



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Goh, Ian (2018) A note on a euphemism in Lucilius. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 109 , ISSN 0073-0688.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/13733/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively

A NOTE ON A EUPHEMISM IN LUCILIUS¹

Gaius Lucilius, the inventor of the genre of Roman verse satire (according to Horace at *Satire* 1.10.48), has a reputation for the practice of ὀνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν, like the Old Comedians, who *multa cum libertate notabant* (*Sat.* 1.4.5). We might expect such an author to leave no holds barred, especially in a situation involving invective against women.² But, even allowing for the possibility that one man's graphic image is another's euphemism (see Archilochus fr. 119 West, which is a probable model for 333 Warmington = 305 Marx, 334 Warmington = 306 Marx),³ on a celebrated occasion Lucilius seems to offer his reader a chance to employ 'do-it-yourself' poetics in a highly allusive vein. In this passage from Lucilius Book 17, the speaker plays a decorous role by refusing to resort to direct abuse (567--573 Warmington = 540--546 Marx, as Warmington prints it):⁴

num censes calliplocamon callisphyron ullam
 non licitum esse uterum atque etiam inguina tangere mammis,
 conpernem aut uaram fuisse Amphitryonis acoetin
 Alcmenam atque alias, Helenam ipsam denique – nolo
 dicere; tute uide atque disyllabon elige quoduis –
 κούρη⁵ eupatereiam aliquam rem insignem habuisse,
 uerrucam naeuum punctum dentem eminulum unum?

Surely you don't believe that any woman with lovely locks and ankles could not touch her paunch and groin with her breasts, and that Amphitryon's wife could not have been knock-kneed or bow-legged, Alcmena, and that others, even Helen herself – I don't want

¹ Much gratitude for help and encouragement is owed to many, but especially David Butterfield, Emily Gowers, David Langslow and Enrica Sciarrino, as well as a couple of anonymous reviewers, to one of whom I owe help on many detailed points below. Translations of Lucilius are adapted from Warmington's Loeb; others are mine.

² See e.g. Henderson 1989:54--57; cf. Miller 2005:272, on Juvenal 6: "what we see in *Satire* 6, on one level, is *satira* functioning as a tool of social discipline in much the same ways as it does in Lucilius."

³ The correspondence is identified by Chahoud 2004:10, though the Lucilian fragments cited above lack (via a lacuna?) the smutty image of the vagina as a wineskin to which I refer. Richlin 1992:251n4 considers Lucilius to imply equality in intimacy. Recently, Hobden 2013:71 has called Archilochus' wineskin a euphemism.

⁴ This text is the result of multiple emendations, mostly owing to Joseph Scaliger: particularly relevant to the argument are *ullam* for transmitted *illam*, *Helenam* for *lenam* (read by several older editors *Ledam*), and *punctum*, Marx's conjecture for transmitted *dictum*.

⁵ Marx 1904--5: vol. 2, 203 explains this, his conjecture for transmitted *RIN*; it was Junius who had earlier substituted *Ἰνώ*, on the analogy of *Ἰνώ ἴδον εὐπατέρειαν* (*Od.* 11.235). Morgan 2010:327 agrees. The most convincing argument is that *Ἰνώ* would create the Greek effect of hiatus (in contrast to the line's elisions): Morgan 2004:13.

to say it; see to it yourself and choose any two-syllabled word you like – that a maiden of noble birth could not have had any mark of note, a wart, mole, pock-mark, one prominent little tooth?

