

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



**Marx's *Lucilius C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*.
Recensuit, enarravit Feidericus Mabx. Volumen prius:
Prolegomena, Testimonia, Fasti Luciliani, Carminum
Reliquiae, Indices. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904. Pp. cxxxvi +
169. M.8.**

W. M. Lindsay

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 05 / June 1905, pp 271 - 272

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00992837, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00992837

How to cite this article:

W. M. Lindsay (1905). The Classical Review, 19, pp 271-272 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00992837

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MARX'S *LUCILIUS*.

C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae. Recensuit, enarravit FRIDERICUS MARX. Volumen prius: Prolegomena, Testimonia, Fasti Luciliani, Carminum Reliquiae, Indices. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904. Pp. cxxxvi + 169. M.8.

Sospitator Lucilii—that is the title which Prof. Marx has won for himself by this edition, and especially by the Preface, with its Biography of the poet. Lucilius was previously little more for us than a name. We knew that he came from Suessa Aurunca, that he was a close friend of Scipio Aemilianus, that his house in Rome was the one that had been built for the hostage-son of Antiochus the Great (Ascon. in Cic. *Pison.* p. 12, 9), and that he satirized Metellus Macedonicus, Mucius Scaevola, and Lupus. Also that the philosopher Clitomachus dedicated a book to him (Cic. *Acad.* ii. 32, 102). But now, thanks to this Preface, we seem to know as much about Lucilius as about the other Satirists. It gives us a wonderfully clear and detailed picture of the wealthy young Campanian, who, after serving as 'eques' under Scipio in the Numantine War, settled in Rome and took up the pen in support of his old commander's political career. Metellus Macedonicus, Scipio's rival, was censor in the year 131 B.C., shortly after the return of Scipio and Lucilius to Rome, and used all the influence of his office to encourage matrimony. Lucilius in his first publication, Book XXVI in the re-arrangement of the Satires, ran a tilt at matrimony:

Homines ipsi hanc sibi molestiam ultro
atque aerumnam offerunt,
Ducunt uxores, producunt, quibus haec
faciant, liberos.

Metellus made Lupus 'princeps senatus.' Lucilius turned his lance against Lupus and attacked him as violently as his patron. Horace speaks of the delight of Scipio and Laelius over:

laeso . . Metello
Famosisque Lupo cooperto versibus.

After the publication of Books XXVI-XXX and the death of Scipio, Lucilius desisted from writing, until the death of Lupus gave him opportunity of resuming. Book I, which opens with a meeting of the gods to discuss the death of Lupus, was the

first book of his second venture: Book II deals with the prosecution of Q. Mucius Scaevola by T. Albucius for 'repetundae'; Book III with a journey to Capua and the Sicilian straits; and so on, until Book XXI, the last of the series. Books XXII-XXV were a later publication and seem to have been concerned with Lucilius' slaves. The second line of this epitaph on an old retainer is quoted by Martial:

Servo' neque infidus domino neque inutili'
quaquam,
Lucili columella hic situt Metrophanes.

These four books were apparently in Elegiac Metre, while Book XXX and Books I-XXI were in Hexameter Verse. Books XXVI-XXVII were Trochaic Septenarii, and Books XXVIII-XXIX a patchwork of Trochaic Septenarii, Iambic Senarii, and Dactylic Hexameters. In other words, the Satirist began with Trochaic Metre, then tried a combination of this with Iambic and with the Dactylic Hexameter, and finally adhered to the last. His Elegiac compositions may have been mainly epitaphs and the like.

Lucilius' niece was the mother of Pompey the Great, so that the Satires were a family possession and pride of the Pompeys, and were edited by learned men of the Pompeian circle, Pompeius Lenaeus, Valerius Cato, and others. No doubt, Horace, in pointing out the faults of Lucilius, had the additional zest of political opposition.

Marx ingeniously suggests that it may have been Valerius Cato who arranged the Books in their present un-chronological order, and that the reason for the re-arrangement was the fashion of Cato's time, and later, to make Hexameter Verse precede Elegiac and to put both before Iambic, etc. This is the order in which the three metres are treated in the *Ars Poetica* and in Quintilian's textbook. The interpolated preface to Horace's *Satire* (I x):

Lucili quam sis mendosus teste Catone
Defensore tuo pervincam, qui male factos
Emendare parat versus, etc.,

he ascribes to a grammarian of Suetonius' time and supposes it to refer to Valerius Cato's edition and to Cato's disagreement with his teacher, Nettius Philocomus. But it is impossible to give more than

a brief outline of the wonderful reconstruction of the biography of Lucilius and the history of his writings, which this fascinating Preface offers us. We owe to its author hearty thanks.

