CHAPTER 1

Introduction
Lucilius and Second-Century Rome

Brian W. Breed, Rex Wallace, and Elizabeth Keitel

1 *ut noster Lucilius*

Gaius Lucilius, writing in the last third of the second century BC, effectively created the one literary genre that Romans thought of as "entirely ours," *tota nostra*. For Quintilian, whose characterization of satire this is, the tradition founded by Lucilius is distinctly Roman because, unlike other genres, it is not directly taken from the Greeks.[1] That element of differentiation from established generic canons is important at the time Lucilius was writing, but there is much more to what makes Roman satire from the beginning so crucially "ours,"[2] and the poet so distinctively "one of us" in the eyes of his fellow Romans. Lucilius' poems respond deeply to the cultural conditions in which they were created, and they give influential expression to forms and varied meanings of Roman identity. In the hands of other poets satire would continue to draw energy from the culture around it, even as definitions of Romanness, and Rome itself, changed.

The texts of later Roman satirists inspired by Lucilius' model were written after the republic that Lucilius knew and depicted in his poems had ceased to function. With this in mind Kirk Freudenburg has influentially called Lucilius a problem for the tradition he created.[3] As spokesman for and embodiment of a republican past, and in particular of republican *libertas*, Lucilius founds a genre identified with free speaking, so that later authors, writing under the restraints of changed political and social circumstances, can never hope to attain the ideal generic purpose that was achieved by the founding father. And so Lucilius is a weight around the necks of his generic successors, their permanent opponent in a battle over what it means to be a satirist, a battle that he won long ago. He is both the indispensible enabler of the Roman tradition of satire and a model who

[1] Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93 *satura quidem tota nostra est.*
[2] On this theme, see Freudenburg 2005b: 1–7.
[3] Freudenburg 2001.

closes down possibilities by showing his successors what they cannot do as much as what they can. Lucilius fills the negative space around the texts of Horace and Persius and Juvenal. He is what they avoid or fail at. He is what has been edited out. He is the promise, or the threat, of a version of satire that is never realized, a weapon that might be, but never is, brought to bear.[4]

Void and absence are also undisputable facts for readers of Lucilius' satires thanks to the state in which we find his text, pitifully disheveled remnants of a former abundance. When looking at those 1300 or so lines and partial lines, the easiest thing to see is that so much is missing. There is not even one complete poem. Few fragments are longer than two or three verses, none is longer than thirteen. At one time there were thirty books that expressed the fullness of a life (Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.30–4 *omnis vita senis*), and the excess of a flooding river carrying along far more than it needed to (Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.9–13). The present collection of papers follows in the direction Horace points us, back to the text of Lucilius' satires itself. We do not venture forth in the hope of recovering what has been lost.[5] All of the Lucilius that Horace had is not coming back.[6] But in looking at the fragments directly there are opportunities to challenge and enlarge the picture of Lucilius that is developed by his generic successors and to explore more deeply the creation of the expectations that later satirists grapple with. Our primary purpose is to ask what sorts of linguistic, cultural, and literary trends fed into the creation of Roman satire and what functions in society that satire was performing before Horace made his bid to control the legacy of satire by accommodating it, and memories of the genre's founder, to the conditions of his own day. We are encouraged in this direction by the substantial progress that has been made in recent years in understanding the fertile ground of early Roman poetry's productive phase. We enjoy new appreciation of the innovations and self-awareness of the texts that later poets could self-interestedly pigeonhole as archaic. We are attuned to the varieties of cultural processing they engage in at the intersection of Greek and Roman realities, and the complicated ways social and political forces made use of this new phenomenon we call "Roman literature."

This work has not fully taken account of Lucilius, and there are many questions waiting to be addressed. Some of these questions relate to who

[4] Juv. *Sat.* 1.165–8, Pers. *Sat.* 1.114–15; cf. Macrob. *Sat.* 3.16.17 *acer et violentus poeta*.
[5] Fiske 1920 is representative of a former optimism we can no longer share.
[6] There is no evidence for Lucilius at Herculaneum; Marx remains safe from the adverse fate Housman conjured for him: "none has such cause to wish that the earth may lie heavy on Herculaneum and that no roll of Lucilius may ever emerge into the light of day" (1907: 74).