Recent criticism of the passage has focused on its metrics. Particularly noteworthy is the use of multiple elision (synaloepha), such as in the second line, which looks at first glance far too long and “in its bloatedness obviously reflects the bloated female body it describes,” with the result that the passage clearly has no limits, even if it paradoxically remains constrained by the dactylic hexameter.⁶ Simultaneously, the conversational style here attained with the aside, *tute uide*, participates in the debasement of the lofty inspiration of higher-genre composition to which these mythological ladies usually belong.⁷ A similar effect is attained by the emphasis in that line on a *disyllabon*, replaced by a different two-syllable word, *nolo*, coming after the horrible sound of the monosyllabic *fuisse* in synizesis elided into the following word *Amphitryonis*.⁸ But to leave open the choice of *any* two syllables to describe the women of myth is an authorial nudge and wink whose protest of inability to compose in adverse circumstances leads us to delve further. The ingenuity of the versification on show here reflects the careful differentiation between “Greek for the ladies’ perfections and Latin for their defects,”⁹ which has even led one critic to argue that the passage is a negative comparison of the beauties of today with those of old.¹⁰ My suggestion, however, concerns a different kind of elision on show here: the elision of the iambic impulse. This takes the form in this passage of a refusal to say a dirty word, one which has an unexpected history in Homeric epic, but which also would not actually fit at the end of a hexameter line (where *nolo* currently sits).¹¹ As a result, the refusal to say the word could be

⁶ Morgan 2005:177, which, like Morgan 2004:10--15, is an earlier version of Morgan 2010:326--334.

⁷ On satire as epic’s ‘evil twin’: see Morgan 2004:8; Morgan 2010:317. Krenkel 1970b:188--189 thinks tragedy is in the frame as well, though no explanation is given.

⁸ Noted by Morgan 2004:13; Morgan 2010:333.

⁹ Rudd 1986:168.

¹⁰ Lieberg 1962:38--47. Some of the argumentation there seems to rest on whether one prints *ullam* or *illam* (the latter being the received text) at the end of the first line.

¹¹ Thus the present fragment can be listed among the examples of *aposiopesis* in sexual contexts collected in Adams 1981; the formula (*nolo dicere*) has a kinship with the rhetorical strategy of *praecisio* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.41).

motivated by a surprising desire to preserve the rules of versification as well as an (in)appropriate decorum: stepping back from the abyss of insult, as it were, but also hiding the poet's craft and/or near-slip-up behind a demotic, 'crowd-sourcing' veneer.

I propose that as well as the usual suspects proposed for the *disyllabon* (*moecham* and *scortum* in the accusative come to mind), another possibility that should be considered consists of a reference back to the character assessment of Helen in the *Iliad*, with her complex but essentially self-pitying description of herself as a 'bitch':¹² hence the two-syllable word that has been elided is κύνα.¹³ It is for this reason that I favour, at the beginning of 572 Warmington = 545 Marx, the textual reading, κούρην, which could like Τυρώ have been written in Greek confusing to a copyist, in part because its initial syllable resembles that of κύνα. While it could be objected that the oblique citation might require a familiarity with the *Iliad* greater than might be expected for Lucilius, we should be mindful that he quoted in Book 6 the Homeric tag denoting rescue, τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων (267 Warmington = 231 Marx, *Il.* 20.443).¹⁴ Additionally, although the Odyssean context of the 'Catalogue of Heroines' might lead us to accept Leda, and reject Helen, as a companion for Alcmene,¹⁵ the epithets καλλιπλόκαμος and καλλίσφυρος in this very fragment are used in *Iliad* 14.326 and 319: Lucilius is appropriating epic vocabulary. So this passage is not responding solely to *Odyssey* 11 – and indeed, not only to the *Iliad* as well if my

¹² On the *Iliadic* examples, e.g. *Il.* 3.180, 6.344, 6.356 (κυνός), there is a wide literature, e.g. Graver 1995; Blondell 2010. On Homeric breaches of decorum, see Bain 2007, esp. 46–52 on dung, breasts and farts.

¹³ The closest I have seen to this suggestion is that of Terzaghi 1934:365–366, who proposes πόρνην in the Cynic diatribe tradition, but does not connect the idea of Helen as πόρνη with dogs, as I will do below.

¹⁴ So too Lucilius seems to mention Homer as the poet of the *Iliad* (*tota Ilias una est*, 405 Warmington = 342 Marx) in a literary-critical context, although this is Dousa's conjecture for transmitted *totaque illa summast*. Note also that εὐπατέρειαν (in the accusative) describes Helen at *Il.* 6.292.

