

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

LUCILIUS, LUCRETIVS, AND PERSIUS 1. 1

The medieval scholia on Persius 1. 2 report:

QVIS LEGET HAEC hunc uersum de Lucilii primo transtulit. et bene uitae uitia increpans ab admiratione incipit.

It has long been recognized that the comment deals with the first line of Persius' poem, and the verse "O curas hominum! O quantum est in rebus inane!" can accordingly be found as fragment 9 of Marx's edition of Lucilius.¹ The source of the line, indeed, is rarely questioned. Nevertheless, I believe that the attribution is far less certain than either the scholiast or Marx suggests. And, although what I would like to think is the correct solution was proposed as long ago as 1928 by G. L. Hendrickson,² it has been firmly denied again in the most recent work on Persius.³ That is enough reason to re-open the question.

Hendrickson pointed out that the end of line 1, *in rebus inane*, is a Lucretian phrase, occurring some ten times in Book 1 alone, and suggested that the mistake in the scholia was due to confusion between the abbreviated forms of the names Lucilius and Lucretius.⁴ Bramble, in rejecting Hendrickson's suggestion, comments: "[Lucretius] uses themes from diatribe; but is it inherently likely that P[ersius] should make his debut with an imitation of a writer who was not a member of the *satura* tradition?"⁵ In fact, it can be shown not only that the correction of the name is paleographically possible, but also that reference to Lucretius makes

1. F. Marx, ed., *Lucilii Carminum reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1904; repr. Amsterdam, 1963). Among recent scholars, D. Henss, "Ist das Luciliusfragment 9 Marx echt?" *Philologus* 98 (1954): 159-61, believed that 1. 2 was from Lucilius because (a) 1. 1 seemed to come from Lucretius 1. 330 and 2. 14; and (b) Albin's and Hendrickson's suggestion that *Lucretii* should be read for *Lucilii* in the scholium was unthinkable. W. Krenkel, ed., *Lucilius: "Satiren"* (Leyden, 1970), prints Persius 1. 2 as fragment 2 of his edition. It is worthwhile to reconsider briefly some arguments concerning the placement of the note:

- (1) In general, it is hard, despite Henss, to see 1. 2 as a close borrowing from anything. The closest parallel, Horace *Serm.* 1. 4. 22 f. (which Henss thinks must also reflect the alleged line of Lucilius), contains only two words, *nemo* and *legal*, in common with Persius.
- (2) Not only the first sentence of the scholium is concerned. *Vitae uitia* and *ab admiratione incipit* in the second sentence can only refer to line 1, and that provides a strong reason for believing that the whole note concerns the first line.
- (3) The transmission of the Persius scholia (and of Latin scholia in general) ought to be considered. The scholia to Persius are found in four main manuscripts of the tenth century or later which contain a continuous commentary. Internal features, however, show that this version is based on notes transmitted in the margins of manuscripts of Persius. Such notes are easily misplaced and connected to the wrong lemma in the process of transcription. For an example in the Bembin scholia to Terence, see *HSCP* 79 (1975): 348 ff.; see also P. Wessner, *Scholia in Iuuenalem vetustiora* (Leipzig, 1931), p. xvi. It is also worth pointing out that the scholia on the opening lines of Persius 1 are badly confused and are most likely to have been disturbed in the transmission. I intend to discuss these problems in detail elsewhere, in connection with the critical edition of the *Commentum Cornuti* which W. V. Clausen and I are preparing; I give the text of the scholia from his collations of three manuscripts and my own of the fourth.
2. G. L. Hendrickson, "The First Satire of Persius," *CP* 23 (1928): 97-100. I have not seen the article by G. Albin, "Di chi è il primo verso di Persio," *A&R* 10 (1907): 131, cited by Henss.
3. J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge, 1974), p. 67, n. 1.
4. Hendrickson, "The First Satire of Persius," pp. 98 f.
5. Bramble, *Persius*, p. 67, n. 1.

perfectly good sense here. Moreover, even if the attribution to Lucilius were correct, it is most unlikely that the line should be printed as a verse of Lucilius as it stands.