Lucilius was, that is, to the role he created for himself as the author of Roman satire and a member of higher levels of Roman society. Equally important are questions related to who the first audience for satire was and how they might have categorized Lucilius' poetry in an attempt to understand it. Writing at a particularly crucial moment for the understanding of later Romans, such as Cicero, of what it means to be Roman, Lucilius represents an influential expression of Roman ideology, but how that operated in practice is not fully clear. Some, for example, would have Lucilius and his satire identified with the particular values of a Roman elite, its audience comprised of a male aristocracy for whom Lucilius acts as spokesman. But others would extend the reach of satire to a so-called "middle class," and even to a broad sweep of Roman and Italian society. The poet himself is readily identified with his text, which, though crowded with diverse and conflicting opinions, is also stamped with a personality and an outlook, along with numerous appearances of the poet's name.[7] But we find ourselves without information we need to judge on questions that we might like to ask from a historical perspective, for example, where Lucilius stood in the Gracchan crisis, or what he made of Marius. And this is not merely a consequence of fragmentation and the chance of survival. We can see that "Lucilius" speaks not just with a personal voice, but rather as a composite of various ways of speaking drawn from a range of texts and practices including political life, drama, and philosophy, as well as the expansive Roman social world encompassed in friendships, enmities, parties, letters, love affairs, marriage, masters and slaves, commerce, conversation, and so on. Among Rome's early literary products Lucilian satire is distinctively effective at connecting with social realities. The connections between satire and other contemporary discourses revealed in language and metrics, in scenarios and settings, in the multiplication of speakers, in addition to justifying Lucilius' reputation as a painter of the rich pageant of Roman life, are good at suggesting the conditions under which the new genre of satire coalesced by means of a collaboration between the poet and his audiences. For satire does not just represent and reflect on Roman social practices, it fundamentally is a social practice, with many participants and multiple simultaneous sources contributing to its meaning and authority.[8] At the same time, the personality in the text is also important to its impact and legacy. The poet's life is itself an object of interest, not as a mere exercise in biographical documentation, or in naïve belief in the transparent

[7] Uses of the poet's name are conveniently gathered by Coffey 1976: 45 n. 59.
[8] Habinek 2005.

individuality of the poetic *ego*, but as an essential part of satire's participation in shifts in attitudes towards literature, education, language, and new possibilities for proper ways of being in society. In all of these areas, Rome in Lucilius' day was negotiating Greek influence. And so among the most pressing issues raised by reading Lucilius' fragments is how the foundational identification of satire with what it means to be Roman and satire's unique status as "wholly ours" in the panoply of Latin literary genres are implicated in the complicated ways Rome was managing its new status as an imperial power.

So, we can agree with Freudenburg that later satirists had a Lucilius problem, but that does not mean conceding that the original version of satire was unproblematic or that it was oriented towards some singular purpose. Features of Lucilian satire with which later authors are forced to contend, such as his freedom of speaking, the mixing of Greek and Latin, the development of an authorial persona, and even something as mechanical as writing in hexameters, represent choices by Lucilius operating within a range of possibilities open to the author at the time of composition. One goal of the present volume is to expose some of those possibilities and the complications they entail, which means that it is not always possible to make a final choice among different lines of interpretation. The Lucilius that we find reflected in the papers collected here is, therefore, not a single unity of settled meaning. Rather we believe that Lucilian satire's relationship to issues such as genre and politics can only be seen within a range of contradictions and complications. The disputed composition of Lucilius' audience has already been mentioned. In addition, aspects of Lucilius' satires make it look like he was a self-aware generic innovator; other perspectives suggest that he would not know "Roman satire" if it hit him in the face. He could be, and frequently is, claimed as an aristocratic partisan. He has also been taken for a popularly oriented voice of reason.

