http://theses.gla.ac.uk/79481/

Generic Refashioning and Poetic Self-Presentation in Horace's *Satires* and *Epodes*

Sarah May Wolstencroft
MA (Hons)

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of
PhD

School of Humanities
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

December 2016

Abstract

This thesis will examine Horace's two books of *Satires* and his collection of *Epodes* and will look at three main aspects of the collections: how the three volumes are connected through a shared dialogue with each other, the issue of genre and the task of literary self-fashioning against a problematic political landscape. In particular, I will look at the influence of Lucilius on Horace and show how Horace's reworking of Lucilian satire plays a vital role in his presentation of himself and his development as a poet. I will examine the Lucilian allusions and intertextuality found within Horace's work and will show how Horace's treatment of iambic poetry is connected to his refashioning of Lucilian satire.

Horace's first book of *Satires*, where the poet announces himself with his updated version of Lucilius' genre, works as a vital reference point for the following two collections. I will show how the three volumes are linked through repeated references to and echoes of each other as Horace employs his previous work for different effects throughout the collections. I will examine how Horace continually uses what has gone before – either his own work or that of his generic predecessor Lucilius – to progress and establish himself as a poet.

I will also consider the political context of Horace's early work and the effect of this on Horace's establishment as a poet and his handling of different genres. I will show how Horace adopts and adapts satire and iambic poetry to create literary works appropriate for both the poetic and political tastes of his time.

Table of Contents

If Roman satire can teach the modern reader one lesson it is that some things have changed very little since Horace's day. Centuries roll past, but the same concerns about money, sex and power – and why other people have more of them – survive through more than two thousand years. The familiar themes and recognisable attitudes found in Horace's *Satires* enable today's reader to feel a link to the past through the things we have in common with either the poet or, sometimes (even if we don't always like to admit it), his targets. Satire's subject matter is rooted in the everyday and instead of a backdrop of the legendary past, it often centres around situations to which we can still relate. Here, heroes are for sending up in epic parodies and the only battles are scrappy tussles fought with insulting words as weapons or waged by a man against his stomach complaints. Grand passions are put aside in favour of convenient couplings with whoever is at hand. Even important state missions are presented with a focus on singing drunks, soiled sheets and kitchen fires rather than any vital diplomatic affairs. But it is precisely these sides of satire that I believe make the genre so continually fascinating and relevant. Grand literature such as epic puts a distance between its subject matter and its readers as it holds up its noble examples. But for satire to work, it needs to get close to its readers. It holds out a grubby hand and takes them on a trawl of the city, giving a guided tour of sin and sleaze with a knowing wink. This intimacy survives across the millennia and through satire the modern reader can still feel a warts-and-all closeness to the original audience, getting a glimpse of what would have raised a smile or an eyebrow or a temper. Satire allows you to take a step near enough to smell the ancient world it reveals and realise it often contains a familiar whiff of the present.

The lasting relevance of satire and its parallels with contemporary culture are a large part of my personal interest in the topic. After almost 20 years working for a national tabloid newspaper, I am continually struck by the similarities between Horace's satire and my own 'genre'. Both share a style of language that might at first appear to be casually thrown-together conversation, but is actually carefully constructed colloquialism fitted in to a particular rhythm. Horatian brevity and satire's playful use of puns and alliteration also find their echoes in tabloid tales. These are texts with a close relationship with their readers, which must show something that their audience can identify with or react to for them to be effective. Satirists and sub-editors need to know who their words are for.

The similarities are not confined to style but extend to subject matter as well. The focus is usually on people and the present day. Both turn their gaze on the famous and the

infamous, picking out politicians and the powerful, and delving gleefully into salaciousness and scandal. And as a result, the tabloid newspaper and the satirist often face accusations of either pushing boundaries too far or sometimes not going far enough, something Horace admits at the start of his second book. Pleasing everyone would be as impossible as winning praise from both a Guardian reader and a devotee of the Daily Mail.

It is this lasting relevance of satire, both to my own professional interest and to human concerns in general, that has driven my fascination with the genre. In one description of his satiric predecessor Lucilius, Horace famously insists that the earlier poet would struggle to come up to scratch if he were writing in Horace's day. But if Horace were writing today, I have a suspicion that he would have no trouble at all fitting in with my fellow sub-editors.

I declare that, except where explicit reference is made to the contribution of others, that this thesis is the result of my own work and has not been submitted for any other degree at the University of Glasgow or any other institution.

Signature _____

Printed name _____

Introduction

Horace's first collection of satiric works announced the arrival of the poet in Republican Rome's literary landscape and revealed a new take on a genre notorious for outspoken attacks and personal invective. With his version of satire, Horace reclaimed and reshaped the genre as a type of poetry that could now display friendship as well as ferocity and champion a new form of freedom of speech. He credited his poetic predecessor Lucilius with the invention of the genre and the shadow of the earlier satirist loomed large over the collection. But Horace's *Satires* were no slavish imitation of his predecessor's work. Through a careful use of allusions and echoes of Lucilius' poetry, Horace could place his own work firmly in the genre of satire, yet still highlight the differences between what had gone before and what he was now composing. The importance of looking back to previous works while still creating something different would continue to be a key aspect in Horace's next two volumes of poetry, the *Epodes* and his second collection of *Satires*. In the *Epodes*, Horace again took a notoriously savage genre, this time iambic poetry, and once more produced a version more suited to his own times. But as well as looking back to Greek iambic poets such as Archilochus, Horace also used his own work in *Satires* 1 as a constant reference point, despite the shift towards another genre. And as he created his second collection of *Satires*, Horace again turned to his own previous work to assert his position in the literary hierarchy and show he had moved from satire's newcomer to overtake the genre's former master, Lucilius.

This thesis will explore three main aspects of Horace's two collections of *Satires* and his *Epodes*: how the three volumes are linked through a dialogue with each other, the issue of genre, and the task of literary self-fashioning in a potentially problematic political climate. It will argue that Horace's refashioning of Lucilian satire plays a key role in his own self-fashioning as well as his establishment and development as a late Republican poet and that his first book of *Satires* provides a vital reference point not only for the second collection of satiric poems but also for his *Epodes*. It will examine the Lucilian allusions and Lucilian intertextuality found in Horace's *Satires* and the way his treatment of iambic poetry relates to his relationship with Lucilius. I will argue that *Satires* 1, with the adaptations Horace has made to the genre by reworking Lucilius' style of satire, is a constant presence in the background of the later collections, and I will show how Horace continues to use the same approach he has taken with satire as he turns to a different genre in the *Epodes*. I will also examine how, throughout all three collections, Horace repeatedly uses what has gone before – either the work of his generic predecessor Lucilius or his own books of poetry – to

develop and progress as a poet. Horace reflects the shift in his own position in the changing way he uses Lucilius throughout his two books of *Satires*.

However, it is not only the poetic aspect of Horace's early works that will be examined in this thesis but also their political setting. I will discuss the effect of the political scene within which Horace develops and establishes himself as the leading poet who changes the substance of Greek iambic poetry and Roman satirical verse of the Lucilian kind in a political atmosphere that can no longer favour Aristophanic-style outspokenness.

While there has been plenty of research looking at these separate volumes of poetry individually, this thesis will consider them together and the relationship that exists between them and will also look in particular at the Lucilian aspects of the collections. It will consider how Horace uses – and, I would argue, equally as significantly, how Horace chooses not to use – his generic predecessor as he defines his own changing position in the literary landscape. In his first book of *Satires*, Horace is a satirist who is starting out on a literary career and uses Lucilius to mark his own work out as part of the genre and to show how satire – and its accompanying *libertas* – can be refashioned for his own times. Then, in the second collection of *Satires* he moves away from Lucilius to use his own work as the main source of references and allusions to assert his position and superiority as a poet. At the same time, the *Epode*s look back to *Satires* 1 and across to *Satires* 2, forming links between the volumes and revealing a continued persona which may not be identical in all three works, as different parts of that persona are displayed at different times, but is distinct enough in each book to be identifiable as the voice of the same poet.

The major analysis of the relationship between Horace's *Satires* and Lucilius' poetry is George Fiske's 1920 volume entitled *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*. Fiske conducts a thorough exploration of the possible links between the work of the two satirists that also examines Lucilius' connection with Greek satirists, as well as Horace's *Epistles* and *Ars Poetica*. Despite Fiske's comprehensive approach to the topic, I believe it is worth looking again at some of the more tenuous links he suggests, as well as examining where new connections may possibly be found between the two satirists.

There have been several studies focusing on Lucilius himself, rather than on his relationship with Horace. The linguistic side of Lucilius' work is examined in Mariotti's *Studi Luciliani* (1960), where the satirist's language and style are considered along with the re-interpretation of selected fragments. The possible influences on the satirist and his relationship with other genres, authors and aspects of his times are explored in the essays

collected in Gesine Manuwald's *Der Satiriker Lucilius unde seine Zeit* (2001). More recently, both Anna Chahoud (2011, 2004) and Ian Goh (2016, 2015, 2013) have devoted attention to Lucilius' work, with Chahoud (2004) examining the use of Greek in his poetry, something Horace was notoriously critical of.

Scholarship on Horace is far more abundant than that on Lucilius and the bimillennium of the poet's death in 1992/3 in particular sparked the publication of several useful volumes on his work. Fraenkel's *Horace* (1957) is perhaps dated at times but is still important for providing a chronological analysis of Horace's poems. Niall Rudd's 1966 work, *The Satires of Horace*, is also a very useful resource when looking at the *Satires* alongside Lucilius' work, particularly for its study of the names used by Horace. Stephen Harrison's extensive work on Horace is also of great value, especially his 2010 analysis of the 'horizontal' and the 'vertical' development of Horace's poetic career.

For Horace's early work and its political context, Jasper Griffin's *Horace in the 30s* is particularly useful from Rudd's 1993 volume marking the bimillenium of Horace's death. I. M. Le M. DuQuesnay's *Horace and Maecenas* (1984) provides an excellent argument for the potential propaganda value of *Satires* 1 and examination of the wider context of the poems within the world in which Horace was writing. Horace's approach to satire is also explored thoroughly and persuasively by Kirk Freudenburg in *The Walking Muse* (1993).

Andrea Cucchiarelli's 2001 *La satira e il poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones* does look at both the *Satires* and the *Epodes*, but without the specifically Lucilian slant which this thesis will adopt in its treatment of the three collections. The most recent study of the *Epodes* and their relationship to other literary works, Horatian and otherwise, is Philippa Bather and Claire Stocks' 2016 volume, *Horace's Epodes: Context, Intertexts and Reception,* which includes Goh's assessment of possible echoes of Lucilius in the first half of the *Epodes*. Timothy Johnson has also examined Horace's approach to iambic poetry recently in *Horace's Iambic Criticism*.

The text of Lucilius' fragments is taken from Warmington's 1938 edition in *Remains of Old Latin Volume III*. For Horace's *Satires*, I have used Emily Gowers' 2012 edition of Book 1 and Frances Muecke's 1993 edition of Book 2. David Mankin's 1995 edition of the *Epodes* was used along with Lindsay Watson's invaluable 2003 commentary. All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

I have chosen to focus on the *Satires* on a poem-by-poem basis rather than tackling them thematically, since Horace uses the sequence of poems to exploit the Lucilian thread running throughout them. Perhaps the most striking example of this careful juxtaposition occurs in the transition from 1.4 to 1.5, where Horace's first explicit criticism of Lucilius' literary talents is immediately followed by a Horatian version of Lucilius' journey poem. The placing of the poems ensures that Horace's attacks on Lucilius are still firmly in the reader's mind when they come to his reworking of his predecessor's theme. Horace changes his use of Lucilius throughout both collections of *Satires,* and his own development as a poet can also be seen through them, making a sequential approach more effective in showing both the Lucilian influence and also the development of the different aspects of Horace's poetic identity.

Horace shows the same careful construction in his *Epodes,*[1] where again he uses juxtaposition to highlight shifts in tone, to emphasise links between the poems and to stress his own progress as a poet and his changing concerns throughout the collection. This thesis however will focus on the relationship of the *Epodes* to the *Satires*, rather than to each other, so I believe a thematic approach is more effective and appropriate in this case. I have placed the chapter on the *Epodes* between those covering the two collections of *Satires* because I believe that such a placement gives the most effective view of the *Epodes'* relationship to the other volumes. The *Epodes* build on the foundation laid in *Satires* 1 while at the same time contain echoes across to *Satires* 2, which also looks back to the first collection of satiric poems. Placing the analysis of the *Epodes* between the chapters on the *Satires* reinforces the idea of all three collections sharing a dialogue with each other, rather than being segregated by their genres.

Lucilius Before Horace

Around 70 years passed between the death of Lucilius and the publication of Horace's first book of *Satires,* where the inventor of the genre would be presented in such a critical light by his successor. During those decades, Lucilius' poetry continued to be circulated, read and quoted, and also inspired imitators who created their own compositions which attempted to copy the satirist's style. The works of Cicero and Varro contain references to and quotations from Lucilius' poems, which provide proof that he still had an audience in the generations which followed his death. And Horace's own words about Lucilius in

---

[1] Examined in depth by Robert Carrubba (1969).

Satires 1.4, 1.10 and 2.1 (to be discussed below) offer more evidence of his continued readership, albeit by what appears to be a less than impressed audience. By the time Horace came to writing satire, it is perhaps not surprising that he presented Lucilius as old fashioned and outdated, which also helped emphasise the novelty of his own approach to the genre. I would also argue that rather than creating new criticisms of the earlier poet, Horace was taking a more widely held belief about Lucilius' more dated style and stretching it for satiric effect to make his point about the difference between himself and his predecessor.

In the years between the two writers, there was enough interest in Lucilius to make sure his work was still known when Horace came to pick up his pen. Suetonius describes how Lucilius' friends Laelius Archelaus and Vettius Philocomus kept the satirist's works alive after his death by continuing to read them to large audiences.[2] Warmington tentatively suggests that Philocomus could also have been responsible for publishing a small roll of Lucilius' poems after his death in Naples in 102 BC.[3] This interest in Lucilius was carried on by Archelaus' pupil, Lenaeus Pompeius, and Valerius Cato, who read Lucilius with Philocomus, and whom Freudenburg describes as "a self-professed Lucilian scholar ... perhaps the leading authority of his day".[4]

Nothing more is known of Philocomus, but Valerius Cato's interest in the works of Lucilius is referred to in the eight opening lines found in some manuscripts of Horace's tenth satire, commonly held to be spurious.[5] The lines describe Cato as preparing an edition of Lucilius' work and correcting his style, leading Gowers to describe him as someone whose "interest in Lucilius sounds similar to Horace's own critical perspective".[6] Although these opening lines are generally believed to have been written by someone other than Horace, they show that there was still continued interest in Lucilius' writings at the time Horace was composing his own satiric works. The use of *emendare* to describe the work Cato was carrying out with Lucilius' poetry also suggests that Horace was not alone in his criticism of his predecessor's style,[7] even if Cato took a gentler approach than Horace would probably have employed if he had been editing his work (*hoc lenius ille S.* 1.10.3). It has also been suggested that 1.10 contains another swipe at Cato, as well as the

---

[2] Suet. *Gram.* 2. See Kaster 1995: 66-7.
[3] Warmington 1938: xxi.
[4] Freudenburg 1993: 175.
[5] See p100.
[6] Gowers 2012: 310.
[7] Gowers (2012: 310) points to how the verb *emendare* can mean to correct both style and moral faults (*OLD* s.v. 2, 1). See also Freudenburg (1993: 175-8) on the use of *emendare* in theoretical works.

supposedly spurious opening lines. Anderson describes how the Neoteric Cato would have been seen by the Roman reader as a "representative of the school and manner which Horace attacks"[8] in the poem through his jibes about Calvus and Catullus (1.10.17-19).

As well as working on Lucilius' poems, Cato was a successful teacher whose own writings included the *Indignatio* as well as his most esteemed works, *Diana* and *Lydia*.[9] The *Indignatio* contained autobiographical details about his birth and the loss of his patrimony in the time of Sulla and it is unclear whether it was a work of prose or poetry. Anderson suggests it could have been a satiric poem and, although he does not go as far as to suggest it was a direct imitation of Lucilius' work, he argues that it "would have been in the invective tradition that the influence of Lucilius did so much to stimulate in the first century BC".[10] As well as keeping Lucilius' work alive through an edition of his poems, it seems Cato could also have been continuing the spirit of his satires by taking the same tone in his own work.

Stronger evidence for the direct influence of Lucilius can perhaps be seen in the case of Lenaeus Pompeius, who showed his knowledge of the satirist by writing poetry with what appears to be a distinctly Lucilian flavour. Mariotti identifies him as one of three writers who showed a Lucilian character in their poetry (the others being Lucius Abuccius and Trebonius, both of whom will both be discussed below) through their freedom of speech, irascibility and plain style of speaking.[11] Suetonius describes how Lenaeus wrote a savage attack on Sallust because he had disparaged his patron, Pompey, and says that he tore into the historian in a ferocious satire (*acerbissima satura laceraverit*).[12] Suetonius also reveals some of the insults Lenaeus hurled at Sallust, telling how he called him a degenerate, a glutton and a good-for-nothing who haunts cheap bars, branding his life and writings monstrous and claiming that he was a most ignorant thief of the old writers' words:

> *lastaurum et lurconem et nebulonem popinonemque appellans, et vita scriptisque*
> *monstrosum, praeterea priscorum Catonisque verborum ineruditissimum furem.*
>
> (Suet. *Gram.* 15)

---

[8] Anderson 1963: 65.
[9] Suet. *Gram*. 11. See Kaster 1995: 148-50.
[10] Anderson 1963: 64.
[11] Mariotti 1969: 6.
[12] Suet. *Gram*. 15.

As Mariotti points out, the alliteration, language and similar sounds of the line, as well as the frequent terms of abuse, strongly suggest a Lucilian influence.[13] *Lastaurus* survives only here, but Lucilius also uses *lurco* when he wishes good living to gluttons, gourmets and stomachs (*vivite lurcones, comedones, vivite ventris* 70); before Suetonius the word appears to be only attested elsewhere in Plautus.[14] *Nebulo* is another word used by Lucilius (and like *lurco* is also found in comedy, adding to its 'low genre' sound[15]) when he describes the shady character of Spain's quaestor Publius Pavus Tuditanus (*Publius Pavus Tuditanus mihi quaestor Hibera in terra fuit lucifugus nebulo* 499-500). Horace too uses *nebulo* in his own satires to describe a worthless man,[16] and it also appears as an insult in Cicero's work.[17] Lenaeus' series of insults ends with another jibe which also finds an echo in Lucilius' work. Although *popino* is not found in Lucilius' surviving lines, he does use *popina* to describe a notorious and shameful inn (*infamem... turpemque odisse popinam* Lucil. 11). Again, *popino* is a word also used by Horace in his *Satires* as part of a string of derogatory terms.[18] Mariotti has also highlighted Lucilius' fondness for adjectives ending in –*osus*,[19] although *monstrosus* is not found in his surviving work, and more alliteration follows with the 'p' sounds of *praeterea priscorum*. Lenaeus delivers his insult to Sallust with a very Lucilian choice of words.

Lenaeus' line thus appears to show recognisable similarities with Lucilius' work and suggests that he not only read Lucilius' satires but also wrote his own compositions in a similar style. However, the choice of Lucilius as his literary model may have been not only a poetic decision, but one which may also have been influenced by personal ties. Lenaeus was a freedman of Pompey, who was the great nephew of Lucilius through his mother's side of his family, although, as Anderson points out, no contemporary refers to this link between Pompey and the poet.[20] Anderson also argues that it is "not unlikely that Pompey... would feel impelled to spur attention to Lucilius"[21] which may explain Lenaeus' choice of poetic role model. Lucilius' connection to Pompey will be discussed further below, but a Lucilian-style attack would perhaps have seemed an appropriate way to avenge Sallust's comments about his patron, the poet's own great nephew.

---

[13] Mariotti 1969: 6-7. Kaster (1995: 179-80) also points out the similarities to Lucilius' satire and notes that this poem "would have have been contemporary with Horace's refining of the tradition in the *Sermones*".
[14] Plaut. *Per*. 421.
[15] Ter. *Eu*. 269.
[16] Hor. *S*. 1.1.103. 1.2.12.
[17] Cic. *S. Rosc*. 128, *Att*. 6.1.25. See discussion of Horace's use of *nebulo* at p45-6.
[18] Hor. *S*. 2.7.39.
[19] Mariotti 1969: 104-109.
[20] Anderson 1963: 63.
[21] Anderson 1963: 61.

Lenaeus was not the only writer linked to Pompey who was familiar with Lucilian satire. Suetonius describes how Curtius Nicias had once been one of his adherents before they fell out when Nicias passed on a proposal letter to Pompey's wife from Gaius Memmius.[22] Nicias is mentioned in Cicero's letters[23] and Suetonius tells how the grammarian Santra also referred to him and praised his books 'On Lucilius' (*huius 'De Lucilio' libros etiam Santra comprobat*).[24]

Anderson also points to Varro's association with Pompey and argues that the author of the Menippean Satires "could not have produced what he did without a thorough acquaintance with Lucilius' poetry, a thorough grasp of what his predecessor had accomplished, and a clear intention of doing something different, if not better".[25] Anderson also points to four books of *saturae* by Varro which are now lost but are thought to have been "strictly of the Lucilian type, that is, entirely poetic and in hexameters".[26] Varro's familiarity with Lucilius is clear from the number of fragments of the satirist's work that have been preserved in his *Lingua Latina*.[27]

Varro's preferred form of satire may have differed from Lucilius' verse compositions, but elsewhere in his writings, in the *de Re Rustica* 3.2.17, he tells of a writer who did follow the earlier satirist's style. Varro describes a certain Lucius Abuccius, an educated man (*homo, ut scitis, opprime doctus*) who had written works with a Lucilian character (*cuius Luciliano charactere sunt libelli*). We do not have Abuccius' work, so we are unable to judge precisely what is meant here by *Luciliano charactere*. It has often been assumed that the phrase refers to invective and the abusive style that is so often linked to Lucilius, and this image of the satirist savaging his targets is also suggested in a letter to Cicero from Trebonius. In the letter, Trebonius describes how Lucilius would turn on those he hated with the *libertas* he was closely associated with.

> *Deinde, qui magis hoc Lucilio licuerit assumere libertatis,*
> *quam nobis? cum, etiamsi odio pari fuerit in eos, quos laesit,*
> *tamen certe non magis dignos habuerit, in quos tanta libertate*
> *verborum incurreret.*

---

[22] Suet. *Gram*. 14.
[23] *Ad Fam.* 9.10, *Ad Att.* 12.26.
[24] Suet. *Gram*.14.
[25] Anderson 1963: 70.
[26] Anderson 1963: 70.
[27] Warmington identifies Varro as the source of 15 fragments (1; 46; 232; 615; 937; 1162; 1169; 1175; 1192; 1215; 1221; 1242-3; 1248; 1271; p421 of words not included in Warmington's text).

> Again, why should Lucilius have been allowed to use this
> much more freedom than us? Since, even if his hatred of those he
> attacked was equal to ours, surely his targets were not more worthy
> of being attacked with such freedom of speech?
>
> Cic. *Fam.* 12.16.3

Trebonius' words seem to suggest that to write like Lucilius meant to unleash a literary tongue-lashing aimed at a hated target. However, there has been debate over to what extent *Luciliano charactere* refers specifically to invective as the defining characteristic of Lucilian satire. Svarlien argues that it is "not simply synonymous with invective" and that Lucilius' name was not "a byword for vituperation".[28] In the case of Abuccius, Svarlien suggests that Varro mentions Lucilius to show that Abuccius was a learned and educated man, rather than to suggest he wrote particularly fierce poetry.[29] Svarlien points to Varro's description of the different types of oratory (reported by Gellius) in which Lucilius is said to be "the poetic exemplar of *gracilitas*, or the plain style".[30] It is this feature of Lucilius' language which Svarlien claims Varro would associate with him. The description of Abuccius' poems does not contain anything that links them specifically with invective; however, the same cannot be said of Trebonius' letter to Cicero, where Lucilius' hatred of his targets is mentioned. Even if Abuccius was, as Svarlien argues, referring to Lucilius' style of language, it does not mean there was not an association between Lucilius and invective. The use of Lucilius as an example by Trebonius shows that he was still remembered and known and, as Goh argues, Trebonius "manages to assert Lucilius' relevance to the tumult of the contemporary scene".[31] Lucilius was still in people's minds and could still be invoked as an icon of invective.

---

[28] Svarlien 1994: 257.
[29] Svarlien 1994:254.
[30] Gel. 6.14; Svarlien 1994:256.
[31] Goh 2013: 80.

As well as the letter from Trebonius, Cicero's work provides one of the richest sources of references to Lucilius, and Svarlien has identified 35 passages where Cicero quotes, or paraphrases or refers to Lucilius.[32] The Lucilian references appear in letters, treatises and philosophical works rather than in Cicero's speeches. Shackleton Bailey has shown how Cicero tended to avoid quoting from poets in speeches before his consulship and argues that his use of Ennius, Accius, Plautus and Terence in later speeches was perhaps driven by a reaction to the Neoteric poets of the time.[33] But he also argues that after 54 BC, Cicero's tendency to quote during his speeches had "flagged" and such lines are found more rarely.[34]

The different types of work that include Lucilian lines show Cicero using the quotations in slightly different ways. The quotations that are found in Cicero's letters are often shorter than those included elsewhere and are not usually directly attributed to Lucilius, with only one direct quotation out of five naming the satirist as the source.[35] This may well be because Cicero knows that his correspondent is familiar with the lines he is quoting, as he points out in *Att.* 6.3.7 when he refers to Atticus often quoting the line he mentions, a line he also refers to at 2.8.1. If Cicero is certain that his correspondent would recognise the quotation, there is no need to attribute it to Lucilius. Shackleton Bailey also suggests that the quotations which are included in the letters are those which "came spontaneously from memory" and can offer an insight into Cicero's "taste and knowledge" of poetry.[36] The use of these quotations in his letters suggests that Cicero and at least some of his friends shared a familiarity with Lucilius' poetry and that the satirist was still being read.

As well as appearing to be well acquainted with Lucilius' work, Cicero's references to the satirist are often flattering ones. He twice calls him learned and sophisticated (*doctus et perurbanus, de Orat.* 1.72, 2.25), praises his clever use of wit (*de Orat.* 2.253) and describes him as one who is capable of putting things most elegantly (*is qui elegantissime id facere, potuit de Orat.*3.171) in another quotation where he does not explicitly name Lucilius. However, I would argue that for all Cicero appears to be an ardent admirer of Lucilius in these passages, the presentation of the satirist in Cicero's works is not quite as

---

[32] Svarlien 1994: 258.
[33] Shackleton Bailey 1983: 240-2.
[34] Shackleton Bailey 1983: 243.
[35] Lucilius is named as the source of the quotation in *Att.* 13.21.3 and Cicero quotes Lucilius directly without naming him at *Att.* 2.8.1, 6.3.7, 13.52.1, *Fam.* 7.24.1.
[36] Shackleton Bailey 1983: 244.

glowing as it may first appear and actually shares similarities with the presentation of Lucilius by Horace. In his *Satires*, Horace grudgingly admits that Lucilius may indeed have been witty and amusing, but his work would not stand up to the scrutiny of Horace's own day (1.10.67-71). He shows him as being outdated and old-fashioned, and I would argue that a very similar presentation is also found in Cicero's treatment of Lucilius' work. In Horace's poem, this idea of Lucilius as being old-fashioned is stretched for comic and satirical effect. But evidence from Cicero would suggest that Horace could well have been playing with commonly held beliefs about his generic predecessor, rather than creating a stereotype of Lucilius for his own poetic ends. Around 70 years had passed between Lucilius' death and the creation of Horace's own satiric compositions, so it is perhaps not surprising that by Horace's day, with shifts in taste and the emergence of new poets, the inventor of verse satire was now viewed as rather old-fashioned.

Out of the 35 passages from Cicero's work which have been identified as containing references to Lucilius, a fifth of them are in *de Oratore* and it is in these passages that the most fulsome praise of the satirist is found. This is where Lucilius is described as *doctus et perurbanus* (1.72, 2.25), and held up as the poet most capable of writing *elegantissime* (3.171). Examples of Lucilius' wit are included, with a description of a play on words at 2.253 and an anecdote at 2.277, which Svarlien identifies as having a Lucilian origin, although it is not attributed to him in Cicero's work. Lucilius' words are quoted again at 3.86 and another unattributed quotation appears at 3.171 during a discussion on the arrangement of words, which is followed by a jibe at Crassus. As well as anecdotes from Lucilius, there is also a story told about the satirist at 2.284, where a dispute about Lucilius' animals allegedly grazing on public land is described.

The praise of Lucilius found in *de Oratore* appears at first glance to be at odds with the picture Horace paints of the poet, in particular the description of him as *doctus et perurbanus*. Horace may grudgingly admit Lucilius' *urbanitas* (*S.* 1.10.65) but he would perhaps have disagreed with the suggestion that the poet appeared to be *doctus*. However, I would argue that the praise of Lucilius found in *de Oratore* must be read with the work's context in mind. Although it was finished in 55 BC, Cicero set his dialogue in 91 BC, much closer to the time that Lucilius was composing his satires and only 11 years after the poet's death. Horace argues that Lucilius appears outdated by the time he himself is writing, but this praise of Lucilius in Cicero's work is not placed at the time Horace is writing, instead it is supposed to be from decades earlier. The time in which *de Oratore* is set may also explain why it is the Ciceronian work that contains the most references to

Lucilius. By including so many references to a poet who was writing closer to that time, Cicero can reinforce the setting and the idea that it is a dialogue from 91 BC, rather than 55 BC. Lucilius is an appropriate choice of poet to quote given the time in which the work is set, and also, as will be discussed below, given the people involved in the dialogue. The inclusion of references to Lucilius may not be intended to be an accurate reflection of attitudes towards him and his popularity at the time in which Cicero was actually writing, but at the time which he was writing about. Cicero can use these references to enhance characterisation in his work as well as make it sound more suited to its time.

The description of Lucilius as *doctus et perurbanus* occurs twice, and both times it is put into the mouth of Lucius Licinius Crassus. The first instance occurs as Crassus tells Scaevola about the similarity between orators and poets, and the second is addressed to Catulus as Crassus discusses his preferred audience. The praise of Lucilius may occur in a work written by Cicero, but it has been put into the mouth of another speaker, so it is not possible to say that this was Cicero's personal opinion of Lucilius or an accurate reflection of opinion on Lucilius in the mid first century. By putting this praise into the mouth of his speakers, Cicero can add to his charcterisation of them and make it more effective.

The choice of participants in the conversation may also have had an influence on Cicero's decision to include references to Lucilius. Cicero's Crassus points out to his father-in-law Scaevola that Lucilius was not particularly well-disposed towards him (*homo tibi subiratus* 1.72), and refers to how that meant that his own relationship with the poet was not as close as he would have wished (*mihi propter eam ipsam causam minus, quam volebat* 1.72). Scaevola was also part of the so-called Scipionic Circle, of which Lucilius was also a well-known member, and he married the daughter of Laelius, who also appears in Lucilius' poems. Scaevola himself features as a target in Lucilius' poems about his trial over extortion charges brought against him by Titus Albucius. The characters' association with Lucilius would perhaps make the poet an obvious source of quotations for them to use rather than reflect contemporary opinion in Cicero's time. The fact that the characters knew Lucilius also means that the opinions expressed about him and his poetry cannot be taken to be generally held opinions about him at that time. These are remarks made by people who knew Lucilius and had an association with him, so would perhaps be expected to show some bias in their opinions.

By including a mention of contemporaries and choosing to quote from a poet who was known personally to the speakers in his dialogue, Cicero can create a more effective and

realistic dialogue. This enhancement of his dialogue could perhaps be a more likely motivation for the inclusion of references to Lucilius, rather than simply to praise the poet or because he was particularly popular in the time Cicero was writing. This suggestion that the praise of Lucilius is included to reflect Crassus' opinion, rather than that of Cicero himself, is perhaps strengthened by Cicero's description of Lucilius in *de Finibus*:

> *neque tam docti tum sunt erant ad quorum iudicium elaboraret, et sunt illius saepe scripta leviora, ut urbanitas summa appareat, doctrina mediocris.*

> There were not such educated critics then, to tax his best efforts; and his writings are often in a lighter style: they show the upmost wit, but not much learning.

Fin. 1.7

In this passage, Cicero appears to share some of the opinions expressed by Horace, although they are not stretched as far as Horace's satirical assessment of Lucilius. Cicero highlights the fact that Lucilius was writing at a time where there was not the same level of learned scrutiny applied to his work which could be seen to share similarities with Horace's opinion that Lucilius' work would need to be improved if the earlier satirist had been writing in Horace's day (*S.* 1.10.67-74). Cicero describes Lucilius as showing the greatest *urbanitas*, which does fit with the description of the poet as *perurbanus* in *de Oratore*. Horace, too, admits the elegance and wit of his predecessor's poetry, calling him *urbanus* and *comis* (*S.* 1.10.65). However, there is no longer any hint that Lucilius could be considered by contemporary standards to be *doctus*, the term used to praise him in *de Oratore*, with Cicero instead describing his work as showing *doctrina mediocris*. Horace may paint a far more disparaging picture of his predecessor, but both he and Cicero describe Lucilius as elegant and urbane, yet lacking the critical scrutiny he would have faced in their own time.

Lucilius' image as a poet who belongs in the past is reinforced again in one of Cicero's letters to Lucius Papirius Paetus. Cicero tells Paetus how it is only in him that he can see any trace of ancient and native merriment (*antiquae et vernaculae festivitatis, Fam.* 9.15.2) and lists the poets who signify this form of wit for him, including Lucilius' name in that list. The satirist is linked to a very native form of humour, backing up what Quintilian will

later say about satire being a specifically Roman literary form (*satura quidem tota nostra est* 10.1.93), and once again it is Lucilius' association with an older type of poetry that is emphasised with the use of *antiquae*. Goh also suggests that Cicero's mention of Lucilius here could be motivated by the satirist's geographical origin as much as any poetic skills.[37] He points out that the list of poets cited by Cicero all have links with Campania, where Lucilius' home of Suessa Aurunca was situated, which makes them a suitable choice for a letter to someone like Paetus who is now living in that region himself.

The idea that Lucilius was viewed as having a more outdated style is perhaps seen once more in another reference to him by Cicero. In *Orator*, Cicero discusses how it was once fashionable to omit the final letter of words which end in –*us* but reveals the practice is now avoided.

> *Sic enim loquebamur:*
> *qui est omnibu' princeps*
> *non omnibus princeps et:*
> *vita illa dignu locoque*
> *non dignus*

> Thus we used to say:
> *qui est omnibu' princeps* (who is chief among all)
> not *omnibus princeps*, and:
> *vita illa dignu' locoque* (worthy of that life and position)
> not *dignus*.

<div align="right">

Orat. 161

</div>

Cicero does not name Lucilius as the source of the second quotation (or identify Ennius as the author of his first quotation) and this is not the only passage where he uses the same unattributed lines. A slightly longer version of the quotation appears again in the *Tusculanae Disputationes*.

---

[37] Goh 2015: 99.

Tamtum exercitatio, mediatio, consuetudo valet. Ergo hoc poterit

Samnis, spurcus homo, vita illa dignus locoque

vir natus ad gloriam ullam partem animi tam mollem habebit quam non

meditatione et ratione corroboret?

Such is the force of training, practice and habit. And thus will

The Samnite, a filthy man, worthy of his life and station,

be capable of this, and will a man born to glory have any part of his soul so weak

that he cannot strengthen it by systematic training?

<div align="right">

Tusc. 2.41

</div>

The Lucilian lines quoted by Cicero refer to a gladiatorial contest between the Samnite Aeserninus and Pacideianus.

Aeserninus fuit Flaccorum munere quidam

Samnis, spurcus homo, vita illa dignus locoque.

Cum Pacideiano conponitur, optimus multo

Post homines natos gladiator qui fuit unus

There was a certain Aeserninus in the Flacci's show,

A Samnite, a foul fellow, fit for that life and position.

He was pitted against Pacideianus, the single best gladiator by far,

Since men were created.

<div align="right">

Lucil. 172-5

</div>

This episode is one that Cicero returns to repeatedly when he is referencing Lucilius. As well as the instances cited above, it appears at *de Orat*. 3.86, *Tusc*. 2.41, 4.48, *Q. Fr*. 3.4.2 and *Opt. Gen*. 17.[38] Pacideianus' name first appears in Lucilius and is attested elsewhere

---

[38] *Magister hic Samnitium summa iam senectute est et quotidie commentator; nihil enim curat aliud: at Q. Velocius puer addidicerat, sed quod erat aptus ad illud totumque cognorat, fuit, ut est apud Lucilium, Quamvis bonus ipse Samnis in ludo, ac rudibus cuivis satis asper sed plus operae foro tribuerat, amicis, rei familiari, de Orat 3.86; Tantum exercitatio, meditatio, consuetudo valet. Ergo hoc poterit Samnis, spurcus homo, vita illa dignus locoque vir natus ad gloriam ullam partem animi tam mollem habebit quam non*

only in Cicero and Horace.[39] However, not every instance in Cicero's work is linked to or attributed to Lucilius and it is possible that the episode was a well-known one and Cicero was not deliberately recalling the poet each time he referred to it. Horace mentions charcoal paintings of the fighters' contest which suggests it may have enjoyed an enduring fame outside of Lucilius' work. Cicero's repetition of the same Lucilian quotation or theme is not limited to his use of this gladiatorial bout, although this is the most frequent of the recurring Lucilian themes. Another example can be seen in the way in which Cicero quotes the lines Lucilius puts into Scaevola's mouth several times when discussing the correct arrangement of words.

Quam lepide λέξεις compostae! Ut tesserulae omnes rite pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato!

How charmingly are *ses dits* put together – artfully like all the little stone dice of mosaic in a paved floor or in an inlay of wriggly pattern!

Lucil. 84-6 (Warmington trans.)

These lines appear at *de Orat* 3.171, where they are spoken by Scaevola's son-in-law Crassus and Lucilius is not named as the source. They are quoted again and attributed to Lucilius at *Orator* 149, and the same lines are paraphrased and again attributed to Lucilius at *Brutus* 274.

Another repeated theme from Lucilius is his description of his ideal readership and how Lucilius claimed he was not writing for the most educated, but for those of more modest learning.

---

meditatione et ratione corroboret? Tusc. 2.41; *Sed in illo genere sit sane Pacideianus aliquis hoc animo, ut narrat Lucilius: Occidam illum equidem et vincam, si id quaeritis, inquit |Verum illud credo fore; in os prius accipiam ipse,| Quam gladium in stomach spurci ac pulmonibus sisto. |Odi hominem, iratus pugno, nec longius quidquam | Nobis quam dextrae gladium dum accommodet alter: |Usque adeo studio atque odio illius ecferor ira. Tusc.*4.48; *cum Aesernino Samnite Pacideianus comparatus viderer Q. Fr.* 3.4.2; *A me autem, ut cum maximis minima conferam, gladiatorum par nobilissimum inducitur, Aeschines, tamquam Aeserninus, ut ait Lucilius, non spurcus homo, sed acer et doctus cum Pacideiano hic componitur, - optimus longe post homines natos – Opt. Gen.* 17.
[39] *Cum Fulvi Rutubaeque | aut Pacideiani contento poplite miror | proelia rubrica picta aut carbone* Hor. *S.* 2.7.95-7.

<ab indoctissimis>

    nec doctissimis <legi me>; Man<ium Manil>ium

Persiumve haec legere nolo, Iunium Congum volo.

    ...that I should be read by the very uneducated nor the very

educated; I don't want Manius Manilius to read these things, but I

do want Junius Congus to.

