

beginning of a poem. If so, there is a powerful and completely objective argument that the "*otium stanza*" does not belong to Catullus 51.

University College, Dublin

J.A. Richmond

---

HORACE *Sermones*, I. X. 64-67

---

Fuerit Lucilius, inquam,  
 comis et urbanus, fuerit limatior idem  
 quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor,  
 quamque poetarum seniorum turba...

N. Rudd, in an article on the *Origins of Satira*<sup>1</sup>), vividly describes the exasperation of an imaginary young student of Horace confronted by the controversy that has raged for so long around the interpretation of this passage. A good idea of the age and notoriety of the problem can be gathered from that part of Rudd's article where he sets out the names of the principal contenders and the standpoints they have taken on the question of the identity of the *auctor* of l. 66. The list of those who maintain that this *auctor* is Lucilius includes, as well as the ancient commentators, the names of Orelli, C.F. Hermann, Wickham, Palmer, Hendrickson and Fairclough. Under the banner of Ennius are ranged Dousa, Müller, Kroll, Schanz-Hosius, Lejay and Laidlaw. A third band, with fine impartiality, rejects the claims of both and counts Nipperdey, Heinze, Fraenkel and Morris amongst its numbers<sup>2</sup>). It is with this band that Rudd throws in his lot. Van Rooy<sup>3</sup>), on the other hand, prefers to

---

1) *Phoenix* 14 (1960), 36-44. The same writer's *Satires of Horace* (Cambridge, 1966), while not re-opening the specific problem here discussed, contains a most illuminating analysis of this satire in relation to I. iv and II: i (pp 86 ff).

2) For detailed references, see Rudd, *Phoenix* 40-41.

3) *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden, 1965)

follow Büchner<sup>4</sup>), in identifying the *auctor* with Ennius. Those who would care to pursue the history of the controversy further are referred to C.F.Hermann's *Disputatio de Satirae Romanae Auctore* (Marburg, 1841).

Whatever else emerges from all this, one thing at least is certain: namely, that Horace, not as a rule the most enigmatical of writers, has for once at least failed here to make his meaning beyond all peradventure plain. The question is evidently not susceptible of easy solution and may well remain an open one for as long as the *Satires* of Horace continue to be read. This, perhaps, can be the only justification for the present attempt to deal with a problem to which only Horace himself could give the answer that would put an end to all argument; though, doubtless, even then there would still be those prepared to set their own opinions over his!

Much of the controversy has turned – and rightly – upon the grammatical construction of these lines. In this connection it is worth quoting the comments of H. Stephanus and Xylander on the passage. The former paraphrases as follows: *limatior quam necesse esset auctori carminis rudis et Graecis intacti*<sup>5</sup>). Xylander's interpretation is similar: *habeatur, inquit, id quod non est, politior et tersior quam ab auctore novi carminis et in quo praeceuntem Graecum nullum habuit quem sequeretur, fuerit exspectandum aut requirendum*<sup>6</sup>). This is still the interpretation commonly put forward by that body of opinion that holds that Lucilius is here being compared with himself.

Hermann referred Horace's mode of expression to that usage wherein the simple comparative construction replaces that used at other times is expressed in Greek by ἢ κατά and in Latin by *quam pro* (i.e. disproportion). Among the examples he cites are Sophocles *OT* 1374, ἔργ' ἐστὶ κρείσσον' ἀγκόνης εἰργασμένα, and *OC* 439, μεῖζω κολαστὴν τῶν πρὶν ἡμωρτημένων; and from Latin, Plautus *Rud.* 20, maiore multa multat quam litem auferunt; Seneca *Hipp.* 1032, malum maius timore, and Tacitus *Hist.* iii. 53, litteras ad Vespasianum composuit iactantius quam ad principem. On the basis of these and similar examples he reached the following conclusion: *Lucilium limatiorem fuisse...*

4) K. Büchner, review of U. Knoche, *Die Römische Satire, Gnomon* 22 (1950), 239ff.

5) *QHF poemata, novis scholiis et argumentis ab H. St. illustrata* (Paris, 1575).

6) *QHF poemata ... accuratissime castigata etc.* (Neostadii, 1590).

quam pro ea condicione in qua auctorem rudis Graecisque intacti carminis versari consentaneum fuerit<sup>7)</sup>.