¹⁵ As Morgan 2010:327 is tempted to do. Mariotti 1960:80 notes that this is the first time that *Alcmene* is spelt thus rather than *Alcumena*, which is a cretic: prosody is the rationale. Tentatively, I would surmise that 491–492 Warmington = 462–463 Marx, *non paucis malle ac sapientibus esse probatum* | ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν (“not to prefer to be thought honourable by the few and wise men ‘than to be a king over all the spirits which have perished’”) which quotes verbatim a line from Achilles' speech to Odysseus in the Underworld (*Od.* 11.491) is connected in some way with our present passage, if that is based on the nearby 'Catalogue of Heroines' (11.225–332).

proposal is accepted, as Helen refers to herself as a ‘bitch’ also at *Odyssey* 4.145 (more specifically there: she is “dog-eyed,” κυνώπητος).

The suggestion of ‘dog’ is not as left field (or indeed as ‘epic’) as it may seem. For one, κύων is used comically in abusive address to women (as at Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1402).¹⁶ Moreover, Horace, even before he mentions Lucilius in *Satire* 1.4, tendentiously but deliberately equates Helen with a *cunnus* as the cause of the Trojan War (*Sat.* 1.3.107). The collocation of *Helenam* and *cunnus* in that line may be a bilingual pun, on the genitive κυνός, that refers back to the same Homeric episodes of ‘bitch’-calling that I have mentioned.¹⁷ Also, it is possible that the fragment alludes, via its ending on a “prominent little tooth” (a canine?) as a feature of even the prettiest woman,¹⁸ to dog-like aspects.¹⁹ If we accept that a Lucilian guise, as a “Cynic dog,”²⁰ might have something to do with the present fragment, then the refusal to label Helen as a self-satirist, by association with the passage’s author, is intriguing.

We may compare such reluctance with the devil-may-care attitude of the diatribe preacher of the first three Horatian satires, who (if he is the same for all three diatribe-influenced poems) has already used the term *cunnus* twice in the previous poem, before the juxtaposition with Helen (*Sat.* 1.2.36; 1.2.70): the Lucilian speaker seems, in this fragment at least, to exercise less foul-mouthed *libertas* than that Horatian persona!²¹ Indeed, the second example of the word *cunnus* in Horace *Satire* 1.2 is spoken by a *mentula*, whose owner responds with the platitude *magno patre*

¹⁶ Zimmermann 2001: 193 includes the Lucilian passage without explanation in a list of ‘erotische Miniaturen’ with parallels in Aristophanes.

¹⁷ As suggested by Gowers 2012:141, who collects there her references to other bilingual puns in the same work of Horace; cf. a passing reference in Richlin 1992:125, to the labelling of Helen as *Taenario ... cunno* in *Priapea* 68.

¹⁸ See the scholia on Persius 1.115 for the *genuinum* that Lucilius broke in that line on Lupus and Mucius (*genuinum fregit in illis*) as a canine rather than a molar, with Tzounakas 2005:562--563.

¹⁹ The scholia mentioned in the preceding note may have been influenced by Persius’ earlier lines about guard-dogs, *sonat hic de nare canina | littera* (1.109--10); this itself owes a debt to the Lucilian take on the letter ‘r’ as an ugly, animalistic sound typical of a dog (4 Warmington = 2 Marx; 389--390 Warmington = 377--378 Marx). In the present passage, a noteworthy initial ‘r’ sound is created by the elision of *rem* (572 Warmington = 545 Marx), for whose influence see Nilsson 1952:22.

²⁰ Gratwick 1982:164.

²¹ However, Lucilius does seem to foreshadow Horatian obscenity elsewhere in referring, for instance, to *mut(t)o*, ‘penis’ (335 Warmington = 307 Marx), and the *eugium*, thought to mean ‘hymen’ (896 Warmington = 940--941 Marx); see the discussions in Adams 1982:62--63, 83, and more recently Chahoud 2011:380--382.