                                         Lucil. 632-4

Persium non curo legere,

Laelium Decumum volo;

I don't care for Persius to read me,

I want Laelius Decumus to;

                                         Lucil. 635

Cicero quotes this passage at *de Orat.* 2.25, *de Fin.* 1.7 and *Brut.* 99. Cicero also repeatedly discusses Lucilius' description of Laelius and what it means to dine well, quoting the early satirist at *Fin.* 2.24-25 and *Att.*13.52.1. And he also repeats Lucilius' description of the unsmiling Crassus at *Tusc.* 3.31 and *Fin.* 5.92.

Although there are 35 instances of Cicero referring to Lucilius, it is clear that not all of these instances are unique quotations, and it appears that Cicero often returned to the same lines and themes. It could be that these quotes were particularly well known, since Cicero does not always attribute them to Lucilius, suggesting that identification of their source may not have been necessary. It could also suggest that despite writing an abundance of lines with the famous fluency of which Horace is so critical, only a small proportion of Lucilius' work was still being read and circulated in Cicero's time. It is impossible to say for sure what Cicero's motives were in choosing and returning to these quotations. However, this treatment is not reserved only for Lucilius' lines, and Shackleton Bailey points out that around a quarter of the quotes Cicero uses in his letters appear more than once, and the same percentage are repeated elsewhere in Cicero's work.[40] This is perhaps

---

[40] Shackleton Bailey 1983: 244.

to be expected if the quotationss that Cicero uses in his letters are those which came first from his memory.

Further light may perhaps be thrown on the question of which of Lucilius' poems were still in circulation in the time between his death and Horace's adoption of satire by considering the rolls which contained his work. Warmington identifies Lucilius' poems as being collected on three separate rolls, the earliest containing Lucilius' Books 26 to 30, a second which covered Books 1 to 22, and a third, published after the satirist's death, that contained Books 22 to 25.[41] Out of the fragments mentioned by Cicero, seven are from the second roll[42] (books 26 to 30), one is from the first roll[43] (Books 26 to 30), and the rest are not able to be classified as belonging to any particular book.[44] A similar pattern is found in the fragments quoted by Varro: four are from the second roll,[45] one is from the first roll[46] and the remaining ten are not assigned to any particular book.[47] It is tempting to infer from this that the second roll was more widely circulated and well known, particularly in comparison to the third roll. However, the large proportion of fragments in the list which are not assigned to any book make it impossible to draw any definite conclusions about the differences in survival between the three rolls identified by Warmington.

Lucilius and Pompey

The survival of Lucilius' satires and the continued interest in his work and circulation of his poems was thus helped by the writers and admirers discussed above. However, as well as sharing an appreciation of Lucilius' work, the majority of these men also held another attribute in common: an association with Pompey. Lenaeus Pompeius was the general's freedman who had joined him on almost all of his campaigns,[48] and his Lucilian-style attack on Sallust showed how his loyalty and dedication continued even after his patron's death. Curtius Nicias, an "authority on Lucilius",[49] was close to Pompey before their falling out over Nicias' role in Memmius' advances towards his wife. Varro, described by

---

[41] Warmington 1938: xxi.
[42] Lucil. 84-86, 87-93, 176-81, 182-3, 200-7, 595, 609-10 .
[43] Lucil. 635.
[44] Lucil. 1134, 1135, 1138-41, 1177, 1226-7, 1249, p422 of words not included in Warmington's text.
[45] Lucil. 1, 46, 232, 615.
[46] Lucil. 937.
[47] Lucil. 1162, 1169, 1175, 1192, 1215, 1221, 1242-3, 1248, 1271, p421 of words not included in Warmington's text.
[48] Suet. *Gram.* 15.
[49] Anderson 1963: 56.

Anderson as "one of the most active and versatile admirers of Lucilius",[50] was a supporter of Pompey's political ambitions and served as tribune, curule aedile and praetor, as well as joining him on military campaigns. Varro also wrote a guide for Pompey informing him of the workings of the Senate. Cicero, who shows an obvious familiarity with Lucilius' work, sided with Pompey at the start of the civil war with Julius Caesar, albeit less than enthusiastically. Anderson argues that it is "at least possible" that Valerius Cato was also a supporter of Pompey and "did take sides against Caesar".[51] Suetonius describes how Cato lived to very old age but lost his villa at Tusculum and fell into poverty which left him almost destitute when he died.[52] Anderson argues that Valerius Cato "probably wrote lampoons against Octavian",[53] and it was this hostility that was the reason he was left to struggle with financial problems. He suggests Cato's "later misery" could be linked to the fact that he "espoused the cause of Pompey and that he edited Lucilius as a Pompeian".[54]

The link between Trebonius and Pompey is less straightforward. Trebonius fought for Caesar in the civil war and was driven out of Hispania Ulterior, where he was governor, by Pompey's troops. However, his allegiance then changed and he was part of the plot to assassinate Caesar, delaying Mark Antony outside the Senate while the killing was carried out. Goh suggests that the intended target for the abuse which Trebonius refers to in his letter to Cicero could actually be Caesar, rather than the previously suggested candidates of Mark Antony or Dolabella.[55] If that were the case, it would perhaps make sense for Trebonius to hold up as his example a poet known to have links to Caesar's former enemy.

Pompey's family relationship to his great uncle Lucilius could have been the reason why figures such as Lenaeus and Curtius chose the satirist as their inspiration and the object of their literary attentions. There certainly appears to be evidence to support the idea that Pompey's household was one "which busied itself with editing, commentaries and poetic adaptation of Lucilius' *satura*",[56] and Anderson suggests that Pompey had a literary circle around him which was similar to the so-called Scipionic Circle of which Lucilius himself had been a member.[57] It would perhaps be appropriate for those reviving Lucilius' work to model their literary society on his example, as well as their poetry. Anderson argues that it was Lucilius' literary skill rather than any other fact that inspired the interest of Pompey's

---

[50] Anderson 1963: 70.
[51] Anderson 1963: 69.
[52] Suet. *Gram*. 11.
[53] Anderson 1963: 67-8.
[54] Anderson 1963: 69.
[55] Goh 2013: 80.
[56] Anderson 1963: 85.
[57] Anderson 1963:74.

friends, and that "his literary importance would shed a certain aura of distinction around Pompey, his great-nephew".[58] But as well as the family association and talents as a poet, Lucilius may have proved an attractive role model because of his associations with *libertas*, which will be discussed further below. Freudenburg describes *libertas* as "much more the watchword of the old republicans, such as... the Pompeians who made the most of Pompey's kinship with Lucilius".[59] Poetically and politically, Lucilius had much to offer the changing times.

The argument for a link between Lucilius' admirers and support for Pompey can perhaps find more evidence in Horace's *Satires* and in the later poet's choice of targets among his fellow writers. The first to taste Horace's scorn is the garrulous Stoic Fabius Maximus (*cetera de genere hoc adeo sunt multa, loquacem | delassare valent Fabium* 1.1.13-15). Freudenburg highlights the identification of Fabius as a supporter of Pompey by Porphyrio (*Pompeianas partes secutus*) and suggests that his patrician *nomen* Fabius would make this association "not surprising".[60] DuQuesnay suggests that the same political leanings may have been shared by the other literary figure attacked in 1.1, the bleary-eyed Stoic Crispinus (*ne me Crispini scrinia lippi | conpilasse putes, verbum non amplius addam* 1.1.120-1) who also appears in the third and fourth poems of the first book as well as the seventh work in Horace's second volume (1.3.139, 1.4.13-16 and 2.7.45).[61] Porphyrio identifies him as Plotius Crispinus, who may have had a link to the proscribed L. Plotius Plancus, and DuQuesnay argues that these "scraps of information tend to support speculation that Stoicism had a special connection with the Pompeian-Republican cause". Stoicism was a frequent target in Horace's *Satires* and if its followers did have an association with a political faction which was not only opposed to Horace's friends but were also linked to his poetic rival, then it is perhaps no surprising that it features so often.

Appian describes a Pomponius and a Balbinus who fled to Sextus Pompeius after being proscribed; DuQuesnay suggests that they could be the characters who appear in Horace's poems (Pomponius at 1.4.52 and Balbinus at 1.3.40), although there is no literary link to the pair, unlike with other targets, and Gowers suggests that Pomponius is being used as "a contemporary Roman equivalent of the prodigal son of comedy".[62]

---

[58] Anderson 1963: 74.
[59] Freudenburg 1993: 86.
[60] Freudenburg 1993: 111.
[61] DuQuesnay 1984: 54.
[62] Appian *Bell Civ.* 4.45 and 4.50; DuQuesnay 1984:53-4.

Another reference to a literary figure with links to Pompey comes in the final poem of Horace's first book, one which opens with a repeat of the attack on Lucilius from the fourth satire. In this tenth poem, the satirist refers to how he snubs the competitions for Tarpa's verdict (*haec ego ludo, | quae neque in aede sonent certantia, iudice Tarpa* 1.10.37-8), a reference to Sp. Maecius Tarpa, whom Pompey appointed to choose which plays would be performed in his theatre.[63] The tenth poem also includes a disparaging remark about Alpinus (*turgidus Alpinus* 1.10.36) who has been identified as the poet M. Furius Bibaculus, described by Tacitus as attacking Julius Caesar and Augustus.[64] Suetonius reveals that Bibaculus was a friend of Valerius Cato[65] and Anderson suggests that he may also have shared his admiration for Lucilius. He claims that the poet "obviously had been influenced by Pompey's ancestor" and was "probably a Pompeian partisan and a student of Lucilius".[66]

The names of some of Horace's other targets may also suggest a link to those with associations to Pompey. DuQuesnay lists those who "share their *nomina* with notorious opponents of the Triumvirs" as Cassius (1.10.62), Trebonius (1.4.114) and Tillius (1.6.24 and 107) and also highlights a possible link between Fannius (1.10.80) and C. Fannius, "the most honoured and faithful adherent of Sex. Pompeius".[67] He also suggests the Alfenus mentioned by Horace at 1.3.120 could be the P.Alfenus Primus who served as *legatus pro praetore* in Achaea, which had been granted to Sextus, making it "possible (no more) that he was acting for Sextus". [68] DuQuesnay also identifies a group of targets in Horace's satires who were hostile to Caesar or Octavian, listing the mime-writer Laberius (1.10.5-6), Pitholeon (1.10) and Alpinus (1.10), who he agrees is "plausibly identified" with Furius Bibaculus.[69] As part of the plot to assassinate Caesar, Trebonius, who showed his familiarity with Lucilius' work in his letter to Cicero which is discussed above, would also fit into this group if the Trebonius Horace refers to is the same C. Trebonius involved in the killing.

The case of Tigellius, one of Horace's most frequent targets, is slightly more problematic. Horace repeatedly singles him out for abuse (1.2.1-4, 1.3.4-19, 1.4.72, 1.10.80 and 90), yet Porphyrio describes how the singer was a close friend of Julius Caesar and all also much

---

[63] DuQuesnay 1984: 55; Gowers 2012: 166.
[64] Gowers 2012: 323: Tac. *Ann.*4.34.
[65] Suet. *Gram.* 11.
[66] Anderson 1963: 69.
[67] DuQuesnay 1984: 55.
[68] DuQuesnay 1984: 55.
[69] DuQuesnay 1984: 54.

admired by Octavian. DuQuesnay suggests that Tigellius may have switched his support to Sextus Pompeius and Horace does attack his inconsistency in particular (*nil aequale homini fuit* 1.3.9, *nil fuit umquam | sic impar sibi* 1.3.18-19), which would fit with the idea that he had changed his allegiance.[70]

It may be expected that Horace would turn his pen against those who were critical of the regime he was so close to, and several of the literary figures he targets do appear to have taken swipes at Octavian and those in power. This fact alone may have been the motivation for Horace's inclusion of them in his *Satires* and made them a fitting choice to face Horace's ridicule. However, it could be that some of Horace's literary targets were particularly attractive because of their Pompeian links and because of the association with Lucilius that some literary supporters of the faction held. If Lucilius was the poet most associated with Pompey's supporters, by choosing them as the victims of his satirical attack Horace also adds an extra layer to his disparagement of his predecessor.

Horace attacks Lucilius' poems directly in his fourth and tenth poems of the first book, putting the earlier satirist into his readers' minds and drawing the comparison between his own work and that of his apparently inferior predecessor. If many of the literary figures who supported Pompey were also admirers of Lucilius, by mentioning them in a disparaging tone Horace can again bring Lucilius to mind in a less than flattering light, this time without even having to name the earlier poet. The fact that they have hit out against Horace's powerful friends or that their loyalties lie elsewhere is an added bonus for the satirist looking for a target with a Lucilian flavour. Not only is the political loyalty of Horace's targets misplaced, but their literary judgment is called into question as well.

This may well be true in the case of Trebonius, who showed his familiarity with Lucilius and his wish to emulate him in his letter to Cicero discussed above. Although the surviving sources do not name Horace's other targets as having the same well-known association with Lucilius' work as figures such as Lenaeus Pompeius or Curtius Nicias, it is not implausible to think that they too could have been known at the time as admirers of Lucilius' poetry, helping to put them firmly in Horace's firing line. By choosing to attack such figures, Horace can strengthen his point both poetically and politically.

The shifting political allegiances of Horace's time however make it difficult to draw any definite conclusions about where rivals stood at any particular time and how far this influenced Horace's choice of targets. Horace knew from personal experience how

---

[70] DuQuesnay 1984: 56.

advantageous it could be to change sides and what effect the shifts in the political backdrop could have on circumstances.

While it is not possible to know the exact extent of Lucilius' readership when Horace was writing his *Satires*, or how much of Lucilius' work still survived in circulation in the decades following his death, it is clear that his poetry did not die with him. Readings of Lucilius' work by his friends and an edition of his poetry created by Valerius Cato would have helped ensure Lucilius still had an audience after his death. His work is quoted in a way that suggests he was still considered relevant to these later audiences and was used in different ways by different groups of readers. For the supporters and associates of Pompey, he was a major influence and inspiration when creating their own work as well as the poet whose work they chose to produce editions of, a decision perhaps not entirely surprising given Lucilius' family connection to Pompey. Lucilius' spirit and ferocious attacks were imitated in savage swipes such as Lenaeus' attack on Sallust and Trebonius wished to follow in his fierce footsteps with his own writing.

For Cicero, Lucilius was a source to be used in direct quotations, paraphrasing or through other unattributed references, with some of his work apparently committed to memory. Cicero's letters reveal a shared familiarity with certain lines of Lucilius between himself and his friends, suggesting that the satirist continued to have a readership in the years following his death. Lucilius also proves to be an effective tool which Cicero can employ to give certain dialogues a suitable sound for the time in which they were set. Cicero shows his knowledge of poets of the past by quoting him and uses this to ensure that his characters are more effective and realistic creations, drawing on a poet who would have been familiar to them as well as to Cicero's audience.

While at first glance Horace's assessment of his predecessor may appear to be harsher than that of Cicero, a closer investigation of how Cicero uses Lucilius' quotations shows that perhaps their opinions of Lucilius were not separated by such a great gulf. Both present Lucilius as a writer from an earlier generation who did not have to face the same critical scrutiny as he would have faced from later critics. While Horace exploits Lucilius' dated image for satiric effect and to make his own satire appear more up-to-date and novel, he may well have been drawing on beliefs about the satirist which were already held by his readers. But whatever the perception of Lucilius was before Horace, it is Horace's own comments on his predecessor that leave one of the most vivid pictures of his predecessor.

CHAPTER 1

Lucilius and the legacy of libertas: Horace's first book of Satires

The biting wit and scathing attacks of Roman satire had a fierce and fearless founder in Lucilius. He swung satire's sword and exploited the freedom granted by his social position and the age in which he lived. To Quintilian he was the poet of "remarkable learning and liberty,"[1] and to Varro his work was the supreme example of the simple style.[2] Lucilius' work was quoted by orators such as Cicero and Asinius Pollio,[3] and he was lauded as the favourite poet of many.[4] However, Horace, the successor to Lucilius' satiric genre, was not quite so forthcoming with praise of his predecessor. Despite grudging admissions of Lucilius' wit and an apparent insistence that he could never steal the inventor of satire's crown, the picture Horace presents of the poet is one of a rambling and careless composer, content to cram words into his metre and scatter his Latin lines with Greek. But although Horace appears to reject Lucilius' style of poetry, throughout his first book of *Satire*s there are still many traces of Lucilius' influence that can be found in the language, imagery and themes Horace chooses for his own compositions.

Horace addresses the issue of Lucilius directly in two of the poems of the book, the fourth and the tenth, where he explicitly lays out his criticisms of his predecessor. However, it is in the poems where Lucilius is not mentioned directly that his influence and continued presence in the background of Horace's satiric work can be felt most strongly. Horace uses allusions and references to the language of his predecessor to both bring him to the mind of the reader as well as to highlight his own differences from Lucilius and the qualities closely associated with him, such as his fierce invective and outspoken style. Horace employs these associations and allusions to create his own form of satire, an updated and reworked form of the genre that will be more suitable for the tastes and political climate of his own times.

Although Horace acknowledges Lucilius' place in satire's history, examples of language shared by both poets do not automatically provide evidence of a direct link between them. Both may have been drawing on other shared sources, such as the Cynic diatribes that

---

[1] 10.1.94 *Eruditio mira et libertas.*
[2] Gell. 6.14.6 *Exempla in Latina lingua M. Varro esse dicit ubertatis Pacuvium, gracilitatis Lucilium, mediocritatis Terentium.* See Holford-Strevens 1988: 162.
[3] Quint.1.8.11.
[4] Quint.10.1.93-94.

influence the first three satires in Horace's book. Ferriss-Hill argues for the strong influence of Old Comedy on both Lucilius and Horace and the use of Aristophanes' *Frogs* in particular will be discussed later in regard to the fifth poem of the first book.[5]

A further problem which must be considered when comparing the two satirists' work is the fragmentary nature of Lucilius' surviving poetry. With so much of the work missing, it is impossible to know for certain the precise nature and full extent of Horace's linguistic debt to Lucilius. Even those lines which do survive could well be thrown into a drastically different light if their full context were available to us. Warmington identifies at least 35 different sources in his edition of Lucilius' fragments with the most frequent by far being Nonius Marcellus.[6] Nonius cites 590 fragments, compared to just 30 which come from Sextus Pompeius Festus, the second most frequent source of Lucilius' surviving work. However, although the fragmentary nature of the surviving lines does present obstacles to examining linguistic links between the poets, it is not a reason to reject the attempt altogether. Many of the lines that do survive have been preserved because of the grammatical and lexical peculiarities they contain and because they have been of particular interest to grammarians. In tracing one author's influence on a later writer, the words and phrases which are of most interest and importance are precisely those that are unusual and that have been coined by the earlier author himself, or used in a unique or different way. However, the surviving text's preservation through its grammatical interest also creates another issue, which is highlighted by Korfmacher.[7] The text that remains could provide a skewed representation of the proportion of certain features in Lucilius' work, such as the inclusion of Greek words. It may be that Lucilius did use a large proportion of Greek words throughout his satires, or this may only appear to be the case because the fragments we have are those that have survived precisely because they include Graecisms, creating a disproportionately high picture of their frequency.

In looking at Horace's refashioning of Lucilian satire, it is not only the linguistic differences and similarities which will be examined here. The political context must also be taken into account, particularly when considering what Lucilius' poetry might have brought to a reader's mind during the time in which Horace was writing his *Satires*. Horace was himself in a potentially awkward position. He had been on the losing side at Philippi, but had moved on to become friends with some of the most powerful people in Rome. I will argue that through his poems and his reworking of Lucilius' genre, as well as through

---

[5] Ferriss-Hill 2015.
[6] Warmington 1938.
[7] Korfmacher 1935: 456.

creating a new style of satire, Horace is also presenting a new definition of *libertas*, one which is better suited to the political times and the position in which he found himself. By following in Lucilius' footsteps and making it clear that he is the successor to the poet of *libertas*, Horace can reclaim and reshape the idea for his own political side. It is a more refined, polite and discreet *libertas* Horace presents, the freedom to live an untroubled life, as shown in 1.6, rather than the licence to launch attacks on individuals.

The political landscape Horace was working in was markedly different to that of Lucilius' time. The Republic had all but slipped away as power began to shift into the hands of one man. Lucilius did not have associations only with figures who were linked with Pompey,[8] but also with the past days of the Republic, and in particular with the *libertas* linked to that time. This freedom was displayed in the invective so often linked with his poems. It was freedom in the sense of freedom of speech, the notorious, unrestrained licence of Lucilian poetry.[9] Horace accuses Lucilius of copying the *libertas* of Old Comedy (1.4.5-6) when he strikes at his targets, and it is this ferocious freedom of speech that Trebonius wishes to emulate in his own attack.[10] However, the line between justified *libertas* and unacceptable *licentia*, the sort of unruly outspokenness that goes too far,[11] is not a clear one. Attitudes to Lucilius show how the satirist may "claim a moral superiority that is loaded in *libertas* ... while fending off criticism that he is indulging in *licentia*".[12] Viewed from the perspective of Horace's day, there would perhaps be some debate over which side of the line Lucilius' work should be placed. Changing political times meant that what was once seen as acceptable outspokenness could now be viewed as risky dissent. The triumvirs' proscriptions were a recent and bloody reminder of the danger of falling out of favour.

As a citizen of Republican Rome, Lucilius "possessed an impressive, grade-A freedom in abundance ... so he speaks in abundance, freely, whatever he wants against whoever he chooses to name".[13] However, by Horace's day the political landscape had shifted and, as a genre intrinsically linked with its contemporary surroundings, these changes are not surprisingly reflected in satire. The freedom which Lucilius so famously exploited would perhaps not be seen in the same way in Horace's day, when Rome was taking the final steps away from being a Republic and when the satirist would be advised to think twice about whom he targets or whom he encourages to speak out. By the time of the late

---

[8] See Introduction.
[9] *O.L.D.* s.v. 8.
[10] Cic. *Fam* 12.16.3, see Introduction.
[11] *O.L.D.* s.v. 2a.
[12] Braund 2004: 410.
[13] Freudenburg 2001: 49.

Republic, *libertas* had become "a political watchword which meant in the first place republicanism".[14] It was an idea that was not merely concerned with free speech or lifestyle choices, but was a complex and loaded concept that had been frequently appropriated by political rivals and Dio tells how *libertas* was the watchword of Brutus' followers at Philippi.[15] *Libertas* was a word loaded with connotations as well as the word most frequently linked with Lucilius' free-speaking poetry. This was a combination of associations that Horace would inevitably have to navigate his way through once he had decided to follow in Lucilius' literary footsteps by writing satire.

In her 2012 work on *libertas*, Valentina Arena has argued that by the 40s there had been a shift in the meaning of the word that sees it become a concept that is more about personal freedom, a freedom from interference and a freedom to live life as one wishes. *Libertas* has gained "a new moral and universalistic dimension, centred round the *iudicium* of individual men".[16] As the state changes, the freedom enjoyed under it alters and I would argue that in his *Satires* Horace uses Lucilius' work as an example of this change in *libertas,* as he shows what is now preferred. In the same way that Lucilius' poetic style is seen by some as being out of date, his type of *libertas* is also rejected in favour of something more suited to the present times. Instead of *libertas* which provides a justification for outspoken invective, *libertas* is now concerned with the freedom to live in peace in the way one chooses. It is this type of *libertas* that Cicero describes in his *De Officiis* when he says that the mark of liberty is to live as one pleases.[17] In a shift away from Lucilius' brand of freedom, it is this type of *libertas* that Horace is also advocating. In the same way he updated Lucilius' poetic style and rectified what he sees as literary faults, Horace has also updated the *libertas* that is an integral part of satire.

Lucilius shows his *libertas* by not shying away from attacking powerful targets. As Gruen argues, he strikes at "public figures of every stripe" and is accorded a license which "stands out strikingly and undeniably".[18] But it is the quieter, more private form of freedom found in *de Officiis* which Horace extols. Horace's descriptions of his pleasant, relaxed style of living – thanks in no small part to his powerful friends – show this kind of *libertas* in action. In the sixth poem of his first book of *Satires*, Horace describes the untroubled way he spends his days, removed from the world of politics and power and free to devote himself to his studies. In the ninth poem, Horace talks about his relaxed, easy

---

[14] Wirszubski 1950: 95.
[15] Dio 47.43.1, 47.38.3, 47.42.3.
[16] Arena 2012: 261.
[17] *libertate uterentur, cuius proprium est sic vivere, ut velis* (Cic. *Off.* 1.70).
[18] Gruen 1993: 295.

friendship with Maecenas and his educated and urbane circle. No longer is *libertas* about Lucilian licence and free speaking abuse. It is now about freedom from interference and this is a freedom that Horace presents as being able to survive and flourish under the triumvirs, with no need to look back to the past days of the Republic. This is the *libertas* Horace is putting in his poems and his form of satire and Lucilius is an important point of comparison in this. Lucilius' satire is inextricably linked with *libertas,* and just as Horace has updated his poetic style, he has also updated the way *libertas* can survive and thrive in satire. Horace claims satire and its associated *libertas* for himself and his friends.

While Lucilius' reputation for *libertas* appeared to survive until Horace's day, it is difficult to know to what extent his poems carried the same association at the time he himself was writing. With so many of Lucilius' most notable admirers having associations with Pompey and Republicanism, it would not be hard to imagine that the link to the coveted crown of *libertas* could be something that was increased and amplified in the decades after the poet's death, when his outspoken insults became a useful example of former free speech. *Libertas* was a concept which political rivals battled to claim for their own side and the association between it and Lucilius' work could well be one that was cultivated by those looking back at it from the turbulent 30s and 40s. By writing satire espousing a different sort of *libertas*, Horace can claim back the concept from the political opponents of his powerful friends and place it among the qualities of his allies instead.

The different times in which Horace lived, and his more humble social status as freedman's son, meant Horace could never exactly imitate Lucilius' freely-spoken invective. As Freudenburg highlights, Horace tells in 1.6 how he learned his free-speech "from a *libertus*, a man of severely compromised freedom".[19] The later poet will almost inevitably produce a different style of satire. Horace draws attention to these differences between himself and Lucilius by using allusions to his predecessor, both explicit and implicit, throughout his first book. Particular words or phrases that are used by Lucilius, or found only in his work, bring the poet to the mind and reinforce the idea that Horace is creating a distinct and new style of satire. I will also argue that there are times when Horace deliberately avoids Lucilian language and allusions, for instance in his seventh satire, as he tries to distance Lucilian satire from previous associations.

For all their differences (and Horace is at pains to point them out at times), some similarities between the two satirists do still emerge, particularly in their attitude towards

---

[19] Freudenburg 2001: 50. See Williams (1995) for discussion of the possible background to Horace's description of his father as a freedman.

their desired audience. Neither Lucilius nor Horace aims to please everyone, but instead have a select few in mind. Cicero tells how Lucilius did not wish his work to be read by the very learned or the uneducated but by a reader who falls somewhere in between.[20] Horace, too, claims he is not writing for the masses. In the fourth poem of the book, he sets himself apart from those poets who are happy to recite anywhere and everywhere and to anyone who will listen (1.4.71-8). Horace's writings are not pawed by the sweating hands of the common crowd, instead they are recited to a select group of friends. In the final poem, we hear the names of these friends in a catalogue of leading figures (1.10.81-90). Like Lucilius, Horace refers to his desired reader by name, spelling out who he hopes will enjoy his form of satire. But while Lucilius may have insisted his work was not for the most educated, Horace manages to drop some weighty literary names into his list. Just as Horace opened his book with a nod to Maecenas, his famous patron is included in the list of readers he hopes to please as he closes the collection.

Satire 1.1

In his first three satires, Horace begins to reveal his idea of how the genre should work in his time. While the fourth satire is the most obviously programmatic in the book, there are also elements in the three preceding poems that help lay out what the satirist intends to do through clues in their language and style. Horace traces a path through Cynic diatribe, Lucilius' Republican rhetoric and Lucretius' philosophy to where he now sees satire. He calls each of them to the reader's mind before reaching the point in his fourth poem where he is ready to reveal what it is that he will do with the genre. Horace tries on the language of other authors, playing with their styles, before finally revealing what his own satire will be about. Freudenburg argues that, if Lucilius is brought to mind in Horace's opening poems, it is through "understated clues...such as the steady presence (in hexameters) of a strong first-person voice, fond of vulgar expressions, and ready to criticize moral faults and, at times, to name names".[21] However, I would also argue that Lucilius is also present through Horace's foreshadowing of the criticisms he will later make of his predecessor. Curran highlights how Horace often takes his time to reach the real point of each satire and works up to it gradually.[22] I would argue that as well as taking this approach to individual poems and their meaning, he also uses it across the book as a whole with regard to Lucilius. Horace uses the first three poems to gradually approach the topic of his predecessor, dropping hints of allegations he will later aim at him and bringing the earlier

---

[20] Cic. *de Or.*2.25.
[21] Freudenburg 2001: 19.
[22] Curran 1970: 224.

satirist to mind through linguistic and stylistic echoes. It is not until the fourth poem that Horace finally mentions Lucilius by name and is explicit in his criticism of him.

Horace opens his *Satires* with an immediate message to the reader about his own position through his address to Maecenas (*Qui fit, Maecenas* 1.1). Gowers sees this dedication as Horace's way of thanking Maecenas for his own self sufficiency – he is not troubled by dissatisfaction because of his patron's help.[23] However, it can also be seen as a way of putting in place a key aspect of the context of Horace's *Satires*. Maecenas, like Lucilius, will be another thread running through the book. From the first mention of his name in the opening words, through the description of life as his friend in 1.9, Horace's relationship with Maecenas develops throughout the book.[24] Through the reminder of their friendship, the reworked form of Lucilian *libertas* which is about to be revealed in Horace's poems is immediately linked with his patron and his powerful friends. Horace is updating his predecessor's genre in a political way, as well as poetically, and by locating himself within Maecenas' circle he can strengthen his position. Horace can show himself as reflecting ideas he has found in that company and link his satire to the changing political times.

Horace begins his first satire with a topic which appears to have an immediate connection with Lucilius, discussing dissatisfaction and 'mempsimoiria' (μεμψιμοιρία), the idea of unhappiness with one's lot. Gowers points to parallels between the poem and Book 19 of Lucilius, where similar themes are found, and suggests that Horace's work may have been a "compressed version" of his predecessor's book.[25] Warmington suggests that the Lucilian book contained only one satire and identifies 11 surviving lines from the work, which will be discussed below.[26] In their separate satires both Lucilius and Horace deal with those who are unhappy with the hand that life has dealt them and are offered an alternative, and both highlight the importance of knowing what is enough; both poems also feature the idea of piling up stores to last through the winter. Although the Lucilian influence is not as strong as in other poems of the collection, shared themes and ideas can still be found.

Straight away Horace has in his sights those he accuses of being overly loquacious and garrulous, the charge he will later lay specifically against Lucilius (1.4.12). Their verbose speech is in contrast with his own carefully controlled brevity, and all the chatterers (*cetera de genere hoc* 1.1.13), who would wear out the loquacious Fabius (*loquacem | delassare ualent Fabium* 1.1.13-14), are not the models Horace will use for his satire. In highlighting

---

[23] Gowers 2012: 59.
[24] Zetzel 1980: 68-70.
[25] Gowers 2012: 60.
[26] Warmington 1938: 182.

their over-effusive language, Horace foreshadows the criticisms he will later make about Lucilius, accusing him of carelessly churning out line after line of muddy verses (1.4.9-13) and producing poetry that stumbles clumsily along (1.10.1-6). Horace is already revealing his own tastes before explicitly introducing Lucilius and his verbosity.

After a swipe at those who covet what they do not have, Horace then claims he is turning to more serious subjects (*seria* 1.1.27) and putting aside playful sport (*amoto ludo* 1.1.27). The choice of *ludus* to describe this sport is appropriate after his mention of children learning their ABCs a few lines earlier, as it can also mean a school, and Horace uses this meaning later when he warns against a poet's work being recited in "cheap schools" (1.10.75).[27] However, it also appears to be a more significant choice, as it is one of the words Lucilius uses to describe his own satirical works. Lucilius refers to his work as "play and conversations" (*ludo ac sermonibus nostris* 1039) pairing *ludus* with *sermo*, the title used for Horace's satires by ancient commentators and the same word the poet himself uses later to describe his satiric works (*Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro, Ep. 2.2.60*).[28]

As he shifts his focus from envy to avarice, Horace employs the simile of an ant sensibly storing food for the winter, before using the comparison to launch a lengthy attack on the greedy man who will not be parted from profit. Fiske and Rudd agree that the same idea of the ant may also have been used by Lucilius in Book 19, where he describes the piling up of produce for the winter.[29]

> *Sic tu illos fructus quaeras, adversa hieme olim*
> *quis uti possis ac delectare domi te*

> Thus you should seek those rewards, which you may enjoy
> And delight yourself with at home when one day winter rages

> (586-7)

Both satirists use *quaero* in their description, with Horace describing the ant's haul as *illis quaesitis*, and they both choose *uti* to describe the enjoyment of those reserves (*et illis*

---

[27] *O.L.D* s.v. 6.

[28] Coffey: 1976: 69; Warmington (1938: 339) suggests that Lucilius wanted to pay tribute to the girl's beauty in one of his poems and points to the pairing of *ludus* and *sermones* as descriptions of his work (*Cuius vultu ac facie ludo ac sermonibus nostris | virginis hoc pretium atque hunc reddebamus honorem* 1039-40); Horace also refers to his work as *satura* where he reveals the complaints he claims have been made about Book 1 in the first poem of Book 2 (*sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer at ultra | legem tendere opus* 2.1.1-2).

[29] Fiske 1920: 232; Rudd 1966: 29.

utitur ante | quaesitis sapiens 1.1.37-8). However, it is not only Lucilius and Horace who employ this imagery, and Fiske notes the "wide use of animal similes and fables" by the Cynics, whose influence can be traced through the themes of Horace's so-called diatribe poems.[30] Rudd claims that Horace himself reveals Bion's influence on his work with his description of satire as *Bionei sermones*.[31] It must be asked whether similarities between Lucilius and Horace are due to the early writer's influence on the later poet, or whether both drew on an earlier, separate source.[32]

Horace moves on to a description of the risks of wanting too much and uses the image of drinking water mixed up with mud (*limo | turbatam haurit aquam* 1.1.59-60). Lucilius also uses *limus* in his description of the mud and filth of rivers (*fluvium limum ac caenum* 358) and Horace will use the image himself in his description of his predecessor, bringing to mind the famous Callimachean contrast between the filth-filled Euphrates and a pure stream to highlight the difference between his own poetry and that of Lucilius.[33] Horace describes Lucilius' poetry as flowing muddily on like a silted-up river (1.4.11), the opposite of the brevity which Horace admires. The same contrast is used here in the first satire where Horace questions the choice of a great river over a little stream (1.154-60). His later criticisms of Lucilius show the earlier satirist's work as the overflowing flood compared to Horace's carefully-controlled flow. The verb *limo* can also mean to polish a literary work[34] – something Horace would claim Lucilius' verses were in need of – which makes it appropriate in terms of the satirist's professed attitude to Lucilius. In his grudging admission that Lucilius' work is not quite as rough as that of earlier writers, Horace describes his poetry as *limatior* (1.10.65). Although Lucilius' poems are slightly more polished than those of his predecessors, Horace still makes it clear that more refinement would be needed for them to meet the standards of contemporary critics. Just like the earlier reference in the satire to chatterboxes, the image of the mud-thickened water foreshadows the explicit criticism Horace will later make of Lucilius.

---

[30] Fiske 1920:223.

[31] Rudd 1966: 18; Hor. *Epist*. 2.2.59-60 "You are pleased by lyric poetry, this man is delighted by iambic verse, that man by Bion's conversations and dark wit" (*Carmine tu gaudes, hic delectatur iambis,| ille Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro).*

[32] See Fiske (1920) 219-38 for the Cynic influences on Horace and Lucilius. He concludes that both satirists reveal a familiarity with their Greek predecessors and with Bion in particular.

[33] *Hymn to Apollo* 108-12 'Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ | λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ᾽ ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει. | Δηοῖ δ᾽ οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι Μέλισσαι, | ἀλλ᾽ ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει | πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον.'

[34] *O.L.D.* s.v. 2. The word is used in this way by Cicero to describe an orator's style at *de. Orat.* 1.115 and 3.190, again in a description of M. Piso's skill at *Brut.* 236 and in *Ac.* 1.2, where Varro describes polishing and refining one of his works. Cicero also uses the adjective *limatus* to refer to more polished philsophical works in *Fin.* 5.12.

The theme of dissatisfaction continues with the speaker's assertion that nothing is enough and that worth is judged by one's wealth (1.1.62). Here again Horace appears to echo Book 19 of Lucilius, where in fr. 591 the fool is never happy with what he has got: Lucilius' *nil sit satis* is mirrored in Horace's *nil satis est* (1.1.62). Both satirists choose *nil* instead of *nihil* which Mariotti claims was a feature of spoken language,[35] but this choice may also be influenced more by the confines of metre, particularly in Horace's case where the word is placed in a very emphatic position at the start of the hexameter. What Fiske describes as the "Horatian commonplace" of 'you are worth whatever you have' (*quia tanti quantum habeas sis* 1.1.62) has two forerunners in Lucilius. The first appears when Lucilius urges the reader, "May you hold so much, are yourself so much and be held to be so much" (*Tantum habeas tantum ipse sies tantique habearis* 1194-5), using several of the same words Horace will later use when he describes how wealth is equated with worth. Fiske argues that Lucilius deals with "essentially the same topic" again, when he compares a man with his gold.[36]

> *Aurum vis hominemne? Habeas. "Hominem? quid ad aurum?*
> *Quare, ut dicimus, non video hic quid magno opere optem"*

> Do you want gold or the man? Choose. "The man? What is he to the gold?
> Therefore, as we say, I do not see what I should particularly wish for in this case"
> (588-9)

The first example from Lucilius, fr. 1194-5, is not assigned to a particular book, but the second is again from the nineteenth, where several similarities to themes in Horace's first poem are found.

Turning next to the subject of frustrated desire, Horace chooses Tantalus as his example, thirstily snatching at the fleeing water (1.1.68-9). Again, this image has a forerunner in Lucilius who describes how Tantalus pays the penalty for his wicked deeds (*Tantalus qui poenas, ob facta nefantia, poenas | pendit* 136-7). Although both satirists use the image, it may not be evidence on its own of a direct borrowing from Lucilius by Horace. Lucilius' line mentions that Tantalus was punished, whereas Horace focuses on the nature of that

---

[35] Mariotti 1969: 96.
[36] Fiske 1920: 236.

punishment. Fiske argues that Tantalus was a "stock example of insatiate greed", which occurs as early as the third century B.C. in the work of the philosopher Timon of Philus.[37]

The despised miser lies hated in his sickbed (1.1.80-91) and Horace warns his readers of the dangers of greed with Ummidius' grisly end (1.1.95-100). The message of his opening satire is clear; moderation is the best path. Horace lays out an idea which will continue throughout his satires, where moderation is presented as essential not only in private and public life, but also in poetry. His reproaches aimed at lack of restraint once more foreshadow the criticism he will go on to make of Lucilius.