When we add the element of how Lucilius appears in the work of his generic successors and in the eyes of other ancient readers, things are no more clear. He has rightly been called "a bundle of contradictions adaptable to the varied narratives of later generations" (Gowers 2012: 310), and our attempt to describe a version or versions of who Lucilius was at the time he was writing his poems must make concessions to the degree to which subsequent generations of Roman poets and readers used Lucilius to suit their needs. The interpretation of his text is wrapped up with various instances of identification with the poet. So, for example, in Horace's day Lucilius was a bone of contention. Horace casts himself in conflict with some devotees of Lucilius, *fautores Lucili*, who policed the poet's

reputation, meaning to constrain others' ability to do what they wanted with the poet's example: "our Lucilius, not yours."[9] Of course Horace was not dissuaded from simplifying and cherry-picking in order to set Lucilius up as a foil, and this Lucilius, Horace's Lucilius, verbose, uncareful, and free, looms over later attempts to control what satire is by reference to the creator. But Horace was not the first to identify with Lucilius as an author and as a Roman, and the interest in claiming Lucilius was not restricted to generic contexts.[10] For Cicero, from whom we take our section heading (*ut noster Lucilius*, *Fin.* 1.9), Lucilius is "ours" in the sense of "one of us."[11] Cicero makes the same appeal to Ennius (*noster Ennius*, *Arch.* 22.1), and the two together are national poets and spokesmen, or at least allies in representing Latin literary culture as opposed to Greek, but Lucilius may be "ours" in a way that Ennius was not. Ennius' biography is one of cultural transition, from multi-lingual provincial with Greek, Oscan, and Latin "hearts," (Gell. 17.17.1), to honored citizen (Cic. *Brut.* 79), from paid teacher and *semigraecus* (Suet. *Gram.* 1) to national poet. In the perspective of later Romans Ennius was received as "one of us," a fact the poet himself speaks to with apparent pride in his epic (*Ann.* fr. 525 Sk.). Ennius' pride in his status was well earned. More than any poet who had preceded him in Roman life, Ennius was able to define his own, new role, as learned authority and modernizer, with valuable skills that could meet the needs of a changing society. On the basis of those skills Ennius himself built relationships with elite Romans outside of the patron–client system, even though he likely started there.[12] He, nevertheless, seems to rub up against a prevailing expectation that poets were to be dependents of the powerful. His most famous self-representation was masked. The so-called "Good Companion" of the *Annales* (268–86 Sk.), identified by Aelius Stilo, one of Lucilius' own prominent contemporaries, as the poet's self-portrait (Gell. 12.4), is defined only in relationship to a more powerful figure, through the support he offers as confidant and friend to one actively engaged in politics and military affairs.

[9] The author of the spurious lines prefixed to *Sat.* 1.10 appears to be well-informed about the players in an ongoing controversy about Lucilius and his text; active interest in the satirist is also described by Suetonius *Gram.*

[10] Freedom of speaking and criticism is chief among the characteristics invoked for Lucilius in one source from around the time of the *Satires* (Cic. *Fam* 12.16.3, Trebonius' Lucilian agression). But that is not the only summation of Lucilius' distinctive quality at the time. For Varro, the poet represents the epitome of *gracilitas* (ap. Gell. *NA* 6.14); cf. Svarlien 1994.

[11] Also Gell. 20.8.4 *Lucilium…nostrum*, cf. Lucr. 1.117: *Ennius noster*; *OLD* s.v. 7.

[12] Rossi and Breed 2006: 402–8, Feeney 2016: 187–9.

