gloss. Whenever we find a word or phrase that seems particularly inappropriate in its context, it is a good principle, before seeking to emend the word to something more intelligible, to scan the environment to see whether the words could have intruded from elsewhere. So at *Aen.* 12.869 (646.31 Thilo), the words *quod . . . Calchanta* (transmitted by **Γ**) have intruded from 12.830 (644.8); at *Aen.* 10.341 (429.20), the reading printed by Thilo, *comprobat et ostendit*, is a conjecture by a scribe of the τ family, which had *comproba ostendit*, a corruption resulting through the intrusion of *comproba* from *comprobata* in *Aen.* 10.333 (429.8); and, close to the passage with which we are concerned, *propter* at *Aen.* 10.91 (397.5) is an intrusion from *praeter* (variant *propter*) at *Aen.* 10.92 (397.9). The second of these examples prompted an "emendation," the third elicited from Thilo an explanation of proper learning but little sense: *propter* is no more appropriate in context as an adverb than as a preposition.

For our passage on *Aen.* 10.104, I note that the word *republicam*

⁸ If *ducis* were superscribed over *in rep.*, it could have been taken as a variant and supplanted the phrase, instead of being conflated with it.

⁹ If the reading *de interitu Lupi cuiusdam in republica* were correct, *in republica* would best be taken as modifying *interitu*. But few teachers of Latin prose composition would allow their students to compose so awkwardly; we should allow no greater liberty to Servius' scribes.

(often abbreviated *rē p.*) is found at *Aen.* 10.88 (396.13). I also note that the word is found in different order in the two traditions:

DS**Γ**

Res ergo fluxas rempublicam fluxam Res fluxas^{*} fluxam rempublicam.
dicit.

The words *ergo* and *dicit* were inserted by the Compiler. It is clear, however, despite Thilo, that **DS**'s order *rempublicam fluxam* is correct: Servius would normally prefer to explain the Virgilian words in the same order as the lemma; the order of words in Virgil is *fluxas Phrygiae res*; Servius had deliberately rearranged Virgil's words in the lemma, in order to be able to write his scholium in normal order, with unemphatic¹⁰ adjective following the noun; having gone to the bother of rearranging Virgil, he would hardly have put his scholium in inverse order.

What I think most likely to have happened is this: 1) in a manuscript from which **Γ** descends, *rē p.* fell out, probably through the laziness of a scribe who thought that the letters were a continuation of the lemma;¹¹

¹⁰ When I say unemphatic, I mean unemphatic for Servius. The word being defined by Servius is *res*; *fluxas* is present only for identification. Servius' meaning is *Res fluxas* = **rem publicum fluxam**. Any emphasis in the voice should be upon *rem publicam*, and not either adjective.

¹¹ The ends of lemmas were frequently abbreviated to initials, and these initials were frequently omitted by scribes. In calling *Res fluxas* a lemma I am referring to the form of its transmission in **Γ**: the words of Virgil followed by Servius' paraphrase, without connective verb or other unit of sentence structure. Servius has apparently felt free to rearrange Virgil's words because the main lemma for the line has already been given with the words cited in correct order. Thilo has not printed *Res fluxas* as a lemma, but a comparison of the following passages in *Harv.* and Thilo will illuminate the style of Servius and **DS** (I cite from *Harv.*):

- in *Aen.* 1.1.9 et arma virumque **DS** ARMA VIRVMQVE **Γ** recte.
1.41.7 noxam autem **DS** NOXAM **Σ** recte.
1.1.29 virum autem **DS** VIRVM **Γ** recte.
1.6.12 Latio autem **DS** INFERRETQVE DEOS LATIO **Σ** recte.
1.11.10 animis caelestibus autem **DS** ANIMIS CAELESTIBVS **Σ** recte.

It is a stylistic trait of **DS** that where the Servian manuscripts transmit lemma followed by scholium, when there has been a previous citation of the words as lemma, **DS** tends to subjoin secondary lemmata with connectives. In the first two examples cited, **DS** has subjoined Servius to Servius, in the last three, Servius to **D**. The question of whether *Res fluxas* is a lemma does not affect the argument for the cause of omission of *rempublicam*, since all citations of all authors, whether in lemmata or not, tend to be abbreviated, and the abbreviations to drop out.

2) a corrector added *rē p.* (with a *signe de renvoi*), either at the bottom of the page (which happened to end with *lupi cuiusdam*), or between the columns of a two-column text (after a line ending *lupi cuiusdam*); 3) a scribe copying this codex simply copied in order *lupi cuiusdam rē p.*; 4) a later corrector, noticing the omission of *republicam* in 396.12, inserted it, but in the wrong place, after *fluxam*; ¹² 5) at *Aen.* 10.104 (398.15) *cuiusdamrēp* was eventually changed (by accident or design) to *cuiusdāinrep.*, the easiest of changes, especially when the latter can be construed, however awkwardly, while the former cannot. ¹³

This explanation of the intrusion is recommended because it seems to solve two corruptions at once. We must confess however that the precise path by which a word intrudes is often more complicated than can readily be seen. Consider the reading of τ at *Aen.* 5.112.5 ff.:

quod nos cogit aliquid minimum intellegere. nam si
primus victor bovem accepit, consequens non est ut
dicamus intelligere ultimum tam magnum accepisse prae-
mium.