More examples of apparently Lucilian language are found in the names of the next characters that Horace brings before his readers to reinforce this lesson, Naeuius and Nomentanus. Gowers suggests that Naeuius is "possibly a Lucilian miser" after Porphyrio's note on Lucilius' description of him as stingy.[38] Nomentanus also features in Lucilius' satire, when he comes under scrutiny in court in 80-1 and is damned in the following fragment (82). Gowers calls him "one of Lucilius' favourite butts", and also suggests that his name could include a pun on Horace's refusal to abuse his targets by name.[39] The names also reappear in Horace's second book of satires, where Naevius is depicted as a host who offers greasy water to his guests (2.2.68-9) and Nomentanus is one of the guests at Nasidienus' dinner in 2.8.[40] Further echoes of Lucilius' language can be found in the following lines with Horace's warning of the risk of becoming a waster (*uappa* 1.1.104) or a good-for-nothing (*nebulo* 1.1.104). Here Horace slips into the abusive language particularly associated with his free-speaking predecessor and uses words that are also found in the earlier satirist's work. Fiske argues that Horace's use of *uappa* is linked to Lucilius' use of *uappo* to describe moths[41] and claims that "in changing *uappo* to *uappa* Horace gains variety and avoids the double use of the favourite Lucilian plebeianism ending in -o".[42] However, attribution of this word to Lucilius is described as dubious by the *O.L.D.*, and even if the attribution is accurate, it is too great a leap to link Lucilius' use of it to the form and meaning found in Horace. Horace's use of *nebulo*, however, does

---

[37] Fiske 1920: 226: Timon 18 (quoted in Fiske).
[38] Gowers 2012: 80: "However, Naevius was so thrifty that he was rightly held to be a miser, as Lucilius says" (*Naeuius autem fuit in tantum parcus ut sordidus merito haberetur ut Lucilius ait* Porph. on Lucil. 1257-8).
[39] Gowers 2012: 80.
[40] Rudd (1966: 142) argues that Porphyrio must have misread Lucilian lines since Naevius shows no miserly characteristics when he reappears in *S.* 2.268-9 and also argues that there is "no certain connexion between the Horatian and Lucilian Nomentanus".
[41] Warmington 1938: 421. The expression *hos uappones* has also been attributed (wrongly according to Fiske) to Lucretius.
[42] Fiske 1920: 245.

appear to have a more distinctly Lucilian flavour. It is also used before Horace as a term of abuse by Terence (who uses it twice in his *Eunuchus*, suggesting he may have coined the word)[43] and by Cicero,[44] and appears in Lucilius' description of a light-shunning wretch (*lucifugus nebulo* 500)[45] and a silly scoundrel (*nugator cum idem ac nebulo sit maximus multo* 611). Both *uappa* and *nebulo* also appear in Horace's second satire (1.2.12) where they are again placed close to each other in the text.

Horace finishes his first poem with the Lucretian image of the man who leaves life like the sated diner leaving the feast (*conuiua satur* 1.1.119), where *satur* brings to mind the *satura* we are reading.[46] In the penultimate line, Horace describes how Crispinus is bleary-eyed (*lippus* 1.1.120), a word which will recur in the satires, most memorably in Horace's description of himself during his journey with his influential friends, where he tactfully turns an ointment-smeared blind eye to whatever they may be engaged in (1.5.30). His choice of the word has a precedent again in Lucilius, who uses it to describe "an onion grower, teary-eyed through constantly eating the acrid onion" (*lippus edenda acri assiduo ceparius cepa* 217). However, the link with Lucilius is weakened by the fact that before the satirist the word is attested twice in Plautus[47], although Horace does appear to be the first author to use it after Lucilius.

Horace's first satire then shows several instances of language shared with Lucilius as well as common themes between the two satirists. As Fiske points out, this alone is not evidence for direct influence of Lucilius upon Horace, as the words shared by Horace and Lucilius also show the influence of earlier Greek works, and the two satirists could be drawing from another common source.[48] Rudd agrees with the influence of earlier authors, such as Bion, and claims that "many of the techniques found in the Horatian diatribes...had already been employed by Bion".[49] However, despite the likelihood of a shared source for

---

[43] Ter. *Eu*. 269 "I'm determined to have some sport with this scoundrel" (*Nebulonem hunc certum est ludere*), 785 "Clearly this man here now seems to be a great rascal" (*sane quod tibi nunc vir videatur esse hic nebulo magnus est)*.

[44] Cic. *S. Rosc*. 128 "And we are deceived by this good-for-nothing more cleverly than we think" (*nosque ab isto nebulone facetius eludimur quam putamus*); *Att*. 6.1.25 "I heard this from P.Vedius, a great scoundrel but nevertheless a friend of Pompey", (*haec ego ex P. Vedio, magno nebulone sed Pompei tamen familiari, audivi*).

[45] *Publius Pavus Tuditanus mihi quaestor Hibera | in terra fuit lucifugus nebulo, id genus sane* (499-500).

[46] Horace does not refer to his own work as *satura* (rather than *sermo*) until his second book of poems (*Sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer et ultra | legem tendere opus* 2.1.1-2).

[47] Pl. *Mil*. 1108 *(matrem) cubare...lippam atque oculis turgidis...dixit*; *Rud*. 632 *ab lippitudine usque siccitas ut sit tibi*. The fact that *lippus* and *lippitudo* refer to an actual medical condition suggests the word probably circulated widely and outwith Plautus, Lucilius and Horace.

[48] Fiske 1920: 247.

[49] Rudd 1966: 18.

some of the topics presented by Horace and Lucilius, Horace's poem still reveals glimpses of the criticism of Lucilius that is to come.

The linguistic echoes of Lucilius may not be particularly strong in the opening poem of the book, but Horace scatters hints throughout the satire of the accusations he will later level at his satiric predecessor. Horace uses the poem to set up his own position as a poet who believes in moderation and disapproves of excessive verbosity in others and this position will work as a contrast to the image of Lucilius he presents later. Readers may have started Horace's satires expecting to find a poet following closely in Lucilius' footsteps and there are indeed shared themes and vocabulary between the poets. But while he does share similarities with Lucilius' work, he also uses the opening poem to introduce his criticisms of Lucilius, and the loquacious Fabius and mud-filled waters will find an echo in Horace's verdict on his predecessor. Dufallo argues that the focus on *satis* in Horace's opening poem is linked with the idea of *satura*, where "'this is now enough' here means 'this is now (a) satire'".[50] . Horace begins his book of poems with a plea for moderation, and will go on to reveal how he believes his predecessor fell short of this ideal.

Satire 1.2

The Lucilian links in Horace's first satire may have been fairly subtle, but in his second poem of the book they emerge in a more obvious way. The Cynic-style diatribe of the opening poem is given a stronger Lucilian flavour as Horace turns to the issue of sex. As in the first poem, Horace uses some of the same themes as Lucilius, but it is his choice of language and use of words employed by only a few other authors except Lucilius which give the poem a clearer echo of his predecessor. As in the case of the opening satire, I would argue that Horace's second poem of the book also contains hints of the specific criticisms he will later level at Lucilius. Horace scatters the satire with Greek-influenced words, foreshadowing the complaints he will make about Lucilius' incorporation of the language into his Latin verse (1.10.20-30). Unusually for Horace's poetry, he also includes obscenities such as *cunnus* (1.2.36, 1.2.70)[51] and *futuo* (1.2.127) in a poem where he appears to deliberately lower his tone. But Horace still follows his own advice from the satire and makes a point of not going too far. He may use words with a Greek origin and sound to hint at Lucilius' incorporation of Greek into his Latin, but he does not go so far as to actually include Greek words in his satire. It is the same with his use of obscenity – Horace shows flashes of outspokenness but knows where to draw the line. Heeding the

---

[50] Dufallo 2000: 580.
[51] The word *cunnus* also appears in the third satire at 1.3. See Adams 1984: 80-1.

warning given by his graphic description of the adulterer's painful possible fates, Horace makes sure *he* does not go too far.

Armstrong also sees echoes of another Horatian criticism of Lucilius through the structure of this poem as well as of 1.1 and 1.3.[52] He argues that the parallel construction of the first three poems of the book acts as a comparison to the "formlessness" which Horace objects to in Lucilius' work.[53] The similar structure would begin to be apparent in the second satire, helping to highlight the difference between the satirists' work. Horace again shows he will take a different path to his predecessor before even mentioning Lucilius' name.

Fiske argues that out of all of Horace's satires, *S*.1.2 is "the most Lucilian in directness and crudity of diction, and ruthlessness of personal attack".[54] Richlin agrees that the language chosen by Horace helps to "bring Lucilius strongly to mind".[55] Horace exploits – with Lucilian *libertas* – the satirist's position as one who can say what he likes.[56] Fiske also points to the "distinctly Lucilian" vocabulary used by Horace in this poem and I would agree that the linguistic echoes of the earlier satirist are stronger here than in the opening satire.[57] Horace uses these echoes to bring Lucilius to the reader's mind and to highlight the differences between their forms of satire, as well as once more foreshadowing the criticisms he will make of Lucilius in the fourth satire. Although Horace has not yet referred to his predecessor by name, he has already begun to let Lucilius appear.

The poem opens with a string of foreign-sounding pejorative terms for the mourners of Tigellius, and Gowers suggests that Horace's use of recent events in his work may have been inspired by Lucilius' practice of writing about real-life occurrences.[58] Horace brings on stage a cast of characters with a foreign flavour as the Syrian word *ambubaiarum* and the Greek-derived *pharmacopolae* flank the very Roman *collegia*.[59] This is the first example in the poem of Horace foreshadowing the criticism he will make of Lucilius for using Greek words in his satire. In the fourth poem of the book (discussed further below), Horace questions alleged admiration for mixing Greek and Latin and makes it clear that it

---

[52] Armstrong 1964.
[53] Armstrong 1964: 94.
[54] Fiske 1920: 256. Fiske uses this as evidence for an early date of composition compared to the other poems in the book.
[55] Richlin 1983: 174.
[56] Hooley 1999: 38.
[57] Fiske 1920: 271.
[58] Gowers 2012: 90.
[59] The word *pharmacopoles* also appears before Horace in a speech by Cato (*Orat*.121 = Gell.1.15.9) and also in Laberius' mimes, according to Chatisius (*Simiam auctores dixerunt etiam in masculino, ut Afranius in Temerario… Laberius tamen in Cretensi ait: pharmacopoles simium |deamare coepit* 25). Panayotakis (2010: 238) highlights how the Greek word φαρμακοπώλης can be traced back to Old Comedy in Aristoph. *Nub.* 766.

is not a practice he will use. The second satire has a distinct Lucilian flavour to it and this is strengthened by the incorporation of Greek-sounding words. But Horace does not go so far as to include actual Greek words in his own poetry. Instead, he uses Latinised versions of Greek words that have crossed over into Latin to keep to the satire's message of not going too far. He chooses a Greek loan-word which has already appeared in the work of another Latin writer, Laberius (also writing in a 'low' genre), for the first line of his Lucilian-sounding poem.

The grieving beggars (*mendici* 1.2.2) have a possible precedent in Lucilius' wretched beggar (*miserum mendicum* 745) and the repeated *m*-sounds found in Horace's lines echo similar alliteration in the line by Lucilius.[60]

> *Mendici, mimae, balatrones, hoc genus omne*
> *maestum ac sollicitum est cantoris morte Tigelli.*

> The beggars, actresses, clowns, all this type
> Are grieving and distressed by the death of the singer Tigellius.
> (Hor. *S.* 1.2.2-3)

> *Rerum exploratorem mittam, miserum mendicum petam.*

> I shall send someone to investigate the matters, I shall seek a miserable beggar
> (Lucil. 745)

While Horace's beggars are qualified by the adjective *maestus* rather than *miser*, *maestus* is also used by both satirists, although it is not an uncommon word and it is neither poet's preferred word for melancholy.[61] The alliterative cold and hunger, *frigus* and *famam*,

---

[60] There is also another possible echo of Laberius 73a here as he used the term *mendicimonium* (*Laberius in mimis quos scriptitavit oppido quam verba finxit praelicenter. Nam et 'mendicimonium' dicit et 'moechimonium' et 'adulterionem' 'adulteritatem'que pro 'adulterio' at 'depudicavit' pro 'stupravit' at 'abluvium' pro 'diluvio'...* Gell.16.7).. It is perhaps appropriate that lines describing mime actresses in mourning should feature echoes of the language of mime.

[61] *Maestus* appears twice in Lucilius, at 745, quoted above, and 931-3, compared to six instances of *tristis*. Horace uses *maestus* on five occasions with *tristis* appearing 32 times, with two of those uses in *Satires* 1 at 1.2.3 and 1.5.93.

which Horace describes in 1.2.6, also appear in Lucilius (686, 460), who prefers *exigo* to *propellere* for his description of driving out the cold (686).

In line 8, Horace uses the first of several words which have a primarily agricultural meaning: he describes the wasting of an inheritance with the verb *stringat,* a term used for stripping leaves or fruit.[62] *Exsecat,* used in line 14 to describe Fufidius trimming off his cut, also has an agricultural flavour to it, and later in the poem Horace, like Lucilius before him, uses terms borrowed from the world of farming to describe sexual acts. Horace refers to grinding (*permolere* 1.2.35) where Lucilius has *molere* (302), and the similarly agricultural-sounding 'winnowing' (*uannere)* also appears in the same fragment.[63] Adams describes how *molo* "had already acquired a sexual use in Republican Latin", and Lucilius uses *molo* in this way, to which Horace adds the intensifying prefix *per*.[64] Adams notes how Lucilius may also have used the word to describe an adulterous encounter, and highlights "the tendency of the verb to be restricted to the male role in adulterous liaisons", pointing out how it was used in the same sense by Varro.[65] Along with the other agricultural terms used in the poem, such as *stringat, exsecat* and *demeterent* (1.2.46), this adds to the sense of a ruder, earthier setting, instead of the sophisticated city-home of Horace and his friends. This is satire from an earlier, more rustic time with earthy language to match. Here again Horace pairs the Lucilian *uappa* and *nebulo,* terms discussed above, to describe the good-for-nothing reputation Fufidius fears acquiring (1.2.12).

Horace continues with an image from comedy, presenting the unhappy father and the opening scenes from Terence's *Heauton Timoroumenos* before answering imagined objections that he is straying from his point; the poet who pillories garrulous others emphasises the fact that he is not wasting words on irrelevancies (1.219-24). The reference to Terence is an interesting one after Horace's earlier use of *nebulo,* a word coined by the comic playwright and also used by Lucilius. Horace opens the poem with a disreputable cast of characters from the stage, described in language that mirrors that of Laberius, then keeps up the theme with references to comedy. Repeated references to these lower genres help to add to the outspoken and earthy character of Horace's second poem. Lucilian satire is linked to mime and comedy as an insalubrious source of Horace's allusions.

---

[62] *O.L.D.* s.v. 3.
[63] 'To not grind against others' wives' (*non alienas | permolere uxores* 1.2.34-5); 'He grinds, but she winnows out with her loins as if it were corn' (*hunc molere, illam autem ut frumentum vannere lumbis* Lucil. 302)
[64] Adams 1982: 152-3.
[65] Adams 1982: 153; Varro, *Men*. 331.

The reader is then introduced to Horace's tunic-trailing Maltinus in line 25, who also appears to have his roots in Lucilian language with a name hinting at his effeminacy.[66] Nonius refers to the use of *malta* to describe someone soft and womanish and points to its Greek root in μαλακος , adding Maltinus' name to the list of words in the poem formed with a Greek influence.[67] Lucilius uses *maltus* to describe someone effeminate (*Insanum vocant quem maltam ac feminam dici vident* 744), a meaning Horace plays on to characterise effectively one of his satiric cast.

After a scent-filled stroll past Rufillus and Gargonius, Horace reaches the main theme of his satire: a discussion about the most sensible sexual choices. Fiske points out how setting a scene outside the brothel (*fornix*) brings to mind the title of one of Lucilius' works,[68] and the lines that follow also contain distinct similarities to the earlier satirist's work. In what Fiske describes as "a clear Lucilian reminiscence",[69] Horace refers to the godlike opinion of Cato in line 32 of the poem (*sententia dia Catonis*). The phrase echoes that used by Lucilius to describe a similar verdict of Valerius (*Valeri sententia dia* 1240).[70] Gowers points out that Cato's encouraging praise of the brothel visitor (*macte virtute esto* 1.2.31-2) is "possibly an imitation" of Lucilius' fragment 245 ('*Macte', inquam, 'virtute simulque his versibus esto*').[71] Horace's speaker uses the same words in the same order as Lucilius' speaker, although he omits the earlier mention of verses. Horace then uses the agricultural-sounding *permolere* (as discussed above) to describe the lover's actions. Horace also includes the more archaic passive infinitive form *laudarier*,[72] possibly for metrical reasons, which helps add an older feel to the language, perhaps appropriately because of the recollection of Ennius that will soon follow.

In line 36, Horace includes the first of several obscenities in the poem when he describes Cupiennius, the "admirer of white-robed cunt" (*mirator cunni Cupiennius albi* 1.2.36). Although *cunnus* is not in extant Lucilius, Fiske argues that it is one of a number of words in Horace's second satire that, although they are not found in the surviving lines of

---

[66] Gowers 2012: 95; Rudd 1966: 143.
[67] Nonius 37.6.
[68] Fiske 1920: 256; Arnobius, 2.6.4 'Because you have stamped on your memory the *Fornix* of Lucilius and Pomponius' *Marsyas*' (*quia* Fornicem *Lucilianum et* Marsyam *Pomponi obsignatum memoria continetis)*
[69] Fiske 1920: 256.
[70] Fiske (1920: 257) speculates that Lucilius could be basing his phrase on an unknown Ennian line and is referring to the contemporary satirist Valerius Valentinus, who claimed in one of his poems to have seduced a free-born girl. Fiske claims that Lucilius "might have used this incident to point to a moral in the very satire in which he praised *per contra* the institution of the brothel".
[71] Gowers 2012: 98.
[72] cf *S*. 1.2.78 *sectarier*. See de Melo 2007: 1-2, Clackson and Horrocks 2007: 100 and de Melo 2011: 327-8.

Lucilius, still contain a "Lucilian coloring", along with the clowns of line 2 (*balatrones*),[73] the insatiable gullet of line 8 (*ingluuies*) and the sexual tension described in line 118 (*tentigo*).[74] The choice of name also seems significant, blending *cupio* with Ennius, who is the model for the following line. Horace assures the reader it is worth listening if they are the type who do not want to see adulterers do well (*audire est operae pretium, procedere recte | qui moechos non uultis* 1.2.36-7). The Ennian line focuses on the advancement of Rome,[75] which makes Horace's use of it in his discussion of adulterers a comical contrast between the elevated style of language and the subject matter in the poem.

In his description of these lovers in line 38, Horace calls them *moechos* instead of *adulteri*, a word also employed by Lucilius in his abusive compound *moechocinaedus* (1048).[76] Gowers describes the "shocking" effect of using a "colloquial Greek word" such as *moechus* after a line from the very Roman Ennius.[77] The word is a legal term which made its way into Latin through comedy which may explain its colloquial associations. It is echoed later in line 49 when Horace uses the verb *moechatur*. Again, the use of *moechus* is an example of Horace's choice of a word which has entered Latin from Greek; in using it, Horace does not commit the sin he accuses Lucilius of, namely to mix the two languages.

Horace then reveals the high price some pay for their pleasures, including the unfortunate victim of the servants in line 44. The compound *permingere* is found only here in Horace and in Lucilius (*perminxi lectum, inposui † pedem † pellibus labes* 1183), but there is a difference in the meaning implied by the two authors. Gowers[78] suggests that it should be read as 'buggered' in Horace, but Lucilius uses the term to describe a different action, that is the wetting of a bed. Adams points out how verbs which describe urinating are also often used to refer to ejaculation and it may be argued that in Lucilius' line either meaning could be applied.[79] However, in Horace's case the meaning seems more likely to be ejaculation,

---

[73] *Balatro* reappears in *Sat.* 2.8.21 as the name of one of Maecenas' hangers-on, Servilius Balatro, who accompanies him to Nasidienus' dinner.
[74] Fiske 1920: 271.
[75] Ennius, *Ann.* 494-5 *Audire est operae pretium, procedere recte| qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere uultis.* Skutsch (1985: 653) claims that the "humorous use" made of these lines by Horace suggests they are from the *Annals* as the comic contrast "would lose much of its effect" if they were from the less well-known *Satires*. Skutsch says it is not possible to know in what context the words were spoken, but highlights the fact that *operae pretium est aurdire* is "a phrase used when an important piece of information is to be conveyed" (1985: 653).
[76] There is another possible echo of Laberius here who coined the term *moechimonium* (Panayotakis 2010: 413). The term *moechus* is also used repeatedly by both Terence and Plautus, adding to the comedic echoes found in the poem. Horace is giving the passage a mock-legal flavour through his choice of words.
[77] Gowers 2012: 100.
[78] Gowers 2012: 101.
[79] Adams 1982: 142.

where the description of the servants' sexual release is used to convey the idea of the assault on the adulterer.

As he continues to warn of the dangers lying in wait for illicit lovers, Horace again returns to agricultural-sounding language with the risk of castration described as 'cropping' (*demeterent* 1.2.46). The target of this attack is the lover's *cauda*, a word which Lucilius uses for a scorpion's raised tail (*scorpios cauda sublata* 1079-80), and which, according to Adams, may have first been given the meaning of penis by Horace.[80] For a safer sort of sexual liaison, Horace suggests the freedwomen he describes as goods of the second class (*merx in classe secunda* 1.2.47); Lucilius also uses *merx* as well as *mercatura* (340, 341-2), albeit not in relation to women in a sexual context. Horace warns how sexual desire can put not only a person but also their property at risk, muddying their inheritance (*rem patris oblimare* 1.2.62). Like the earlier muddied image, the use of *limo* means "Lucilius' artistic sloppiness…is also anticipated"[81] with another hint at the criticism to come.

To deliver his next message, Horace introduces a new speaker: the lover's penis (*muttonis* 1.2.68). Adams describes this sort of personification as common in Latin;[82] it is a device also employed by Lucilius, who uses the image of the penis' 'tears' being wiped away by a mistress (*at laeva lacrimas muttoni absterget amica* 335). As with *permingo*, Horace and Lucilius provide the only surviving examples of the use of *mutto*, and Adams argues that Horace "would certainly have taken it from Lucilius".[83] Horace chooses *mutto* despite having already shown that he has several words he could have used for penis, for example *uenas*, which appears at 1.2.33 and is used "not infrequently", as well as *cauda* (1.2.45).[84] Fiske, however, argues that the imitation of Lucilius lies not so much in the use of *mutto* but "rather in the personification of the animus which speaks in the name of the *mutto*",[85] although in Lucilius' poem the *mutto* does not speak, but sobs. However, these two aspects are by no means mutually exclusive and the links to the Lucilian use of the word are strengthened by the dual nature of the echo of the earlier satirist.

Horace continues with his calls for caution and compares choosing a lover to a king's appraisal of a horse (1.2.86-9). The examination of the animal's anatomy immediately brings to mind the corresponding parts of a woman's body and the horse is described with

---

[80] Adams 1982: 36.
[81] Gowers 2012: 104.
[82] Adams 1982: 29.
[83] Adams 1982: 63. Adams also points out the derivative *mutonium*, used by Lucilius (Warmington 1967: 418) and *mutuniatus,* which is found in Martial 3.73.1 and 11.63.2.
[84] Adams 1982: 35.
[85] Fiske 1920: 265.

language already used by Lucilius about sexual encounters. The beautiful haunches of Horace's horse (*pulchrae clunes* 1.2.89) are described with the same word which is applied to the jerking buttocks of Lucilius' liaison in 361 (*crisabit ut si frumentum clunibus uannat*), which, as in Horace's second satire, employs agricultural imagery in a sexual setting with the description of the woman moving as if she is winnowing corn. Lucilius also uses the same word as Horace (1.2.89) for a horse's neck (*cervix* 152), and a few lines later (1.2.93) Horace selects an uncommon word, *nasuta* (259), which is also found in his predecessor's work, to describe a lover's long nose.[86] Horace's creation in the same line of the compound *depugis,* "flat-buttocked", also has an apparent precedent in Lucilius' use of *puga* in a compound adjective, in his case his use of *noctipuga* as an obscenity (*noctipugam<medica>*1179).[87] This is another example of Horace choosing a word derived from Greek, for the hapax legomenom *depugis* is a Latin version of the Greek ἄπυγος.[88] However, while some of Horace's language has a precedent in Lucilius, there are also occasions where he appears to deliberately distance himself from the earlier satirist's use of words. With his choice of *tentigine* to describe sexual tension in line 118, Horace "Latinizes the technical Grecism of Lucilius 332", who instead uses the obscene ψωλοκοποῦμαι to express the same idea.[89] Again, Horace shows how he believes Greek should be treated in Roman satire, predicting his attack on Lucilius' use of the language.

As the poem nears its close, Horace again chooses an obscene word, as he describes the lover 'fucking' his mistress (*futuo* 1.2.127). The excessive license of the adulterer is matched by the narrator's license in the use of language, perhaps appropriately in a poem that contains so many words that are shared with Lucilius. The satire is unusual in its use of so many obscene words (*futuo*, *cunnus*, *mutto*), but perhaps this is explained by the particularly Lucilian character of the poem. Fiske argues that Horace's second satire is "inconceivable" without the "satirical moulding" of material by Lucilius.[90] There are also echoes of comedy and mime, as Horace gives the satire a 'lower' tone through his language and subject matter. And as in the opening poem, Horace continues to foreshadow his explicit criticisms of Lucilius, sprinkling Greek loan-words and Latinized versions of

---

[86] Used later with the different meaning of 'witty' or 'satirical' in Seneca, *Suas*. 7.12 and Martial 2.54.5, 12.37.1
[87] The O.L.D. defines *noctipuga* as "the female genitals" while Warmington (1938: 385) translates the fragment as "the midwife ... the nightly-poked slut". Paulus' note on the fragment says that Lucilius meant the word to signify something obscene (*Lucilius cum dixit obscenum significat*).
[88] Gowers 2012: 110. Horace uses *puga* again near the end of the satire at 1.2.133 in his description of what could lie in store for the adulterer caught in the act.
[89] Gowers 2012: 114.
[90] Fiske 1920: 274.

Greek terms throughout his poem to show the difference between himself and Lucilius. Horace, unlike his predecessor, knows how far to go and when to stop.

The idea of knowing the appropriate limit is a key aspect of Horace's treatment of Lucilian satire as a whole. In the second poem of the book, the reader sees a glimpse of Republican satire under the free-speaking Lucilius as Horace presents an outspoken style of poetry. But the satire also shows the potential consequences of this lack of restraint. Horace's immoderate lovers meet an unhappy end as they fall victim to floggings, thieves and furious husbands. In the same way, the excess found in Lucilian satire – poetically through his verbose style and politically through his outspokenness – could have an equally unpleasant outcome. Horace may use his predecessor's language, but he will not follow Lucilius' example and he shows that he knows where to employ restraint. The repeated echoes of Lucilius through language bring the earlier satirist to mind and allow Horace to show how different his poetry will be from that of his predecessor. Lucilius may have had the political freedom to say what he liked about whomever he liked, but Horace knows when restraint is necessary. He uses Lucilian language to create a satire with a Lucilian flavour but keeps his outspokenness to a sprinkling of obscenities.

Satire 1.3

In the last of the so-called diatribe satires, Horace makes his third appeal for moderation. This time, his focus is on friendship and the appropriate way to treat the faults of others. The poem at first appears to owe a greater debt to Lucretius than to Lucilius and the echoes of *De Rerum Natura* in the satire have often been noted.[91] Horace's discussion about not seeing a loved one's faults (1.3.38-66) mirrors the same idea in Lucretius (4.1153-80) and his description of the development of civilisation (1.3.99-112) also has a parallel in the earlier work (5.783-1457). The linguistic echoes of Lucilius are scarce in this poem and Fiske argues that the third satire was "written without the direct consciousness of a Lucilian model".[92] However, there are still some traces of shared language to be found, and Horace continues to foreshadow his complaints about Lucilius. Here, the spotlight is turned on the earlier satirist's notoriously savage treatment of others in his poetry and the free-speaking attacks that Horace claims Lucilius inherited from Old Comedy (1.4.1-5). Horace uses the poem to highlight how different his approach to such satiric onslaughts will be.

[91] See for example Gowers 2012:120, Rudd 1966: 26, Freudenburg 2001: 16-17 and Mayer 2005: 149.
[92] Fiske 1920: 274.

As discussed previously, Horace's refashioning of Lucilian satire was not only restricted to updating Lucilius' poetic style but also had a political aspect in its association with the idea of *libertas*. Horace takes the genre associated with Lucilius, invective and Republicanism and reclaims it – and its famous *libertas* – for his own allies. Satire's poetic style must be updated and so must the *libertas* associated with the genre. One of the clearest examples of this change in outspokenness can perhaps be seen throughout the third satire. The poem urges tact and cautious discretion in dealing with the faults of others, describing the gentle ways to deal with describing a friend's failings. These carefully chosen words reflect Horace's own approach to the invective previously thrown at individuals in Lucilius' satire. Horace will not turn on his powerful friends or reveal their secrets. It is better that the satirist exercises his *libertas* elsewhere and in a much less controversial manner.

Horace reassures his patron Maecenas, who also appears in the poem showing tolerance to Horace's own faults (1.3.63-6), that he will show only kindness to his friends. In addition to the mention of Maecenas, the third satire also contains the only direct reference in the whole book to Octavian. Horace describes how Caesar could have compelled the singer Tigellius to perform in what Gowers describes as a "sinister hint at his powers of control and censorship" (1.3.4).[93] With this line, I would argue that Horace is also making a point of acknowledging the fact that he recognises the power of Rome's future leader. He knows better than to use Lucilian *libertas* against friends or figures in power and his satire will celebrate a more suitable style of that freedom.

Although the linguistic similarities with Lucilius are difficult to find in the third poem, they are not entirely absent. Names once again provide a link between the two satirists with the mention of a Maenius by Horace at 1.3.21 being identified as the same Maenius whom Lucilius describes looking for his pillar overlooking the forum (*Maenius columnam cum peteret* 1136-7). In 1.3.56 there appears to be another link with Lucilius, when Fiske suggests that Horace's encrusted pot (*uas incrustare*) is "evidently a recollection" of that of Lucilius at 128-9 (*incrustatus calix*).[94] However, *incrustare,* although not a particularly common word*,* is not unique to Lucilius and Horace, and the word is also used by Varro.[95] Horace also uses *uas* to describe his encrusted vessel, rather than Lucilius' more Greek-sounding *calix*. Horace is no longer creating the Lucilian-sounding tone of the previous poem. However, Lucilius, like Horace, uses the phrase during a discussion on how something apparently negative may be judged positively by a different viewer.

---

[93] Gowers 2012: 122.
[94] Fiske 1920: 275.
[95] Varro *R.* 3.14.5; 3.15.1; *Men.* 533.

nam mel regionibus illis

incrustatus calix rutai caulis habetur

For in those regions

The dirt-encrusted pot and stem of rue are regarded as honey

(128-9)

 It is even argued that Lucilius himself features in the satire, with the drunken guest spraying diners at 1.3.90 "thought to be a portrait of the uninhibited *bon viveur* Lucilius".[96]

Instead of the Greek-sounding *moechus* that Horace prefers in the second satire, he now uses *adulter* to describe illicit lovers in line 106. Again, as with his choice of *uas* rather than *calix*, he is leaving the more Greek-sounding language of 1.2 behind. The use of *adulter* is soon followed by another use of the obscenity *cunnus*, but on this occasion, as Gowers points out, it also works as a play on the genitive form of the Greek word for 'bitch' (κυνός), a term which Helen applies to herself in the *Iliad*.[97]

By focusing on friendship and tolerance, Horace is again foreshadowing later poems and presenting his style of satire as different to that of Lucilius. Horace is a tactful friend, and although he will drop an impressive list of names when he discusses his companions in poems such as his fifth, sixth and tenth satires, he will be careful not to place his friends in his satiric spotlight. He will not employ savage invective or personal attacks as Lucilius did. The order of the poems in the book also adds a piece of typically Horatian irony to what will come next. Horace may have devoted the third satire to the importance of kind treatment and avoiding malice, but he uses the fourth poem to launch his first explicit attack on Lucilius as he finally brings his generic predecessor on to his satiric stage.

Satire 1.4

In his fourth satire, Horace finally reveals his own plans for the genre in the most explicitly programmatic poem so far. He lays out his idea of what satire should be in the culture favoured by Maecenas now that Lucilius and his unrestrained Republican invective are in

---

[96] Gowers 2012: 136.
[97] Gowers 2012: 141; *Iliad* 6.344, 6.356; Mayer (2005: 149) sees the inclusion of *cunnus* as Horace's way of taking a Lucretian idea and then "bringing the whole context down to the level of satire" with one word.

the past. Horace shows that his new breed of satire can be trusted and that his friends are safe. However, while unveiling his own particular interpretation of the genre, he still includes in his language reminders of its founder to bring him to readers' minds and to remind them of the differences between himself and his literary predecessor.

Straight away Horace creates the idea of a genealogy for his genre by highlighting the poets of Old Comedy before moving quickly on to Lucilius. Shortly before the satirist's name is mentioned, Horace highlights the frankness (*libertate* 1.4.5) with which the comic writers struck at their targets, using a term heavily associated with Lucilius. Before we even hear his name, we think of Lucilius' trademark *libertas*, a word which does not appear anywhere else in Horace's first book. Horace then accuses Lucilius of relying entirely on the playwrights of Old Comedy, an allegation described by Rudd as an "absurd over-simplification".[98] Ferriss-Hill argues that the inclusion of Lucilius and Old Comedy means that Horace can place himself in the tradition of Roman writers claiming a Greek origin for their chosen genre.[99] She sees the opening address of the satire as Horace's way of expressing "the parabatic essence shared by Old Comedy and Roman satire" and claims it contains the suggestion that "Roman satire is Greek Old Comedy made Roman".[100] The issue of genre may also contribute to another possible motivation for Horace's claim about Lucilius' total dependence on the playwrights of Old Comedy. Sommerstein argues that Horace chose to link Lucilius to these writers because he did not want to present him as the heir to the Greek iambic poets, since that was a position he wished to claim for himself through the *Epodes*.[101] By simplifying the influences he presents as shaping Lucilius' poetry, Horace can leave other Greek genres free of a Roman innovator until he presents his own compositions. Horace cannot ignore Lucilius' role in Roman satire, but he can "deny him the mantle of Archilochus" by associating him with the comic playwrights.[102]

By presenting Lucilius as a poet who did nothing but change the metre of Old Comedy,[103] Horace clears the way for his own style of satire and paints a picture of his predecessor as a poet who is unoriginal and no longer up to date.[104] However, even in Horace's supposed dismissal of his predecessor, Fiske sees a Lucilian echo. He argues that Horace's *hic omnis*

---

[98] Rudd 1966: 89. For discussion of the veracity of Horace's claim see also Sommerstein 2011: 35-8.
[99] Ferriss-Hill 2015: 5. Zimmermann (2001: 188-95) argues for a series of parallels between Lucilius and Aristophanes. The question of the extent of the Greek influence on Roman satire raises issues over the accuracy of Quintilian's famous claim that *satura quidem tota nostra est* (10.1.93).
[100] Ferriss-Hill 2015: 10, 5.
[101] Sommerstein 2011: 37.
[102] Sommerstein 2011: 38.
[103] Sommerstein points out that "in most of his early work, Lucilius did not even change that but used the most common metres of Old Comedy" (2011: 35).
[104] Gowers 2012: 149.

pendet Lucilius appears to be a paraphrase of *unde haec sunt omnia*, a phrase from Lucilius' line on what has arisen from older works (*archeotera ... unde haec sunt omnia nata* 411), and is a "direct and significant allusion to the critical theories of Lucilius".[105]

Horace then arrives at his key criticisms of Lucilius and returns to the Callimachean image of a flood as he accuses the earlier satirist of flowing on like a muddy river (*flueret lutulentus* 1.4.11), overflowing with words which he is too lazy to polish (*garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem* 1.4.12). Lucilius' poetic style is presented as having none of the moderation that Horace has repeatedly recommended in his first three poems and, as Gowers points out, Lucilius himself refers to his work as something thrown together spontaneously (*qui schedium fa<cio>* 1131).[106] Horace also chooses the same word to describe Lucilius (*garrulus*) that he will later apply to the pest who bothers him in 1.9; once again, loquacious abundance will be contrasted with Horatian brevity. However, there may be a faint echo of Lucilius in Horace's use of *famosus* for the notorious targets of comedy (1.4.5) and *vitiosus* to describe Lucilius' poetic fault (1.4.9), since the earlier satirist was particularly fond of –*osus* endings[107]. These endings, however, are by no means unique to Lucilius.

Despite levelling his accusation at Lucilius, it is a different writer who challenges Horace to a literary joust. It is Crispinus who throws down the poetic gauntlet in 1.4.14. Crispinus may see merit in an endless flood of words but Horace humbly presents himself as a poet of few words and a feeble mind (1.4.17-18). This self-deprecating persona foreshadows the same picture Horace will paint of himself in the *Epodes*, where the collection opens with an admission of failings (*Epod.* 1.10). Horace's use of *inopis* to describe himself may also hint at another difference between him and Lucilius, referring to Horace's lack of material wealth compared to his predecessor. Horace's emphasis on his rare and few words has both a poetic and a political aspect. Poetically, he stresses the importance of un-Lucilian brevity

---

[105] Fiske 1920: 281.

[106] Gowers 2012: 157. *Schedium* is derived from the Greek σχεδιάζω, which means to improvise or do something without care. Cicero uses it in a letter to describe telling stories in a haphazard order (*te enim sequor* σχεδιάζοντα *Att*.6.1.11). The word *schedium* is attested twice in descriptions of Lucilius' poetry. In the *Satyricon*, Agamemnon offers to put together a few improvised low lines in the style of Lucilius (*ne me putes improbasse schedium Lucilianae humilitatis, quod sentio et ipse carmine effingam* (Petr. 4.5). Apuleius also uses it to refer to an improvised style of poetry associated with Lucilius (*in isto, ut ait Lucilius, schedio... incondito experimini, an idem sim repentius, qui praeparatus* (*Soc.* pr.1). However, as both these references occur after Horace's *Satires* it is impossible to say how much the characterisation of Lucilius as someone who throws out improvised lines is based on the later satirist's description of his predecessor, rather than an impression gained of him from his work alone or from a separate source. Ingersoll (1912) discusses other later occurrences of the word and argues it could have been used as an early name for satire.

[107] Mariotti 1969: 104.

in his work and marks his place as a modern writer following Alexandrian principles.[108] Gowers suggests that this contrast between the styles of Horace and of Lucilius can be seen again in 1.4.38, where Horace invites his imagined interlocutor to accept a few arguments against his point of view (*agedum pauca accipe contra*) and "perhaps meaningfully compresses the pleonasm of Lucilius 1063" (*summatim tamen experiar rescribere paucis*).[109] Lucilius may attempt to reply in a few words, but Horace makes sure he expresses the same sentiment in just four words instead of five. Politically, Horace shows he knows when to keep quiet and reassures readers of his harmless intentions. This reassurance is strengthened by Horace's portrayal of himself in the following lines as a private poet who shuns public recitations and is read by no one. The theme of impotence which will run through the *Epodes* is seen here as Horace plays down any possible power.

Horace moves to reassure his reader while revealing how poets are feared and their verses dreaded because of their merciless writings (*omnes hi metuunt uersus, odere poetas* 1.4.32). The allegations and accusations levelled at satirists are something Lucilius also dealt with in his poetry and in his thirtieth book in particular. Warmington claims that the book contained an argument between the satirist and "at least one other literary man" and the surviving lines do appear to show traded accusations and responses.[110] The lines refer to libelling someone, using the same word Horace gives his collection of satires (*et maledicendo in multis sermonibus differs* 1086) and describe the writer's pleasure in publishing such reports (*Gaudes cum de me ista forus sermonibus differs* 1085). The claim that the writer relishes such attacks is echoed in the allegation Horace imagines someone else making later in 1.4, where he presents himself as facing a charge of taking pleasure in hurting another's feelings (*'laedere gaudes' | inquit 'et hoc studio prauus facis'* 1.4.78-9).