This conclusion, it will be seen, is not significantly different from the interpretations arrived at by Stephanus and Xylander quoted above, nor from that of Lambinus who says: demus (inquit Horatius) Lucilium limatiorem fuisse quam auctorem satyrae Graecis intactae esse videmus, quod idem fere valet ac si dicat, demus Lucilium fuisse limatiorem quam ipse sit<sup>8)</sup>. Lambinus, however, quarrels with those who, while entertaining no doubt that the *auctor* was to be identified with Lucilius, reached their conclusion by a different route, that is to say, by regarding *rudis* not as a genitive, but as a nominative: nomen *rudis* (says Lambinus magisterially) in patrio casu accipio et cum voce *carminis* coniungo.

Probably few since those days have attempted to treat *rudis* as anything else but a genitive – and understandably, for, where different aspects or qualities of the same person or thing are under comparison, Latin uses a formula like *artem... magis magnam atque uberem quam difficilem et obscuram* (Cic. *de Orat.* i. 190) or *Celer tuus disertus magis est quam sapiens* (Cic. *Att.* X. i. 4), or that other construction involving two comparatives, e.g. *suam vitam superiorem... esse quam innox(i)orem* (Cato *Orat.* fr. 10. 2 (Jord.)), which gained in popularity with writers like Livy, Velleius, Valerius Maximus, Tacitus, Gellius etc.<sup>9)</sup>. It would, therefore, be surprising to find a turn of phrase like *limatior quam rudis*, though this in effect is not so very different from saying *magis limatus quam rudis*, at which no one would cavil.

Those who attempted to read the passage along these lines tended to come to grief for want of a parallel, and one can only blush for Cruquius<sup>10)</sup>, who thought he had found one in Columella xii *praef.* 5, idcirco (muliebre sexum) timidior reddidit quam virilem! Hermann remarks in this connection: scilicet dicturum fuisse *limatior quam rudior* and goes on to say of this construction: prorsus singulare exemplum est Tacit. *Agric.* c. 4, speciem excelsae magnaue gloriae vehementius quam caute

7) Hermann, *op. cit.* 15.

8) *QHF ... opera D.L. emendatus* (Paris, 1604-5).

9) Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, II. 2. 2, 162.

10) *QHF cum commentariis et enarrationibus commentatoris veteris et J. Cruquii* (Antwerp, 1578).

appetebat [*sic*]<sup>11</sup>). It may be said at once that in his latter assertion he is mistaken, for the use of the positive adverb in the second member of such a comparison occurs again in Tacitus, in *Hist.* i. 83, *nimia pietas vestra acrius quam considerate excitavit*. These two examples from Tacitus would seem to open up a more promising line of inquiry than Tac. *Hist.* iii. 53, *litteras ad Vespasianum composuit iactantius quam ad principem*, cited by Hermann, or the two further Tacitean examples of the same construction adduced by Rudd<sup>12</sup>, *corruptius quam in privata domo habiti* (*Hist.* i. 22) and *segnius quam ad bellum incedens* (*Ibid.* iii. 40). These are merely compendious ways of saying, e. g. in the case of *Hist.* iii. 53, *litteras ad Vespasianum composuit iactantius quam eum oportuit qui ad principem scriberet*, and are less apposite in the present context than the examples quoted from *Agr.* 4 and *Hist.* i. 83. The use of the positive in the second part of the comparison following the comparative in the first is to be found again in Livy xxx. 15. 8, *non locuta est ferocius quam acceptum poculum impavide hausit*, though with the difference here that each of the two clauses has its own verb.

In matters of this sort, Tacitus is, of course, a great individualist, and the question at once arises whether this usage, comparative – *quam* – positive, is ever in fact found outside of Tacitus, or extended beyond the adverb to the adjective. To both of these questions an affirmative answer may be returned, since an exact parallel to the construction *limatior quam rudis* has been unearthed by Wistrand in Vitruvius v. 11. 2, *exedra... tertia parte longior sit quam lata*<sup>13</sup>). Here, then, are three (or four, if we count Livy xxx. 15. 8) examples of the positive replacing the comparative in constructions involving the comparison of attributes (whether expressed adjectivally or adverbially) of the same person, thing or action.

If, on this basis, we admit that *rudis* may conceivably be not a genitive but a nominative, obviously *rudis* and *intacti* must be separated and a different role assigned to *et. Idem* and *et may*

11) Hermann, *op. cit.* 5, note 4.

12) Rudd, *Phoenix* 41.