For Lucilius, always a figure of "strong social definition" to his readers (Freudenburg 2001: 24), the existing categories for poets were an even poorer fit than they had been for Ennius. Lucilius was nobody's client, had no need to wear a mask, and he was, if anything, a bad companion, at least in his verse ("now Gaius since it's you doing us harm in turn with your sniping," *nunc, Gai, quoniam incilans nos laedis vicissim*, 1075W [1035M]; "along with that jerk, Lucilius," *cum improbo illo … Lucilio*, 929–30W [821–2M]; "for you they're all lovely, valiant, but I'm a jerk; OK," *omnes formonsi, fortes tibi, ego improbus; esto* 1077W [1026M]). He must have been better company in life. He associated on intimate terms with important people.[13] He likely did so at least in part by virtue of his own birth. Where Ennius and the other early poets entered Roman life as outsiders of lower status, Lucilius' profile more closely resembles the aristocrats who were pioneering Latin prose literature in the same decades he was developing his satires.[14] Horace, intent on representing himself as not in this league, refers to Lucilius as a man of superior rank (*Sat.* 1.10.48, 2.1.75), and he turned to Ennius' good companion as an appropriate model for his own relationship to a great man, namely Maecenas (*Sat.* 1.5.44, 1.3.93–4; cf. Hardie 2007: 134–6).[15] The fact that Lucilius was with Scipio's army at Numantia at equestrian rank (*eques militaverat*, Vell. Pat. 2.9.4) indicates that he was a Roman citizen, though his birth at Suessa Aurunca (Juv. *Sat.* 1.20 with schol.), a Latin colony just over the border from Latium in Campania, would not by default have given him that status.[16] In the late second century there was a senator by the name of Manius Lucilius, a possible brother for the poet; one is mentioned at 455W [427M].[17] A Lucilia, who came from a senatorial family (*stirpis senatoriae*, Vell. Pat. 2.29.2), married Pompeius Strabo and became the mother of Pompey the Great. The

[13] For the intimacy between Lucilius and Scipio and Laelius cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.71–4 and PsAcro's anecdote (ad 72) about the napkin chase around the dining room.

[14] An observation of Coffey 1976: 38 n. 27. Known or likely contemporaries of Lucilius include the historians L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (cos. 133), Sempronius Tuditanus (perhaps cos. 129, and possibly addressed in book 30; cf. Cichorius 1908: 189–92), Fannius (also connected to Scipio), and Cloelius Antipater.

[15] Lucilius' rival Accius was of origins similar to Horace. It seems Lucilius held him in no high regard (844W [794M]), while, for what it is worth, Accius himself seems to have deferred to no man's pedigree (Val. Max. 3.7.11).

[16] Marx 1904–5: 1.xviii doubts Lucilius' citizenship, and skepticism is still sometimes expressed, e.g. Gratwick 1982: 163; Feeney 2005: 237, 2016: 187; but Cichorius's refutation (1908: 14–22) of Marx has persuaded many, such as Gruen, "The conclusion [that Lucilius was not a citizen] can be categorically rejected" (1992: 278), and Goldberg, "the first poet to come from the very ranks of the aristocracy" (2005: 166).

[17] Cichorius 1908: 1–7.

testimonies of a family relationship between the poet and Pompey through Lucilia disagree on what exactly the relationship was, whether grandfather, uncle, or great-uncle, which may be reason to be skeptical.[18] A belief in the poet's massive landholdings in the South is uncertain at best.[19] Jerome says that he was given a public funeral at Naples (*Chron.* 1914), so he likely had enduring ties to Campania, but he was also the owner of a noteworthy house in Rome.[20] He had a name to protect in the capital,[21] and others very well known in the city had to be on the lookout for him. Among the most notorious targets of his abuse we find the *princeps senatus* (L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, book 1), a future consul (Q. Mucius Scaevola, book 2), and a censor (Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, cf. 636–46W [676–86M], Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.67 *laeso … Metello*). Lucilius was, we can conclude, a substantial and independent figure, enmeshed in the life and high society of the *urbs*. That he chose not to seek elected office but pursued a career as a writer of verse makes him unlike any Roman of high social status who came before him. Only Accius could challenge Lucilius for the claim to be the first true Roman poet, that is to say, a Roman citizen who chose to pursue poetry as his vocation.[22]

Connections between Lucilius and Rome run deep not only in the poet's life, but also in the linguistic fabric of his text. For all that the satires express a brilliant diversity of language, it is supported on a foundation of urbane Latin. Though Lucilius' own roots were not from the capital itself, he could make a point of shortcomings in the language of others, including those from backgrounds not unlike his own (Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.56, p. 370W [1322M]; 232W [1130M]). The Latin that Lucilius speaks is, in other words, "our" language, at least in the eyes of the likes of Cicero. Or it is an even better version of it. In the *Brutus* (258) Cicero says that Laelius and Scipio and nearly all the men of that time spoke correct Latin, if only by virtue of their existence in an edenic state of language not yet corrupted

[18] Schol. ad Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.29 *avus*, ad *Sat.* 2.1.75 *avunculus* (*maior avunculus* in some mss. and in Porphyrio ad loc).