Horace's apparent modesty continues as he excludes himself from the ranks of those called poets (1.4.39-40), and Lucilius' views on what makes a poem can perhaps be traced in this claim. Gowers suggests that the tradition of not regarding satire as poetry may have begun with Lucilius himself after he described his own work as merely impromptu lines (*qui schedium fa<cio>* 1131)[111] and Fiske argues that Lucilius' discussion of the distinction between *poema* and *poesis* reveals his interest in the question of "true poetry".[112] Lucilius describes his work as conversation and play, *sermo* and *ludus* (1039), but Horace insists that the man who writes what is close to everyday speech (*sermoni propiora* 1.4.42) cannot

---

[108] Schlegel 2010: 257.
[109] Gowers 2012: 162.
[110] Warmington 1938: 344-5.
[111] Gowers 2012: 162. See n176.
[112] Fiske 1920: 287.

be called a poet. But, as Schlegel highlights, the evidence contradicting this statement is obvious and plays a key role in the comedy of the poem. Horace is obviously writing verse and also identifies his own writing with that of Lucilius (*ego quae nunc,| olim quae scripsit Lucilius* 1.4.56-7).[113] He then goes on to disprove his own point about the unpoetic nature of satire with a complex word-order that shows up the simplicity of the lines he has selected from Ennius (1.4.55-62).

After explaining his preferred audience (1.4.71-8), Horace imagines the allegations he might face, including the suggestion he takes pleasure in injuring others (*laedere gaudes* 1.4.78), and chooses a word that is used both by Lucilius and in a description of events involving the earlier satirist to describe this attack. Lucilius imagines an adversary accusing him of lashing his victims (*nos laedis vicissim* 1075), using the verb *laedere* in the same sense as Horace did, that of causing harm with words.[114] It is also the term used in the description of how someone verbally attacked Lucilius on stage and was prosecuted and acquitted.[115] Just as in previous satires, Horace again shows how he can adapt Lucilius' use of Greek words to present a more acceptable Latin equivalent. The *triclinium* of Lucilius is replaced by a Romanized description of the three couches in the dining room (*tribus lectis* 1.4.86), as Horace "domesticates the Grecizing word".[116]

As will also be seen in the tenth poem, Lucilian influences on Horace's language are not as strong when he is explicitly referring to his predecessor. When the reference to Lucilius is a direct one, Horace does not need to rely on more subtle allusions through his language to remind his readers of the earlier satirist. He can draw the contrast between himself and Lucilius directly as he makes clear the differences between his own satire and what has gone before. In such contexts, Horace's language is more his own and relies less on Lucilian echoes. With the fourth satire, Horace finally introduces Lucilius by name – along with his criticisms of him – after scattering hints of him and his perceived failings throughout the first three poems. But the Lucilian thread running through Horace's book does not end there. The fourth satire plays a key role in being a programmatic declaration of the un-Lucilian path Horace will follow by bringing together the foreshadowing of the opening trio of satires. As well as a culmination of what has gone before, the poem also provides context to what will follow. Horace's reader approaches the fifth satire with the criticisms of Lucilius fresh in their mind. They have seen Horace's rules for satire and will

---

[113] Schlegel 2010: 259.
[114] *O.L.D.* s.v. 4: *T.L.L.* s.v. VII.2 868.84-869.32.
[115] *Rhet. Her.* 2.19 *Item C. Caelius iudex absoluit iniuriarum eum, qui Lucilium poetam in scaena nominatim laeserat.*
[116] Gowers 2012: 172.

now see them in action as he reworks a Lucilian poem with echoes of the Old Comedy he accused his predecessor of relying upon so heavily.

Satire 1.5

In the fifth poem of his first book of *Satires*, Horace takes his reader on a journey with him from Rome to Brundisium. Throughout this trip, allusions to Lucilius can be traced in the language Horace uses and the situations he describes. The poem's position in the book of *Satires* can also be seen as significant when considered in this Lucilian context. Appearing directly after Horace's accusation that Lucilius is wholly dependent on Old Comedy (1.4.6), it can be argued that Horace now attempts to prove his point by presenting his version of a Lucilian poem and by scattering it with echoes of Aristophanes.

The exact purpose of this diplomatic mission which Horace is part of is not clear, although we are teased with hints about its importance and the famous figures involved. Three suggestions have been made for the reason behind the trip, with the most likely purpose, according to Gowers, being the Treaty of Tarentum, which was signed in 37 BC.[117] Tarentum is at the end of the Via Appia, although the ever tactful and discreet Horace carefully ends his recollection of the journey in Brundisium before the crucial meeting.

In choosing to compose a satire about a journey, the grammarian Porphyrio reveals in his scholia on Horace that the poet used an earlier model for his work: Lucilius' *Iter Siculum*.[118] The account of his journey is found in Lucilius' third book and was probably a much longer account than Horace's traveller's tale, which fits with the later poet's insistence on brevity.[119] The shared subject matter on its own is obviously not enough to claim evidence of a direct link between the satirists, and Gowers argues that Horace is "exploiting a long history of comparing *sermo* to a journey".[120] However, the repeated similarities, the examples of shared language, and the poem's position in the book of

---

[117] The other suggestions are the Treaty of Brundisium, which was signed in 40 BC, before Horace and Maecenas knew each other, and Antony and Octavian's meeting in Athens in 38, which would have probably involved leaving from Brundisium.

[118] "In this *Satire* Horace emulates Lucilius in describing his own journey from Rome to Brundisium, which he also did in his third book, first from Rome to Capua and from there to the strait of Sicily" (*Lucilio hac satura aemulatur Horatius suum a Roma Brudisium usque describens, quod et ille in tertio libro fecit, primo a Roma Capuam usque, et inde fretum Siciliense*).

[119] Fiske (1920: 314-316) suggests a possible reconstruction of Lucilius' journey as opening with a proem (94, 95, 96, 143, 133, 140), followed by the first day (102-5, 106), a period of rest (107), the contest of the *scurrae* (109-10, 111, 114), getting a ship in Puteoli and sailing (118, 119, 120, 121, 123), and then a stay at the Syrian landlady's inn (124, 99-100, 125-32, 135).

[120] Gowers 2012: 184; Gowers (1994: 51) points to the presentation of conversation as a journey in Cicero's *De Oratore* 2.234: *Et Antonius 'perpauca quidem mihi restant,' inquit 'sed tamen defessus iam labore atque itinere disputationis meae requiescam in Caesaris sermone quasi in aliquo peropportuno deversorio.'*

satires combine to create a convincing argument of a link between the two satirical road trips. After using *Satire* 1.4 to reveal the form he believes satire should now take, Horace puts his theory into practice with his own version of Lucilius' journey poem. Fiske describes Horace's work as a "direct paraphrase" of the third book of Lucilius,[121] and Cucchiarelli agrees it is a deliberate decision by Horace to use the poem which follows his criticism to "measure up for the first time to his direct predecessor".[122] Horace was "bent upon continuing the satires of Lucilius in a more polished form",[123] and took Lucilius' description of a journey and applied to it his rules of style to produce a more polished poetic tour. Lucilius' muddy route, described in what Horace sees as a muddy rambling style, will be transformed into an updated satirical trip more suited to Horace's day. Although Horace will encounter similar situations to his predecessor, the reader who joins his journey will be taken on a markedly different trip.

As both satirists make their journeys, we learn about the physical conditions of their trip, with descriptions of the forms of transport they use and the conditions they encounter on the road. For Horace, whose apparent lazy and laidback attitude contrasts with the pressing political issues that sparked his travels, an early stage of his trip takes twice as long as it might do for others. Horace also puts emphasis on his party's slow pace later in the poem with verbs that suggest crawling along (*repimus* 25, *erepsemus* 79) and time spent waiting (*manemus* 37). Gowers highlights the contrast between the "humble traveller Horace and the mounted *eques* Lucilius, who got through a faster journey more slowly on paper".[124] Welch also sees a link between Horace's speed and that of his predecessor, arguing that his pace at 1.5.5-6 is a jibe at Lucilius' journey which "covered far more geographical ground but moved, poetically speaking, much more slowly".[125] With his slimmed-down style, Horace hopes to avoid the clogged and muddy path of Lucilius' poetry. Horace's slowness and caution in travelling reflects the care he takes in his compositions.

Lucilius' description of travelling to Setia seems to suggest that he completed the trip in one day.

> *Verum haec ludus ibi, susque omnia deque fuerunt,*
> *susque haec deque fuere inquam omnia ludus iocusque;*
> *illud opus durum, ut Setinum accessimus finem,*

---

[121] Fiske 1920: 306.
[122] Cucchiarelli 2002: 844.
[123] Fraenkel 1957: 107.
[124] Gowers 2012: 189.
[125] Welch 2008: 52.

ἀιγίλιποι montes, Aetnae omnes, asperi Athones.

The fact is these things there were all just fun, and everything was easy going,

I say all these things were easy going and fun and a joke;

But when we came to Setia's boundary, that was hard work,

Goat-deserted mountains, all Etnas, harsh Athoses.

(102-5)

As Gowers points out, the passage contains examples of the stylistic idiosyncrasies that Horace had criticised in Lucilius' poetry.[126] The "singsong repetition" of *susque… deque* and the repeated idea of a leisurely start to the day could well be examples of the muddy style that drew Horace's criticisms in the previous poem (1.4.11). Horace may have spread out his journey, but he keeps his description of it concise (1.5.5-6). The final line of the fragment, also containing typically Lucilian alliteration and elisions, includes another of Horace's complaints about his predecessor, the use of Greek words in Latin (1.10.20-1). When Horace sees the mountains of Apulia, they are the familiar peaks of home, unlike Lucilius' foreign-sounding and troublesome range.

While the *eques* Lucilius would have been able to travel by horse, the humble freedman's son Horace is accompanied by mules. They draw the barge (1.5.13), carry the packs (1.5.47) and do not escape the journey unscathed (1.5.21). Horace uses *mula* to describe his animals, whereas Lucilius employs the more Greek-sounding *cantherius* to describe the nag whose ribs were being pressed by the weight of its load (*mantica cantheri costas gravitate premebat* 101). Through Horace's choice of transport, Gowers argues that he "manufactures a social distinction" between himself and horse-riding Lucilius (191).

In the description of the angry traveller's violent outburst, there is another link to Lucilius' language. Horace describes the hot-headed passenger who turns on the mule and the sailor as *cerebrosus* (1.5.21). This is a word which, before Horace, is attested only in Lucilius. The earlier satirist uses the term to refer to a man who is easily maddened *(insanum hominem et cerebrosum* 519), apparently like Horace's short-tempered boatman.

---

[126] Gowers 2012: 188.

Just like Horace's route, Lucilius' journey also involved travel by water, passing Minerva's headland after leaving Puteoli (119), stopping at Salernum (120), sailing on to Portus Alburnus, arriving at night at Palinurus (122) and seeing Stromboli erupt as they sail past (146-7). Fiske claims that, to Horace's audience, his journey would appear to be a "contemporary paraphrase" of Lucilius' coastal trip.[127] However, some of the language Lucilius chooses to describe these journeys presents him as a different sort of traveller to Horace. As Gowers points out, Horace takes a passive role along his route, where he is "swallowed up by inns and villas (*accepit* 1, *recepit* 50, *recepisset* 80), swept along (*rapimur raedis* 86), thrown out (*exponimur* 23), carried away by sleep (*aufert* 83) or diverted from it (*avertunt* 15)".[128] Even when he finally sees the mountains of Apulia, Horace does not actively look at them, instead it is the mountains that show themselves to the poet (*montes Apulia notos | ostentare mihi* 77-8). Out of the 19 first-person verbs used in the poem[129], only six are in the singular, including one in a quotation from Messius (*accipio* 58) and another in a passage that contains Horace's formulaic plea to the Muses (*velim memores* 53). Of the remaining four uses, it is only Horace's description of waiting for the girl who never arrives (*exspecto* 83) and his declaration of war on his stomach (*indico* 8) that relate directly the events of the journey. The other examples describe the narrator's more general view of matters, first his opinion on friendship (*contulerim* 44) and lastly his knowledge of the gods (*didici* 101). Lucilius however appears to have a more active attitude towards travelling. He describes his party's passing of Minerva's headland with *superamus*, a nautical word but also one with connotations of overcoming and outdoing which are anything but passive (*promontorium remis superamus Minervae* 119). He also describes himself arriving with the verb *peruenio* (*Palinurum pervenio* 122), a term which Horace uses only once in his poem and which Rudd describes as "a colourless travel word" of the sort rarely found in Horace.[130]

Back on land, both satirists face the problem of battling through roads clogged with mud. Lucilius picks a path through the alliterative slippery mire (*praeterea omne iter est hoc labosum atque lutosum* 98), while Horace finds his way made more unpleasant by rain (*corruptius imbri* 1.5.95) with Fiske arguing that the later writer "paraphrases a Lucilian allusion to the wretched conditions".[131] Horace avoids the alliteration and elision of

[127] Fiske 1920: 314.
[128] Gowers 1994: 57.
[129] *Diuisimus* 5; *indico* 8; *sentimus* 21; *exponimur* 23; *lauimus* 24; *repimus* 25; *subimus* 25; *linquimus* 35; *manemus* 37; *contulerim* 44; *uelim* 53; *ridemus* 57; *accipio* 58; *tendimus* 71; *erepsemus* 79; *exspecto* 83; *rapimur* 86; *peruenimus* 94; *didici* 101.
[130] Rudd 1966: 58.
[131] Fiske 1920: 312.

Lucilius' description; however, mention of mud brings to mind his own accusations against his predecessor's poetry (*flueret lutulentus* 1.4.11).

While both Horace and Lucilius describe the travelling involved in their journeys, they are not always on the move. Both reveal the hospitality, entertainment and disappointments encountered during stops along the way. Horace's first problem comes from the water, causing him to "declare war on his stomach" (*uentri | indico bellum* 1.5.7-8) and leaving him waiting while his companions eat. Horace is not alone in his digestive discomforts and Lucilius describes the acrid belches breathed out by an unhappy diner (*exhalas tum acidos ex pectore ructus* 120). Rudd[132] also argues that Horace's frustrated dinner guest who can only watch the feast has a parallel in the third book of Lucilius in his reference to Tantalus.

> *Tantalus qui poenas, ob facta nefantia, poenas pendit*
>
> Tantalus, who pays the penalty, the penalty for his impious acts
>
> (136-7)

The Lucilian fragment is sometimes explained as a reference to sexual frustration, and Fiske suggests that it may refer to Lucilius in a similar situation to that of Horace, waiting for a girl who does not arrive (1.5.82-5).[133] The combination of frustration and untouchable food however does makes Rudd's analysis an attractive one. Although Rudd admits that "Lucilian influence may well account for the mention of the erotic episode", he disagrees with the inclusion of the unassigned fragment 1183, which describes another solitary ejaculation, in Book 3 (*Perminxi lectum, inposui pedem pellibus labes*).[134] It is perhaps tempting to link this line with Horace, since *permingo* appears to occur only here and in Horace's *S*.1.2.44,[135] although, as discussed previously, the later satirist uses it with the sense of penetration.[136]

Despite discomfort and disappointment, the two satirists also describe the hospitality encountered during their journey. Both mention innkeepers, the dishonest kind in Horace

---

[132] Rudd 1966: 56.
[133] Fiske 1920: 311.
[134] Rudd 1966: 55-6.
[135] 'Servants buggered this man' (*hunc perminxerunt calones* 1.2.44).
[136] Adams 1982: 142.

(1.5.4) and a Syrian hostess (or possibly a tavern) in Lucilius (123). The hospitality however does not always end well, and Horace's party faces an unexpected fire, described with epic-style imagery. The cause of the blaze, the skinny thrushes (*macros...turdos* 1.5.72) being roasted, also has a flavour of Lucilius, who uses the same word (also in the accusative case) to refer to another sort of bird, this time doves (*macrosque palumbes* 479).

Along the way, the satirists also find time for entertainment, and in Horace's case this takes the form of the verbal scrapping between the *scurra* Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus which occurs in the centre of Horace's poem (1.5.51-70). Their verbal duel "plays out some of the obsessions of the oldest Roman satire, with its hints of cuckoldry, farce and animal abuse".[137] More insults are revealed in Lucilius' description of traded abuse in Book 3. Some of the Lucilian lines are loaded with alliteration, such as the repeated *p* sound in the jibe about being poured out rather than born (*non peperit, verum postica parte profudit* 111), as well as the fragment which follows, containing another animal image which refers to "with one eye and two feet, halved just like a pig" (*uno oculo, pedibusque duobus, dimidiatus* 112-13). Horace shows much less of this alliteration in his choice of words, although there are examples in the description of the mutilated man's threats (*mutilus minitaris* 1.5.60) and the mistress' claims (*deterius dominae* 1.5.67). His use of alliteration is kept to shorter phrases when compared with Lucilius' use of repeated sounds. Horatian brevity can also be seen elsewhere during the verbal jousting. He does not fill his poem by quoting each insult and joke flying between the pair, but instead uses "conscious abbreviation"[138] in describing their number (*permulta iocatus* 62, *multa* 65). After attacking Lucilius' overflowing style in his previous poem, Horace ensures that even the characters he presents do not clog up his listeners' ears with their words.

It is not only the jibes of the *scurra* that bring a smile to Horace's face during their trip. He and his companions also find amusement in mocking the locals they meet, laughing at the official's pretentious regalia (1.5.34-6). This sort of teasing is particularly significant in the case of Horace, who has moved up in society from a small town to the sophisticated city of Rome. Similar mockery is found in Lucilius 232, where he warns against making Cecilius a yokel praetor and reflects the official's more rustic accent in the spelling of his office

---

[137] Gowers 1994: 59.
[138] Gowers 2012: 202.

(*Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat* 232). Both urbane authors share a joke at the expense of their less-cultured country counterparts.[139]

Horace may be quick to notice the faults of others, but he also demonstrates his discretion when it comes to the affairs of his friends. He ensures he is blind to events on the political mission unfolding around him by covering his eyes with black paste (*nigra collyria* 1.5.30). It can be argued that the ointment he uses has a certain Lucilian scent to it, since Porphyrio comments at the start of Lucilius' twenty-first book that the book was known as *Collyra*, after the name of Lucilius' mistress.[140] Once more, Horace reassures his reader that he will not let his satire stray towards subjects he would be best to avoid.

In both journey-poems the satirists, perhaps unsurprisingly, include details of distances covered during their travels. However, as Fiske highlights, these figures are more common in Lucilius' poem than in Horace's satire. Horace avoids repeating the number of miles he has travelled on his journey and only mentions these distances twice, where in each case there is a reason for revealing the number of miles travelled.[141] In 1.5.25 he emphasises the short distance they have managed to crawl (*milia tum pransi tria repimus*) and later he refers to covering more ground when his party are travelling in carriages (*quattuor hunc rapimur uiginti et milia raedis* 1.5.86). In Lucilius' journey, the references to distance create more "prosaic turns".[142] He gives the distance from Capua to the river Volturnus (*Volturnus Capua longe III milia passum* 106), the distance between the port and the harbour of Salernum (*ad portam mille a portu est exinde Salernam* 120) and the distance they have travelled from Capua (*bis quina octogena videbis | commoda te, Capua quinquaginta atque ducenta* 140). Lucilius also measures the journey to the river of Silarus and Alburnus Haven in hours instead of actual distance, with a similar sounding start to Horace's carriage journey (*quattuor hinc Silari ad flumen portumque Alburnum* 121). As Fiske points out, the remaining fragments do not provide enough evidence to conclude that Horace was either following Lucilius in recording the amount of distance covered, or he was deliberately leaving out these facts. If the four examples in Lucilius are the only examples from his travels, this would suggest that both authors were fairly sparing with

---

[139] Horace and Lucilius also appear to share a taste in puns on names. Horace introduces his reader to his hosts Murena ('lamprey') and Capito ('mullet'), as they, rather appropriately, supply his party with food (1.5.38). Lucilius also plays with the equally fishy name of Lupus ('bass'), warning of the dangers of two other sorts of fish (*Occidunt, Lupe, saperdae te et iura siluri* 46).

[140] Warmington points out that the book number given in the manuscripts is XVI, and adds that there is no reference to a mistress in the remaining fragments of that book and that instead the name could belong to Book 21, of which no fragments remain (see Warmington 1938: 195).

[141] Fiske 1920: 311.

[142] Fiske 1920: 311.

exact details such as these. However, Lucilius' *Iter Siculum* could equally have contained many more instances, perhaps making Horace's avoidance of distance details a deliberate choice to demonstrate a difference between his style of satire and that of Lucilius.

One place where Horace does appear to follow Lucilius is his treatment of words that do not fit into the rhythm of his poetry, in this case the name of the town where his party were taken.[143] The strict confines of his metre mean that it is a place "which cannot be said in verse" (*quod uersu dicere non est* 1.5.86) by a poet working in Lucilius' satiric hexameters. The problem of fitting subject matter into metre is also one which is encountered by Lucilius, although it does not occur in a fragment from Book 3, where his journey is detailed. Lucilius, using a typically longer expression than the more concise Horace, describes "the slaves' holiday which you certainly could not say in a hexameter line" (*Servorum est festus dies hic | quem plane hexametro versu non dicere possis* 252-3).

After examining the evidence, Horace's satiric journey does seem to share several features with the journey of Lucilius. However, it has been argued that Horace chooses a poetic path that also brings to mind another earlier work: Aristophanes' *Frogs*. As Cucchiarelli, Sommerstein and Ferriss-Hill have highlighted, some of the circumstances that arise during the journeys of Horace and Lucilius can also be found during Dionysus' and Xanthias' journey in Aristophanes' work. These shared occurrences appear to take on more significance when viewed in the context of the position of poem 1.5 in Horace's book of *Satires*. In his discussion of Lucilius in his previous poem, Horace accuses him of being wholly dependent on the writers of Old Comedy (*hinc omnis pendet Lucilius* 1.4.6). In his reworking of one of Lucilius' poems, the deliberate inclusion of cues from these writers would certainly help prove Horace's point and strengthen his case against his predecessor. A reader who approached Horace's first book of satires in order would still have Horace's accusations against Lucilius and his association with Old Comedy in mind when they reached 1.5. If Horace is revealing his version of a Lucilian satire, and if he claims that his predecessor was influenced by Old Comedy, then we could expect to find traces of it in Horace's version of Lucilius' journey. Obviously the references would only work if Horace's audience were familiar with Aristophanes; however, as Gowers points out, much of the humour in the poem is "at the expense of local rustics",[144] implying a more educated

---

[143] Porphyrio, in his note to Lucil. 252-3, claims that Horace's unmentionable town is Equus Tuticus (*Aequum Tuticum significat*). Gowers (2012: 209) also suggests A(u)sculum, Herdoneae and Horace's birthplace of Venusia.
[144] Gowers 2012: 185.

urban audience who would be able to pick up Horace's point and understand the references he was making – if the poem does indeed include parallels with *Frogs*.

Working from Cucchiarelli's analysis of the possible links between *Frogs* and *S.* 1.5, Sommerstein identifies eight areas where Horace, Lucilius and Aristophanes appear to share a common link.[145] The first is the muddy conditions and bad roads each encounters on their way. For Horace it is the rain-soaked route to Rubi and Barium (1.5.94-7), Lucilius has a slippery and muddy path (98), and Dionysus and Xanthias also face mud and filth (145, 273).[146] As discussed above, Horace and Lucilius share digestive problems, which also affect Aristophanes' characters (237-8, 308).[147] As in the satirists' work, Aristophanes' play also features a boat trip[148] which for Horace and Dionysus is accompanied by a chorus of croaking frogs as well as travel using humble animals.[149] Sommerstein points to the fact that there are also verbal duels,[150] simple hospitality[151] and links to tragedy.[152] The exact position of these features in Lucilius' satire is impossible to know, but Cucchiarelli points out how the verbal contests in Aristophanes and Horace both occupy the very centre of the work.[153] Sommerstein's final connection, which is not mentioned by Cucchiarelli, is the "solitary orgasm", which is mentioned in *Frogs* (542-5, 752-3)[154], as well as the lines discussed above in Lucilius (1183) and Horace (1.5.82-5).

Cucchiarelli also sees a connection between Dionysus and Xanthias and Horace and his companion Heliodorus.[155] However, Gowers suggests that *comes* (1.5.2) could mean a book rather than an actual person accompanying Horace on his trip, and that the reference

---

[145] Sommerstein 2011: 30-35.

[146] *Frogs* 145: εἶτα βόρβορον πολὺν / καὶ σκῶρ ἀείνων ("Then [you will see] a vast sea of mud and everflowing dung"); *Frogs* 273: τί ἐστι τἀνταυθοῖ; / – σκότος καὶ βόρβορος ("What are things like down that way?—All darkness and mud") (Sommerstein's translation).

[147] *Frogs* 237–8: χὠ πρωκτὸς ἰδίει πάλαι, / κᾆτ᾽ αὐτίκ᾽ἐκκύψας ἐρεῖ – / (Βα.) βρεκεκεκὲξ κοὰξ κοάξ ("And my arsehole has been oozing for a long time, and any moment it'll pop out and say—[*the Frogs interrupt*] Brekekekex koax koax!"); *Frogs* 308: ὁδὶ δὲ δείσας ὑπερεπυρρίασέ σου ("Well, *this* [the lower rear of Dionysus' robe] was so frightened for you it turned *brown*!") (Sommerstein's translation).

[148] Lucil. 119, 121-2; *S.* 1.5.11-24; *Frogs* 180-270 .

[149] Lucil. 101; *S.* 1.5.13, 18, 22, 47; *Frogs* 21-32.

[150] Lucil. 109-11, 114-16; *S.* 1.5. 11-13, 51-70; *Frogs* 209-68, 830-1478.

[151] Lucil. 123, 126-9; *S.*1.5.71-2; *Frogs* 549-78.

[152] Porphyrio on Horace, *S.* 1.10.53 '*Nil comis tragici mutat Lucilius Acci?*' *Facit autem haec Lucilius cum alias, tum vel maxime in tertio libro*; *Sat.* 1.5.63-4; *Frogs* passim.

[153] Cucchiarelli 2002: 849.

[154] *Frogs* 542-5: οὐ γὰρ ἂν γελοῖον ἦν, εἰ | Ξανθίας μὲν δοῦλος ὢν ἐν | στρώμασιν Μιλησίοις | ἀνατετραμμένος κυνῶν ὀρ- |χηστρίδ᾽ εἶτ᾽ ᾔτησεν ἀμίδ᾽, ἐ- |γὼ δὲ πρὸς τοῦτον βλέπων | τοὐρεβίνθου ᾽δραττόμην. . . . ("Well, it would be ludicrous, wouldn't it, if Xanthias, a slave, was lying on his back on a Milesian coverlet and kissing a dancing-girl, and then asked for a jerry, and I was gazing at him and clutching my bean. . . .) "; *Frogs* 752-3: τί δὲ τοῖς θύραζε ταῦτα καταλαλῶν; – ἐγώ; | μὰ Δί᾽ ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν δρῶ ταῦτα, κἀκμιαίνομαι ("And what about blabbing [things you have overheard from your master's conversation] to outsiders?—What, me? I tell you, by Zeus, when I do that, I have an orgasm!") (Sommerstein's translation).

[155] Cucchiarelli 2002: 848.

to Heliodorus is to the author of an epic poem on Italy entitled *Italica Theamata*.[156] Instead of being joined on his journey by another traveller, Gowers makes the convincing suggestion that Horace takes with him a travel guide. If 1.5 was designed to have deliberate parallels with *Frogs*, then perhaps the reader would expect more to have been made of this double act of travellers, giving Horace a companion to mirror the pairing of Dionysus and Xanthias. Instead, after the brief mention of Horace's learned companion, we hear nothing more of him throughout the rest of the poem. Other much-loved and well-known friends join the journey and are mentioned after their arrival, but this is not the case with Heliodorus.

Other suggested links between the three authors may also perhaps prove slightly tenuous. Satire and comedy are no strangers to bodily functions, meaning a more sceptical view should perhaps be taken of them as evidence of a direct connection between the three texts. Similarly, satire does not shy away from the mud and filth that is harder to find in a genre such as epic, again suggesting that it is not enough to claim Horace and Lucilius were influenced by *Frogs* because they share their dirt-clogged roads.

However, if the similarities with *Frogs* are deliberate attempts by Horace to link his work with that of Aristophanes, then it could be argued that this too is a particularly Lucilian allusion, and that it shows Horace continuing his claim that his predecessor was wholly dependent on Old Comedy. In reworking Lucilius' own journey poem, Horace would also be weaving in traces of those very elements he criticised the earlier satirist for relying upon too heavily. Viewed in this context, the choice of play from which Horace selects these elements may also be significant, in particular when the *agōn* between Aeschylus and Euripides is considered (830-1478).[157] If Horace is deliberately using references to *Frogs,* he is taking as his starting point a play that has at its centre an argument between two authors of the same genre, an older writer and the more recent challenger, and the two different styles they each champion for their shared form of poetry. The situation bears more than a passing resemblance to Horace's own apparent relationship to Lucilius. Euripides insults Aeschylus with the same charges that Horace lays against his predecessor: he is too wordy, his work needs refining, the successor to the genre can

---

[156] Gowers 2012: 187-8.

[157] Ferriss-Hill sees echoes of the agon in the verbal joust between Messius Cicirrus and Sarmentus (2015: 50). She also argues that opening of Horace's fourth satire sees him highlighting how "Lucilius aligns with Cratinus, leaving Aristophanes to be Horace's own model" (2015: 242). In her discussion of Frogs, she sees "Cratinus as the Aeschylean poet and Aristophanes as the Euripedean one" (2015: 175). This analysis would fit with the idea that the agon reflects the differences between Lucilius and Horace's poetry, as well as the work of Aeschylus and Euripides.

produce more elegant poetry than what has gone before. A work which includes the same accusations between authors that Horace himself uses would seem an appropriate choice.

Horace finally brings his journey to an abrupt and unexpected end with a flourish of Epicurean sentiment. In his final line there is perhaps another hint at his more long-winded predecessor. Horace claims that Brundisium is the end of a long journey and a long story (*Brundisium longae finis chartaeque uiaeque est* 1.5.104), although he is actually rounding off the shortest poem in his book so far. Once again, Horatian brevity shows it is his idea of polished quality and not quantity that will please the later satirist and his patron.

In his journey, Horace shows how he can take a Lucilian model and apply to it his own concept of what satire should now be. Unlike Lucilius' version, Horace's journey-poem is a shorter and more streamlined trip, reflecting his claims of how the genre should work. The argument for a link between Horace and Aristophanes' *Frog* is a tempting one, particularly since poem 1.5 appears directly after Horace's allegations involving Lucilius and Old Comedy, and the choice of insults thrown at Aeschylus by Euripides fits neatly with the differences between the two satirists. However, shared material between comedy and satire is perhaps to be expected because of their style of humour, and common circumstances may be an unsurprising coincidence rather than a deliberate imitation of another genre. But even without a link to the older text, the position of the poem is still relevant to the Lucilian allusions it contains. After detailing the faults of his predecessor, Horace shows what *he* can do with similar material and "succeeds in producing something new, something that was entirely Horatian".[158] After telling the reader what he does not plan to do, we are given an example of what we can expect from the new breed of satirist.

The careful omission of any details about the reason for Maecenas' mission continues Horace's approach to updating satire for the late Republic. Horace's *libertas* comes from being free to focus on friendships and he will not speak out about political matters. His ointment-smeared eyes ensure his discretion as he shows which subjects are suitable for satire in his time.

<center>*Satire 1.6*</center>

In his sixth satire Horace gives the reader a glimpse into his past with autobiographical details charting his rise from freedman's son to friend of one of the most powerful men in Rome. He describes two of the major influences on his life, his father and his patron

---

[158] Fraenkel 1957: 112.

Maecenas, but through his language and allusions the reader can also trace the effect of a third force shaping his art from the shadows: his satiric predecessor Lucilius. Although the earlier poet is never named or explicitly referred to, I would argue that the poem contains enough hints to reveal the third of the trio of influences on Horace's life, Lucilius, a constant presence in the background. In the way he repeatedly chooses to highlight his own status and ancestry, Horace contrasts his situation with that of Lucilius and also draws attention to the difference between himself and the earlier satirist in their use of *libertas*. Lucilius' name may not appear, but his language and lines are used by Horace to signal his presence alongside the other influences he credits with shaping him and his work, as well as to contrast and distance himself from his predecessor.

One of the main themes throughout the poem is Horace's social position and status as the son of a freedman. Instead of trying to disguise or make excuses for these humble beginnings, which appear to have attracted criticism and comment (1.6.45-8), Horace makes a point of mentioning them himself. He takes the factors which may have made him a target for critics and uses them himself to "make a virtue of complete frankness".[159] By repeatedly drawing attention to his more modest background, Horace also draws attention to the difference between himself and the equestrian Lucilius. Gratwick describes Lucilius as a "rich and independent" poet, whose position enabled him to launch his notorious attacks on famous men.[160] But Horace, from a different background, must write a different sort of satire. Horace has compared himself in poetic and stylistic terms to his predecessor in his fourth satire, and now the comparison shifts to their different social status. The shift is also one from explicit reference to Lucilius to implicit allusions. The later satirist presents his simple life without mentioning Lucilius, but the poem is scattered with language that calls the earlier poet to mind.

However, Horace's situation as *libertino patre natum* (1.6.6) may perhaps not be quite as humble as it first appears. Williams suggests that, far from being the son of someone who had been born into slavery, Horace's father had been taken captive when his hometown of Venusia sided with rebels in the Social War and was later freed and made a full citizen following this temporary enslavement.[161] Williams argues that, if this is the case, by repeating the phrase *libertino patre natus* Horace is referring to insults levelled at him by

---

[159] Fiske 1920: 320.
[160] Gratwick 1982: 163.
[161] Williams 1995.

enemies who want to cause offence.[162] Through this, Williams claims, Horace can put more emphasis on his own morality and character by showing the disadvantages he suffers socially.[163] This emphasis also means that Horace can mark a stronger divide between the humble life he presents himself as living and the more affluent Lucilius.

Horace describes his modest situation with a "vivid Lucilian cameo".[164] He tells how his status means that he is not carried around Tarentine estates on horseback (*non ego circum | me Satureiano uectari rura caballo* 1.6.58-9) in a line that Gowers argues "may well be a direct quotation from Lucilius", pointing to other Lucilian descriptions of nags (101, 153), while also noting the possible pun on *Satureiano* and *satura*.[165] Fiske also suggests that Lucilius may have been Horace's source for this line and that, if *Satureianus caballus* is an allusion to Lucilius, then *claro natum patre* (1.6.58) must relate to the earlier poet as well, with Horace again drawing a distinction between his own position and the ancestry and wealth of Lucilius.[166] *Caballus* is one of several words Lucilius also uses to describe horses[167] and is employed in his lines to indicate a jerking, hideous and lazy nag (*succusatoris taetri tardique caballi* 153). Moreover, Gowers suggests that the use of *rura* is another allusion to Lucilius' estates in the south of Italy,[168] and the contrast between Horace and his land-owning predecessor is again made clear later in the poem with the mention of the tiny *agello* of Horace's *pauper* father (1.6.71).[169] However, although Horace may lack noble ancestry, he still makes it clear that he stands well apart from the masses with his noble *amicus* Maecenas (14-15). He may not be able to boast of illustrious ancestors, but he has risen to a position where he can rub shoulders with Rome's finest.

As well as emphasising Horace's social position, the book's sixth poem – like the fourth – presents autobiographical details of the poet's life. He reminisces about the care his father took over his education, then praises Maecenas for taking him into his circle despite his humble origins. The reader is presented with a picture of the satirist who has risen from the small town schoolyard to the highest circles in Rome. Such autobiographical details are not unique to Horace and, as a parallel to the information the poet offers in his sixth satire,

---

[162] Williams 1995: 311. Williams describes the words *libertino patre natus* as a "metrically discordant phrase that draws emphatic attention to itself" (1995: 297).
[163] Williams 1995: 298.
[164] Rudd 1966: 45.
[165] Gowers 2012: 234.
[166] Fiske 1920: 320.
[167] *Cantherius* 101, 507-8*; equus* 289, 1249*; ecus* 505, 1250*; equa* 99-100*; caballus* 153*; musimo* 289.
[168] Gowers 2012: 235.
[169] Gowers 2012: 237.

Fiske identifies several passages he claims deal with a similar theme in Lucilius[170]. Just as in Horace, Warmington suggests that Lucilius presents a picture of his own father, first describing his son's lavish spending:

"As for me, I need some finance officer and chorus equipper

who might give me gold from the exchequer at public expense"

"huic homini quaestore aliquo esse opus atque corago.

publicitus qui mi atque e fisco praebeat aurum."

(456-7)

Later he claims the father speaks of the sacrifices he has made for his sons:

I cut myself off from the rewards of living

quibus fructibus…

me decollavi victus.

(458-9)

"Wrinkled and full of hunger"

"rugosum atque fami plenum"

(460)

And Lucilius' father is also shown offering advice to his son:

"Let this be fixed firmly and likewise in your heart"

"Firmiter hoc pariterque tuo sit pectore fixum"

(463)

---

[170] 455, 456-7, 460, 463, 464, 458-9 (Fiske 1920: 318).

> I agreed with him
>
> *Assensus sum homini.*

<div align="center">(464)</div>

While both satirists present a paternal figure in their poems, the father we meet in Lucilius shows a distinctly different character to the father in Horace. Lucilius' father is given the opportunity to bemoan the extravagance of his sons, while Horace's father makes silent sacrifices for his child's education and his son reproduces none of his words.[171] Horace gives us no hint that his father begrudged the efforts he made to ensure his son's success, while Lucilius presents a less perfect picture and one that seems to be perhaps not as idealised as Horace's image of a perfectly harmonious father-son relationship. However, like Horace, Lucilius does appear to listen to his father's advice, if Warmington is correct with his interpretation of fragment 464 (*assensus sum homini*).

Just as the presentation of their fathers differs, so too does the style of language the two satirists use. Lucilius' description includes the transliterated word of Greek origin *coragus* (456), while Horace keeps to his rule of sticking only to Latin. Horace's avoidance of Greek in his account of his upbringing even extends to missing out any mention of the time he spent in Athens while studying philosophy and ethics.[172] The presentation of his upbringing is a carefully constructed picture of Roman learning and morals with any Greek influence discretely omitted.

Horace's relationship with his father is obviously an important one and a large proportion of the poem is devoted to the topic. However, another relationship is also given a central role in both the satire and in Horace's life: his friendship with his wealthy and influential patron Maecenas, Horace's second father-figure. The importance of Maecenas is stressed straight away. He is named in the poem's first line, as Horace opens his work with praise of his patron. In his description of their first encounter, Horace is careful to stress that their meeting did not take place by chance, reinforcing an idea also found in Lucilius that a success reached through chance (*fors*) alone is not an honourable one.[173]

---

[171] Unlike in 1.4, where Horace quotes his father's warnings to him in lines 105-20.
[172] Coffey 1976: 65.
[173] "Or to win in war entirely through luck and fortune; if through luck and entirely through chance, what again does it have to do with honour?" *aut forte omnino ac fortuna vincere bello; si forte ac temere omnino, quid rursum ad honorem?* (477-8).

Although he may share his predecessor's opinion on the role of glory and chance, Horace shows his difference from Lucilius in his description of his meeting with Maecenas. Typical Horatian restraint is in evidence again, there is no trace of the spontaneous outpourings of Lucilius, and even Maecenas himself sticks to the Horatian principles of brevity with his few words in response. There is no impulsive haste in this introduction; Horace must wait another nine months before finally being included in Maecenas' circle of friends. Horace's stammering reticence, emphasised, as Gowers notes, by the "exaggerated alliteration" of the letter *p* in line 57,[174] contrasts with Lucilius' garrulous loquaciousness. Careful control replaces spontaneous overflowing.