13) E. Wistrand, *De Vitruvi sermone in Apophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata* (Gotoburgi, 1936) p. 21: *rursus notabile est adiectivum posterius ad prius non assimilari, v. 11. 2 exedra ... lata. corrigantur igitur quae legimus in Schmalz-Hofmann p. 462: „Die Verbindung von Kom. im ersten und Positiv im zweiten Glied ist auf Tac. beschränkt.“*

then be taken together in the sense of *both... and* or *at once... and equally*, as e.g. in *Odes* II. xix. 28, *sed idem | pacis eras mediusque belli*, where, as in the passage under discussion, this form of coupling is used to combine two very strongly contrasted aspects of the same person. The words *fuert limatior idem | quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor* will then contain not one concession, but two, and the whole passage may be rendered somewhat as follows: 'Granted, I say, that Lucilius was good-tempered and urbane, granted that he was more polished than rough – and this though the author of a kind of verse untouched by the Greeks – and granted that he was more polished than the general run of older poets...'

A difficulty remains in that it may be objected (as, for example, by Rudd) that 'the two *quam*'s must surely have parallel constructions, and this is made even more certain by the enclitic *-que*<sup>14</sup>). In the first place, the use of parallel constructions is not, of course, mandatory on the poet and, in the second place, if it were, the *-que* by itself would suffice to achieve this without the repetition of *quam*. The second *quam*, however, is by no means otiose: it is introduced to discharge the important function of referring the second or external standard of comparison (*poetarum seniorum turba*) clearly and emphatically back to the head-word *limatior*.

The movement and rhythm of the verse may also be called in defence of this interpretation. Most experienced readers of Latin will tend naturally to make a pause after *rudis* and by so doing achieve a grace and balance that are lost if such a pause is not observed. To read the clause *fuert limatior idem | quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor* in any other way is to produce an uncouth mouthful of words, too long for convenient utterance, devoid alike of elegance and intelligibility, and of a turbidity surely equal to anything that Horace could have found to censure in Lucilius.

A more copious fund of examples of the construction, comparative – *quam* – positive, would certainly be desirable in support of the present interpretation of the passage. But, common as it is to the workaday Latinity of Vitruvius and to the sophisticated prose of the conscious literary stylist, Tacitus, its existence should not be overlooked where, as in this place, it may make sense of what is otherwise a puzzle.

14) Rudd, *Phoenix* 42.

It remains briefly to consider the implications of this interpretation. The most important perhaps and certainly the most obvious is that it removes any possible uncertainty regarding the identity of the *auctor* of l. 66, who can now be no one else but Lucilius. This is consistent with Horace's own clear statement in *Serm.* II. i. 62-3:

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

and it avoids recourse to such implausible equivocations as supposing that the *inventor* of l. 48, whom most, though by no means all (e.g. Lejay) take to be Lucilius, must in some way be different from the *auctor* of l. 66. Above all, it would lay once and for all the ghost of Ennius, a ghost first raised by Dousa<sup>15</sup>). The exorcism is necessary, for Ennius is an author who is never referred to by Horace, either expressly or by implication, as a writer of satire, and – no less important – whose branch of satire ancient literary theory was at pains to distinguish from that practised by Lucilius and those who owned him as their master<sup>16</sup>).

The tenor of Horace's argument will be sufficiently clear to students of satire and need only very summarily be stated here.

Horace, having begun by making a concession ('hoc tribuens', l. 5), is prepared, if only for the purpose of his argument, to concede the following further points:

1) Lucilius was *comis* and *urbanus*. Horace himself uses the first of these epithets in connection with the critical propensities of Lucilius in l. 53, *nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Acci?* but the choice of epithet here is probably faintly derisive and may be supposed to represent the point of view of Horace's *adversarius*, rather than his own. That the *Lucili fautores* claimed *urbanitas* for him as well is clear from the fact that the stock Ciceronian description of Lucilius is *doctus et perurbanus* (*de Orat.* i. 72, ii. 25; cf. also *de Fin.* i. 7, where, however, the *doctrina* of Lucilius is stated to be *mediocris* in comparison with his *urbanitas*

15) Edition of Cruquius (Lugd. Bat., 1597) *access. J. Dousae* '... *commentariolus*. The passage, quoted here from the edition of Schrevelius (Lugd. Bat., 1670), p. 483, runs as follows: 'esto; fuerit, inquam, Lucilius urbanus et comis, demus etiam limatiorem, id est tersiorem ac emendatiorem fuisse quam Ennium nostrum, primum illum satyrae inventorem, aut etiam secutam seniorum, hoc est antiquiorum Lucilio, poetarum turbam.