As far as the textual problem is concerned, Hendrickson, like Lachmann before him, was right to say that the emendation is of the simplest sort.⁶ The substitution of Lucilius for Lucretius in our manuscripts is not common; I have found other examples only at Charisius 116. 8B and 118. 2B. Its rarity, however, is not surprising, as Lucretius is in most contexts a far more expected name. Hendrickson gave several examples of the substitution of Lucretius for Lucilius, as in Varro *Ling.* 5. 17 and 7. 94. Other examples that I have noticed occur at Nonius 229. 1M and in some of the manuscripts of Macrobius at *Sat.* 6. 1. 35 and 43, and in the scholium on Juvenal 10. 65. The name Lucretius is abbreviated to *luc̄* in Macrobian manuscripts at *Sat.* 6. 1. 48, 49, and 65, and to *luc* at Charisius 268. 5B. A more tantalizing alteration of this type, which cannot be proven, is suggested by Wilkinson for Jerome's famous entry on the death of Lucretius. Comparing the notices on Lucullus' death by love-potion in Nepos (*ap. Plut. Luc.* 43) and Pliny (*NH* 25. 25), he suggested that Jerome or Suetonius confused the names Lucretius and Lucullus.⁷ In fact, Lucullus, Lucilius, and Lucretius might all be abbreviated LVC.⁸

Bramble suggests that a reference to Lucilius is in any case more appropriate to Persius, as Lucretius was not a satirist. That is technically true, but his influence on Horace's *Satires* was immense.⁹ References to Lucretius appear in Horace's *Satire* 1, from *cetera de genere hoc* (13) on, culminating in the image of life as a banquet at the end of the poem. Persius, even apart from his close attention to Horace throughout his *Satires*, is interested in establishing himself as a philosophical poet no less than as a satirist in the Lucilian mold. A reference to Lucretius, with the artfully twisted meaning of *inane*, is certainly appropriate.¹⁰

It would be foolish to claim that emendation of the scholium from *Lucilii* to *Lucretii* is inevitable; in the absence of a complete text of Lucilius, certainty is not

6. K. Lachmann, *Kleinere Schriften zur classischen Philologie* (Berlin, 1876; repr. Berlin, 1974), p. 62, cited by Hendrickson, "The First Satire of Persius," p. 100.

7. L. P. Wilkinson, "Lucretius and the Love-Philtre," *CR* 63 (1949): 47 f. The problem is more complex than Wilkinson realized. He believed that Suetonius merely misread the name. That is unlikely unless the information were in a source where Lucretius and Lucullus might both be found in the same context; this suggests to me only an alphabetical, biographical dictionary, and I know of none at that time.

8. Note also that *Lucillum* is a variant for *Lucullum* at Pliny *NH* 25. 25 and Porphyrio on Horace *Epist.* 2. 2. 26, 37. The Pithoeanus of the scholia to Juvenal 9. 5 reads *Lucullus* for *Lucilius*. Monacensis 14482 (U) of the scholia to Persius reads *Lucii* for *Lucilii* on 1. 2, and Iulius Rufinianus p. 45. 6H reads *Lucius* for *Lucilius* (Lucilius frag. 40M); similarly Porphyrio on Horace *Epist.* 1. 1. 74, 2. 2. 94.

One other confusion of the names may appear in Servius on *Geo.* 2. 42 and *Aen.* 6. 625, where Lucretius is said to have written *aerea uox* rather than *ferrea uox* in the lines "non mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum / ferrea uox." The ascription to Lucretius was accepted by Lachmann in his edition, but the verse was hesitantly given to Lucilius by L. Mueller (*dubia* 7, p. 159) and by F. Marx (1364 f.) in their editions of that poet. See also G. Regel, *De Vergilio poetarum imitatore testimonia* (Diss. Göttingen, 1907), pp. 81 f.; M. Wigodsky, *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry* (Wiesbaden, 1972), pp. 98 f.