[19] The manuscripts of *De Or.* 2.284 (about enmity for letting herds graze on *ager publicus*) are divided between Lucullus and Lucilius. A possible descendent, Lucilius Hirrus, was a rancher in Bruttium (Pliny *HN* 9.171); Horace has been taken to locate Lucilius in the vicinity of Tarentum (*Sat.* 1.6.58–9). Fragments that speak to the horse trade and the appreciation of horses (e.g. 505–6, 511–13W [476, 1278, 506–8M]) are hardly evidence of Lucilius' personal devotion to such pursuits or of his wealth.

[20] Asc. *Pis.* 12, with the proviso that the text depends on emendation.

[21] The poet sued a comic actor for naming him on stage, and lost (*Rhet. Her.* 2.19).

[22] Feeney 2005: 237.

by experts and foreigners.[23] Similarly Papirius Paetus' admirably old-fashioned and native style of wit (*Romani veteres atque urbani sales*) reminds Cicero of the speech of Lucilius or another man of that generation (*Fam.* 9.15). Here is what looks like a role for Lucilius to play, as a defender of good Latin, along with Roman identity, but that turns out inevitably to be a complicated negotiation. Lucilius book 1, for example, is already bewailing the death of *Romanitas* in culture and in language.[24] Meanwhile, the extent to which Lucilius imports new words and foreign words into the language of Roman poetry is among the most notable features of his text. This, in fact, is central to Romanness as the satires constitute it. The Greek in the satires is not some foreign strain insufficiently suppressed and bubbling out, nor is it a necessity imposed on culturally captive Rome by her Greek conquests. Greek words are, rather, a sign of Rome's confidence in its position with respect to Mediterranean culture, especially in the literary sphere. Greek is, for example, prominent in the language of literary attack and defense already in the earliest satires (e.g. 672–5W [700–2M]). Roman poets and Roman audiences have their own expectations for decorum in "Greek" tragedy (720–1W [588–9M], 723W [587M]). This is not to say that Greek in Lucilius' satires is restricted to learned contexts; far from it.[25] Nor is mastery of bilingual usage and etiquette universal among speakers in the satires. Ridicule falls on those, like Albucius in 87–93W [88–94M], who fail to observe the distinction between Latin's capacity to enrich itself linguistically and a Roman using Greek to pretend to be someone other than himself.

Lucilius is not just a bilingual adept, but the poet frequently acts as commentator on the translation between Greek and Latin. The play of native elements vs. foreign imports is highly productive, just as it is in other second-century literary genres and in Roman republican culture as a whole. This volume's particular emphasis on language reflects the importance of Lucilius' satire's embeddedness in what were dynamic times for evolving Roman identity.[26] In the decades in which Lucilius was writing the Romans were interacting with the broader Mediterranean world as the dominant power, while the cities and populations of the Italian peninsula were feeling out their relationship with Rome. Lucilius' fragments offer a

[23] That Caecilius and Pacuvius are cited as exceptions indicates that Cicero means to include poets, and therefore Lucilius, among the proper Latinists. On the passage, Dench 2005: 300–1.
[24] Cf. Freudenburg 2001: 151–5
[25] Mariotti 1960: 50–81.
[26] Subject of important recent scholarship on republican, and imperial, Rome, Dench 2005, Wallace-Hadrill 2008.

vantage point to observe important cultural dynamics related to Rome's adoption and adaptation of the cultural influences of the Greek world, notably in the guises of philosophy and literary theory, along with Greek customs and luxuries, and the terminology used to describe them. That said, those fragments cannot be treated simply as a pass through to social reality. The language of Lucilius' satires might occasionally aspire to effects of naturalism as if documenting the talk of the marketplace or brothel or dining room, but it also manifests stylization and embellishment worthy of a Plautus or a Petronius. He merits his reputation as a virtuoso in command of the full stylistic range of Latin for purposes of characterization and parody, whether the register is colloquial or highly formalized.[27] The fragments deploy Latin extracted from and evocative of diverse social settings, such as dinner parties, the courts, and the forum, but also Latin that was at home in different literary genres like drama, epic, and literary criticism.