nata puella est (Sat. 1.2.71); this is in fact a paraphrase of κούρην *eupatereiam* (572 Warmington = 545 Marx), and surely serves as corroboration of that reading, and as evidence that Horace has this fragment in mind. I would add that the effect of the paraprosodokian (once it is realised) in the original fragment is increased, if the word which Lucilius wants us to think of is Greek instead of Latin, because it overturns the neat scheme already mentioned which delineated the Greek and Latin terms according to praise and blame; indeed, we might want to rule out *cunnum* as the word Lucilius omitted because of the lack of a “comparable example of an adjective or pronoun alluding to the female sexual organs,” but not stating the word, in Latin.²²

I finish with some possible connections – that involve invective complications – which the proposed reading now opens up with other fragments of Lucilius. One move could be to relate the mention of bow-leggedness in the last line of this passage with verse 628 Warmington = 583 Marx, *insignis uaris cruribus et petilis* (“marked by being bow-legged and thin-shanked”).²³ It is tempting to link these with a favourite conceit of Archilochus (again!),²⁴ whose preferred general was similarly ῥουκός (“bow-legged,” fr. 114.4 West).²⁵ Whether or not Archilochus’ preference in that instance is politically or socially motivated, the identification of a Greek precedent again speaks to the cultural identity problem of Lucilius’ Latin lines on a Greek theme.²⁶ Another observation that may be pertinent is that Lucilius re-uses the phrase *dens eminulus* in a fragment which has been interpreted as referring to a rhinoceros horn: *Broncus Noulitanus dente aduerso eminulo hic est | rhinoceros uelut Aethiopus* (“this is a jut-mouth from Nola with a little tooth sticking out in front, just like an Ethiopian rhinoceros,” 109--110+184 Warmington = 117--118+159

²² Adams 1981:128.

²³In comparing the two passages, Hass 2007:144 arrives at the rather weak conclusion that “Lucilius verfährt mit allen Menschen gleich.”

²⁴ Despite Mankin 1987, who believes that Lucilius read such Greek fragments in a collection, much as we must, rather than knowing Archilochus in an authoritative edition, there is surely a link between the early jambographer and the early satirist. I treat Archilochus’ influence on Lucilius in a forthcoming book chapter.

²⁵ The full fragment can be translated thus: “I have no liking for a general who is tall, walks with a swaggering gait, takes pride in his curls, and is partly shaven. Let mine be one who is short, has a bent look about the shins, stands firmly on his feet and is full of courage” (Loeb trans. D. E. Gerber).

²⁶ Morgan 2004:14-15; Morgan 2010:333--334.

Marx).²⁷ Much about this stitched-up fragment is mystifying, but – if there is a rhinoceros horn here – that is a weapon that could be being mentioned in an aggressive context (note the mention of *aduersus*).²⁸ In any case, if it is merely a tooth, then we are returned to the ‘Cynic dog’ interpretation.

A third relevant fragment, which I cite inspired by Horace’s putative desire to separate wolves, which encode *Lupus*, the target of Lucilius’ Book 1 (literally a wolf, *lupus*), from dogs in *Satire 2.2*,²⁹ appears, just as the verse about the letter *r* (*irritata canes quam homo quam planius dicit*, “which a dog when teased utters more plainly than a man,” 4 Warmington = 2 Marx), is thought to appear, in Book 1, perhaps in *Lupus’ Concilium deorum* trial: *ut contendere possem | Thestiadus Ledae atque Ixiones alochoeo* (“that I might be able to compare my beauty with that of Leda, Thestius’ daughter, and with that of Ixion’s wife,” 28--29 Warmington = 24--25 Marx). This Book 1 fragment’s topic is the same as in the Book 17 passage, namely the beauty of mythical characters held over from epic. If we believe the generally agreed interpretation of the last two words, it sports an Iliadic line-ending (*Il.* 14.317) once again. And it is common to associate this fragment with the statement of Servius *auctus* that the god Apollo (who saved the speaker in the Homeric tag that became the end of verse 267 Warmington = 231 Marx!) expressed dissatisfaction with the designation *pulcher*, as it was effeminate.³⁰ Should the fragments be connected, there is a generational switch at work, because Leda is of course Helen’s mother – time has passed, for the reader too from Book 1 to Book 17. Such speculation could re-open the debate over the context of the Book 17 passage, namely whether it is spoken by a woman in conversation with another