Prof. Marx has, it must be added, 'the defects of his qualities.' For here and there one cannot but feel that the foundation is too insecure to support the fabric of conjecture which has been raised upon it. Let me give an example. The extant fragments of Lucilius come mostly from Nonius' *Dictionary of Republican Latin*. Nonius possessed and excerpted Books I-XXI and XXVI-XXX, but not Books XXII-XXV. He found in glossaries and scholia some quotations from Lucilius (including Book XXII) which he has added to his own collections. Now he used some Books more carefully than others. There is a large mass of excerpts from Books XXVI-XXX, a fair number from Books I-XI, XIII-XV. There are only three from Book XII, none from Book XVIII (for the two citations come from glossographical works consulted by Nonius) and none from Book XXI. The lines preserved by other grammarians, Priscian, Charisius, Diomedes, etc., are insignificant in number compared with Nonius' excerpts, and do not always specify the Book from which the quotation comes. They add nothing to the couple of lines preserved by Nonius from Book XVIII, but they increase the fragments of Book XII from three to six. They offer no fragments of Book XXI. Marx is bold enough to infer from the silence of Nonius and of the other grammarians that Book XXI, the last book of this division of the *Satires*, had been lost from some imaginary unique copy before the time of Nonius and the others. And he goes on in the next sentence to make a similar inference regarding an early edition of Plautus. The *Vidularia* is not cited by Varro, *Ling. Lat.*, nor by Verrius Flaccus. *Therefore* it had been lost! I wonder whether these unsupported conjectures will find their way into future textbooks of Latin Literature.

Again, his argument on p. lxxxiii regarding the quotations from Horace in Nonius is very strange. He has noticed that the five quotations (there are no more) from Horace appear in this order:—

In Chap. II	Section H	<i>Sat.</i> II	4, 73.
" II	" L	" I	3, 81.
" III	" C	" I	2, 89.
" III	" D	<i>Odes</i> IV	14, 28.
" IV	" C	" I	18, 5.

What inference does he draw? That Nonius, after finishing his Dictionary, added a few quotations from Horace, and, for this purpose, excerpted a volume of the *Odes* and another of the *Satires*, commencing at the end of each volume and working back to the beginning. It is so wrong-headed an inference that one can scarcely believe it to be really intended by the author. Suppose that it were found that in Johnson's Dictionary five quotations from Pope's *Rape of the Lock* appeared in this order, namely, one from the end of the poem to illustrate let us say the word 'abandon,' another from the middle of the poem to illustrate 'alone,' another from an earlier part to illustrate 'amount,' and so on. Could one infer from this that Johnson excerpted this poem of Pope's backwards? Why should the first quotation which Johnson selected for use stand first in his dictionary? Its place is surely determined by the order of the word which it illustrates. If the first appropriate quotation that caught his eye were a line containing the word 'amount,' it would of necessity stand on a later page in his dictionary than the quotation illustrative of 'alone.' Has not Prof. Marx fallen into some curious mental confusion? Or do I misapprehend his meaning?

His use of the quotations in Nonius from Cicero's *Academies* to prove this favourite theory of his, that Nonius excerpted authors, in crab-like fashion, backwards, is still more extraordinary (p. lxxxiv). But really I am unwilling to dwell longer on this part of the Preface. It was written before the nature and origin of the 'extra-quotations' (as they are called) in Nonius' Dictionary had been rightly explained; and the account which it gives of Nonius' method of compiling his materials from Lucilius seems to me quite untenable. I hope that in his second volume Prof. Marx will have a word to say on this point. Unfortunately he has arranged the Lucilius fragments in accordance with this ill-conceived theory, so that the error of the Preface pervades the whole presentation of the text.

Marx's emendations of the fragments are often brilliant and convincing. But since the second volume is to contain critical and explanatory notes, it will be well to reserve until its appearance a discussion of the new readings. Of misprints I have only noticed '301' for '300' in the note on XXVII 698.

W. M. LINDSAY.