For their diverse language and content, Lucilius' satires reach out along multiple trajectories, Greek, Italian, and Latin, society-facing and text-based, and at their intersections we often find that Ennius was already there. His model enriches and complicates Lucilius' project in equal measures. He is, in the first place, a direct predecessor as himself the author of four books of miscellaneous poems called *Saturae* (Porphyrio ad Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.46). He also contributes in his role as epic poet, writing in the same meter that Lucilius made standard for satire and subjected both to criticism and to apparently appreciative literary commentary. That Lucilius was both Rome's first satirist and a successor following along trails blazed by Ennius is a paradox that ancient authorities attempted to deal with. For Diomedes (*GLK* 1.485), for example, Lucilius' particular role as founder is expressed in editing down Ennian variety and choosing a focus for satire, namely invective, that subsequently becomes the basis for the generic tradition represented by Horace, Persius, and Juvenal.[28] The relationship between Lucilius and Ennius not only shows that the boundaries and expectations of satire had yet to be fully established when Lucilius was at work, but also confirms the more basic truth that a literary genre is not something that can simply be invented, but always requires negotiating for recognition by audiences on the basis of both innovation and

[27] Petersmann 1999.
[28] For Lucilius, and not Ennius, as the inventor, cf. also Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.46–9, 64–7, 2.1.62–3, Quint. 10.1.93–5; Goldberg in this volume for discussion.

continuities.[29] We do not fully know what sorts of back-and-forth Ennius staged between his own roles as epic poet and author of lesser genres.[30] In the more fully attested case of Lucilius, satire's appetite for literary controversies is not simply something one can do with satire, but rather something satire does in the process of defining itself. Part of that is the marking out of boundaries by differentiation from literary forms with which audiences were already familiar. This is also a factor in, for example, the selection of meters. The iambic and trochaic meters in Ennius' satires would have invited his readers to associate satire closely with comedy, helped by the fact that Ennius himself wrote for the stage. Such associations are continued in Lucilius, though on a strictly textualized basis, where appeals to comedy do not evoke possible performances, but picture realities you can only find in books. The comic scenario of 793–814W [771–92M] is, for example, set not in a Greek neverland, but, implausibly, in Rome, with the threat of the Roman courts hanging over the hijinks.[31] The eventual adoption of the hexameter as the unvarying meter serves to place satire even more completely in the world of books, while giving Lucilian satire further definition as both a departure from the mixed metrical format of Ennian satire and as a variety "not-epic." In style and diction too, there are important relationships with other sorts of contemporary texts, not only poetry but also literary prose.

Our grasp of the full range of associations Lucilius' satires would have evoked for his first readers is greatly hindered by the state of the texts. So much has been lost, not only of Lucilius, but also of the tragedy, comedy, historiography, and oratory that was being written in the later decades of the second century. It is a particularly dark period in Roman literary history, but it is also highly consequential, when Rome was flooded with new cultural influences in the aftermath of Pydna. The creation of satire, happening as "Roman literature" itself was emerging as an organizing concept and field of enquiry, should be counted among the chief consequences.[32] The late second century witnessed the first steps towards the professionalization of literary study at Rome by grammarians, and Lucilius quickly became an object of their teaching and scholarship. In the *De Grammaticis*

[29] We have to disagree with Goldberg (2005: 170); "Nor, as a pioneer in a new style of writing, did he have to concern himself with the expectations of that audience or with any complex of generic conventions." The very absence of clearcut generic conventions makes audience expectations all the more crucial.
[30] Goldberg in this volume takes the evidence as far as it will go.
[31] Goldberg 2005: 159–60.
[32] Feeney 2016: 160–3 on the period of developing literary criticism.