16) Diomedes, p. 485 K; Quintilian, X. i. 95.

*summa*). Horace's indignation at those who bestowed the same pair of epithets, *comis et urbanus* (*Serm.* I. iv. 90), upon the society slanderer who spared no one, absent or present, is noteworthy and significant.

2) Lucilius was, on balance, more polished than rough, and this, notwithstanding the originality of his achievement and the want of an exactly parallel Greek precedent. *Limatus*, like *gracilis*, is one of the customary epithets of the plain style<sup>17</sup>), and this view of Lucilius clearly derives from a famous canon of Varonian criticism which expressly instanced Lucilius as an example of the *χαρακτῆρ ἰσχνός* or *genus gracile*: vera autem et propria huiuscemodi formarum exempla in Latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit ubertatis Pacuvium, gracilitatis Lucilium, mediocritatis Terentium (Gell. vi. 14. 6; cf. Fronto, p. 131 van den Hout, in poetis autem quis ignorat ut gracilis sit Lucilius, and Petronius, Sat. 4, schedium Lucilianae humilitatis). It may be noted further that Pliny said of Lucilius' stylistic consciousness, *primus condidit stili nasum*<sup>18</sup>), and also that Quintilian, while objecting to the indiscriminating enthusiasm of the *dediti amatores* of Lucilius, dissents equally from what Horace says about his muddy flow<sup>19</sup>).

3) The pioneering aspect of Lucilius' work is amply attested, most notably by Horace himself in *Serm.* II. i. 62-3.

4) Lucilius was *limatior* than the *poetarum seniorum turba*. It is not altogether clear from this whether by the *poetarum seniorum turba* Horace means the older poets generally, or whether the expression carries a hint of Lucilius' attitude to the activities of the literary Establishment of his day, the *collegium poetarum*, to which he stood in vigorous reaction. Horace, in l. 53, has succinctly recalled his feud with Accius, possibly the *magister collegii*, whose meeting place at the Temple of the Camenae he had presented with an outsize statue of himself<sup>20</sup>). Want of polish (*nitor*) and finish (*summa in excolendis operibus manus*) are indeed charges which Quintilian laid at the door of both Accius and Pacuvius, though these faults he attributes to their times rather than to want of ability in the writers themselves<sup>21</sup>). There is a certain irony in the circumstance that Horace should here be levelling precisely the same charge against Lucilius, the castigator

17) Cf. A. E. Douglas, *Brutus* (Oxford, 1966), xliiff.

18) *N.H. praef.* 7.

19) *X.* i. 94.

20) Pliny, *N.H.* XXIV. 10.

21) *X.* i. 97.

of Accius. The allowance that Quintilian makes for Accius also serves to increase our confidence in Horace's criticism, to highlight his objectivity, and even to demonstrate a degree of generosity towards the object of his disapproval, when we discover that he has allowed precisely the same grounds for charity to operate in Lucilius' case.

Horace, then, in these four concessions appears to retreat from his standpoint, but it is only a question of *reculer pour mieux sauter*, and his denunciation, when it comes, falls with the greater force, though it is directed not so much at Lucilius himself as at his too partial *fautores*. Granted, he says, that Lucilius was all of these things that are claimed for him; none the less, were he alive to-day, the more rigorous standards of literary taste now prevailing would compel him to stop indulging his bent for facile and hastily improvised composition, to take the trouble to write properly, to curb his natural garrulity and scratch his head and gnaw his fingernails to the quick in his anxiety to trim away everything that stood between him and perfection: *detereret sibi multa...*

University of Liverpool

William Barr

---

BUCOLIC-LYRIC  
MOTIFS AND DRAMATIC NARRATIVE  
IN LONGUS' DAPHNIS AND CHLOE

---

The second century A.D. pastoral Greek love romance, *Daphnis and Chloe* comes at the end of a rather long tradition of bucolic literature in classical antiquity and occupies a kind of mediatorial position in the history of Western European literature thereafter. Longus' prose romance has influenced more than a few prominent writers and artists working in the pastoral tradition from the Renaissance to modern times: Torquato Tasso, Guarini, J. Sannazaro, Rodrigo de Cota, Jorge de Montemayor, Alonzo Perez, Lope de Vega, Philipp Sidney, Robert Greene to mention several<sup>1)</sup>.

---

1) For Longus influence on the pastoral tradition in Western literature,