However, even Lucilius' flood of words can be held back in the presence of his patron. Just as the client and patron relationship is pivotal in Horace's life, it also plays an important role for Lucilius. Fiske identifies three fragments where he believes the earlier satirist shows a "similar tone" towards a patron. Fiske argues that in them Lucilius describes forging his relationship with a new patron following the death of Scipio Aemilianus.[175]

> They lead me to you, they compel me to show these things to you
> *Producunt me ad te, tibi me haec ostendere cogunt.*
>
> (1065)

> No one's talent should be trusted so much
> *Neminis ingenio tantum confidere oportet*
>
> (1062)

> Thanks to both, and to them and to you as well
> *Gratia habetur utrisque, illisque tibique simitu.*
>
> (1092)

Fiske describes these lines as "marked by a tone of respectful courtesy, uncommon in Lucilius", and sees the situation presented by Lucilius as "essentially identical with that in

---

[174] "Speechless, for shame stopped me saying more", *infans namque pudor prohibebat plura profari*; Gowers 2012: 234.
[175] Fiske 1920: 318-9.

Horace's *Satire* 1.6".[176] He also highlights how Lucilius' apparent reticence over revealing his poems is mirrored in Horace's "stammering embarrassment on the occasion of his introduction to Maecenas".[177] As well as those noted by Fiske, other Lucilian fragments also seem to fit the theme of a poet's possible praise for a patron, including:

> And (it is worthy of)[178] your merit and it suits illustrious pages
> *et virtute tua, et claris conducere cartis.*
>
> (1013)

> These tributes to your merit are placed in these pages
> *Haec virtutis tuae cartis monumenta locantur.*
>
> (1014)

> Meanwhile, content with these verses, contain yourself
> *et te his versibus interea contentus teneto.*
>
> (1015)

The importance of Maecenas and of Horace's father as influences on the poet's life is thus made clear in the first two thirds of the poem. However, as he moves into the closing section of the work, we can detect more allusions to Lucilius, the third force shaping his work. While the poem so far has drawn attention to their differences in background and status, the difference and distinction between the two poets that is revealed in the final third of the satire focuses on political as well as on personal concerns.

Rudd divides the sixth satire into three sets of paired groups, dealing in turn with eminence, merit and freedom.[179] It is in this final section where it can be argued that the allusions to Lucilius appear to be the strongest, which is perhaps not surprising considering the association Lucilius had in Horace's day with the concept of *libertas*. Lucilius and his work would probably still have been in the reader's mind after Horace's very Lucilian fifth

---

[176] Fiske 1920: 319.
[177] Fiske 1920: 319.
[178] Following Warmington's interpretation.
[179] The first pair being 1-22 and 23-44, the second at 45-64 and 65-88, and the third at 89-11 and 111-131; Rudd 1961b: 202.

satire, and the focus in the sixth poem on Horace's influences could perhaps lead his audience to expect some reference to his famous literary predecessor. With the use of particularly Lucilian language in this final section of his poem, Horace reinforces this connection and brings it back to his reader's mind.

During the final third of the poem, Horace celebrates the freedom that life outside the political rat-race allows him. His critics may be envious of his closeness to Maecenas and they fear he plans to exploit that position to gain power for himself, but he reassures them that a political career is definitely not on his agenda. Horace uses the poem to show his type of *libertas* in action, where he enjoys freedom to live his life quietly, rather than the outspoken Lucilian freedom to attack others. He is free from the demands of too many callers and he is not compelled to provide for horses and grooms, again using the word *caballus* to point out the alternative mode of transport to his own (1.6.100-4).

Horace's contentment is a sentiment he shares with Lucilius and both poets stress how they would not wish to change their lot.[180] Horace insists that it would be madness to wish to change his parent (*nil me paeniteat sanum patris huius* 1.6.89) and declares himself happier than if he had a family tree full of illustrious ancestors (*his me consolor uicturum suauius ac si | quaestor auus pater atque meus patruusque fuisset* 130-1). Lucilius, too, would not wish to swap his life for that of anyone else and expresses horror at the idea that he would trade places with a tax gatherer (*publicanus uero ut Asiae fiam, ut scripturarius | pro Lucilio, id ego nolo, et uno hoc non muto omnia* 650) or be persuaded to give up what is his in exchange for state funds (*mihi quidem non persuadetur publiceis mutem meos* 647). The idea of contentment also appears earlier in the poem, where Horace describes the pitfall of not being "quiet in his own skin" (*in propria non pelle quiessem* 1.6.22) and getting ideas above one's station. Lucilius uses a similar description of "skin-changing" (*uersipellis* 653)[181], and Fiske and Gowers link Horace's metaphor to the earlier poet's description; Fiske argues that Lucilius provided the model for Horace's choice of words.[182]

The assertion of their contentment is one of several sentiments shared by the two satirists; however, one of the most striking similarities between Horace's language and Lucilius' language is also found in the final third of the poem in the description of the load pressing

---

[180] The same idea is explored by Horace in the opening of the first poem of the book.
[181] "But he is a freedman, triple thick-skinned, a very Syrian, a scoundrel, with whom I change my skin and everything" *At libertinus tricorius Syrus ipse ac mastigias | quicum versipellis fio et quicum conmuto omnia* 652-3.
[182] Fiske 1920: 318; Gowers 2012: 227.

down on the mule (1.6.106). Horace's line and the choice of words show what appears to be a clear echo of a Lucilian original:

> The bag rubbed sores on its loins with its load and the rider on its withers
> *Mantica cui lumbos onere ulceret atque eques armos.*
>
> (*S.*1.6.106)

> The bag pressed on the horse's ribs with its weight
> *Mantica cantheri costas gravitate premebat.*
>
> (Lucil. 101)

Although the two lines do show differences, the links between them can be seen quite clearly. Both satirists use the relatively uncommon noun *mantica*[183] in the same position at the start of their line, and Porphyrio links Horace's use of the word to Lucilius, noting how he has taken the word from his predecessor. Lucilius continues with customary alliteration, with the '*c*'s on *cantheri* and *costas* echoing the same sound at the end of *mantica*. Horace appears to be following his lead with *cui*, but then chooses *lumbos* instead of *costas* as his animal's aching spot, a word which is also found twice in Lucilius' surviving satires. In one occurrence, it is used in a sexual sense,[184] but the earlier poet also uses it to describe part of a horse suffering from a sore,[185] where it is also in the accusative case.

> So that he touches the sore with his nose or the loins with his neck
>
> *ut petimen naso aut lumbos cervicibus tangat*
>
> (152)

---

[183] Catullus also uses *mantica* at 22.21 when he appears to be quoting a proverb about seeing another's faults but not one's own (*sed non uidemus manticae quod in tergo est*).

[184] "He grinds, but she winnows with her loins just as if she were winnowing grain", *hunc molere, illam autem ut frumentum uannere lumbis* 302. This fragment is discussed above, in the section on *S.* 1.2.

[185] A note on this fragment by the grammarian Festus explains that *petimina* could refer to sores on animals' shoulders, but was also used for part of a pig's body.

Despite Horace's love of brevity, his line is longer than that of Lucilius and also includes two instances of elision, another feature more commonly found in the earlier satirist than in Horace's work.[186] Horace also places this line directly after mentioning Tarentum, which Gowers argues is not only "a reference to Lucilius' Southern Italian estates, but also alluding to the destinations avoided in Satire 5".[187] Horace's readers would no doubt still have his satiric journey (and its Lucilian model) in mind when they came to his sixth poem, particularly when Horace returns to the idea of travelling. Lucilius' own line 106 is thought to be from his journey poem in Book 3[188] which would reinforce those references to Horace's reworking of Lucilius' poetry. After justifying his rejection of public and political life, Horace describes the journey of Tillius as a contrast to the quiet life he himself embraces. In his depiction Horace uses another word which Fiske argues has a "Lucilian colouring".[189] The wine jar carried by slaves is called an *oenophorus* (1.6.109), the same vessel used by Lucilius in his travellers' tale in Book 3.[190]

Once he has revealed the perils of public life that he is so keen to avoid, Horace turns to a description of his own daily routine, free from the pressures of politics. He emphasises the simplicity of his food, lifestyle and household as he shuns extravagance and luxury, and he includes a description of his modest tableware:

A cheap bowl stands nearby,
a flask with a bowl, Campanian ware

adstat echinus
uilis, cum patera gutus, Campana supellex.
(117-18)

---

[186] Rudd 1966: 106.
[187] Gowers 2012: 243.
[188] Fiske assigns this fragment to Book 30 instead, "in which Lucilius may have set forth to his new patron the simplicity of his life on one of his country estates" (Fiske 1920: 323).
[189] Fiske 1920: 324.
[190] "The base of the wine jar is overturned, along with our feelings", *Vertitur oenphori fundus, sententia nobis* 132.

Before Horace, the use of the word *echinus* to describe a piece of tableware[191] appears only in Lucilius, which Fiske claims is proof that Horace "found the word ... in the pages of Lucilius".[192] I do not believe that the shared use of the word alone is proof of a direct borrowing from Lucilius, as it may well have appeared in literature which no longer survives. However, Horace does employ the word in a similar way to Lucilius. Porphyrio explains how Lucilius used *echinus* to describe a leather bottle, in this case one "stained with dragon's blood" (*echinus | cinnabari infectus* 1155-6). Fiske admits the line is "hopelessly corrupt",[193] but Warmington describes it as referring to the luxurious habits of women and cosmetics. If this is the case, then Horace's use of the word in this way is perhaps designed to add another layer to his contrast between his simple life and that of others. By taking a rare word, which has previously only been used in relation to something luxurious, and by applying it to his tableware, Horace highlights this contrast. The reader is reminded of the difference between Horace and his wealthier predecessor.

The contrast between cheap simplicity and expensive extravagance can also perhaps be linked to the satire's position in the poet's book. As discussed above, the poem comes directly after Horace's reworking of Lucilius' journey poem, which is believed to be part of the earlier satirist's third book. In his introductory note to Lucilius' fourth book, Warmington describes how it was split into two satires, one contrasting the simple life with luxury and another describing a bout between gladiators.[194] Just as Lucilius moved from his travelling tale to one of simplicity versus extravagance, Horace – who will also cover a dispute in the poem which follows 1.6 – continues with some of his predecessor's themes in his next work. Lucilius' fourth book also contains a description of clients lavishing gifts on a patron and this provides another contrast to Horace's depiction of the client/patron relationship he enjoys with Maecenas, as well as his own restrained dining habits.[195]

A final example of language shared between Horace and Lucilius can be found towards the end of Horace's poem, where the satirist describes avoiding the Campus Martius and three-cornered ball games (*fugio Campum lusumque trigonem* 1.6.126). The same game, as Fiske points out, is played by Lucilius' Coelius and Gallonius, with Horace's *lusum* suggesting

---

[191] Lucilius does use the literal meaning of *echinus* ("sea urchin") elsewhere in his description of the effect of the moon on oysters, sea urchins and fish, *Luna alit ostrea et implet echinos, muribus fibras | et iecur addit* 1222-3.
[192] Fiske 1920: 324.
[193] Fiske 1920: 324.
[194] Warmington 1938: 48.
[195] "These men carry in front of them huge fish as a gift for me, thirty in number", *Hi prae se portant mi ingentes munere pisces | triginta numero* 159-60.

the earlier poem's *conlusor* and repetition of *ludet* (*Coelius conlusor Galloni scurra, trigonum | cum ludet, scius ludet et eludet* 211-12).

Throughout the poem Horace repeatedly emphasises and justifies his decision to keep himself apart from the political rat-race. He reassures his critics that he has no interest in exploiting his famous friends to gain power for himself, while the mention of Maecenas also serves as a reminder that to insult Horace would also be to insult him, as pointed out by Rudd.[196] However, all these points could easily be made without including Lucilian language and allusions in his work, which raises the question why Horace chose to use them and what they add to his poem.

To an audience reading Horace's poems in order, Lucilius would no doubt still be in their minds after the previous journey poem. By dropping in more references to his predecessor, Horace can highlight the differences between the creator of his genre and himself, and reinforce the image he has presented of himself as reworking Lucilius' satire to suit his own time, his own agenda, and Maecenas' agenda. His humbler background and his apparent rejection of political life show that he does not have the same platform or motive to recreate the attacks of Lucilius, whose name, to Horace's readers, was "synonymous with personal abuse and invective".[197] DuQuesnay argues that Horace includes "clear allusions to Lucilian models precisely when his poems are least concerned with invective",[198] and this can be seen also in his sixth satire. The words and phrases that seem to have the strongest connections to Lucilius' work come when Horace is describing his life of peaceful leisure. By calling him to mind during these passages, Horace puts greater emphasis on their differences.

The use of Lucilian language during these lines also lets Horace reveal another contrast: this time between the way in which he and Lucilius each employ *libertas*. The free-speaking Lucilius was known as a model of Republican *libertas* through his invective, but Horace has already been careful to step away from this sort of abuse. Instead, he brings Lucilius to mind through his language while describing his own brand of *libertas*, in his case the freedom to live his life the way he wishes, free from the stress of public life. Horace updates Lucilian poetry and also updates Lucilian *libertas* by presenting his own version of freedom, claiming the concept as one which can now be associated with his allies who wield power in Rome.

---

[196] Rudd 1966: 41.
[197] DuQuesnay 1984: 29.
[198] DuQuesnay 1984: 29.

Horace may have been keen to distance himself from a political career, but since he was a friend of one of Rome's most powerful men, it would have been naive for him to believe he could create poetry which would be completely apolitical. By keeping the links between his own satire and that of Lucilius, Horace can present himself as a new version of the earlier poet, one who is more appropriate for the age and who demonstrates a more appropriate form of *libertas*. DuQuesnay argues that, by choosing Lucilius as his model, Horace could link his influential friends and the triumvirs with *libertas* and also "issue a counter-challenge" to those who "had been able to make capital out of their association with Lucilius as the poet of Republican *libertas*".[199]

Schegel sees the sixth satire as a parallel to 1.4, with both poems exploring influences on Horace other than that of his father.[200] In the fourth poem, the parental influence is studied alongside that of Lucilius, while in the sixth it is Maecenas who plays the other guiding role along with the poet's father. However, I would argue that Lucilius' influence on Horace continues to be acknowledged in the sixth satire, as Horace subtly weaves echoes of his predecessor into his poem. These scattered references highlight the differences between the two satirists while at the same time reminding the reader of their connection. Lucilius' influence may not be revealed by name, but it is revealed in the imprint the earlier satirist leaves on the language and concerns of the poet who has inherited his genre.

Satire 1.7

For the seventh, eighth and ninth poems of the book, Horace creates a trio of anecdotes, each featuring potential threats which must be seen off by the satirist. In 1.7, it is poisonous Republican invective – as well as the taint of Horace's own Republican past – that the poet must deal with. In the following poem, sinister witches invade the peace and order created by Maecenas, and need to be tackled by the Horatian Priapus. And in the final story of the anecdotal trio, the poet presents his own battle to shake off the prattling pest who dogs his steps through the city. In each of these satires the traces of Lucilius which are present in the previous poems continue to emerge in Horace's tales, with Horace using them to help characterise his cast, link his separate satires, and reveal differences between past and present in the world of politics as well as of poetry.

In *Satire* 1.7, the reader is given another glimpse into Horace's past. However, instead of the autobiographical details provided in poem 1.6, the focus this time is on the rather less

---

[199] DuQuesnay 1984: 30-31.
[200] Schlegel 2000.

glorious part of the poet's personal history. He turns his attention to his time served with the doomed Republicans at Philippi, as he tells the tale of a bitter courtroom quarrel fought out before Brutus. Horace opens the poem with an echo of the episode in his past, which he is careful not to mention explicitly. He reverses the normal word order of Rex's name to give *Rupili pus*,[201] mirroring the sound of the word Philippi. The reader is given another hint of the Republican stain on Horace's past without the poet explicitly referring to it.

The decision by Horace to set one of his satires during a time in his life he might prefer to forget could be seen as a strange one. However, if it were a well-known part of his past, it would be very difficult to omit it completely from a collection of poems that features so many autobiographical references. Horace has given a one-line hint of his military experience in the previous poem (*mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno* 1.6.48), and now he carefully expands on that theme in "a poem about proscription written by a survivor".[202] He cannot ignore his past, but he can choose just how he will present it in his poetry. The poem is the shortest in the book as Horace quickly dispatches a topic he would rather forget. He presents the Republicans as squabbling, litigious louts, and this makes a stark contrast with the way in which he has portrayed the genteel and egalitarian world of Maecenas and his associates in his previous poem. Horace has given us a flavour of the lifestyle and values promoted by his patron, and now shows the reader the other side. The comparison between Maecenas' circle and that of Brutus is given another layer of meaning with one of the seventh satire's most loaded words, *Rex* (line 1). The word can also have the meaning of patron[203] and Brutus was once Horace's patron.[204] His court and cronies are presented as a far cry from those of Horace's present patron Maecenas, and the poem's position in the book, coming immediately after a text that praises Maecenas, serves to effectively emphasise that contrast.

Despite giving the reader a glimpse of his former sympathies, Horace is careful to hint at them, rather than laying them out explicitly. He does not tell the story as an eyewitness account, but instead he relates it as if he is repeating barbershop gossip and "parodies the protestation of truth that canonically preceded a factual account".[205] Gowers also points to Lucilius' use of a similar introduction to a story that will be told and heard (*Fandam atque*

---

[201] Gowers 2012: 252.
[202] Gowers 2002: 149.
[203] *O.L.D.* s.v. 8. Horace uses *rex* in this way himself at *Ep.*1.17.43 when he describes how those who keep quiet about their poverty in front of their patron receive more than those who speak out (*coram rege suo de paupertate tacentes | plus poscente ferent*).
[204] Gowers 2012: 251.
[205] Gowers 2012: 254.

auditam iterabimus famam 53). But how does Lucilius fit into a poem so tightly bound up with events that happened long after his death? Fiske argues that Horace adopts a "tone much closer to that of Lucilius"[206] throughout this satire and compares its subject matter to a court case, with which the earlier satirist deals in his second book. Fiske draws parallels in the structure of both legal disputes and identifies five similarities shared by the poems: they are anecdotes told by the poets, they involve court scenes, they involve provincial administration, the rivals do battle with invective, and both poems "seem to be built up with direct reference to the rhetorical climax".[207] Lucilius begins his second book with the opening mentioned above, which introduces the anecdote. However, his opening is made in a different style to Horace's introduction. Lucilius chooses a first person plural future verb to explain what he will do (*iterabimus* 53), compared to the more colloquially casual *opinor* of Horace (line 2). Fiske concedes that the link between the two satirists' court cases is somewhat weak, and in the case of the fifth similarity he lists, the idea of building to "the rhetorical climax", he admits it is not possible to know for certain if it featured the same "humorous climax" as Horace uses to end his poem.[208]

Zetzel describes the incident as an "expansion of the mock-epic battle of Sarmentus and Cicirrus in 5",[209] while Gowers compares the verbal duel to a gladiatorial combat; Lucilius does describe at least two such clashes in his work. The travellers watch two fighters during their journey in Book 3 (109-10, 111, 112-13, 114, 115-16, 117), and Warmington argues that Lucilius' fourth book also contained a poem about a well-known gladiatorial bout (172-5, 176-81, 182-3, 184, 185). Lucilius' fighters have more to say for themselves than the rivals featured in Horace, and their boasts and threats are quoted in direct speech. There is a similarity between Pacideianus' statement about how he is transformed by anger and hatred (*usque adeo studio atque **odio** illius ecferor ira* 181) and Persius' overwhelming hatred (*atque **odio** qui posset unicere Regem* 1.7.6), but the link between the duels depicted by the satirists does not appear to be particularly strong.

However, a more obvious parallel can perhaps be found in the language chosen to describe the characters involved in Horace's legal row. As DuQuesnay points out, "these exemplars of *libertas* are also described in language comparable to that used by Horace of the imitators of Lucilius".[210] DuQuesnay lists their shared expressions[211] and points to the use

[206] Fiske 1920: 326.
[207] Fiske 1920: 326.
[208] Fiske 1920: 329.
[209] Zetzel 1980: 66.
[210] DuQuesnay 1984: 37.
[211] DuQuesnay 1984: 205.

of *durus* at 1.7.29, which is also used with reference to Lucilius at 1.4.8. *Durus* is not an uncommon word in Horace's Book 1 and appears ten times in the poems,[212] with two of these uses referring directly to Lucilius or his poetry (1.4.8, 1.10.57). DuQuesnay also sees a link between *tumidus* (1.7.7) and the *turgidus Alpinus* of 1.10.36, as well as between the rushing river of gushing Persius (*ruebat flumen*) and the overflowing Lucilius in 1.4.11. Horace uses *salso* with the meaning of 'wit'[213] in his description of the vinegary abuse of 1.7.28 and also of the invective Lucilius used to scourge the city (*sale multo | urbem defricuit* 1.10.3). Horace does use *sal* four times in the satires, but it is only in these two instances that the word has the meaning of wit, rather than salt, although he does also use *salsus* to refer to the joker Aristius Fuscus in 1.9.65.[214] Finally, DuQuesnay points to Horace's use of *ridetur* in 1.7.22 as well as in 1.4.82-3 and 1.10.7-8. The word is also used about Lucilius again at 1.10.54. Perhaps not surprisingly in a set of satires underpinned by the idea of using laughter instead of invective, *rideo* is also not an unusual word for Horace to choose,[215] and is one of the words in his guiding satirical principle of telling the truth with a smile (*quamquam ridentem dicere uerum | quid uetat?* 1.124-5).

Fraenkel argues that among the "Lucilian touches" in the poem is "almost certainly the deliberately clumsy formula of transition at 1.7.9, *ad Regem redeo*".[216] A very similar phrase is used by Lucilius (*ad te redeo* 1076) and the earlier line has been well-noted in connection with Horace's seventh satire, as well as with his use of a similar phrase in the previous poem (*nunc ad me redeo* 1.6.45). However, the choice of this phrase may seem more significant if looked at in the context of the full Lucilian fragment:

> *Nunc ad te redeo ut, quae res me impendet, agatur*
> Now I'll get back to you, in order to deal with the matter hanging over me
>
> (1076)

---

[212] "That man who turns the heavy earth with the tough plough" (*ille grauem duro terram qui uertis aratro*) 1.1.28; "what could ward off cold or harsh hunger" (*frigus quo duramque famem propellere possit*) 1.2.6; "under strict fathers" (*sub patribus duris*) 1.2.17; "often among severe risks" (*dura inter saepe pericula*) 1.2.40; "a tireless composer of verses" (*durus componere uersus*) 1.4.8; "a hard man" (*durus homo*) 1.7.6; "tough grape-picker" (*durus | uindemiator*) 1.7.29;" It is hard to fight with a winner" (*ut contendere durum | cum uictore*) 1.9.42; "the hard case" (*dura...causa*) 1.10.26; "harshness of subject matter" (*rerum dura*) 1.10.57.

[213] *O.L.D.* s.v. 6.

[214] "A cellar of pure salt" (*concha salis puri* 1.3.15); "wood and salt" (*ligna salemque* 1.5.46).

[215] "Lest I pass over things laughing" (*ridens | percurram* 1.1.23); "To tell the truth while laughing" (*ridentem dicere uerum* 1.1.24); "Why are you laughing?" (*quid rides?* 1.1.69); "He could be laughed at" (*rideri possit* 1.3.30); "If I laughed" (*ego si risi* 1.4.91); "We laugh" (*ridemus* 1.5.57); "Everyone laughs at him" (*ridetur ab omni* 1.7.22); "The sick joker laughed" (*male salsus | ridens* 1.9.65-6); "Does he not laugh at the verses of Ennius that are less dignified?" (*non ridet uersus Enni grauitate minores?* 1.10.54). Plaza (2006: 64) sees the use of *ridetur* at 1.7.22 as a term which is "surely meant to encourage the same reaction in Horace's reader".

[216] Fraenkel 1957: 212.

It could be argued that this is exactly what Horace himself is doing in his seventh satire, namely tackling the problem of his Republican past that has been hanging over him. As Fraenkel points out, the transition phrase is not needed,[217] raising the question why Horace has chosen to include it, especially in a satire where other links to Lucilius are not particularly frequent. In his previous poem, the phrase is used to return to Horace's own story (1.6.45). The poet could now be calling to mind the words he has already used about himself to remind the reader of the Lucilian context and therefore the matter which is still hanging over him.

As well as the individual words and phrases that appear to have a link to Lucilius, Gowers also sees connections between the characterisation of Persius and of Rupilius Rex and the wider issue of satirical style, describing their argument as a "literary critical duel between two old styles of satire".[218] Neither of these, she argues, is Horace's type of poetry and she identifies the "Greek-influenced wit of Lucilius, sharp and uncontrolled" in the presentation of Persius.[219] This more savage style is introduced straight away in Horace's satire, and the opening line reveals a glimpse of a different satirist to the poet presented elsewhere in the book. It promises "pus and poison" (*pus atque uenenum*) in a phrase which "drips with the satirical venom Horace disowned in 1.4.100-1"[220] and "retains the general flavour of Lucilian vituperations".[221] Fiske makes a link between the pus and poison of Rupilius Rex and the *uomitum pus* found in Lucilius' description of the unpleasant effects caused by Lucius Trebellius (532)[222], and he argues that Lucilius' phrase is "surely not far removed" from Horace's use of *pus atque uenenum*. The earlier satirist also uses *uenenum* in his description of someone's deathly appearance ("*Vultus item ut facies, mors, icterus morbus, uenenum*" 37), where, as in Horace, it is at the end of the line.

However, for all Horace tells us about the vicious insults flying around the courtroom, the reader never hears the actual abuse which is said; instead the poet gives us mock-epic descriptions of the rivals' legal clash. The invective and abuse might be suitable for the ears of Brutus and his associates, but the version Horace presents for Maecenas – like his

---

[217] Fraenkel 1957: 121.
[218] Gowers 2012: 250.
[219] Gowers 2012: 250.
[220] Gowers 2012: 253.
[221] Fiske 1920: 326.
[222] "Now first by far among this number is Lucius Trebellius, for he brings on fever, decay, sickness and festering" (*In numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multost | Lucius, nam arcessit febris senium vomitum pus* 531-2).

version of Lucilian satire – has been carefully polished and tailored to suit his elegant audience. All the reader really hears of the angry insults is the bad joke at the end – a joke that, it can be argued, is deliberately bad. To close his satire, Horace uses a gag reminiscent of Cicero's retort to Clodius at the latter's trial in 61 BC.[223] Clodius asks, "How much longer will we have to put up with this king?", to which Cicero, referring to the omission of Clodius from his relative Rex's will, replies, "You are calling me a king, when Rex made no mention of you?".[224] Horace's joke is rather more pointed as it deals with tyrannicide but it is still not a particularly good one. Fraenkel describes it as a "poor pun",[225] Zetzel links it with what he sees as another weak gag at the end of the eighth satire,[226] and, after all the build-up of the legal bout, Rudd argues that the "knock-out punch comes as an anti-climax".[227] This is the sort of humour that would keep Brutus and his like entertained, not the urbane wit suitable for Maecenas' circle.

The Lucilian influences in this satire are not as strong as in the other poems of the book, although perhaps this is not surprising given the subject matter. While the participants in Horace's courtroom drama can be seen to have some shared characteristics with Lucilius, neither is presented as a model of the Lucilian style,[228] despite his close association with Republican ideas of *libertas* and free speech. Horace does employ some of the words he uses about the earlier satirist and his imitators in this poem, but he does not appear to be doing it specifically to label them as Lucilian. Despite this, Persius and Rex do show the types of language and style that Horace is rejecting. He is not going to hurl abuse, nor will he be a fawning follower who gushes the effusive flattery poured out by Persius. These things are left to the faction he has now left behind.

It would have been relatively simple for Horace to add to the characterisation of his litigants by giving them a stronger Lucilian colouring and by identifying them with the Republican poet, if this was what he had wanted. He could have distanced himself from his Republican past and the poetic past of his genre at the same time, but he chooses not to, suggesting that, as in other satires in the book, he is taking over and transforming Lucilian satire rather than completely rejecting it. If Horace is setting himself up as the successor to Lucilius, albeit a poetically refined one, and claiming back satire for the new regime, then

---

[223] Cic. *Att.* 1.16.10. Gowers 2012: 250.
[224] *"quousque " inquit "hunc regem feremus?" "Regem appellas" inquam "cum Rex tui mentionem nullam fecerit?".*
[225] Fraenkel 1957: 120.
[226] Zetzel 1980: 66.
[227] Rudd 1966: 67.
[228] See Introduction.

it would not suit his purpose to draw heavily on his predecessor's language while writing in a poem set in the Republican camp. Lucilius was already associated with the Republicans and their use of the rallying cry of *libertas*, and if Horace were to deliberately place Lucilian language into the mouths of the opponents in his seventh satire, then he would be strengthening that association. Instead, by not linking them with the early satirist through their language, Horace can continue to claim Lucilius, his genre and his famous links with *libertas* for his own side. When Horace does choose to use a link with a particularly strong Lucilian resonance, *ad Regem adeo*, he does not do so in a way that draws a parallel between Lucilius and the Republicans. Instead, as discussed above, the full Lucilian context reveals that the intertextual allusion is probably saying more about Horace himself than the characters in his courtroom.

Satire 1.8

After the sour taste of the squabbling Republicans' quarrels, Horace lightens the mood again with his eighth satire, comically pitting Priapus against the witches invading Maecenas' gardens on the Esquiline. Gowers describes this satire as a "transitional" poem that looks both "back at Republican pus and poison and forward to the metropolitan civility of satire 9".[229] The eighth satire works as a stepping-stone between Horace's Republican past, as shown in 1.7, and his current status as poet about town and friend of the powerful, with "the battered survivor of Philippi reincarnated as a minor god comically guarding the scared territory of the new regime".[230] Horace gives a comic presentation of how he can protect the new order, represented by the cleaned-up site of Maecenas' gardens. He keeps abuse away from the new regime and frightens off their enemies. And, in line with the rest of his satiric style, he fends them off with humour rather than fierce invective.[231]

Fiske dismisses any Lucilian influence in the poem because Priapic verses only developed in the years after the earlier satirist's time.[232] However, the different genre alone is not a reason to rule out the possibility of Lucilius' influence, even if the traces of Horace's predecessor are admittedly fainter here than in some of Horace's other satires. And while there may not be as many direct allusions to Lucilius, the witches' frightening incursion into the ordered calm of Maecenas' gardens does have a certain literary flavour to it. The *uenenum* of 1.7 reappears in 1.8, where the hags' venom is also a poetic one, reminding the reader, as Anderson argues, "of the poisonous invective of lampoons and the Lucilian

---

[229] Gowers 2012: 264.
[230] Gowers 2012: 265.
[231] Anderson 1972: 10.
[232] Fiske 1920: 330.

tradition".[233] Horace will keep these insults away from the poems produced for Maecenas in the same way the protective Priapus defends his gardens from the threatening witches.

Horace's description of the witches' antics is scattered with words that also hint at a literary meaning. The poisonous pair are involved in casting *carmina* (*quantum carminibus quae uersant atque uenenis | humanos aminos* 1.8.19-20), which has the meaning of both poems and spells.[234] Horace uses it another two times in his first book of satires, both times in his tenth poem, where he returns to the topic of Lucilius' satiric style, and both times with the meaning of "poems". In the first instance, Horace uses the word in his description of Lucilius as an "author of poems" (*carminis auctor* 1.10.66), placing the witches and his satiric predecessor in the same position as creators of *carmina*. The second use comes shortly afterwards, when Horace talks disparagingly of having one's work recited in substandard schools (*an tua demens | uilibus in ludis dictari carmina malis?* 1.10.75-6). On both occasions, Horace does not use the word to describe his own books of satirical poetry, which he calls *sermones*. He does not use *carmen* in his *Satires* in an explicitly negative way, but the sense inferred by the reader is not a particularly complimentary one.

In the same line where the reader negotiates the *carmina* and the *uenenum* of the witches, Horace chooses a verb to describe their nocturnal behaviour that continues the poetic allusions. As Gowers points out, the use of *uersant* in 1.8.19 suggests "parallels with versifying",[235] adding another layer of literary reference. Although *uerso* does not have the meaning of creating poetry, the acoustic similarity with *uersus* brings versification to mind. A further literary allusion can be found a few lines later. The word Horace uses for the witches' choice of herbs and bones is *lego*, which, as well as meaning "to select or gather", can also mean "to read", and it is the second meaning which Horace employs more frequently in his first book of satires.[236]

The repeated use of words linked to literary and poetic pursuits suggests an extra level of meaning behind the witches' spells and what they stand for. Horace's Priapus is offering

---

[233] Anderson 1972: 11.
[234] *O.L.D.* s.v. 1b, 2, 3.
[235] Gowers 2012: 272.
[236] *Lego* = "Collect, gather": "He who would take the gods' sacred objects at night" (*qui nocturnus scara diuum legerit*) 1.3.117. Gowers points out that *lego* is also "the standard word used of stealing sacred objects" and highlights Lucilius' use of it in this way at 846, where he talks of someone who will take everything with hands smeared with birdlime (*omnia uiscatis manibus leget*) (Gowers 2012: 142); "to choose any other parents" (*atque alios legere ... quoscumque parentes*) 1.6.95; "gather bones and herbs" (*ossa legant herbasque*) 1.8.22; *Lego* = "Read": "reading" (*legentem*) 1.3.64; 'no one reads my writings' (*mea nemo | scripta legat*) 1.4.23; "after reading" (*lecto*) 1.6.122; "Hermogenes ever reads" (*Hermogenes umquam legit*) 1.10.18; "reading Lucilius' writings" (*Lucili scripta legentes*) 1.10.56; "what deserves to be read" (*quae digna legi sunt*) 1.10.72.

protection from a poetic poison as well as from magical venom. He stands guard against dangerous invective, like that of Lucilius, which is no longer suitable for the changed times in which satire is now being produced. The abuse and insults which may have once been suitable must now be cleaned up, just as Maecenas' gardens have cleaned up what was once a graveyard. Anderson argues that it is easy to see the meeting of the witches and Horace's Priapus as "a conflict between the malevolent forces of the past (including the Lucilian tradition) and the creative spirit of Maecenas and his friends".[237] This contrast between past and present is reinforced with the use of terms such as *olim* and *nunc* (1.8.1, 1.8.14), both of them placed in emphatic positions at the beginning of lines. Anderson also draws a link between the witches' poison and satiric venom, arguing that the close of the poem also reflects Horace's different stance, where the later satirist is "dramatizing a basic theme of his satiric disagreement with Lucilius, that simple laughter achieves more than spiteful invective",[238] stopping short of "calling Priapus a comic version of Horace".[239]

Horace's description of the witch Canidia[240] also echoes the type of humour he has vowed to reject in his own satires, where the *nigra succinctam* of 1.8.23 recalls the *nigrae sucus* of 1.4.100. Anderson highlights this as a similarity and also points out the poisonous nature of *aerugo* (1.4.101), describing how Horace "represents the spiteful language of people (like Lucilius)" through such metaphors.[241] There is no place for poison, poetic or otherwise, in the gardens guarded by Horace's Priapus. As well as distancing himself from the style of his more venomous predecessor, Horace also differs in the targets he chooses. Instead of living victims, he instead aims his brand of satire at the "defenceless dead, inadequate males and witches".[242] His powerful friends can again be reassured that the *lippus* satirist will not turn his pen on them.

In his language, as well as in his satirical style, Horace's Priapus avoids anything too offensive, a decision which is perhaps surprising after the obscene words found in 1.2. As Anderson points out, this version of the god seems to lack the "salty lust" often shown by Priapus.[243] Given the subject matter and some of the scenes Horace describes, the reader could perhaps expect more explicit language. However, even when he is describing Priapus' most famous feature, the tactful satirist does not let his language sink too far,

---

[237] Anderson 1972: 13.
[238] Anderson 1972: 10.
[239] Anderson 1972: 12.
[240] Canidia reappears in Horace's second book of *Satire*s and is also a prominent character in the *Epodes* and her role in these poems will be discussed later.
[241] Anderson 1972: 11.
[242] Gowers 2012: 265.
[243] Anderson 1972: 9.

calling it a "red pole sticking out from the obscene groin" (*obscenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus* 1.8.5), a metaphor that Adams describes as "unique in Latin".[244]

As well as the possible allusions to previous satire, Horace's poem also contains the "Lucilian types" Pantolabus and Nomentanus.[245] The disreputable Nomentanus appears in a court case described by Lucilius (80-1, 82) and the names are a reminder of the past. They are dead and buried, while Horace's Priapus presides over their old ground. With his eighth satire, the "*dramatis personae* of Lucilius...are laid to rest in a common ground, and the satirist plays gamekeeper, not poacher, in the sacred precincts of the new regime".[246]

Terrified by the witches' invasion of his space, panic-stricken Priapus accidentally creates the comic weapon that sends the startled pair scurrying back to the city. It is not his famous phallus that makes them flee, but instead his fear-induced fart. Horace shows how he can achieve more with humour than with satire's former abuse and invective, and highlights "the surprising power of laughter".[247]

<p style="text-align:center">Satire 1.9</p>

After successfully scaring off one threat, Horace turns his attention to another invasion as he describes the pest's pursuit in 1.9. The story rounds off the trio of anecdotal poems that have taken the reader from Horace's Republican past, through the sanitised site on the Esquiline that has been transformed into Maecenas' gardens, and up to Horace's leisurely life as a city poet. The poet's transformation follows the changes in satiric style – from Republican invective and comic attacks to the urbane and polished style that Horace champions. Not only do the poems take the reader closer to the political and social heart of Rome, they also trace a geographical journey from Asia, through the outskirts of the city then on to the centre of Rome, where the reader meets Horace as he is taking his customary walk. The chattering unsophisticated pest personifies the characteristics Horace has previously rejected with the pest's boasts about the quantity of his verses rather than their quality and the way in which he reveals the tricks he plans to use to worm his way into Maecenas' circle. The language Horace uses to describe his unwanted companion is again similar to the words he chooses about Lucilius, and the poet begins and ends his account with distinctly Lucilian lines.

---

[244] Adams 1982: 16.
[245] Gowers 2012: 270.
[246] Gowers 2003: 83.
[247] Anderson 1972: 13.

Horace opens the satire with a description of how he happened to be going along the Via Sacra (*Ibam forte Via Sacra*), and the similarity between his choice of words and those found in Lucilius 258 (*ibat forte domum*) and 559 ("*Ibat forte aries*" *inquit*) has been well-noted, with Gowers describing the formulaic phrase as a "typical beginning for an anecdote".[248] In the latter fragment, the words appear to come at the beginning of an anecdote told by someone other than Lucilius, giving evidence for its use at the start of a story, and in both instances Lucilius, like Horace, places the phrase at the beginning of a line. While the uses found in Lucilius are both in the third person, Fraenkel argues that it is "not improbable that Lucilius once opened a tale about himself with the phrase *ibam forte*" and claims that Horace's use of this formula is evidence that right from the start of his poem he has Lucilius in mind.[249] If the phrase is a standard colloquialism which was commonly used to begin an anecdote, then Horace may have chosen it for that reason alone. However, the fact that Horace also chooses to end his poem with an arguably Lucilian line, which will be discussed below, adds weight to the argument that he was deliberately employing phrases with a distinct flavour of his satiric predecessor.