9. On Lucretius' satirical style see E. J. Kenney, *Lucretius "De rerum natura" Book III* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 17 f. and references there.

10. Hendrickson, "The First Satire of Persius," p. 112 (note), aptly compares Persius' alteration of the meaning of *primordia uocum* (Lucr. 4. 531) in *Sat.* 6. 3.

possible. But even if the attribution to Lucilius is correct, far more care is necessary in interpreting the fragment. If *Lucretii* is correct, then it is at once clear that the comment of the scholiast is wrong: only part of the line, not the whole line as the scholiast says, is found in Lucretius. That is not an argument against the emendation. It does, however, suggest that the whole verse may not be from Lucilius either. Scholiasts are notorious for their exaggeration in the matter of literary dependence; a famous example, much discussed, is Servius' note on *Ecl.* 10. 46: "hi omnes uersus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus." There are many others; Jocelyn, who has collected a number of them, is pessimistic about their accuracy: "Where Macrobius or a scholiast preserves the text of both sides of a parallelism, in only two cases does Virgil appear to have copied as much as a whole hexameter verse from his alleged predecessor."¹¹ We are quite safe in assuming that the scholiast on Persius knew no more than Servius. If the scholium on Persius 1. 2 does refer to Lucilius, we still need not possess a line of Lucilius, merely a part of a line, or a similar line. "The truth is that the difficulties of the text of Lucilius are for the most part inexplicable and its corruptions for the most part irremediable. What more than anything else enables the critic and the commentator of an ancient author to correct mistakes and to elucidate obscurities is their context; and a fragment has no context." So Housman, in his review of Marx's edition.¹² What the reader of a fragmentary text needs always to remember is the precariousness of his knowledge. We will never know for certain whether Persius was alluding to Lucilius or Lucretius in his opening verse.¹³ But it seems most probable that the verse that he had in mind, whoever wrote it, was not the same as the verse now printed as fragment 9 of Lucilius.¹⁴

J. E. G. ZETZEL
Princeton University

11. H. D. Jocelyn, "Ancient Scholarship and Virgil's Use of Republican Latin Poetry, II," *CQ* 15 (1965): 142.

12. A. E. Housman, "Luciliana," *CQ* 1 (1907): 53 = *Classical Papers* (Cambridge, 1972), 2:662.

13. Certainly, even if the whole line could safely be ascribed to Lucilius, Marx's reconstruction of the setting based on a supposed parallel with the council of the gods in *Odyssey* 1. 32 is not acceptable; the two passages are simply not close enough, nor would *in rebus* (sc. *humanis*) be appropriate in the mouth of a god. Housman's criticism ("Luciliana," p. 73 = *Classical Papers*, 2:683) of Marx's remarkable ability to divine the context of Lucilian fragments was quite just.

14. I am grateful to Diana White for her criticisms and suggestions.

ARISTOTLE *EN* 10. 7. 1177b6–15

In Book 10 of the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle proves the superiority of the intellectual over the moral virtues by showing that only the former satisfy every criterion of *εὐδαιμονία*.¹ Intellectual activity, we read in 1177a12 ff., is (1) closest to the divine or the most divine in ourselves, (2) most continuous, (3) accompanied by the most exquisite joy (*ἡδονή*, a22 f.), (4) self-sufficient (a27 ff.), (5) desired for its own sake (1177b1 ff.), and (6) associated with leisure (*σχολή*, b4 ff.). We are ready to believe that Aristotle did not keep the arguments for the last two propo-

1. The criteria reflect commonly held opinions. Franz Dirlmeier in his admirable commentary (*Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. Ernst Grumach, vol. 6: "Nikomachische Ethik" [Berlin, 1960], p. 591) notes a particularly frequent use of *δοκεῖ* in this section. *οἰόμεθα* (a22) has the same function. Aristotle does not introduce any new standards of value.