²⁷ These one and a half lines, cited here as in Krenkel’s edition, were joined by Dousa, followed by Krenkel 1970a:vol. 1, 144--145, who ignored the different book attributions from their respective preservers (Nonius and Priscianus). The printed *Noulitanus*, based on a suggestion by Mras 1928:78--80, to mean *Nolanus*, and *rinoceros* were transmitted as *nouit lanus* and *riceros*, and Warmington prints *Bovillanus* (“from Bovillae”); also, a rhinoceros horn never points downwards (unlike teeth): a problem raised and treated by Gowers 2011:180--181.

²⁸ Evans 2008:138; many scholars, e.g. Fiske 1920:309--310, see here an ancestor of Horace’s Messius (*Sat.* 1.5.56--7), involved in an exchange of taunts. Still, *aduersus* does not have to indicate aggression.

²⁹ Houghton 2004.

³⁰ Cichorius 1908:221, although his identification of Romulus here is debated; e.g. Waszink 1970:270--271 questions the import of Apollo’s speech. See also Manuwald 2009:54.

woman,³¹ to canvass other options: a man who sounds like a woman, just as Apollo is thought to be ladylike (and after all it is the question of beauty which is at issue in the Book 17 fragment), or who is disguised as a woman, explaining away the flaws in his appearance.³²

My final consideration might be called more prosaic: *κύνα*, as a pyrrhic, will not scan in the final foot of verse 570 Warmington = 543 Marx, nor indeed in the first foot of verse 572 Warmington = 545 Marx. Thus the ‘choose-your-own’ instruction – its freedom despite the constraints of the hexameter suggesting a parallel with the satirist’s championing of *libertas* despite unpalatable difficulties – has an affinity with Lucilius’ other celebrated insistence on the nuts and bolts of metrical composition, verses 252--253 Warmington = 228--229 Marx, *seruorum est festus dies hic | quem plane hexametro uersu non dicere possis* (“this is a slaves’ festival which you just could not put in a hexameter verse”).³³ The stated reason for the word’s omission at 570 Warmington = 543 Marx is unwillingness, whereas that at 252--253 Warmington = 228--229 Marx was more strictly inability *metri causa*; but I would argue that if the missing word, as I propose, was *κύνα* then the poet is being especially disingenuous. Not only is it unnecessary to trust him that the reason for the word’s exclusion is the one stated, but doing so would mean that we had to take at face value the following claim that any word at all (*quoduis*, again in the final foot of the line) could be selected by the poet’s audience – presumably without regard for metrics. Whether Lucilius is lying or not, though, he has (by suppressing and not stating *κύνα*) averted possible revelation of his own incompetence, or at the least his carelessness, in verse composition.

³¹ The major players here are Marx 1904—1905:vol. 2, 202--204 in favour, curtly dismissed by Leo 1960:vol. 1, 237. Krenkel 1970a:vol. 1, 79 supports Marx’s position, that we have here part of a conversation between Penelope and Eurycleia, although it is difficult to get around the pronouncement of Housman 1907:66 (who picks “*ualgam, lippam, broccam* or the like” for the omitted word) that the tense of *fuisse* disproves this.

³² There is perhaps a comparison to be made here with the character of Chaerea dressed as an eunuch in Terence’s *Eunuchus*, e.g. 579--580, *adnuo | terram intuens modeste* (“I nod and look modestly at the ground”): both instances involve submissively refraining from speech.