Horace's peace and quiet are soon shattered by the arrival of an unwelcome companion, whom the satirist reveals he knows vaguely (*notus mihi nomine tantum* 1.9.3), but, in keeping with his tactful satirical style, does not name to his reader. His identity may not be revealed, but his type is already known to the audience of Horace's previous poems. The pest falls "crashingly into all the errors of taste and manners that Horace has most condemned".[250] One of the main criticisms Horace has of his interlocutor is his incessant chatter – one of the same accusations he levels at Lucilius. The verbose pest prattles on (*garriret* 1.9.13) in an echo of the garrulous satirist (1.4.12), and Ferriss-Hill argues that Horace's use of *garriret* and *garrulus* (1.9.13, 1.9.33) "lends the poem a persistent echo of Lucilius".[251] Not only has the pest inherited Lucilius' loquaciousness, he also appears to share the satirist's sloppy style of composition. He tells Horace how no one is as prolific or quick to produce poetry as himself (*nam quis me scribere plures | aut citius possit uersus?* 1.9.23-4) and presents this "as a great accomplishment, just as Horace ... scathingly accuses Lucilius of doing".[252]

In Horace's epic-inspired exasperated cry at 1.9.11-12 (*'o te, Bolane, cerebri | felicem!'*) another faint Lucilian trace can perhaps be found. Rudd highlights how elsewhere *cerebri*

---

[248] Gowers 2012: 283.
[249] Fraenkel 1957: 112-3.
[250] Gowers 2012: 281.
[251] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 432.
[252] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 432.

refs to temper only in Plautus and Petronius.[253] However, the term also brings to mind the adjective *cerebrosus*, which has a similar meaning. Horace uses it himself about the angry traveller at 1.5.21, but before this the word is unique to Lucilius (*insanum hominem et cerebrosum* 519).[254] Another of the terms Horace uses in his attack on Lucilius' poetic style also reappears in his exchange with the pest. In his fourth satire, Horace has accused his predecessor of being too lazy to compose in the correct way in the same line where he also accuses him of being too garrulous (*garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem, | scribendi recte* 1.4.12-13). In the ninth satire, the word *piger* is put into the mouth of the pest where he proclaims he is not lazy (*non piger sum* 1.9.19), as he insists on accompanying the poet no matter what. Horace does not directly accuse him of the fault, but the pest's insistence on the fact that he is not lazy could be read as a denial of an implied allegation, particularly coming so close to *garrulus* with its link to Lucilius.

Horace tries in vain to shake off his follower and reveals he is fated to be finished off by such a fellow as he repeats the prophecy at 1.9.31-4. Just as in the two previous poems, the threat of *uenenum* reappears, a shared menace running through all three of the anecdotal satires. It is Horace's destiny to be done in by a chatterbox, with *garrulus* calling to mind both the pest and Lucilius.[255] One plagues his path as he walks through the city, while the other is a permanent presence in the background of his *Satires*.

Horace finally admits defeat and the poet chooses to close his satire with another arguably Lucilian line. After his pleas to Aristius Fuscus fail to free him, his salvation comes in the form of the pest's legal adversary, and he tells the reader "thus Apollo saved me" (*sic me seruauit Apollo* 1.9.78). The Homeric quotation refers to how Hector was rescued from Achilles by the god[256] and is "probably mediated through Lucilius".[257] Anderson argues that Horace is not only using the quotation as a reference to Lucilius, but is also referring to "the ultimate source of the allusion, Homer",[258] which ties in with the martial theme Anderson identifies as running throughout the satire. In his use of the Homeric line in his sixth book, Lucilius repeats the Greek text of the original (*nil ut discrepet ac τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων* 267-8). Horace, however, sticking to his theory of not mixing his own language with Greek (1.10.20-30), is careful to put Homer's words into Latin instead.

---

[253] Rudd 1961a: 82; Plaut. *Poen. 770, Bacch.* 251; Petr. 75.
[254] See previous discussion of fr. 519 and its use in the section on 1.5 above.
[255] See p59.
[256] *Iliad* 20.443.
[257] Gowers 2012: 303.
[258] Anderson 1956: 149.

The same argument about Horace's opening line can also be applied to his choice of words to close his poem. He may well have chosen the phrase in order to reflect the epic and military tone found elsewhere in the poem with a line of Homer. However, to choose a Homeric quotation which is also found in Lucilius, after an opening phrase which is also used by his predecessor, hints towards this choice being more than mere coincidence. Courtney argues that in the final line "the recall of Lucilius is undeniable and gives the poem a frame because of *ibam forte*".[259] He also highlights the relationship of the closing lines to the poem that follows directly after. Just as the Lucilius-inspired 1.5 is placed after a poem where Horace deals with the failings of his satiric predecessor, so here the link "is paralleled by that between 1.9 and 1.10, where in the latter we find Horace's criticism of Lucilius' use of Greek diction and his garrulity".[260] The poetic failings that Horace highlights in 1.9 are immediately attributed to Lucilius in the following poem.

While the language used by Horace in his ninth satire shows possible parallels with Lucilius' satire, Fiske claims that the two poets also share a common subject matter. He argues that Horace's model for this satire can be found in Lucilius' sixth book, which he claims describes an incident where Scipio is followed by a similar pest.[261] Fiske also claims that similar situation can be found in the corrupt fragment 254-8.

> *Cornelius Publius noster*
> *Scipiadas † dicto tempus † quae intorquet in ipsum*
> *† oti et delici<i>s luci effictae † atque cinaedo et*
> *sectatori † adeo ipsi † suo, quo rectius dicas.*
> *Ibat forte domum. Sequimur multi atque frequentes:*

> Our Publius Cornelius
> son o'Scipio's house...
> .... his male lover – or rather his
> follower (to name him more accurately).
> He was as it happened going home. We followed, numbers
> and crowds of us[262]

---

[259] Courtney 1994: 7.
[260] Courtney 1994: 7.
[261] Fiske 1920: 330-6.
[262] Warmington's translation.

Fiske claims that this fragment is "clearly concerned with the abuse that Scipio heaped upon a *sectator*" and argues that it is "reasonable to assume" that the Lucilian pest "sought to enrol himself among the followers of Scipio".[263] However, Rudd sees the fragment in a much different light and argues that "the Lucilian bore should be forgotten altogether".[264] He claims that the man mentioned in the Lucilian fragment is either a "hostile outsider", in which case he would not be trying to gain a place in Scipio's circle, or was already one of Scipio's companions, and that it is unbelievable that "a man eager to improve his social position would attempt to do so by abusing his prospective patron in the street".[265] Rudd is not alone in his scepticism about a link between the character in Lucilius 254-8 and Horace's interlocutor. Fraenkel also cautions against the assumption that "the particular theme of Horace's ninth satire had an analogy in the work of Lucilius".[266] I would agree with Rudd's scepticism; the link Fiske sees between them is a tenuous one, which is not helped by the corrupt nature of the fragment from which he draws much of his evidence.

Fiske also uses the Homeric allusion found in Lucilius to support his theory that Horace's pest has a Lucilian ancestor. Like the fragment discussed above, the line is also attributed to Lucilius' sixth book, and Fiske argues that Horace's line was "directly modelled" on the earlier quotation and refers to the "unfortunate victim of the Lucilian bore, perhaps Scipio himself".[267] But Rudd again points persuasively to the flaws in this theory. He highlights how it is not uncommon for a phrase from Lucilius to reappear in "totally new surroundings" and suggests that the earlier satirist could have been "simply discussing modes of expression and has no thought of an actual context".[268] The fragmentary nature of Lucilius' work means that it is impossible to know for sure who, if any, is correct. The use of Lucilian lines to both begin and end Horace's own satire does point strongly to a deliberate allusion to the earlier satirist, but to claim that the entire poem was based on a direct Lucilian model appears to be stretching the evidence too far. Horace has already given the impression in his sixth satire that his social position is an envied one, which might attract the sort of unwelcome attention encountered in his ninth poem. I would not argue that Horace is revealing an actual episode from his life, but the tale told in 1.9 does not appear to be the sort of story which could only be inspired by an earlier satiric model.

---

[263] Fiske 1920: 331.
[264] Rudd 1961a: 96.
[265] Rudd 1961a: 92.
[266] Fraenkel 1957: 113.
[267] Fiske 1920: 335.
[268] Rudd 1961a: 93.

Considering the language chosen by Horace and the faults he ascribes to the pest, the ninth satire can then be argued to contain several allusions to Lucilius. However, Ferriss-Hill takes this argument even further, and claims that Horace's dogged companion is actually Lucilius himself.[269] Horace's unwanted attendant shows "strikingly Lucilian traits" with his "verbosity" and boasts about his "prolific poetic production".[270] Like Lucilius, Horace knows him only by name and not by his face, but still he "instantly knows who he is".[271] Ferriss-Hill argues that the reader takes longer than Horace to recognise Lucilius but would still realise who the pest is meant to be.[272] She claims that Horace's attempts to escape his tormentor are a symbol of his bid to "define *sermo*, the genre established by Lucilius, as his own".[273] Horace's insistence on the egalitarianism of Maecenas' circle in 1.9.51 is explained through his own insecurities over Lucilius' wealth and learning.[274] And Ferriss-Hill concludes that the poet's inability to flee his unwelcome shadow is because "Horace is resigned to the fact that, as long as he is writing satire, he remains under the sway of Lucilius".[275] His failure to escape the pest is inevitable as his satiric predecessor is an inescapable part of the genre he has chosen. Horace is left as "Lucilius' only living *cognatus* – a generic one".[276] And with Horace heading to court at the end, the satire closes with "the anticipation of a legally sanctioned verdict of the superiority of Horace's brand of milder satire over Lucilius' vitriol".[277]

It is undeniable that Horace's pest does share some characteristics with the satirist's description of Lucilius. They are both garrulous poets with a similar attitude to speedily composed verses, representing the antithesis of Horace's polished brevity. However, there are also aspects of Horace's description of the pest which do not match his presentation of Lucilius elsewhere in the satires and do not sit well with Ferriss-Hill's theory. One of the most obvious differences, which Ferriss-Hill agrees is "admittedly problematic",[278] is the pest's boasts about the graceful movement of his limbs, portraying himself as an effeminate character more like Horace's hated Hermogenes, who is also mentioned directly afterwards (*quis membra mouere | mollius? inuideat quod et Hermogenes ego canto* 1.9.24-5). Nowhere in his descriptions of Lucilius does Horace accuse him of effeminacy;

---

[269] Ferriss-Hill 2011.
[270] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 432.
[271] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 434.
[272] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 435.
[273] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 438.
[274] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 444.
[275] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 440.
[276] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 441.
[277] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 453.
[278] Ferriss-Hill 2011: 441.

in fact one of the words he does employ in his portrayal of him is *durus* (1.4.8),[279] which would seem inappropriate if he believed Lucilius was guilty of the less than manly movements of the pest.

If Horace's pest is indeed Lucilius, then the reader might also perhaps expect to see him employ some of the abuse and invective Horace ascribes to him. In his tenth satire, Horace talks about how Lucilius scoured the city with wit (*sale multo | urbem defricuit* 1.10.3-4), yet the pest finds plenty to praise (*uicos, urbem laudaret* 1.9.13) and is more of an insistent flatterer than a scurrilous slinger of insults. Of course Horace's description of the pest's praise could be ironic or another indication that Lucilian satire cannot find a place in contemporary Rome, but the pest still does not tally completely with the savage satirist we would expect to find from Horace's other poems.

While there does not appear to be enough evidence in Horace's poem to see the pest as Lucilius himself, he does share many traits with the earlier poet. He may not be Lucilius, but he could be argued to be a poet of the Lucilian style of writing, just as can also be found in the seventh and eighth poems. The witches, with their literary-sounding spells and poison, and the rowing Republicans all show traces of the qualities Horace rejects in his own poetry. Horace's careful and current style of satire will be the antidote to vicious *uenenum*, which is best left in the past.

<div align="center">

Satire 1.10

</div>

In the final satire of Book 1, Horace presents a summing up of the stylistic principles he has displayed throughout the previous poems. The message of 1.7 and 1.8, that laughter can be a more powerful weapon than abuse, is now spelled out clearly. After showing his own version of satire, with Lucilius' rough edges and rough invective smoothed away, Horace states directly that his predecessor himself would write a different sort of poetry if he were working in Horace's own time (1.10.67-71). Now that he has shown his own reworking of his generic ancestor's poetry, he reveals the precedent for adapting and updating an earlier writer's work. If Lucilius could find fault in Accius and Ennius (148, 413), then why can Horace not submit the satirist himself to the same treatment? The idea that Horace is now spelling out the rules for satire which his poetry has been adhering to can be seen again in his criticism of Lucilius' use of Greek blended with Latin (1.10.20-30). After providing examples of this practice previously in his satires,[280] he will finally

---

[279] See p87.
[280] For example Horace uses a Latin version of Lucilius' Greek lines at 1.2.118 and 1.9.78.

refer explicitly to this stance. And once again, when Horace describes the importance of knowing when to wield the eraser when writing, he is putting into words the principle he has shown repeatedly throughout the satires with his brevity. Even his description of his desired reader (another feature he shares with Lucilius)[281] is the vocalisation of a point he has already made. The references to other texts and targets such as the small town magistrate and the pushy pest suggest a learned and elite audience, just like the famous friends he names at the end of the tenth satire. By including Maecenas in his list of listeners (1.10.81), Horace also takes his poems full circle, reminding readers of the reference to his powerful patron in the very first line of his book (1.1.1).

Horace emphasises these principles of composing satire (purity of Latin, brevity, poetry appropriate for its audience) not only by spelling out his rules for satire, but also by juxtaposing those guidelines with his renewed criticism of Lucilius, returning to the disapproval found in 1.4. Rudd argues that these two strands of the poem, Horace's satirical style and his view of Lucilius, are closely linked.[282] Horace presents his reader with his picture of Lucilius and his satire, and through this presentation "stages his own emergence as a new, more polished and decorous writer".[283] Rudd sees the later evaluation of Lucilius as "a less favourable estimate" than Horace's earlier description of his predecessor's work, and Freudenburg calls the poem the "second act of his *in Lucilium*",[284] where Horace resurrects his charges against Lucilius to help claim his own place in the literary tradition. Horace does admit that Lucilius is witty enough and more refined than some (1.10.64-7), but it is a grudging concession and the praise seems insincere considering the criticism that follows.

Questions have been raised over the authorship of the eight lines that appear at the beginning of the poem in some less reliable manuscripts and which most modern editors now take to be spurious because of their style and the fact that they are not mentioned by ancient commentators.[285] Courtney argues that the lines are "certainly not" Horace's work, while Freudenburg dismisses them as "probably non-Horatian", stating that "the grammar is vague, the hypotaxis elaborate and uncharacteristic of Horace".[286] Rudd describes them as "probably spurious", although he admits that they may contain "genuine information"

---

[281] Hor.1.10.81-91; Lucil. 632-4, 635.
[282] Rudd 1966: 94.
[283] Muecke 2007: 112.
[284] Freudenburg 2001: 67.
[285] Gowers 2012: 309 .
[286] Courtney 2010: 19; Freudenburg 1993: 170.

about the championing of Lucilius by Valerius Cato.[287] Gowers suggests the lines may have been added because of Horace's "too 'Lucilian' (i.e. improvised and conversational) opening",[288] a beginning which is "abrupt and improvisational (in homage to Lucilius)".[289] I would agree with those who doubt the lines were written by Horace although they do still provide interesting information about interest in Lucilius' work before Horace's *Satires*.[290]

To open the final satire of his book, Horace returns to the criticisms he made against Lucilius in his fourth poem. Horace admits attacking Lucilius' style and accusing him of producing verses which trip themselves up (*Nempe incomposito dixi pede currere uersus | Lucili* 1.10.1-2), and insists that even the most fervent fan of his predecessor would concede that this was true (*quis tam Lucili fautor inepte est | ut non hoc fateaur?* 1.10.2-3). His opening presents the poem as a defensive response prompted by the anger of those *fautores* at his attack on their esteemed Lucilius in his earlier poem. However, it is dangerous to take a satiric stance entirely at face value, and the criticisms Horace appears to be responding to are not necessarily actual objections which have been raised. Rather, they may well be how Horace imagines devotees of Lucilius would have reacted and he is providing his defence to the upset he may expect to cause. He is pre-empting their charges and providing the case for his own defence.

Horace admits that Lucilius is praised for scouring the city with his wit (*quod sale multo | urbem defricuit* 1.10.3-4), but quickly goes on to compare him with the mime-writer Laberius, whose work he describes as *poemata* (1.10.6). Gowers points out that this is the same term Lucilius had used to describe his own work when he "dignified his own poems with this relatively pretentious noun".[291] Lucilius uses it to describe his work being preferred to that of others (*et sola ex multis nunc nostra poemata ferri* 1091), making it perhaps an appropriate choice for Horace to use shortly after his mention of Lucilius' admirers. The word also appears in the same fifth foot position in Horace's line as in the Lucilian line. The Greek origin of the word may also perhaps reflect the use of Greek by Laberius – and Lucilius – in their own works.[292] Once again, Horace stops short of using Greek words, a fact he will highlight later in the poem, and chooses a loan-word instead.

---

[287] Rudd 1966: 118. See earlier discussion on Valerius Cato and Lucilius at p15-6.
[288] Gowers 2012: 309.
[289] Gowers 2012: 304.
[290] See Introduction p14-9.
[291] Gowers 2012: 313.
[292] See Chahoud 2004 on Lucilius' use of Greek in his satires and Panayotakis (2010: 65-6) for the use of Greek by Laberius.

Horace then returns to his familiar theme of *non satis est* (1.10.7), linking what is correct in satire to his previous discussions of what is enough in other areas of life, with the phrase containing "a perverse pun on the generic name *satura*".[293] Gowers[294] also suggests that the use of *uirtus* could be an allusion to Lucilius' poem defining *uirtus*,[295] and the constant repetition of the word in Lucilius' poem is undoubtedly one of the stylistic features Horace would have found fault with. The fragment also contains other examples of the style that Horace is keen to avoid, with its frequent repetition of words and phrases, as well as numerous elisions, which Horace hints at when he berates the way Lucilius shuts up his words into six feet (1.10.57-9). However, *uirtus* is by no means an uncommon word or concept for authors to use and it may be tempting to read more into Horace's use of this word and link it to Lucilius because of the unusually great length of the Lucilian fragment.

Horace lays out the rules of satire with which any reader who has worked their way through his previous poems would by now be familiar. Horace insists on brevity (*est brevitate opus* 1.10.9), which has already been well demonstrated in 1.5, where he takes a Lucilian trip in much fewer lines than his predecessor. A variety of tones must be used, with the satirist sometimes taking the role of the orator and other times the poet (*et sermone opus est modo tristi, saepe iocoso, | defendente uicem modo rhetoris atque poetae* 1.10) with Horace again using *sermones*, the same term employed by Lucilius (*ludo ac sermonibus* 1039) to describe his work. Horace has shown this in practice through the range of voices he has employed throughout his satires, from the Cynic delivering his diatribe in the first three poems to complaints of the comic god Priapus in the eighth poem.

At the start of his instructions for satiric style, Horace makes it clear that merely making listeners laugh is not enough and is not satire (*ergo non satis est risu diducere rictum | auditoris* 1.10.7-8). However, as he has shown in previous poems, Horace does

---

[293] Gowers 2012: 305
[294] Gowers 2012: 313
[295] "Virtue, Albinus, is to be able to pay a true price in the matters which we are engaged in and affairs of life; virtue is to know what each matter has for a man; virtue is to know what is correct and useful and honest for a man, what is good and again what is bad, what is useless, shameful and dishonest; virtue is to know the limit and extent of seeking; virtue is to be able to pay the price from wealth; virtue is to give that which is owed to honour, an enemy and hostile to bad men and character, while on the other hand the defender of good men and character, making much of these men, wishing them well, living as their friend, and besides this to think first of our country's interests, then of our parents' and to think of our own interests thirdly and lastly."
Virtus, Albine, est pretium persoluere uerum | quis in uersamur quis uiuimus rebus potesse; | uirtus est homini scire id quod quaeque habeat res; | uirtus scire homini rectum utile quid sit honestum, | quae bona quae mala item, quid inutile turpe inhonestum; | uirtus quaerendae finem re scire modumque; | uirtus divitiis pretium persoluere posse; | uirtus id dare quod re ipsa debetur honori, | hostem esse atque inimicum hominum morumque malorum | contra defensorem hominum morumque bonorum, | hos magni facere, his bene uelle, his uiuere amicum, | commoda praeterea patriai prima putare, | deinde parentum, tertia iam postremaque nostra (1196-1208).

acknowledge the power of laughter and claims it can be a more effective weapon than harsh abuse (*ridiculum acri | fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res* 1.10.14-15). He has already shown this theory in action with the joke that closes the seventh satire and with Priapus' comic method of frightening away the witches in the eighth poem. By using humour instead of abuse, Horace distances himself from Lucilius' notorious style of satire. He has already shown how he will stay away from the invective associated with his generic ancestor and now spells out this rule directly.

Horace soon highlights another difference between the language of his own poetry and Lucilius' style, when he focuses on what he sees as one of the major faults in his predecessor's work: his use of Greek words blended into Latin (1.19.20-30). Horace has already shown in his treatment of Lucilian lines and ideas earlier in the book how his attitude towards this practice differs from Lucilius'. Like Lucilius, he has referred to the problem of a name which does not fit into the rhythm of hexameter, although unlike the earlier satirist Horace describes the trouble without actually using the Greek word hexameter.[296] The man's lust which Lucilius describes by means of a Greek word in 332 (ψωλοκοποῦμαι) is expressed by Horace with a Latin version of the same concept of bursting with desire (*tentigine rumpi* 1.2.118). Perhaps the most striking example of the two satirists' different approach to Greek is found – maybe not coincidentally – directly before the tenth satire, where Horace takes the same Homeric line used by Lucilius but is careful to put the quotation into Latin instead of Greek.[297] After demonstrating his aversion to the use of Greek in his poetry, Horace now states it explicitly. Even in his cry to the "late learners" (*o seri studiorum!* 1.10.21) who praise Lucilius, Horace emphasises his approach by using the "pointedly artificial translation of Greek ὀψιμαθεῖς".[298]

As Zetzel points out, Horace may often echo "Lucilius' substance" in his poems, but he is careful not to imitate his use of words written in Greek, as shown by the closing lines of the ninth poem.[299] Zetzel also argues that in Horace's description of his dream of Quirinus at 1.10.31-55 – an emphatically Roman deity – Horace is showing the importance of

---

[296] Hor. 1.5.86-7 "We were taken 24 miles in carriages, to stay in a little town which cannot be said in verse" (*quattuor hinc rapimur uiginti et milia raedis,|mansuri oppidulo quod uersu dicere non est*); Lucil. 252-3 "This is the slaves' holiday | which you clearly could not say in hexameter verse" (*Seruorum est festus dies hic |quem plane hexametro uersu non dicere possis.*

[297] Hor. 1.9.78 "Thus Apollo saved me" (*Sic me seruauit Apollo*); Lucil. 267-8 "So that nothing differs and it is a case of 'and Apollo saved him'" (*nil ut discrepet ac τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων.*) See also section on 1.9 above.

[298] Gowers 2012: 318.

[299] Zetzel 2002: 42.

aiming for "Roman substance and elegance of Roman diction".[300] Horace is stressing the necessity of *Latinitas* in poetry, a factor he clearly believes was lacking from some of Lucilius' lines. Anderson defines *Latinitas* as "a good Latin style appropriate to educated Roman citizens...free of provincialisms, of alien elements, of both vulgarity and precosity".[301] Free, in other words, of many of the elements found so liberally scattered throughout Lucilius' work.

Lucilius' poems do include many examples of Greek words and phrases, and Chahoud argues that he uses these not indiscriminately but rather to mark "the change of voice, character, literary persona" and that Greek works as "a characterisation of speech".[302] Lucilius' colloquial style is expressed through language that reflects the way he would speak with his educated friends.[303] However, in Horace's time, the use of Greek in public texts was frowned upon, despite, as Adams points out, large amounts of Greek words being included in private texts, such as letters.[304] As well as Greek, Lucilius also includes examples of regional words and dialect in his poetry,[305] something not specifically attacked by Horace who focuses only on his use of Greek. This omission from Horace's criticism is perhaps linked to Adams's observation that, following the Social War, "Italian regionalisms do continue to be noted, but comment is now exclusively neutral in tone".[306]

Horace's mention of the bilingual Canusians (*Canusini more bilinguis* 1.10.30) may also contain a reference to Lucilius' work. In his third book, the earlier satirist talks about a Bruttian who can speak two languages (*Bruttace bilingui* 142). Porphyrio links this to Horace's use of the word *bilinguis* and points out that *Bruttace bilingui* was also a phrase used by Ennius,[307] while Fiske suggests Horace's phrase "is a deliberate variation on that of Lucilius".[308] Horace then compares the use of Greek in poetry to the mixing of languages in legal cases in a passage, which Gowers suggests could have been influenced by Lucilius' story of Titus Albucius, quoted by Cicero in his *de Finibus Bonorum et Malorum* (87-93).[309] This anecdote again makes clear that, while Greek may be acceptable

---

[300] Zetzel 2002: 42.
[301] Anderson 1963: 9.
[302] Chahoud 2004: 37-8.
[303] Chahoud 2004: 37.
[304] Adams 2003: 203.
[305] Adams (2003: 189) points in particular to Lucilius' "Oscanization of Latin *abiit*" in 623, where he shows a "condescending attitude" towards Italic speakers (*Primum Pacilius tesorophylax pater abzet* 623).
[306] Adams 2003: 194.
[307] See Skutsch on *Annals* 477 (1985: 637).
[308] Fiske 1920: 339.
[309] Gowers 2012: 320; "You preferred to be called a Greek, Albucius, rather than a Roman, and a Sabine, a fellow citizen of Pontius and Tritanus, of centurions, of outstanding men and standard bearers. Thus in Athens, as praetor, I greet you when you approach me, as you preferred: 'Greetings' I say in Greek, 'Titus'.

in private contexts, such as conversations and letters to friends, "formal context makes this liberty unacceptable".[310]

After claiming that he quickly abandoned his attempts at writing Greek verse, Horace turns to what he chose to produce instead, as he describes the poetry he plays at writing (*haec ego ludo* 1.10.37). Likewise, in his description of his own work as *sermones*, Horace again chooses a word also used by Lucilius about his poetry (*ludo ac sermonibus* 1039). The muddy head of the Rhine mentioned earlier in the line also calls to mind the earlier satirist through Horace's description of Lucilius' work as muddy (*cum flueret lutulentus* 1.4.11).

Horace lists the genres already championed by other authors, referring to "specifically Roman muses"[311] with his use of *Camenae* instead of *Musae* (1.10.45), when he talks about the gifts granted to Virgil. The same goddesses inspired Lucilius when they entrusted their locks and bolts to him *(cui sua committunt mortali claustra Camenae* 1064), although he does also use the more Greek-sounding *Musa,* to describe his desire to drink from their springs (*quantum haurire animus Musarum e fontibus gestit* 1061).

Once Horace has revealed how he settled on his preferred genre, he pays what at first sight appears to be a compliment to Lucilius. In an apparently modest and deferential admission, he insists that he falls short of satire's inventor and would not dare to try to snatch the crown from his head (1.10.46-9).

> This remained, tried in vain by Varro of Atax
> and certain others, which I, lesser than the inventor,
> could write better; nor would I dare to drag away
> the crown fixed to his head with much praise

> *hoc erat, experto frustra Varrone Atacino*
> *atque quibusdam aliis, melius quod scribere possem,*
> *inuentore minor; neque ego illi detrahere ausim*
> *haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam*
>
> (1.10.46-9)

The lictors and the crowd and all the troops say in Greek: 'Greetings Titus.' This is why Albucius is hostile to me, this is why he is my enemy." (*Graecum te, Albuci, quam Romanum atque Sabinum | municipem Ponti, Tritani, centurionum, | praeclarorum hominum ac primorum signiferumque, | maluisti dici. Graece ergo praetor Athenis, | id quod maluisti te, cum ad me accedis, saluto: | 'chaere' inquam 'Tite.' Lictores, turma omnis chorusque: | 'chaere Tite'. Hinc hostis mi Albucius, hinc inimicus!"* 87-93).
[310] Chahoud 2004: 34.
[311] Gowers 2012: 327.

However, a closer inspection of the language used by Horace suggests a more ambiguous message. Until the reader's eye reaches *minor* it could appear that Horace is placing himself in the superior position, with the use of *melius* in the previous line. *Minor* perhaps also reflects the earlier satirist's more rambling style and the fact that Horace will write less than the inventor of the genre. The word Horace chooses to describe pulling the crown from Lucilius' head also has other shades of meaning which might imply that Horace's praise is not entirely genuine. As Gowers points out, among the meanings of *detrahere* is be the idea of disparaging someone, exactly as Horace has already done (and will shortly do again) to Lucilius.[312] Horace's apparent insistence that he could never challenge Lucilius for his crown has a more critical undertone when examined closely.

Horace's composition of line 48 could perhaps also be seen as significant when viewed alongside one of his other criticisms of Lucilius: the numerous elisions found in his work. Rudd claims that Horace's main criticism of the stumbling verses of his predecessor was Lucilius' frequent use of elision, and points to the much more common occurrence of this feature in Lucilius' work than in Horace's poetry.[313] Horace is much more sparing with his use of elision and the line in the tenth satire which contains the most instances of this feature is, perhaps unsurprisingly, one in which Horace is referring to Lucilius, and in particular to his own relationship with him.

Inuentore minor; neq(ue) eg(o) illi detraher(e) ausim

(1.10.48)

Out of the 28 lines in the tenth satire which contain elision, 26 include just one instance each and just one line includes it twice.[314] In the whole first book of Horace's satires, Rudd reports that there are just 11 lines which, like 1.10.48, contain three elisions.[315]

---

[312] Gowers 2012: 328; *O.L.D.* s.v. 8.
[313] Rudd 1966: 106
[314] Two elisions are found in 39, *ne redeant iterum atqu(e) iter(um) spectanda theatris*, with one elision in lines 1, 2, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 22, 24, 25, 28, 31, 38, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 57, 63, 73, 76, 77, 86 and 91.
[315] Rudd: 1966: 106

After the supposed praise of Lucilius, Horace returns to his criticisms of the earlier satirist. The effect of Horace's reproaches is increased by the juxtaposition of them with the apparent admiration of Lucilius. As Plaza notes, "a mean, decisive judgement will make the greater impact if placed side by side with a laudatory one".[316] Horace then justifies his position by claiming that Lucilius himself has set the precedent for finding fault with literary predecessors, whose work he adapts, and Porphyrio tells how the earlier writer targeted Accius in his third book (*Facit autem haec Lucilius cum alias, tum vel maxime in tertio libro* 148), just as Horace alleges. Gowers also points to Lucilius' parody of Ennius at 413, where he suggests his own version of the Ennian line (*horret et alget* 413).[317] Oliensis sees a link between Horace's attack on Lucilius and his relationship to the earlier satirist, arguing that "what justifies his criticism of Lucilius is his status as Lucilius' best and strongest descendant".[318]

Again Horace returns to the criticisms of Lucilius' style of composition which he made in the fourth poem, accusing him of rattling off sloppy lines, happy to shut anything up in the right number of feet (1.10.59-61). Horace's choice of language here could again be argued to have a second, more condemnatory, meaning. The verb with which he chooses to describe Lucilius fitting words into six feet, *claudo*, does not sound entirely dissimilar to *claudeo*, the meanings of which include 'to sound imperfect' or 'fall short', or 'to limp along'[319]. These definitions fit well with Horace's view of Lucilius' poetry which trips itself up and is not up to scratch. Lucilius himself uses *claudeo* with the meaning of limping in his description of a hairdresser circling in the atrium, although he employs a slightly different spelling (*zonatim circum impluvium cinerarius...cludebat* 282).

Horace then moves on to the allegation that Lucilius would have written a different sort of satire if he had been composing poetry in Horace's own day (1.10.67-71). Although this is the first time Horace has spelled out this idea explicitly, it can be argued that he has been showing this theory throughout the satires, since he presents his own updated version of the genre. Horace leaves out the abuse and invective, which would perhaps be politically unwise to include in satire created in his own time; in poems such as his fifth satire, Horace shows how Lucilius' work can be altered to suit the tastes of his own time. Horace also

---

[316] Plaza 2006: 288
[317] Gowers 2012: 329; Servius on *Aeneid* 11.602: "'*Horret ager*' is terrible. It is, however, a line of Ennius, reproached by Lucilius who says mockingly that he should have said '*horret et alget*'" (*Servius, ad Aen., XI, 602: 'Horret ager', terribilis est. Est autem uersus Ennianus, uituperatus a Lucilio dicente per inrisionem debuisse eum dicere 'horret et alget'*). Warmington translates *terribilis est* as "means 'is terrible'" (1938: 131).
[318] Oliensis 1998: 40
[319] *O.L.D* s.v.1-3.

highlights the importance of revising and refining poetic work, if you want to create something worth reading twice. The joke between the lines, as Gowers points out, is that the reader of Horace's *Satires* has now read his 'worthy' criticisms of Lucilius twice.[320] In his description of how he imagines Lucilius composing in his own day, he chooses another word which is also used by his predecessor, the verb *scabo*. Lucilius uses it about someone who had scratched themselves against a tree like a pig (*scaberat ut porcus contritis arbore costis* 356), and the word is also said by Nonius to have been included in the title of a satire by Lucilius about scratching each other's back (*mutuum muli scababunt*).[321] It does not appear to survive in authors before Horace, apart from Lucilius.

After outlining his guidelines for composition, Horace turns instead to the poet's preferred audience, an issue that Lucilius also addressed. Cicero describes how Lucilius did not wish to be read by either the very learned, such as Persius (*Persium non curo legere* 635), or the very unlearned, but by someone like Decimus Laelius (*Laelium Decumum uolo* 635), whom Cicero calls a not uneducated man, though one who does not compare with the clever Persius (*quem cognouimus uirum bonum et non inlitteratum, sed nihil ad Persium*).[322] Cicero again talks about Lucilius' desired audience when he says, like Lucilius, that he does not want everyone to read his work, and that Lucilius was writing for the people of Tarentia, Consentia and Sicily.[323] Fiske highlights another fragment where Lucilius appears to be addressing the same issue, when he points to the sort of writers whose attention he wants (*nunc itidem populo... his cum scriptoribus; | uoluimus capere animum illorum* 720-1).[324] He also draws a parallel between Lucilius' mention of specific readers by name, such as Persius, and Horace's list of Maecenas' circle.[325] Fraenkel agrees that Horace "borrows" this idea from Lucilius, when he discusses his own preferred audience.[326] He announces his illustrious list of longed-for admirers with "a last-minute, name-dropping frenzy"[327], reeling off a literary who's-who designed to impress. The message "is not so much that Horace is selective as that Horace has been selected".[328] Despite the presentation of himself in the sixth satire as a modest man who is happy with

---

[320] Gowers 2012: 333.
[321] *O.L.D.* s.v. 1b.
[322] Cic. *de Or.* 2. 25: *Lucilius, homo doctus et perurbanus, dicere solebat neque se ab indoctissimis neque a doctissimis legi uelle, quod alteri nihil intellegerent, alteri plus fortasse quam ipse.*
[323] Cic. *de Fin.*1.3.7: *Nec uero ut noster Lucilius recusabo quominus omnes mea legant... Tarentinis ait se et Consentinis et Siculis scribere .*
[324] Fiske 1920: 348.
[325] Fiske 1920: 348.
[326] Fraenkel 1957: 132.
[327] Freudenburg 2001: 70.
[328] Oliensis 1998: 41.

his humble lot, his insistence that he is "ambition-free totters under the weight of its own irony", when viewed with his list of famous friends.[329]

With this final poem Horace rounds off his first book of satires by spelling out the rules he has been following in his writing, showing his stylistic system for satire just like "a magician… displaying before the audience the devices that enabled his act".[330] Although Lucilius is given such a prominent place in the tenth poem, echoes of and allusions to his language are perhaps scarcer here than in other satires from Horace's first book, such as 1.5. Fiske argues that the poem has less of a direct Lucilian influence because it is more concerned with a "contemporary literary quarrel".[331] He takes Horace's presentation of the poem as a reply to criticism from Lucilius' fans at face value and believes that the poet is using the satire to respond to actual objections made about his fourth poem.[332] I would agree that the influence of Lucilius on the language in this poem appears to be weaker, but I would suggest that it is for different reasons than those Fiske puts forward. Some of the satires which appear to show the strongest Lucilian influence are those in which Horace makes no mention of his satiric predecessor and instead alludes to him through shared words and phrases and themes. For example, in the sixth poem the allusions to the unnamed Lucilius are a subtle way of showing Lucilius' influence on Horace, alongside the credited influence of Horace's father and of Maecenas. Horace's fifth poem, likewise, contains frequent allusions to Lucilius' language, which remind the reader this is Horace's version of a work by his predecessor. However, when he is dealing directly with Lucilius and making explicit references to the earlier satirist, Horace no longer needs to use these hints to reveal to the reader who he is talking about and can show the distance between his own style and that of Lucilius. The reference and the comparison between Horace and Lucilius are clear. In the same way that Horace is spelling out his rules for satire, rather than showing them through his poetry as he has done previously, he is also listing his predecessor's faults, describing the supposed failings of his satire which he now presents himself as having removed in his own work. Horace finishes his book with a summing up of the poetic principles – and pitfalls – that have shaped his satire so far.

---

[329] Freudenburg 2001: 69.
[330] Oliensis 1998: 40.
[331] Fiske 1920: 337.
[332] Fiske 1920: 336.

CHAPTER 2

Anger and Ambiguity: Horace's Epodes *and* Satires

Five years after the publication of his first book of *Satires*, Horace unveils another
collection of satiric poems and, at around the same time, also presents his *Epodes*.[1] By
choosing to experiment with iambic poetry, Horace picks a genre with many similarities to
satire, not least the fact that it may seem a surprising choice for a poet working in the
turbulent political times of Horace's day. Morrison identifies the main features of iambic
poetry as "aggression, invective, abuse and anger",[2] and the poet following in the footsteps
of notoriously savage generic predecessors such as Archilochus and Hipponax would need
to tread a careful path. Just as in his choice of Lucilius as a model for his satires, Horace
has picked a potentially problematic act to follow. All three generic predecessors
composed their poetry at a time when they were free to indulge the *libertas* and *parrhesia*
associated with their chosen style of work. In adopting these genres, Horace must also
adapt them and in the Horatian version of both satire and iambic poetry this includes
addressing the personal attacks and aggression for which each genre was notorious. The
treatment Horace applies to his *Satires* is mirrored in his refashioning of iambic poetry in
his *Epodes,* as the poet faces similar challenges in producing a form of the genre more
suited to his own times.

By selecting satire as his chosen genre, Horace has already had to negotiate the problems
that come with a potentially troublesome form of poetry. Although Horace is writing in the
same genre as Lucilius in satire, he keeps well away from the pointed attacks on
individuals and personal abuse associated with his predecessor's work. As Ruffell points
out, "the closest that Horace ever gets to *onomasti komoidein* are figures that are
nonentities or, more commonly, patently invented speaking names".[3] The reluctance that
Horace shows to exploit his chosen genre's aggression against named individuals in the
Satires continues into his *Epodes*. Although he is once again experimenting with a type of
poetry known for its invective Horace takes a similar approach to produce a softened and
safer form of writing.

---

[1] See Carrubba (1969: 16-7) on the dating of the individual poems of the book.
[2] Morrison 2016: 39.
[3] Ruffell 2003: 37.