A good editor should see that *intelligere* after *dicamus* is an intrusion from *minimum intellegere* above. But unless he had all the evidence of the Harvard apparatus, he would not be able to tell the way in which *intelligere* intruded. In some ancestor of Δ which had a line-length of twenty letters or so, one line, *intellegere nam si primus* was repeated after *dicamus* (so JA). Simply by conjecture τ expunged the words *nam si primus*, leaving *intellegere*. Almost all our other codices have errors based on these errors. Some omit *nam . . . dicamus* (i.e., *nam . . . dicamus intelligere*, after *intellegere*), others omit *victor . . . dicamus* (i.e., *victor . . . dicamus intellegere nam si primus* after *primus*), one (L) omits *est ut dicamus ultimum* (but really *est ut dicamus intellegere nam si primus ultimum*, which happened to occupy a line in its exemplar). My point is that corruptions beget corruptions, and errors of intrusion or omission, even where detectable and correctable, are often not the result of a simple and easily definable process.

¹² The omission of a word or later replacement by a corrector is the most common cause of inversions in order.

¹³ I should not have to point out that *m* and *in* look alike in minuscule, and that m-strokes can readily disappear or be generated. This reconstruction of the error, by the way, confirms that *ducis* was not in Γ 's transmitted text.

Therefore we cannot be sure that, for instance, a whole line did not fall out at 10.88 and was misplaced, with only *rē p.* surviving correction at 10.104. The reader can test his abilities at providing explanations by consulting Thilo's edition at *Aen.* 5.533 (632.10) and seeing if he can determine the source of *certamen* (dagged by Thilo). The solution can be found by consulting the Harvard apparatus *ad loc.*, for J's reading.

I could also be wrong in seeing *republicam* in 10.88 as the source of the intrusion. There is some evidence that **Γ** descends from a codex or codices with a fairly short line-length. Consider

inducuntur dii habere consiliū et age
reprimode interit lupicuiusdam
postea sententias diceret hoc quia

All that a scribe need do after copying *cuiusdam* is to start to copy the wrong line, producing *cuiusdam rep.* Noticing his mistake, he expunges the offending letters, but *rep.* slips through. This is presumably how *comproba* in 10.341 got into **τ**. Once *rep.* has invaded, the rest follows naturally.

I think however that I have shown that it would not be hard for *in republica* to have arisen by intrusion. I hope that I have also shown that intrusion is a common source of error, at least within the tradition of Servius. It is a type of error, however, which some editors seem ill-prepared to recognize. All but one of the examples of intrusion which I have cited were undetected by Thilo; there are many more such that could be cited. Part of the problem is a misuse of the principle of *lectio difficilior*. Whenever Thilo found in some manuscript a reading which made poor sense, he assumed that it was a *lectio difficilior* and tended to defend it, even when other codices omitted it. Since errors of intrusion usually produce apparent *lectiones difficiliores*, any application of the principle which ignores this source of error is bound to leave many corruptions. The tendency of scholars, including medieval ones, has been either to emend such intrusions into other words or to explain them as appropriate. Both these tendencies can be seen in the examples given above. The intrusion of *quod . . . Calchanta* at *Aen.* 12.869 not only has not been noticed before, but Renaissance scholars (cf. Fabricius in Thilo's apparatus) even found a line of Homer to

support the reference. Our fragment of Lucilius does not call for rewording or ingenious explanation.¹⁴ A reading *de interitu Lupi cuiusdam in re publica* is wretched Latin, which must be emended by excision. I therefore propose for Lucilius and Servius simply *de interitu Lupi cuiusdam*.¹⁵

¹⁴ Nicola Terzaghi, *Lucilio* (Torino 1934) 275, note 2, says on *ducis in republica*: "Queste parole non sono da toccare: *dux* ha il semplice senso di 'capo', *princeps* ed è appellativo non sconveniente al *princeps senatus*: cf. Cic. *de or.* III 63 *quem auctorem publici consilii et regendae civitatis ducem et sententiae atque eloquentiae principem in senatu, in populo, in causis publicis esse volumus. regendae civitatis dux* è un preciso equivalent di *dux in re publica*." Terzaghi obtained the reference to Cicero from (Marx (2.5), who rejected it as justification. One could also compare *principes viros Romae* of Pseudacron at Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.67 (123,28 Keller): *Id est laesi vel irati sunt illi duces idcirco quod Lucilius carpesit Metellum et Lupum ceterosque principes viros Romae*; the two *duces* are Laelius and Scipio, who were properly *duces*. Such parallels as these only indicate the sense which *ducis in republica* must have if genuine. They in no way justify the un-Servian awkwardness of expression.

¹⁵ I am indebted to Robert F. Renehan, from whose criticisms this paper has benefited. The question of the reconstruction of Lucilius' *Deorum Concilium* and of the genre of such councils in epic and satire is worthy of pursuit, but is properly a subject for another paper.