³³ Morgan 2000:100--104. If the *plane* here is connected to the *planius* of verse 4 Warmington = 2 Marx quoted above, then there is a surprising emphasis on being clear, which the omission of a word obviously is not.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, J. N. 1981. "A Type of Sexual Euphemism in Latin." *Phoenix* 35:120--128.
- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- Bain, D. 2007. "Low Words in High Places: Sex, Bodily Functions, and Body Parts in Homeric Epic and Other Higher Genres." In *Hesperos: Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry Presented to M. L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. P. J. Finglass, C. Collard and N. J. Richardson, 40--57. Oxford.
- Blondell, R. 2010. "'Bitch that I am': Self-Blame and Self-Assertion in the *Iliad*." *TAPhA* 140:1--32.
- Chahoud, A. 2004. "The Roman Satirist Speaks Greek." *Classics Ireland* 11:1--46.
- Chahoud, A. 2011. "The Language of Latin Verse Satire." In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, ed. J. Clackson, 367--83. Malden, MA.
- Cichorius, C. 1908. *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*. Berlin.
- Evans, R. 2008. *Utopia Antiqua: Readings of the Golden Age and Decline at Rome*. London.
- Fiske, G. C. 1920. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Tradition of Imitation*. Madison.
- Gowers, E. 2011. "The Road to Sicily: Lucilius to Seneca." *Ramus* 40:168--197.
- Gowers, E. 2012. *Horace. Satires I*. Cambridge.
- Gratwick, A. S. 1982. "The Satires of Ennius and Lucilius." In *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. II.1: The Early Republic*, ed. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, 156-71. Cambridge.
- Graver, M. 1995. "Dog-Helen and Homeric Insult." *ClAnt* 14:41--61.
- Hass, K. 2007. *Lucilius und der Beginn der Persönlichkeitsdichtung in Rom*. Stuttgart.
- Henderson, J. 1989. "Satire Writes 'Woman': Gendersong." *PCPS* 35:50--80.
- Hobden, F. 2013. *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge.
- Houghton, L. B. T. 2004. "The Wolf and the Dog (Horace, *Sermones* 2.2.64)." *CQ*, n.s., 54:300--304.
- Housman, A. E. 1907. "Luciliana." *CQ* 1:53--74, 148--59.
- Korzeniewski, D., ed. 1970. *Die römische Satire*. Darmstadt.
- Krenkel, W. 1970a. *Lucilius. Satiren*. 2 vols. Leiden.
- Krenkel, W. 1970b. "Zur literarischen Kritik bei Lucilius." In Korzeniewski 1970, 161--266.
- Leo, F. 1960. *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. 2 vols. Rome.
- Lieberg, G. 1962. *Puella Divina: Die Gestalt der göttlichen Geliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung*. Amsterdam.
- Mankin, D. 1987. "Lucilius and Archilochus: Fragment 698 (Marx)." *AJP* 108:405--408.
- Manuwald, G. 2009. "Concilia deorum: Ein episches Motiv in der römischen Satire." In *Per attentam Caesaris aurem: Satire – die unpolitische Gattung?*, ed. F. Felgentreu, F. Mundt and N. Rücker, 46--61. Tübingen.
- Mariotti, I. 1960. *Studi Luciliani*. Florence.
- Marx, F. 1904--1905. *C. Lucilii Carminum reliquiae*. 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Miller, P. A. 2005. *Latin Verse Satire: An Anthology and Reader*. New York.
- Morgan, L. 2000. "Metre Matters: Some Higher-level Metrical Play in Latin Poetry." *PCPS* 46:99--120.
- Morgan, L. 2004. "Getting the Measure of Heroes: the Dactylic Hexameter and its Detractors." In *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality*, ed. M. Gale, 1--26. Swansea.
- Morgan, L. 2005. "Satire." In *A Companion to Latin Literature*, ed. S. J. Harrison, 174--188. Malden, MA.
- Morgan, L. 2010. *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*. Oxford.
- Mras, K. 1928 "Randbemerkungen zu Lucilius' Satiren." *WS* 46:78-85.
- Nilsson, N.-O. 1952. *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz*. Uppsala.

- Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Rev. ed. New York.
- Rudd, N. 1986. *Themes in Roman Satire*. London.
- Terzaghi, N. 1934. *Lucilio*. Turin.
- Tzounakas, S. 2005. "Persius on his Predecessors: A Re-examination." *CQ* 55:559--571.
- Waszink, J. H. 1970. "Zur ersten Satire des Lucilius." In Korzeniewski 1970:267--274.
- Zimmermann, B. 2001. "Lucilius und Aristophanes." In *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit*, ed. G. Manuwald, 188--195. Munich.