The outbursts of invective and abuse associated with iambic poetry are by no means exclusive to that genre, and Horace has already shown his own critical side with attacks on targets in the *Satires*, leading Freudenburg to argue that the poet is an iambic writer in both that collection and the *Epodes*.[4] With its censure and abuse, iambic also shares features with Old Comedy, the genre which Horace accuses Lucilius of relying up entirely at *S.* 1.4.1-6, and the attacks and aggression of the earlier satirist's work would make him at home with the iambic poets. The iambic character of Lucilius' poetry is reflected again in Diomedes' inclusion of the satirist in his list of Latin writers who composed *carmen maledicum,* just like Archilochus, who is also mentioned by the grammarian.[5] There has been some debate as to the extent of Lucilius' knowledge of and debt to Archilochus and the other possible Greek models for his satire. Coffey sees Lucilius as owing much to the Greek iambists, although he disagrees with Puelma Piwonka on the extent of Callimachus' influence on Lucilius, arguing that "the iambi of Callimachus were far too indirect and contrived to have provided an exemplar for the blunt Lucilius".[6] Coffey claims that Lucilius would have been familiar with Archilochus' work and copied his style in his own compositions, describing the Greek verse as a "formative influence on his approach to satire".[7] Goh agrees that Lucilius "did deal with something Archilochean", although Mankin is sceptical about the extent of the satirist's knowledge of Archilochus' work and doubts whether he was familiar enough with it to use it as a model for his own satire.[8]

The name of Archilochus does appear in the surviving fragments of Lucilius in a line where the satirist refers to disagreeing with him over a fear that something cannot happen (*Metuo ut fieri possit; ergo antiquo ab Arciloco excido* 786). The fragment refers to a line spoken by a father in a work by Archilochus, where it is claimed that nothing is impossible.[9] The fact that Lucilius attributes the line to Archilochus himself, rather than to the character of the father, is seen by Mankin as evidence that Lucilius' familiarity with Archilochus' work was not particularly comprehensive. Mankin argues that Lucilius' knowledge of the Greek poet was "scanty and probably claimed wholly from an

---

[4] Freudenburg 1993:103.
[5] *Iambus est carmen maledicum plerumque trimetro versu et epodo sequente conpositum ... apellatum est autem* παρά τὸ ἰαμβίζειν, *quod est maledicere. Cuius carminis praecipi scriptores apud Graecos Archilochus et Hipponax, apud Romanos Lucilius et Catullus at Horatius et Bibaculus*, Ars Gramm. Keil I. 485.11-17. Lucilius however is left out of Quintilian's list of Roman poets composing iambic verse as he mentions only Catullus, Horace and Bibaculus 1.10.96.
[6] Coffey 1989: 56-7; Piwonka 1949.
[7] Coffey 1989: 1976.
[8] Goh 2016: 65; Mankin 1987: 408.
[9] Mankin 1987:406; Arch. fr. 122.1-9 West (in Gerber 1999).

anthology", meaning that the satirist did not know his work well enough to deliberately use him as the model for his own poetry.[10]

Warmington also identifies another fragment of Lucilius as being an imitation of Archilochus, when the satirist refers to raising spirits in good circumstances and lowering them when things are bad (*re in secunda tollere animos, in mala demittere* 779).[11] Sommerstein agrees it "reads like a translation" of Archilochus fr. 128.6 (ἀλλὰ χαρτοῖσίν τε χαῖρε καὶ κακοῖσιν ἀσχάλα).[12] Marx also sees a reference to Archilochus in Lucilius' description of a man brought to a certain position and fate by chance and fortune (*cui parilem fortuna locum fatumque tulit fors* 473).[13]

While the exact extent of Lucilius' debt to Archilochus is unclear, the satirist's invective does bring to mind the notoriously savage spirit of the iambic poets. But in his description of Lucilius in *S.* 1.4, it is not these writers but the playwrights of Old Comedy whom Horace accuses his predecessor of relying upon entirely. Horace does not link Lucilius directly to Archilochus, despite the fact that the Greek poet's name appears in Lucilius' work while the satirist makes no mention of Old Comedy.[14] Sommerstein offers a persuasive suggestion to Horace's possible motivation in linking Lucilius to Old Comedy rather than to a poet such as Archilochus. He argues that Horace avoids presenting Lucilius as a "Roman Archilochus" because he has his eye on that title for himself with his *Epodes*.[15] Horace would later claim to be the first Latin writer to compose Parian iambics, following the metre and spirit of Archilochus.[16] By focusing on Lucilius only as a satirist and as a follower of Old Comedy, Horace can assert his claim to primacy in the Latin form of the genre.

I would argue that this separation of Lucilius from the iambic poetry found in Horace's *Epodes* can also be seen in Horace's use – or, more accurately, non-use – of his predecessor in the collection. Lucilius' poetry would have offered a rich vein of inspiration for a poet looking to create a book containing such pieces of invective such as *Epodes* 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12. Horace, however, appears to show a deliberate avoidance of Lucilian echoes

---

[10] Mankin 1987: 406-8.
[11] Warmington 1938: 250.
[12] Sommerstein 2011: 37.
[13] Marx 1905: 167; Goh 2016: 65.
[14] Sommerstein 2011: 37.
[15] Sommerstein 2011: 37.
[16] *Parios ego primus iambos | ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus | Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben. Epist.* 1.19.23-25. Horace's claim ignores Catullus' iambic work, which Sommerstein argues "could be discounted because...he had not managed to put together a whole book" of poems in that genre (2011: 38).

in the *Epodes,*[17] and I would argue that there is a combination of different reasons behind this decision. Firstly, I would agree with Sommerstein's suggestion that Horace keeps his new genre free of Lucilius to support his case for primacy in Latin iambic. However, I think this can be taken further and be seen as a sign of Horace's assertion of his position as a poet more generally. In the following chapter I will argue that throughout *Satires* 2 Horace fades out the allusions to Lucilius and replaces them with references to his own work instead, as he claims his place as Rome's foremost satirist. The same process can be seen here as Horace presents a collection of poems which are scattered with frequent allusions to and echoes of his own work, both looking back to the first book of *Satires* and across to his second collection.

The avoidance of Lucilius in the *Epodes* also serves a further purpose in that it helps to put in place a stronger dividing line between Horace's iambic poems and the *Satires*. The two genres do have several aspects in common and by keeping Lucilius away from his iambic work, Horace can draw a more definite generic boundary between them. The *Satires* and the *Epodes* may share themes and ideas, but Horace's exclusion of Lucilius in the latter collection and the restriction of Lucilius' influence on the *Epodes* help to define the distinct genres more clearly.

Horace may restrict Lucilian allusions to his *Satires*, but flashes of his predecessor's spirit can be seen in his *Epodes* as the poet shows a different side of his persona. The private poet of *Satires* 1 begins to speak out as public and political issues now come to the fore. Cucchiarelli argues that the poet of the *Epodes* has taken back the censorial strength which Lucilius employed so freely and which linked him to Old Comedy.[18] Horace removes this public censure from satire, insisting that his satiric poetry is a private production for the pleasure of his friends, and places it in the *Epodes* instead. And instead of restricting aggression to other speakers, such as Persius and Rupilius Rex in *S.* 1.7, Cucchiarelli points to the shift to the first person when displaying such emotions in the *Epodes*.[19]

Horace also shows a shift in how he deals with his generic predecessors in the *Satires* and the *Epodes*. He repeats the technique found in the first book of *Satires* of not mentioning his generic role-model straight away, instead waiting until the book has already got underway before referring to his predecessor. In *Satires* 1, Lucilius is introduced by name in the fourth poem and used as an example of what Horace will not do. However, Horace

---

[17] Goh (2016: 63-84) lists what he considers to be traces of Lucilius in the first half of the *Epodes*.
[18] Cucchiarelli 2001: 123-24.
[19] Cucchiarelli 2001: 124.

changes his approach slightly in the *Epodes* where he refers to Archilochus and Hipponax by their notorious deeds, rather than their names, and holds them up as examples of what he *will* do in his poetry when he refers to them in *Epod.* 6. The approach to Lucilius in Book 2 of the *Satires* echoes this position in the *Epodes*. Now, Lucilius has become a role model, although how seriously the reader can really take that claim will be discussed later.

Throughout the *Epodes*, Horace applies the same treatment to iambic poetry as he has to satire. Although there is indeed more aggression in the *Epodes,* Horace still shows the same discretion he has applied in his *Satires* as he reworked Lucilius' poetry. Horace removes the features which could seem inappropriate and problematic in his own time to instead present a Horatian version of the genre, updated and revised for his Rome and his readers. I would argue that *Satires* 1 plays a key role in this, as Horace builds on the persona he has created in those poems. One of the key shifts between the *Satires* and the *Epodes* is the way in which the poet's focus moves from private matters to the public affairs of Rome. During the *Satires*, Horace has stressed his lack of interest in such important matters, even turning a notoriously blind eye when he himself is involved in them, as in *S.* 1.5. But in *Epod.* 7 and 15, the poet now steps forward and appears to address the people of Rome. I would argue that this shift in stance is partly made possible by what has gone before and would perhaps not have been possible in the *Satires*. Horace's previous disavowal of personal ambition (stressed again in *S.* 1.6) allows him to present himself as offering advice for the public benefit, rather than his own benefit and possible advancement.

The persona the reader meets in the *Epodes* is not exactly the same as that found in the *Satires*, but I would argue that the same characteristics still run through the writer of each genre. The same use of irony and ambiguity permeates all three collections, letting the reader recognise the same hand pulling the strings behind the scenes. Horace still displays the same concerns in both the *Epodes* and the *Satires,* as he returns to the same themes and the focus remains on the poet as a loyal friend to Maecenas. But the reader also gets a glimpse of the less respectable side of Horace, for example in the attacks on the old women with whom he is sexually involved in *Epod.* 8 and 12. The less than reputable sides of the persona presented by Horace are also echoed across the collections, again reinforcing the similarities of the poet of all three books. In *Satires* 2, Horace is accused of having a temper (2.3.323), of being consumed by passions for different boys and girls (2.3.325) and of being quick to slavishly jump to Maecenas' side (2.7.32-5). All these allegations could be seen to be proved correct in the *Epodes*, where Horace repeatedly shows his temper (for

example in 4, 6, 8, 12 and 15), reveals his fickleness as an admirer (11.27-8) and describes his dinners with Maecenas (3 and 9). In the same way, the different sides of Horace's friendship with Maecenas, both positive and negative, are explored repeatedly across the three books, creating echoes and dialogues between the different works. The witch Canidia also appears in all three collections to haunt Horace's pages, providing the finale to both the *Epodes* (17) and *Satires* 2 (8.93-5). And another strong echo is found in Horace's reading list in 2.3.11-12 where he packs Archilochus, a nod to his iambic work. Horace gives no reason in that poem for why his poetic output has been drying up, but the reader of the *Epodes* would know why his pen has been put aside from the luckless lover's lament in *Epod*. 14.

Although there is no mention of either book of *Satires* in the *Epodes*, or vice versa, echoes such as those mentioned above (which will be discussed further in this chapter) provide links between the collections.[20] The *Epodes,* as Cucchiarelli argues, are "encircled" by the two books of *Satires,*[21] and the three works are made more effective by the connections between them. The different collections give glimpses into the different sides of the same persona, emphasising a range of characteristics as the mood shifts between public and private. There is sufficient continuity in character to be able to identify the same author in all three collections, but also enough differences to create an ambiguity that leaves the reader wondering what they can take at face value and where the real Horace can be found.

Unlike the *Satires*, the *Epodes* will be looked at here thematically, rather than following the sequence found in Horace's book. As in the *Satires*, the order of the *Epodes* adds to the effectiveness of the collection as a whole, and the juxtaposition of certain poems helps to add irony and further layers of possible interpretation. However, in looking at the *Epodes'* relationship with the *Satires* it seemed more appropriate to approach them through the themes which can be identified in both collections. Unlike in the chapters on the *Satires*, I do not intend to focus primarily on Horace's relationship with his generic predecessor and how this relationship develops as the book goes on. Instead, I will look at the links between the three collections and the way in which Horace uses his *Satires* in his *Epodes*, looking back to the first book while also glancing sideways at his second collection.

Throughout the *Epodes*, Horace applies the same approach to Greek iambic poetry as he has already used with Roman satire. He reworks a genre which could be problematic and transforms it into a more appropriate and suitable form for his own times. However,

---

[20] Cucchiarelli 2001: 120.
[21] Cucchiarelli 2001: 120.

Horace's approach to the *Epodes* not only involves reworking another poet's style, in this case that of Archilochus, but also relies on the use of his own work. The *Epodes* look back to *Satires* 1 while also looking across to his second collection of satiric works. I would argue that Horace uses his own previous work as a background to the *Epodes* and uses the presentation of his persona in that collection to add another layer to his iambic poetry. Horace looks back with repeated references to themes and ideas he has previously explored which bring the earlier satiric collection to mind. At the same time, Horace also looks across to his second book of *Satires* as he includes references that tie all three collections together. And as Canidia, who has haunted the Horace-like Priapus in *Satires* 1.8, returns to close the show in both *Satires* 2 and the *Epodes,* all three books are joined together in a cloud of her poisonous breath. With the final lines, the reader is given one last reminder of the clever interplay between the trio of Horatian works.

Horace's Self-Presentation

The variety of topics used in the *Epodes* allows Horace to present different sides of himself through different poems as he highlights various aspects of his personality while the focus continuously shifts throughout the book. The reader encounters Horace the loyal friend as well as Horace the lover, the poet and the politically engaged citizen of Rome. Any reader familiar with the *Satires* would already have been introduced to the personality Horace presents through that collection, particularly through the autobiography he reveals in 1.6, where he discusses his father's role in shaping his life (also referred to in 1.4) as well as his first introduction to Maecenas and the life he now enjoys because of their friendship. Shackleton Bailey argues that, by doing this in his *Satires,* Horace is following the example of Lucilius and is introducing himself with a "lavish interjection of the author's personality and day-to-day affairs".[22] While the *Epodes* may not contain the same level of autobiographical detail as the *Satires*, this does not mean that they are devoid of signs of Horace's personality, or at least the personality he wishes to portray in his poetry.

Working from what he has revealed in the *Satires,* Horace uses the *Epodes* to fill some of the gaps in the presentation of himself. The reader now meets a more politically active Horace who is more willing to state his position explicitly, a Horace who reveals more about his romantic liaisons and a Horace whose poetic concerns may not have changed but are now expressed in a different way.

---

[22] Shackleton Bailey 1982: 10.

Cucchiarelli sees the decision to deal with these matters in the *Epodes*, rather than the *Satires,* as being linked to their different genres.[23] Matters of love and the *magna res* of the state must be addressed in 'proper poetry' and not the conversational *Satires*.[24] However, while the subject matter may change, many aspects of Horace's presentation of himself remain consistent throughout the different collections. Other facets of his persona are built on and developed, and I would argue that there are certain sides to the poet's personality which can only emerge precisely because of what has gone before in the *Satires*. Horace uses the picture he has painted of himself already in the *Satires* as a backdrop that makes it possible to present different aspects of himself in the *Epodes*. This chapter will explore Horace's personal life as a lover, his published life as a poet, and his more public role as a citizen of Rome. It is in this last role, when Horace turns his attention to political matters, where I would argue that his presentation of himself in the *Satires* plays a particularly important role. The disavowal of ambition found in that collection and the deliberate avoidance of matters of state provide a key backdrop that puts Horace in a position to be able to address such topics now in his *Epodes*.

One feature of the poet that remains unchanged across the two collections is Horace's lack of success as a lover. The relationships Horace focuses on in the *Satires* are mainly friendships rather than romantic entanglements, but the poet's own amatory exploits are also included in the book. The reader is given a glimpse of Horace the lover through his advice on the best choice of partner in 1.2, as well as his solitary ejaculation following the non-appearance of the girl he was expecting in 1.5. It is on relationships with friends rather than with lovers where Horace prefers to focus and where he has the most success. However, in the *Epodes* Horace begins to fill in some of the spaces he has left in the *Satires*. Instead of more generalised advice on love and sex, he reveals names and details of his often disappointing love-life and the link between his romantic and his poetic life.

In the second satire of the first book Horace has spelled out his strategy for sexual satisfaction, as he lists the advantages of chasing after only freedwomen. Throughout most of the poem he uses examples from the amatory exploits of others, rather than sharing details about his own love life, and it is only near the end of the poem that the examples switch to the first person. Even then, Horace reveals few details about his own sexual partner, admitting that she could be anyone once they are lying together (1.2.125-6). He turns his back on grand passions and advises his reader to follow the same path of careful

---

[23] Cucchiarelli 2001: 172.

[24] Horace himself has raised the question of whether the *Satires* count as 'real' poetry at 1.4.39-40, when he claims he would exclude himself from those whom he would give the name poet.

moderation that he advocates in the three opening poems of the book. The only other glimpse the reader is given of Horace as a lover happens in the fifth poem of the book during his journey with Maecenas. The poet is stood up by a lying girl, who had promised to visit him, and the only sexual satisfaction he achieves that night happens when he is alone and dreaming of what might have happened (1.5.82-4).

The presentation of Horace as an unsuccessful lover continues in the *Epodes* where, although he reveals more to the reader about his romantic life, the poet is still plagued by disappointments. Lovesick Horace pines for Inachia, Neaera and Phryne,[25] proving in the latter's case that his previous advice about choosing freedwomen for trouble-free liaisons was incorrect. Phryne may be a *libertina* (14.15), but she is clearly not the easy and straightforward conquest suggested in the *Satires*. Snubbed by the greedy Inachia and turned into a laughing stock, the poet boasts of having found a new lover in the handsome boy Lyciscus (11.23-6). But Horace immediately undermines this presentation of himself as a successful lover by moving straight from this description to the scene in *Epod.* 12, where his sexual exploits are not with a beautiful boy but instead with a lecherous old woman with whom he is impotent. Horace's partner and performance are certainly nothing to boast about. Just as in his previous collection of poems, there is no single target for Horace's passion. This presentation of the poet as a fickle lover looks ahead to the criticisms Damasippus will make of Horace in *S.* 2.3, where he accuses him of being crazy about a thousand boys and girls (2.3.325). As Shackleton Bailey highlights, there is "no Cynthia *finis erit* for him".[26]

The first mention Horace makes of amatory affairs in the *Epodes* is in the eighth poem, where it is not a handsome boy or a beautiful girl that the poet is involved with but a revolting old woman whom he lambasts for failing to arouse him. Horace lists her foul physical features (8.1-10) and blames her for his lack of erection, insisting that only oral efforts would have any chance of exciting him (8.19-20). However, for all his revulsion at her appearance, the final two lines of the poem show that Horace does not walk out on her or reject her attentions altogether, for all he has criticised her lack of allure.[27] And if she

---

[25] The name Phryne also appears in Lucilius 290 (*Phryne nobilis illa ubi amatorem inprobius quem*) and, like Neaera from epode 15, was the name of a famous Greek courtesan which was often used for prostitutes of later periods (Mankin 1995: 233-4; 239). Lyciscus is a name found in comedy, which Mankin suggests could have been chosen to show the "predatory" nature of Horace's new love (1995: 204). Mankin also describes Inachia, the name of Horace's love-interest mentioned in the eleventh and the twelfth poems, as a name that "does not appear to be a real one", and suggests that its use could be intended to imply the girl's "bovine qualities" because of its use as an epithet for Io (1995: 196).
[26] Shackleton Bailey 1982: 7.
[27] Richlin 1984:75.

really is so repulsive, why is Horace considering sex with her in the first place? The same old woman or a similar character appears again in the twelfth epode where, again, the poet's erection fails him and he blames it on being with a lover fit only to mate with animals (12.1).[28] This time, though, the *vetula* is given the chance to answer back, attacking his impotence with her, yet mentioning his sexual capabilities with Inachia (12.14-16). Although Horace is impotent with someone so grotesque, the poet still makes it clear to the reader that this is not always the case.

Fitzgerald argues that the theme of impotence is one that runs throughout the collection, where Horace's sexual failure in his encounters with the old woman is linked to the poet's powerlessness in the face of the political situation in which he is living.[29] Horace's weakness is shown repeatedly throughout the collection where he is presented as helpless in the face of love, war and witches. But the poet's helplessness is not the only possible subtext that can be uncovered in the epodes concerning the old woman. Clayman sees parallels between Horace's description of the woman's physical faults and the literary faults Horace identifies in the writing of other poets and, in particular, Lucilius.[30] The heavy pearls (8.13-14) mirror the excess of words that weighs down tired ears (1.10.9-10), and criticism of her old age echoes Horace's negative views of archaic poetry.[31] Clayman also sees distinctly Lucilian references in the mention of the woman's *imagines triumphales* and her books on the Stoicism, a philosophy with which the earlier satirist was linked.[32] Through her physical ugliness, the old woman becomes "a composite picture of everything Horace thinks is wrong with literature".[33]

Clayman's argument for a literary subtext is a persuasive one. Horace has already laid out his poetic principles in the *Satires,* so perhaps he does not need to repeat them explicitly in the *Epodes* as well. However, in the same way that the opening poem of the *Epodes* can be read as a reminder of and a link to the *Satires*, the eighth and the twelfth epodes also work as subtle reminders of Horace's previous concerns. As well as the echoes of Horace's criticism highlighted by Clayman, I would argue that the *vetula* poems also contain further hints that Horace's insults have a literary slant as well as more direct similarities to Lucilius through shared subject-matter and vocabulary.

---

[28] Richlin (1984: 75) highlights this as an example of how impotence becomes "a sign of the woman's failure" rather than a source of shame of the man.
[29] Fitzgerald 2009: 155.
[30] Clayman 1975.
[31] Clayman 1975: 59.
[32] Clayman 1975: 59-60.
[33] Clayman 1975: 60.

Horace opens his attack by focusing on the woman's age and the detrimental effect she has had on his virility. As Clayman points out, the attack on her old age fits with his views on older poetry, and in particular the work of Lucilius, whose unsuitability to contemporary times and tastes is mentioned by Horace at *S.* 1.10.67-71. The poet's opening attack on the woman is sprinkled with terms which can also have a literary meaning. The word Horace uses in the description of his failing erection is *enervo* (8.2), a denominative compound verb derived from the noun *nervus* which (as well as being used to refer to the penis[34]) can refer to literary talents as well as sexual powers.[35] Propertius uses it in the former sense,[36] and Horace himself refers to accusations that his poems lacked vigour as he opens his second book of *Satires* (2.1.1-4). Another verb with a literary link appears two lines later with *exaro* (8.4), which can mean the physical act of writing with a stylus as well as ploughing something.[37] And the woman's anus, gaping between her wizened buttocks, is described with *hio* (8.5), which can also refer to a disjointed style,[38] something Clayman highlights as being a feature of the archaic poetry which Horace finds so distasteful.[39] The crone's swollen calves are *tumentibus suris* (8.9-10), a description echoing the idea of inflated style or overfilled verse, like the overstuffed image of Lucilius' poetry presented by Horace.[40] And as he brings his stinging attack to an end, Horace refers to the illiterate *nervi* and *fascinum*, unimpressed by the Stoic *libelli* lying among the woman's silk pillows (8.15-18). Taken individually, these words do not make a convincing case for a literary subtext, but the cumulative effect of them does appear to hint at an extra layer of meaning to Horace's verbal assault.[41]

The opening lines of the epode also contain vocabulary shared with Lucilius' poems. The lines on the old woman's forehead are referred to as *rugis*, the word Lucilius uses to describe wrinkled bellies (*rugas conducere uentris* 536). Like Horace, the earlier satirist associates the word with old age and refers to *rugosi passique senes* (590), a description which also portrays the elderly as being dried up, like the buttocks of the epode's old woman. The word Horace chooses to refer to those buttocks, *natis*, also appears in Lucilius' satires. In a passage that, like Horace's epode, appears to have a sexual context,

---

[34] *O.L.D.* s.v. 1b.
[35] *O.L.D.* s.v.7b.
[36] *nervis hiscere posse meis,* Prop. 3.3.4.
[37] *O.L.D.* s.v. 4.
[38] *O.L.D.* s.v. 4b.
[39] Clayman 1975: 59.
[40] Clayman 1975: 60.
[41] Oliensis also suggests that Canidia could have a literary link through "the musical suggestion of the name (*canere*)" and argues that she "embodies an indecorous poetics against which Horace tries to define his own poetic practice" (1998: 69).

the poet describes buttocks marked with a thick and headed water snake (*si natibus natricem inpressit crassam et capitatem* 62).[42] Mankin points to another similarity, this time between Horace's hendiadys *pectus et mammae putres* (8.7) and Lucilius' lines 923-4, *hic corpus solidum invenies, hic stare papillas pectore marmoreo*.[43] The firm body and breasts of the Lucilian line are reversed in Horace's description of the slack-chested old woman. The unattractiveness of sagging breasts is a common idea and Lucilius also includes the image at 567-73.[44] Horace chooses to highlight the swollen calves of the *vetula* (*tumentibus...suris* 8.9-10) and Lucilius also includes *sura* in his description of an individual, asking whether his nose is straighter than another's or his calves or feet (*nasum rectius nunc homini est suraene pedesne?* 627). Again, taken individually, this scattering of shared vocabulary may not seem significant. But if Horace does intend to convey a message about his views of poetry, and of older poetry such as Lucilius' work in particular, then certain words in these opening lines could perhaps be seen as being chosen precisely because they also appear in his satiric predecessor's work.

The literary and Lucilian echoes are harder to find in Horace's later *vetula* epode; however, these ideas would perhaps already be brought to mind through the two poems' shared themes, rather than needing more direct hints woven into the subtext. Mankin suggests that, as well as representing the literary style disliked by Horace, the old woman could also stand for Rome, "horribly repulsive, yet still strangely fascinating to Horace".[45] This dichotomy perhaps has a slight echo of how Horace portrays his own relationship with Lucilius and his poetry. Horace is quick to list what is so wrong with his predecessor and to find fault with him, yet his own satiric work is still sprinkled with echoes of and allusions to the earlier poet. In the same way, he derides the old woman yet does not reject her entirely – there is still a relationship between them. With his references to her heavy pearls and silk cushions Horace also draws attention to the old woman's wealth, one of the differences he pointed out between himself and Lucilius (*S.* 1.6.58-9). And despite Horace's complaints that she does nothing to arouse him, in the same way he presents himself as not being excited by Lucilius' work, there has clearly been some interest in her from the poet since he is devoting time to her. This perhaps indicates the tension that exists between what Horace says and what he might actually have felt. Horace makes a point of loudly rejecting Lucilius in 1.4 and 1.10, yet still weaves references and allusions to him

---

[42] Warmington (1967: 421) also lists *naterum* among the words and phrases not included in his text.
[43] Mankin 1995: 154.
[44] Watson 2003: 299.
[45] Mankin 1995: 153.

throughout his other poems. Likewise, when Horace does appear to praise his predecessor in 2.1, the apparent compliments are soon subtly undermined.

The potential overlap between Horace's love life and his literary life is not only confined to the *vetula* poems but can also be seen elsewhere in the *Epodes*. Porter argues that from the ninth epode onwards, Horace's own poetry is a central part of all the poems apart from the twelfth, as it is used for curses, celebrations and delivering advice to the Roman people. If the two *vetula* poems are indeed intended to be read with a subtext of literary criticism, then this would extend the poetry-focused *Epodes* to the eighth, and the twelfth would no longer be an exception. But while Horace uses his rejection of the unattractive woman to make a point about unattractive poetry, not all the women in the *Epode*s possess so few charms for him. In the eleventh poem, he laments how the miseries of love have taken away the pleasures of poetry (11.1-2). Horace tells of his unsuccessful affair with Inachia and how it left him a laughing stock. The picture Horace presents of himself as a poor and humble poet again fits with the presentation of himself in the *Satires*, where he emphasises his modest means and simple life in 1.6. Again, there is focus on friendship as he mentions the companions who noticed his unhappiness. While lovers come and go, his friends are a constant. It is Horace's most famous friend, Maecenas, who notices the effect of love on his composition in the fourteenth epode. The poem is Horace's reply to questioning about his lack of poetic output (a question which will be echoed in *S.* 2.3), and he blames his inertia on love, an emotion that he claims Maecenas is also familiar with. The association Horace makes in these epodes between love and his own poetry can perhaps be seen as strengthening the case for a literary subtext to the *vetula* epodes. Horace is making an explicit connection between love life and literary life in the eleventh and fourteenth epodes, continuing the association between the two that he weaves into the eighth and the twelfth poems.

Horace's final appearance as a lover comes in the fifteenth epode, where he curses the faithless Neaera and predicts unhappiness for her with a pun on his name (15.11-12). As in the other epodes, the presentation of the poet as an unsuccessful lover continues. But, once more, there are also links between Horace the lover and Horace the poet. Horace talks of his anger and reprisals in threatening tones, just as in *Epod.* 6 where he vowed to bite back at those who crossed him, the warning he would repeat in *S.* 2.1. Horace's lovesick pining, with the silence and the sighs of *Epod.* 11 and the inertia of *Epod.* 14, gives way to anger as he heads towards the closing poems of his collection. As well as its link to the sixth poem, Porter describes *Epod.* 15 as forming a pair with the tenth poem, with both

presenting Horace ill-wishing an enemy.[46] He sees the punishment promised to Neaera and her new lover as coming through Horace's words,[47] with his poetry used as a weapon, just as he pledged in *Epod.* 6 and *S.* 2.1. But, just as in these other poems, Horace's threats are not followed through and there is no sign of his power to strike back. It is another example of the impotence Fitzgerald identifies as running throughout the collection of poems and the same failure to live up to his ferocious threats will reappear in the second book of *Satires*.

The picture of Horace as a lover then remains generally consistent in the *Satires* and the *Epodes*. He reveals to the reader more details about his amatory exploits, but the poet's love life is not much more successful and there is no single beloved who keeps his attention. Horace shows that he has followed his own advice from 1.2 in choosing the freedwoman Phryne but, again, he enjoys limited success. The woman who is most willing to be his partner is the one who repulses him and in whom he finds so many faults. Through the *Epodes* Horace builds on the glimpses of his romantic exploits given in the *Satires* and uses the image of the unattractive lover to make a literary point that reinforces the criticisms he put forward in his previous collection.

Horace may continue to suffer romantic disappointments through both books but not all aspects of the presentation of himself are so consistent. One of the most striking differences between the poet of the *Epodes* and that of the *Satires* is in the shift from private to public that happens between the two collections. In the *Satires*, Horace is at pains to point out how he shuns public life and political ambition. The poet may share some details of his past with the reader but there are some parts of his personal history he is careful to keep quiet about and not to dwell upon. His association with the losing side at Philippi is represented in just one fleeting mention of his role as military tribune (*S.* 1.6.48) and is brought to mind again – although not explicitly – through the seventh satire's setting in Brutus' camp at that same battle. By the time of the *Satires* Horace's position had changed and he was no longer on the unsuccessful side, having become a friend of Maecenas. However, he still steers clear of making any explicit statements about his political allegiances or activities, perhaps to avoid any comparisons with or reminders of his previous position. The reasons behind Maecenas' journey in 1.5 are carefully covered up and in 1.6 Horace is grateful to have turned his back on personal ambition and the public life that goes with it. The emphasis in the *Satires* on Horace as a private person not

---

[46] Porter 1995: 128.
[47] Porter 1995: 126.

only is restricted to his political ambition but is also reflected in his poetry. He rejects the urge to recite anywhere and everywhere (like certain poets he could mention in 1.4.71-8) and instead seeks the approval of just a few favoured friends in a carefully selected audience (1.4.73; 1.10.81-90).

In the opening epode Horace appears to be choosing the same path, with his interest in Rome's affairs mainly focused on the effect on his friends rather than on any wider concern. He portrays himself as choosing to be by the side of his *amicus* Maecenas for the sake of friendship rather than out of any desire to be involved with contemporary events. However, as the book continues, it is a more public and politically engaged Horace who emerges. His political position is made much clearer through explicit statements of support for Caesar (shown clearly in *Epod.* 9), and the reader is now presented with a poet who puts himself forward to address the Roman people and offer his advice on navigating the city through troubled times.

This shift is most clearly evident in epodes 7 and 16, where Horace moves away from the private conversational tone of the *Satires* to take on a public role, advising his fellow citizens. The reader hears a more assured voice from a poet who now appears more at ease with taking a leading role in important matters.[48] It is a marked change from *S.* 1.6, where Horace is proud to live a private life away from the burdens of public office or ambition. In that poem, Horace has described the months he had to wait between his introduction to Maecenas and his acceptance by him. Shackleton Bailey imagines a scene where Maecenas has seen examples of Horace's "pungent" *Epodes* and suggests at their first meeting that he try his hand at a different sort of writing before their next encounter.[49] He describes the *Satires* as introducing both Horace's poetry and the poet himself, something he claims the *Epodes* could not have done.[50] I would argue that it is partly because of this previous presentation that Horace can adopt the stance he does in *Epod.* 7 and 16. The fact that he can take on the more public voice of a would-be leader is made possible because of how he has presented himself in the *Satires*.

Horace admits in *S.*1.6 that he has already become a magnet for jealousy and ill-will as a freedman's son who has held a military tribuneship (on the wrong side) and has then become friends with Maecenas. To have then included in his book the same sort of voice that is found in *Epod.* 7 and 16 could seem at best presumptuous and at worst a potentially

---

[48] Porter 1995: 125.
[49] Shackleton Bailey 1982: 16.
[50] Shackleton Bailey 1982: 14.

threatening push for power made through an imagined address to a political assembly. Fraenkel sums up the position well in his description of *Epod.* 16:

> "Was any contemporary reader to imagine that Horace, a freedman's son and himself at that time in a rather precarious position and obliged to earn his livelihood as a *scriba quaestorius*, could dare, even if only in the world of poetic fiction, to usurp something resembling that jealously guarded prerogative of the higher magistracies, the *ius agendi cum populo*?"[51]

Fraenkel argues that Horace deliberately puts forward an impossible solution to Rome's problems when he suggests an escape to the Isles of the Blest to ensure that his readers know he does not really intend *Epod.* 16 to be taken as a serious political intrusion. I would argue that it is not only Horace's impractical proposal that allows him to take this position but also the presentation of himself he has already given his readers in the *Satires*.

Throughout that collection, Horace emphasises his lack of interest in politics and ambition and instead stresses the importance of poetry and friendships. It is poetic achievement he is interested in and his friendships are cultivated because of the character of his companions, not because of their status and possible advantage to Horace. Because Horace has made these assertions and reassurances in the *Satires*, he can then take public affairs as his topic in the *Epodes* and his reader will know that he is addressing these issues as a poet and not as someone with an interest in exploiting Rome's troubles to increase his own position. With the *Satires* and their disavowal of ambition and emphasis on living peacefully and privately standing between Horace and his past, he can start to express a political opinion from a more secure position. While in the *Satires* it may have been unwise to include work that was more overtly political, in case it was seen as a sign of Horace's own political ambitions or drew too much attention to his own history, he can now address these topics in the *Epodes*. Only by smoothing over his past and by appearing to emphasise his lack of political interest – and his loyalty to his friends – in the *Satires* can he now be more explicit in his treatment of these topics in the *Epodes*. The *Satires* serve to distance Horace from his past and reassure others in Rome about the scope of his ambitions. He may have once been a military tribune on the wrong side but his sole concern now is poetry. The *Satires* show that the only person Horace directly challenges is the dead poet Lucilius – presenting his ambitions as purely poetic, not political.

---

[51] Fraenkel 1957: 43.

Horace is offering his advice in *Epod.*16 as a would-be *vates* and from this position he explores what he as a poet can do for the benefit of Rome, not for personal enhancement or hopes of power. The escape from civil war and unhappiness that he can offer his fellow citizens is not a physical one, leading their flight to another country, but a mental one, offering respite through poetry and literature. The similarities with Virgil's fourth eclogue[52] reinforce the idea that the paradise Horace describes is one that exists only in poetic landscapes, rather than in real ones. The same poetry which Horace has threatened to use as a weapon against his enemies can also be a sanctuary for his friends, and the literary theme that runs through so many of the *Epodes* continues. Horace may be lacking physical force, as he stresses in the first epode, but he can still make a contribution to Rome using the talents he does have.

But in typical Horatian style, the promises and hopes of *Epod.* 16 are immediately undercut by what follows. For all his claims that he can lead his fellow Romans to a better situation, Horace proves himself powerless and the collection ends with him at the mercy of his own creation, Canidia. Just as in the *Satires*, Horace reassures the reader that he is not attempting to assert his own political power and reasserts his place as being within the sphere of poetry more than politics. His impotence extends to matters of state and of helping Rome through troubled times, and the voice of the would-be leader disappears in the face of Canidia's control. Porter compares the way the final poem undercuts *Epod.* 16 to the effect of Alfius' last lines in the second poem of the collection, claiming that the switch from 16 to 17 works to even more devastating effect than the twist in the tale of rustic bliss.[53] The same undermining can be seen in the seventh epode and the poems that surround it. The sixth epode is a warning of Horace's ferocity and ability to make short work of his enemies. The fearlessness continues in the following poem where he steps up to warn the Roman people against rushing headlong to more ruin, imagining their silent and shocked reaction to his words. The opening of the eighth epode shows that Horace may not have had an answer from his fellow citizens but by now he has instead faced the cutting words of the old woman who has questioned him over his impotence. Once again, Horace's address to the people and his leader-like pose are juxtaposed with the image of the impotent poet, powerless to have any real effect.

Through the presentation of himself in the *Epodes* Horace can build on the image he has already created in the *Satires*. Some facets of that personality remain the same – Horace's

---

[52] Mankin 1995: 244.
[53] Porter 1995: 114.

love-life is still less than successful and his concerns with literary matters remain. But Horace can also use the *Epodes* to show different sides of himself to his reader, either revealing his romantic disappointments or taking a more serious tone in poems which make him appear to be addressing the people of Rome. And just as the theme of impotence running throughout the poems undercuts Horace's apparent declarations of power and leadership, the disavowal of ambition and presentation of the poet in the *Satires* also adds another layer to the *Epodes,* and allows Horace to explore ideas and voices not available to him in his previous collection.

Horace's relationship with Maecenas

Just like the first book of *Satires*, Horace's collection of *Epodes* opens with a message to Maecenas. But while Horace began his earlier work with a conversational question to his friend (*Qui fit, Maecenas, S.* 1.1.1), the later poem starts in a more serious and sombre tone with Horace's account of what now lies ahead for Maecenas (*Ibis Liburnis inter alta nauim, | amice, propugnacula, Epod.* 1.1-2). Horace describes the gruelling journey his friend faces which he wishes to make with his *amicus,* and tells how he is prepared to be by Maecenas' side despite his self-confessed weakness and frailty (*imbellis ac firmus parum, Epod.* 1.16). However, readers familiar with Horace's *Satires* will remember that this is not the first time that poet and patron have travelled together. In his fifth poem of the first book of *Satires*, Horace describes another journey shared with Maecenas in his refashioning of a poem by his satiric predecessor Lucilius. Although the tone of the two poems is markedly different, Horace uses the first epode to explore some of the same themes which are found in *S.* 1.5 as he is once again Maecenas' travelling companion.

Horace's predictions of danger and his sense of foreboding about the coming trip stand as a stark contrast to the light-hearted and playful mood of his earlier poem. The gravity of the journey in the *Epodes* is far clearer – this is not some pleasant jaunt to be enjoyed with amusing friends. Horace spells out straight away that Maecenas is putting himself in danger for the sake of Caesar (*paratus omne Caesaris periculum | subire, Epod.*1.3-4) and the fun and frivolity of the earlier satiric journey are over. The boat full of singing drunks which bore Horace in the *Satires* has been replaced by light Liburnians and floating fortresses (*Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium, | amice, propugnacula, Epod.* 1.1-2), while the familiar mountains of Apulia (*incipit ex illo montes Apulia notos | ostentare mihi S.* 1.5.77-8) are now left far behind for Alpine ridges and the inhospitable Caucasus (*vel per Alpium*

iuga | inhospitalem et Caucasum, Epod. 1.11-12). Horace's two journeys will be very different trips.

In their previous journey, according to Horace's account, the friends faced nothing riskier than a kitchen fire and digestive complaints, as Maecenas carried out a mission with a purpose carefully passed over by Horace. The poet makes sure he covers his eyes when it comes to the serious political matters that have sparked Maecenas and Marcus Cocceius Nerva's journey and discreetly keeps his attention elsewhere (*hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus | illinere, S.* 1.5.30-1). The only hint he gives the reader as to their purpose is when he reveals the envoys' experience in bringing together warring friends (*missi magnis de rebus uterque | legati, aversos soliti componere amicos, S.* 1.5.28-9). It has been argued that the journey described in the poem is the diplomatic mission involving the lead-up to the Treaty of Tarentum, signed by Octavian and Antony in 37 BC.[54] When Horace returns to his travels with Maecenas he again describes a journey which has the actions of the same two former triumvirs at its centre, only this time there is no hope or attempt at reconciliation as they prepare to face each other at the battle of Actium.

As he volunteers to join Maecenas, Horace readily admits his physical frailties and unsuitability for military affairs (*imbellis ac firmus parum, Epod.* 1.16).This emphasis on his unwarlike nature provides another echo of the fifth satire, where the only thing the poet is capable of declaring war on is his own stomach (*ventri |indico bellum, S.* 1.5.7-8). However, both poems show that Horace's worth to his friend in turbulent and dangerous situations lies in something other than physical strength. In the satire, he stresses the joy found in friendships, praising his companions as *optimus* (1.5.27) and *candidiores* (1.5.41), describing the shared happiness in their meeting (*o qui complexus et gaudia quanta fuerunt!* 1.5.43) and sadness at parting (*flentibus hinc Varius discedit maestus amicis* 1.5.93). He shows his loyalty and discretion by refusing to reveal details of Maecenas' mission and by focusing his attention elsewhere. In the opening epode, the reader is given more details about the reason for the journey than in *S.*1.5. Maecenas is risking himself for Caesar (*paratus omne Caesaris periculum | subire, Maecenas, tuo, Epod.* 1.3-4), but although the inclusion of this information shows a shift away from the style of *S.*1.5, the focus again is not on the political aspect of the task or on the details of the mission that lies ahead. Instead, Horace emphasises the idea that pleasure comes from being with friends

---

[54] DuQuesnay describes the journey in *Sat.* 1.5 as "a preliminary to the negotiations between Octavian and Antonius in the summer of 37" (1984: 39). Gowers also finds this the most likely reason for the journey rather than the Treaty of Brundisium in 40 BC or Antony and Octavian's meeting in Athens in 38 BC, "for which Brundisium was a traditional point of departure" (2012: 183).

(*utrumne iussi persequemur otium | non dulce, ni tecum simul, Epod.* 1.7-8) just as he did in the fifth satire of his first book (*nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico, S.* 1.5.44). Horace will stay loyal to the friend who has provided him with more than enough kindness in the past (*satis superque me benignitas tua | ditavit, Epod.* 1.31-2).

The two poems emphasise the benefits of friendship to both poet and patron and in particular, as DuQuesnay highlights, the meaning of friendship within Caesar and Maecenas' circle.[55] Mankin also argues that Horace's choice of genre in writing the *Epodes* was influenced by this focus on friendship, claiming that "in the midst of a crisis which could be seen as the result of the decline and failure of traditional Roman *amicitia*, Horace turned to a type of poetry whose function has been the affirmation of 'friendship' in its community".[56] Alongside this emphasis on friendship and on who Horace's friends are comes an overt and explicit political side which is not found in Horace's *Satires*. Instead of keeping away from directly commenting on politics and covering his eyes to it, as in *S.*1.5, Horace announces that he is on the side of Octavian in the very first epode. It is not the only poem in the collection to feature Actium; the ninth epode also refers to Octavian's victory in the battle of 31 BC, and Griffin describes these poems as "vigorous statements of partisanship, devotion to Caesar's heir and loathing of his enemies".[57] The friendship with Maecenas may have remained from the *Satires* but it is now being used to help make a different point and to affirm Horace's political allegiance.

The final lines of the first epode also contain an echo of one of the themes found in Horace's earlier collection of poems, with the mention of the miserly Chremes burying his gold underground followed by the contrasting comic character of the foolish spendthrift (*haud parauero | quod aut auarus ut Chremes terra premam, | discinctus aut perdam nepos, Epod.* 1.32-4). The importance of following neither of these bad examples and the contrast between the two extremes of character appear in Horace's plea for moderation throughout *S.* 1.1. The miser who buries his gold is attacked (*quid iuuat immensum te argenti pondus et auri | furtim defossa timidum deponere terra? S.* 1.1.41-2) and the reader is later warned about veering to the other extreme in an attempt to avoid the parsimonious man's stingy example (*non ego auarum | cum ueto te fieri uappam iubeo ac nebulonem, S.* 1.103-4). The theme of miserliness and the correct use of money is another which will recur repeatedly in the second book of *Satires,* where Horace touches on the subject explicitly in the second, third and fifth poems and explores the same idea of falling into

---

[55] DuQuesnay 2002: 36.
[56] Mankin 1995: 9.
[57] Griffin 1993: 8.

one vice while trying to avoid its opposite extreme at 2.2.54-5.The first epode ends, as it begins, with another reminder of Horace's previous poems while also looking forward to the second set of satires.

The fifth satire is one of the poems of Horace's first book which boast particularly strong links to his generic predecessor, Lucilius. Horace takes Lucilius' own poem about a journey as his model and shows how the earlier writer's work can be refined and reworked to suit the changed times and tastes. Readers would still have Horace's criticism of Lucilius in mind following his lengthy attack on the earlier satirist in *S.* 1.4, and this would help to emphasise the differences between the two poets and their work which become apparent in *S.* 1.5.[58] Now, in the same way that Horace has updated Lucilius' work, he appears to update his own work in presenting another journey with Maecenas which shows a great contrast with his earlier poem connected to the same subject. The mood has been changed to reflect the changed times and the situation in which Horace now finds himself. Horace updated satire and now he reworks that updated version again to make it fit the times – inside another collection of poems which shows an updated Horatian version of a genre, in this case iambic.

Horace's decision to open his collection of *Epodes* with an address to Maecenas, as he did in the *Satires*, shows the importance of his relationship with his friend and patron, and Fraenkel argues that this is the key reason the poem is placed first in the collection.[59] However, beginning the book with a reminder of his *Satires* also provides a link to and a sense of continuity with the previous work. At the same time, it helps to announce how Horace has chosen to take a different approach to this collection of poems and reveals the shift away from satire towards a new genre. Picking up a theme from his previous collection and alluding to an earlier poem invites the comparison between the two works and emphasises the difference between them and the journeys undertaken. By choosing to echo a particularly Lucilian poem, rather than any other satire from the earlier work, it could be argued that Horace is signalling to his readers that he will apply the same treatment to iambic verse as he did to satire. He is adopting and adapting a genre to fit contemporary tastes and times. Horace also gives a hint in the opening poem of the different topics he will cover in the *Epodes*, compared to the *Satires*. He will no longer turn the same blind eye to political events as in 1.5.

---

[58] See previous discussion on p62ff.
[59] Fraenkel 1957: 69.

As discussed in the introduction to this chapter, both satire and iambic verse could be seen as dangerous genres to experiment with, given the political backdrop against which Horace was writing. They are genres known for their abuse and their targeting of specific individuals in a way that would seem highly inadvisable in the political climate of the 30s. But just as Horace has made Lucilian satire suitable for his own times, he will do the same with iambos, turning his attentions to a Greek literary model rather than a Roman one this time. In the same way that Horace has smoothed away some of the potentially rough and risky aspects of Lucilius' work, Watson argues that Horace's choice of subject for his first epode is a "subtle way of announcing... that readers can expect some dilution of the virulence which had characterized archaic iambic".[60] Horace has revised Lucilian satire, then revised his own version of that satire to create the opening poem of the *Epodes*. He will now show how he will revise iambic poetry as well.

The opening poem thus serves as a reminder to the reader of the way in which Horace reworked a previous genre, as well as bringing to mind his own previous work. But as well as this, it also announces the new genre which Horace has chosen by including echoes of Archilochus scattered throughout the text. Although, unlike Lucilius in the fourth and tenth poems of Horace's first book of *Satires*, Archilochus is not mentioned by name in the *Epodes*,[61] his influence can be felt from the beginning of the book and its very first poem. One of the most noted similarities is Horace's use of the image of a mother-bird protecting her chicks from a snake and her fear for them when she is absent from her nest (*ut assidens implumibus pullis auis | serpentium allapsus timet | magis relictis, non, ut adsit, auxili | latura plus praesentibus. Epod.* 1.18-22). Barchiesi suggests that this could be an allusion to the fable mentioned by Archilochus about an eagle who fails to keep her young safe through her betrayal of an oath to a fox (frgs. 172-81).[62] In that story, the bird befriends the animal but then eats its cubs, leaving the fox to take revenge by burning the eagle's nest and devouring its chicks when they fall to the ground in the fire. Horace turns the image around and "substitutes an appeal to solidarity for a curse on oath-breaking" and in doing so "aligns himself... with the little victims, and favors protection over revenge".[63] In his treatment of this Archilochean image in his first poem, Horace hints at the sort of iambic voice which will be found in the following epodes. In the same way he smoothed away the rough invective of Lucilius, some of the vitriol of Archilochean iambos will be removed

---

[60] Watson 2003: 51.

[61] Archilochus is not named explicitly but Horace does refer to him by reminding the reader of the fate of the Greek poet's enemies, Lycambes and Bupalo (*qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener | aut acer hostis Bupalo, Epod.* 6.13-14).

[62] Barchiesi 2001: 156.

[63] Barchiesi 2001: 156.

from Horace's version of the genre. Harrison describes the "anxious mother-bird" Horace as perhaps being "a 'softened' version of Lycambes the rapacious eagle, just as Horace's *Epodes* are here presented as a 'softening' of the violence of Archilochus".[64]

The opening poem of Horace's *Epodes* thus links the new work with his previous satires through the description of a journey with Maecenas but also emphasises the poet's shift in direction. There are similarities with his *Satires* through the prominent role of Maecenas and the way the poet plans to make use of another genre, although once again his generic predecessor is not explicitly named until later on in the book. The echo of his earlier Lucilian poem, mixed with the allusion to Archilochus' work, shows the shift towards a new model for his poetry. And among these allusions Horace also introduces one of the themes that will recur throughout the collection, the question of what a poet can actually do in such troubled political times.

The first epode is not the only poem in the book to include mention of Maecenas who is referred to again by name in the third, ninth and fourteenth poems of the collection. The third poem, like the first, shows the close friendship between Horace and Maecenas, but, while the opening work focused on their relationship in times of war, the focus now moves to the playful, jocular aspect of their association. In the *Satires*, Horace has hinted at the relaxed intimacy of life inside Maecenas' circle, when he mentions their friendship in 1.6 and 1.9, as well as their closeness in 2.6, but discretion stops him revealing too many details in the face of the pest's persistent questioning. Now, however, Horace gives a glimpse of that relationship as he describes the garlicky trick played on him by Maecenas with a poem that reveals their closeness.

Unlike the first epode, the third poem opens with the type of fierce invective more traditionally associated with iambic poetry and Archilochus' work. Horace begins by launching a furious attack on the worst poison of all, a thing so terrible it is fit only to be used as a punishment for parricides – garlic. Despite the apparently angry opening lines, it quickly becomes clear that the reader should not take Horace's rage seriously as his vitriol is aimed at the pungent plant. In the same way Horace refashioned Lucilius' genre to suit his own times, he shows how he will carry out the same refashioning on iambos with a poem where he swaps the fierce spirit of Archilochus' invective for an amusing send-up of the genre's usual style.[65] Horace packs his epode with "mocking pathos and quasi-

---

[64] Harrison 2001: 171.
[65] Harrison 2001: 175.

Archilochean indignation",[66] as he launches his humorous iambic outburst at the friend who has served up such a garlic-laden dish, cursing him to be snubbed by his lover as revenge.

The poem is a jest with Maecenas and the very fact that such a joke can exist between the two without the fear of accidentally causing offence shows how close they have become. If the *Satires* traced the beginning of the friendship from the nervous poet's anxious introduction to his patron in 1.6 (*ut ueni coram, singultim pauca locutus, S.* 1.6.55), then Horace can now show how far their relationship has come. The once tongue-tied poet can safely deliver a post-dinner ribbing to his powerful friend without fear of repercussions. The relationship Horace now presents between himself and Maecenas appears to echo his description in *Sat.* 2.1 of Lucilius' private and playful friendship with Scipio and Laelius, where the three men shared games as they waited for their dinner to cook (*quin ubi se a vulgo et scaena in secreta remorant | virtus Scipiadae et mitis sapientia Laeli, | nugari cum illo et discincti ludere donec | decoqueretur holus soliti, S.* 2.1.71-4). Both scenarios involve food and dining as the setting for their fun and give a glimpse of the private side of their friendship, rather than the public declaration of loyalty involved in the first epode. Now the reader sees something from inside the world with which the pest in *S.* 1.9 wanted to be made familiar, but was excluded from when Horace refused to reveal his circle's secrets (*S.* 1.9.43-60).

As well as describing his first meeting with Maecenas in *S.* 1.6, Horace also uses the autobiographical poem to reveal the effect the friendship has had on his life, both positive and negative. Horace describes his leisurely way of life, free from political ambition and with time to read and write and relax. The third epode reflects this side of Horace's life where he can enjoy himself joking with friends and composing poems based around their association. However, *Sat.*1.6 also deals with the negative side of his rise to favour and shows how great fortune can attract great jealousy. Horace's status as a freedman's son and his closeness to Maecenas have seen him targeted with swipes from envious others who question why he should enjoy his current position (*nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum, | quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum, | nunc quia sim tibi, Maecenas, coniunctor, S.* 1.6.45-7). While the third epode shows the positive side of life as Maecenas' friend, I would agree with Fitzgerald's argument that the following poem deals with the

---

[66] Fraenkel 1957: 68.

negative attention Horace receives as a result of this relationship and his background and the two are linked through Horace's description of his life in *S.* 1.6.[67]

The fourth epode contains an attack on a despised and unnamed tribune who has succeeded despite his low birth (*fortuna non mutat genus, Epod.* 4.6), is judged unworthy of the office (*hoc, hoc tribuno militum? Epod.* 4.20), and is hated by the people (*ora uertat huc et huc euntium | liberrima indignatio? Epod.* 4.9-10). The "disturbing similarities"[68] between the poet's target and Horace himself have often been noted with Shackleton Bailey describing *hoc, hoc tribuno militum* as "surely an allusion to Horace's own army rank and the carping tongues it sharpened".[69] These resemblances to the poet himself become particularly striking when the poem is read with *S.* 1.6 in mind. Horace has stressed his humble origins in the earlier poem with references to his father and Maecenas' acceptance of him, despite his less than glorious family. Satire 1.6 also contains the first satiric book's only explicit reference to Horace's military past, as he explains that his role as military tribune is another reason why he is singled out for ill-feeling (*at olim, | quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno, S.* 1.6.47-8).[70] Now, in the fourth epode, he addresses the negativity his position has attracted, as he "attacks the image of himself as an ambitious opportunist that is both provoked and, he hopes, dispelled by his friendship with Maecenas".[71]

Although the fourth epode does not mention Maecenas by name or refer to his friendship with Horace, I believe that its position directly after the third work and its link through that poem to *S.* 1.6 justify its inclusion with the other epodes which deal more explicitly with Horace's relationship with Maecenas. Horace splits the positive and the negative sides of the relationship laid out in the earlier poem to reveal a fuller picture of the effect of his friendship and his rise in fortune. Horace will return to the idea of the negative sides of his closeness to Maecenas in the sixth poem of his second book of satires. There, he describes his daily life and the people who approach him because of his association with Maecenas (2.6.38). But instead of focusing entirely on the negative consequences of the relationship, Horace admits in the satire that he cannot deny he gets pleasure from being associated with his powerful friend. Horace uses the features of the two different genres to explore the same idea in two different ways. The aggressive attacks belong in his iambic work while

---

[67] Fitzgerald 2009: 150-151.
[68] Watson 2003: 150.
[69] Shackleton Bailey 1982: 4.
[70] The seventh satire of the book is set in Brutus' camp and Gowers argues that in it Horace "lances the boil of his republican past" (2012: 250); however, she also points out that Horace does not put himself at the scene as a witness or reveal his participation with Brutus' allies.
[71] Fitzgerald 2009: 151.

the conversational tone of the *Satires*, where Horace avoids ferocious anger, is more suited to his gentler description of being pestered by others who want access to Maecenas. Through *S.* 1.6, *Epod.* 4 and *S.* 2.6 Horace traces the development of his friendship with Maecenas and its consequences by using it as a recurring theme running through all three collections.

The next time Maecenas' name appears in the *Epodes* is in the ninth poem, where Horace describes his wish to toast Caesar's victory with his friend. The poem refers to the battle of Actium, bringing to mind the first epode where Maecenas is also mentioned and the two poems, as Anderson highlights, are carefully arranged so that they both occupy prominent positions at the opening and the centre of Horace's book.[72] After showing how their friendship has fuelled his wish to be by his side during times of danger, Horace shows that the same bond means that Maecenas is the man he chooses to celebrate with when the victory has been won. But, just as in the first poem, Maecenas's name appears in the fourth line of the poem and it is Caesar who is named first. The danger faced in the first epode is Caesar's (*omne Caesaris periculum, Epod.* 1.3), just as the victory in the ninth poem also belongs to him (*uictore laetus Caesare, Epod.* 9.2). The poem emphasises the friendship between Horace and Maecenas but also stresses their shared support for Octavian. Just as the third epode showed a side to their friendship that was not revealed in the *Satires* – a closer, more intimate side – the first and the ninth epodes also show another aspect of their association: a shared political partisanship.

Horace is careful to keep any explicit political statements out of his *Satires*,[73] sticking to topics such as morality, moderation and friendship. When the world of politics and important state affairs creeps close to his satiric poem, as in the fifth poem of his first book of *Satires*, he turns a deliberately blind and bleary eye to the weighty matters at hand (*hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippus | illinere, S.* 1.5.30-1). The only mention of Caesar in Horace's first book appears in relation to the singer Tigellius in the third poem (*Caesar, qui cogere posset, | si peteret per amicitiam patris atque suam, non | quicquam proficeret, S.* 1.5.4-6). The reference can be seen as praising Octavian's restraint in not compelling the performer,[74] but contains none of the overt and explicit support for him found in the *Epodes*. The political dimension of the *Epodes* shows another side to Horace and Maecenas' friendship, where they are not only connected through the shared values

---

[72] Anderson 2010: 40.

[73] As discussed in another chapter, this lack of explicit political pronouncements does not mean I would argue that Horace's satiric poems are apolitical.

[74] However, as Gowers highlights, the reference could still be read as a "sinister hint at his powers of control and censorship" (2012: 122).

explored in the *Satires* but also through sharing the same political views. The representation of their friendship in the *Epodes* adds another layer to the relationship depicted in the *Satires* and strengthens the bond between them.

When Horace returns to Maecenas again in the fourteenth epode, the mood has switched back to the playful tone found in the third poem. While the first and the ninth epodes set their friendship against the backdrop of contemporary Roman politics, the third and the fourteenth poems focus instead on the private sphere and focus on the lighter side of their friendship.[75] Serious state matters are put aside in favour of discussions about dining and love. Horace complains of Maecenas' persistent questioning about when he will have finished his collection of poems (a complaint also levelled at the poet in the opening of *S.* 2.3, providing another link between the collections) and blames his idleness on the fact that he is in love (*candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando, Epod.* 14.5). Again, as in the third poem, the fact that Horace is able to deliver this rebuke to his friend, safe in the knowledge that the intimate and friendly tone will be understood and not cause any unintended offence, reveals the closeness of his friendship with Maecenas.

It is not only his own love-life that Horace mentions in the poem but also that of his friend, claiming that Maecenas will understand his position because he too is burning up with love (*ureris ipse miser, Epod.* 1.14.13). It is another mark of the men's closeness that Horace can bring up Maecenas' amorous endeavours without fear of repercussions or overstepping boundaries and this shows how far their relationship has come since its beginning. The fledgling friendship found in Horace's *Satires* and described in the sixth poem of the first book is between a powerful patron and a more humble poet. In that poem, Horace has been accepted by Maecenas into his circle of friends but the poet still reveals the difference between them and does not present himself and his friend as being on a completely equal footing. Horace is from a humble background and while he takes care to present this as a factor which Maecenas overlooks in favour of more important qualities (*cum referre negas quali sit quisque parente | natus, dum ingenuus, S.* 1.6.7-8), he stresses Maecenas' own noble lineage (*Lydorum quidquid Etruscos | incoluit fines nemo generosior est te, S.* 1.6.1-2). It was Maecenas who decided whether the friendship would progress after Horace's initial introduction and his nine-month wait (*reuocas nono post mense iubesque | esse in amicorum numero, S.* 1.6.61-2). And it is Maecenas who is the pest's goal in the ninth satire where Horace is merely a stepping stone to the true prize. In the *Epodes*, however, the gap between Horace and Maecenas has become smaller and their friendship is

---

[75] Anderson 2010: 40.

presented as a more equal relationship, a relationship where Horace is able to joke with him freely and share his troubles – in both amatory and military matters – and triumphs. But although the pair appear to be moving towards a more equal standing, Horace is still careful to put himself in Maecenas' shade, just as in the *Satires*. Horace may be one of many who are consumed by desire for the former slave Phryne,[76] but the object of Maecenas' affections is someone with the beauty of Paris or Helen (*non pulchrior ignis | accendit obsessam Ilion, Epod.* 14.13-14) – a lover fit for his impeccable taste.[77]

The friendship Horace depicts between himself and Maecenas in the *Epodes* shows the continuation of a bond, the origin of which was revealed in the first book of *Satire*s. The poet who once stood tongue-tied in front of an influential potential patron can now joke with him about his romantic and culinary escapades. But Horace is no fair-weather friend who is only concerned with sharing the benefits of Maecenas' friendship, such as dinner parties and amatory adventures in Rome. He makes it clear both that he will stand by his friend through the hardships and dangers of war and that they are linked by a shared political view and their support for Octavian. Through the *Epodes*, Horace builds on the picture of their friendship revealed in the *Satires* to give a glimpse inside the public and private aspects of their relationship. The bond between Horace and Maecenas continues to play an important part in the second book of *Satires*. Horace reveals that their friendship has lasted for almost eight years (2.6.40-2) and the poet's devotion to his friend is well-known in Rome. The jibes Horace tells the reader he faces about running back to Maecenas (2.6.30-1), the pleas for his friend's help (2.6.38-9) and Davus' description of him rushing to his friend's house for dinner (2.7.32-4) show how other people link him to Maecenas in a way he admits he finds pleasing (2.6.32), even if he is still Maecenas' inferior (2.3.312-13). Horace uses the three collections to show the evolution of his friendship with Maecenas and the pivotal role it plays in his life. There may be negative consequences of their relationship, such as attracting the sort of criticism found in *Epod.* 4, but 2.6 proves that these are a price worth paying and something which Horace can take pride in. Although there are negative aspects to the friendship, these do not extend to Maecenas himself who is consistently shown in a flattering light.

---

[76] Griffin points out how Horace here undermines his own assertion in *Sat.* 1.2 that affairs with freedwomen are easier by showing himself to be "helplessly tortured by love of Phryne, a *libertina*, but impossible to take calmly" (1993: 19).
[77] Mankin suggests that Maecenas' unnamed lover could be male or female, arguing that the line "probably" refers to Helen but "could mean Paris, who was also beautiful and whose mother Hecuba dreamed she gave birth to a torch that set fire to Troy" (1995: 232).

Johnson has pointed to the parallels *Epod.* 1 presents between Horace's relationship to Maecenas and Maecenas' own relationship to Octavian.[78] Just as Horace fulfils the duties of friendship to Maecenas, so Maecenas is putting himself at risk for his more powerful friend. However, although Horace also sides with Octavian, through both his friendship with Maecenas and in lines such as the opening of *Epod.* 9, there is still an ambiguity which can be read towards him in the *Epodes*. Horace strongly condemns the rush to civil war in *Epod.* 7 and 16, and he makes clear the effect of the current situation on the safety of his friends in *Epod.* 1. As Mankin points out, Horace's friendship with Maecenas does not automatically mean he is a "Caesarian" and there are signs of his uncertainty over Octavian.[79] But while there is an ambiguity about Horace's view of Octavian, that ambiguity does not taint Horace's presentation of Maecenas. He may be an important player in events which Horace is clearly anxious about, but those events do not decrease Horace's loyalty to his friend.

Anger and Aggression

Horace's audience has a hint in the opening epode that they should not expect to find the furious invective of iambic poetry here. The early emphasis on the poet's unwarlike nature suggests that here there will be none of Archilochus' aggression, ready to be turned on recognisable targets (*imbellis ac firmus parum, Epod.*1.16). Likewise, in the *Satires* this poet will show more restraint with his rage. But although Horace's anger is a toned-down version of Archilochus' and of Hipponax's aggression, the *Epodes* do contain more invective and anger than the *Satires,* even if that rage cannot always be taken completely seriously. The first flash of fury comes in the third epode and is not targeted at an individual but is instead aimed at a garlic-laden dinner dish served up by Maecenas. The anger and the invective are clearly not meant to be taken seriously and are used to show Horace's familiarity with Maecenas through the fact that he is in a position to make such a joke with his powerful friend and not risk causing offence. The first lines may lead Horace's reader to expect furious invective, but the revelation of his target in the third line amusingly punctures the atmosphere of rage. The same use of anger for comic effect can also be found in both books of Horace's *Satires,* where the poet describes his anger at Aristius Fuscus' failure to save him from the pest (*S.* 1.9.61-74) and in Horace's furiously spluttered responses to Damasippus, who jokes about his temper (2.3.323-25), and to Davus (2.7116-19). Likewise, in the *Satires* Horace uses his own faux outrage for comic

---

[78] Johnson 2012: 80-2.
[79] Mankin 1995: 143.

effect. This reinforces the image introduced in the first epode of Horace as an iambic poet who will deal with aggression in a different way to his predecessors.

Putting aside the comic anger of the third epode, the poems where invective or more aggressive fury can be found are the fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, tenth, twelfth, fifteenth and seventeenth epodes. Of these, *Epod.* 5 and 17 are linked through their focus on the evil witch Canidia, 8 and 12 share the theme of attacks on a repulsively lecherous old woman, 15 shows Horace the jilted lover, 4 is aimed at an unnamed tribune, 6 is programmatic, and 10 contains an "inverse propempticon"[80] wishing Maevius an ill-starred sea-crossing.

The fury of the fourth epode follows Horace's comic anger in *Epode* 3 at the trick which has been played on him by Maecenas. As previously discussed,[81] it can be argued that the third and the fourth poems are linked by the fact that they show the different consequences of Horace's friendship with Maecenas, as described in *S.* 1.6 and 2.6. The third epode reveals their closeness and the relaxed relationship they share, while the fourth can be viewed as describing Horace himself and some of the resentment he has faced from those envious of his position. The link between the third and the fourth poems is strengthened by the juxtaposition of the comic anger found in the third poem and the aggressive invective unleashed in the fourth epode. As Horace shifts from focusing on the positive consequences of the friendship he described in *S.* 1.6 to the negative side, so the tone is altered to reflect the change.

The fourth epode also reveals to the reader another way in which Horace will use invective differently to his predecessors in his version of iambic poetry. The attack is not aimed at a named individual and, as discussed previously, the target shares several similarities with Horace himself. The first time the reader sees Horace's iambic invective in action against a potentially recognisable individual, it is turned on a character very similar to the poet himself. The ambiguity that runs through the *Satires* returns in the *Epodes* with a poem which could be taken in a very different way to the meaning that is apparent at first glance. The attack on the arrogant tribune with ideas and wealth above his station may at first appear to be a sign that the poet has powerful men in his sights and they should watch out. But a closer reading with *S.* 1.6 in mind reinforces the feeling that, just as in the *Satires*, Horace will not turn his pen against identifiable and powerful individuals. What looks at first to be a venomous attack on a prominent person can actually be read as another reassurance and restatement of Horace's position as a poet who will handle invective in a

---

[80] Harrison 1989: 271.
[81] See p32-3.

different way to the previous composers of iambic verse. Like in the *Satires*, he will be careful where he aims his poetic attacks. His target, as will often happen in an amusing way in the second book of *Satires*, is modelled on himself.

The aggressive tone continues in the fifth epode where Horace returns to one of his satiric targets: the witch Canidia. Readers of *S.* 1.8 would already be familiar with her nefarious antics and sinister rituals, carried out with her accomplice Sagana, who also returns along with new cronies, Veia and Folia. In the satire, the pair scrabble for the ingredients of their black magic on the Esquiline, plundering corpses for bones, tearing animals with their teeth and torturing effigies as they carry out their terrible rites. But the potential horror of the scene is turned comic by its narrator, a statue of Priapus, and the witches' spell is broken by the flatulent finale. Wigs flying, they are forced to flee by Priapus' buttock-splitting blast that sends them scurrying off. The aggression and invective aimed at the witches is comic and the pair's potential to terrorise is punctured by the way they flee. They become figures of fun as Priapus tells the reader how much they would have laughed at the scene he describes (*S.* 1.8.48-50).

The witches of the *Epodes* however are a more sinister breed than those in the *Satires*, and there is no longer a comic character such as Priapus to act as a foil to their evil intentions. Horace devotes much more space to them in the *Epodes* than in the *Satires* – the Canidia epodes cover a total of 183 lines compared to the 50 lines of *S.* 1.8 – and he shortens the distance between himself and his target. In the satire, the witches' antics are revealed in a story within a story, as Horace presents Priapus relating his account of what happened. But in the two epodes, the extra layer of distance is removed, as Horace tells the story of a boy doomed to die in the fifth poem, then puts himself directly in desperate conversation with Canidia in the final poem of the collection. I would argue that as he steps closer to his targets, the comic features are reduced and the invective increases.

The use of Canidia by Horace creates a link and a contrast between the *Epodes* and the *Satires*. As well as looking back to 1.8, the inclusion of Canidia also looks to Horace's second collection of *Satires*. The sudden reappearance of the witch at the end of 2.8 closes the book and brings to mind the mention of Canidia and her poisonous effect on food (*Epod.* 3.7-8, *S.* 2.8.94-5).[82] By bringing in a character from his previous work, Horace puts those poems in the reader's mind, and the different presentations of Canidia in the two collections also highlight the differences between the books. The focus on invective in the

---

[82] See p220 for discussion of Canidia's role in 2.8.

Canidia epodes, instead of the comic effects of *S.* 1.8, also reflects the shift in tone between the two collections. The *Epodes* show more aggression and anger than the more conversational *Satires*, which make more use of comic features and humour. But although his anger may appear to have increased, Horace shows that his targets have stayed the same. It is fictional fiends and character types whom the poet will attack, rather than identifiable individuals. As Griffin points out, Horace chooses safe targets and turns his anger on those whom no one would profess sympathy for or wish to identify themselves with, judging that "nobody is distressed by the thought of hideous hags being satirised as witches or nymphomaniacs...nobody identifies himself as a vulgar upstart, or herself as a lusty hag".[83]

This careful choice of target type can be clearly seen in what are arguably the most aggressive and invective-laden poems of the collection, the eighth and twelfth epodes. The poems are savage attacks on lecherous old women (possibly the same woman in both poems) whose sexual repulsiveness Horace describes in explicit detail.

The use of anger presented through obscene abuse was common in Archilochus and seen as a defining characteristic of *iambos*.[84] As a satirist, Horace generally steers clear of obscene language. The notable exceptions to this are in *S.* 1.2, where *cunnus* is used twice then again in 1.3[85] (the only examples of the word appearing in satire[86]) as well as *futuo*.[87] Horace could have been following Lucilius in his choice of language here since, as Adams points out, the earlier satirist did permit "basic obscenities"[88] in his work. Adams also highlights the closeness of Lucilius' language to that of mime and farce, which used a vocabulary which was more obscene and vulgar, and Horace's inclusion of them may be a faint nod to this side of Lucilius' language which, like other aspects of his predecessor's satire, Horace chooses to tone down.[89] Apart from the instances in *S.* 1.2 and *cunnus* in 1.3, Horace avoids this type of language in his version of satire and continues to follow the same pattern in the *Epodes*.

---

[83] Griffin 1993: 12.

[84] Watson 2007: 98.

[85] *cunni Cupiennus albi* 1.2.36; *numquid ego a te | magno prognatum deposco consule cunnum | uelatumque stola* 1.2.69-71; *nam fuit ante Helenam cunnis taeterrima belli | causa* 1.3.107-8

[86] Adams 1982: 81. Horace also uses *muto* in *Sat.*1.2, a word which, as Adams points out, is only found elsewhere in Lucilius and. although the precise tone of the word is "impossible to determine", distribution of *muto* and its derivative *mutonium* "suggests that they were vulgar or obscene"

[87] *dum futuo* 1.2.127. See discussion on p54.

[88] Adams 1982: 83.

[89] Adams 1982: 83.

Horace's eighth and twelfth epodes provided the poet with the perfect opportunity to take advantage of the iambic tradition of *aischrologia* and create the sort of poem expected from someone following in the literary footsteps of Archilochus. But although the depiction of the woman is graphically repulsive, Horace does not employ obscene language in his description of his companion's hideousness.[90] Horace uses *podex* to refer to the woman's anus (8.6), a term which Adams classes as "'descriptive' or 'functional'"[91] rather than obscene in itself. The penis which is unmoved by the woman's Stoic books is described as *fascinus* (8.18), a word more frequently used for representations of the penis than the organ itself,[92] and it is Horace's choosy *inguen* which must be won over (8.19), not a more obscenely-termed bodily part. The pattern continues in the attack in the twelfth epode. Horace refers to his drooping *penis* (12.8), a word Adams describes as "a milder term than *mentula*" since Cicero openly cites the word.[93] Even the crocodile dung smeared on the woman's face is *stercus* (12.11), the "polite equivalent of *merda*".[94] Just as in the *Satires*, Horace turns away from the obscene language found elsewhere in his chosen genre. He shows he can still summon up the aggression and invective associated with iambic poetry but his anger is expressed in carefully chosen non-obscene language. The picture he paints of the revolting woman may be obscene, but the vocabulary he uses in that grim and graphic description is not.

Richlin identifies Horace's attack on the old woman as the longest and most personal to be found in Latin literature,[95] and also points to similar examples of invective targeted at ageing women in Lucilius' satires.[96] She identifies one fragment as describing a man ready to revenge himself on a sex-mad old woman by castrating himself with a Samian sherd, with the following fragment also referring to the sexual voraciousness of an old woman.[97] Both poets present old women as lust-crazed and use their targets' sexual cravings in their invective. However, there are also differences in the two poets' attacks. Lucilius highlights one old woman's love of drinking which is a common insult in invective of this type[98] but

---

[90] Adams1982: 221.
[91] Adams 1992: 57.
[92] Adams 1982: 63.
[93] Adams 1982: 35; Cicero's use of the word occurs when he brands it obscene (*at hodie 'penis' est in obscenis, Fam.* 9.22.1), but, as Adams points out, "the fact that he cites it openly implies that it was a milder term than *mentula,* which alludes to only in a roundabout way" (1982: 35).
[94] Adams 1982: 234.
[95] Richlin 1983; 109.
[96] Richlin 1983: 167.
[97] Richlin 1983: 167; *Hanc ubi vult male habere, ulcisci pro scelere eius, | testam sumit homo Samiam sibi; "anu noceo", inquit, | praeceidit caulem testisque una amputat ambo* 303-5; *Dixi. Ad principium venio: vetulam atque virosam | uxorem caedam potius quam castrem egomet me* 306-7.
[98] Richlin 1983: 109.

not an aspect of Horace's verbal assault on his victim (*hinc ad me hinc, licet: | anus russum ad armillum* 831-2).

Richlin argues that in situations such as that in *Epod.* 12, where a man is in bed with a repulsive old woman, it is an assertion of the man's power since it is he who will decide if they have sex or not.[99] Even though he may appear physically impotent with her, as in the case of Horace, Richlin argues that he still has control of the situation. If this reading is taken in conjunction with the earlier assessment of the literary subtext to the *vetula* poems, it could perhaps provide an interesting extra layer to Horace's position with regard to Lucilius. As well as rejecting the older style of poetry he dislikes, Horace is asserting himself as being in control and placing himself in the more powerful and influential position. This could be seen as showing the beginning of the position Horace will later take in the second book of *Satires,* where, as will be discussed in the following chapter, I would argue he presents himself as having replaced Lucilius as the leading writer of satire.

Horace's iambic invective is on display again in the sixth poem of the book which provides the first explicit reference to the poet's choice of generic role model. Just as in the *Satires*, where Horace does not explain his generic intentions until the fourth poem of the first book, his literary role-models for the *Epodes* are not explicitly revealed in the opening poem of the collection. The reader is already several poems into the book, before Horace spells out in whose footsteps he is following. However, unlike in the *Satires* where Lucilius is mentioned by name, Horace uses a more roundabout way of referring to Archilochus and Hipponax, describing the former as Lycambes' spurned son-in-law (*Lycambae spretus infido gener* 6.13) and the latter as the enemy of Bupalo (*acer hostis Bupalo* 6.14). Whereas in *S.* 1.4 Horace uses his predecessor as an example of what he will not do and highlights the differences between his own style and that of Lucilius, in epode 6 Horace refers to the earlier poets as an example of how he claims he will behave. In this respect the poem shows more similarities to *S.* 2.1, where Horace vows (disingenuously as it turns out) to closely follow Lucilius and strike back with his savage satire at any detractors (2.1.39-46). However, as in the *Satires* where Horace fails to deliver his promised ferocity, the poet of the *Epodes* does not bite back in the way he has threatened. As Watson points out, "the retaliatory stance sketched out for iambic...is heavily

---

[99] Richlin 1983: 73.

overloaded with irony".[100] Just as in the *Satires*, Horace's position in the *Epodes* should not be taken at face value and he foreshadows the stance he will take in the later collection.

Although addressing an individual by name was a frequent feature of iambic poetry,[101] the target of Horace's invective in the sixth epode, like in the poems discussed above, is not identified. Harrison argues that this leaves the poem with "less bite" and immediately calls into question the veracity of Horace's threats.[102] Watson suggests it could perhaps be seen as a "pseudo-programmatic" piece, in which Horace describes – not entirely factually – the way he will treat his new genre.[103] Dickie also sees a programmatic side to the epode, describing it as Horace's pledge to "follow Archilochus and Hipponax at their most pugnacious and personal".[104]

Taken as a programmatic piece, the epode then has a link to *S.* 1.4, where Horace reveals the path his form of satire will take. But while it may share a programmatic agenda with the satire, the epode reverses many of the ideas found in 1.4. Unlike in the satire, Horace focuses on what he *will* do, rather than on what he will not do. In 1.4, Horace uses Lucilius as an example of bad practice and stresses the differences between himself and his generic predecessor, criticising his slapdash compositions. Horace also reassures readers they have nothing to fear from his work, insisting that he will avoid malicious attacks, the ink of the black cuttlefish and pure malice (*hic nigrae sucus lolliginis, haec est | aerugo mera*, 1.4.100-1). However, it is precisely this venom that Horace promises to deliver in his sixth epode. He reminds his reader of Archilochus and Hipponax, not by name as with Lucilius, but with a description that brings to mind the consequences of their ferocity. Archilochus is identified through the reference to Lycambes, who was said to have been driven to commit suicide with his daughters after the poet attacked him following his refusal to let him marry his daughter Neobule. The sculptor Bupalus too is said to have hanged himself because of retaliation by Hipponax. By choosing to identify the two iambic poets through these particular features, rather than simply naming them, Horace highlights the fierce and aggressive aspects of their poetry with which he is associating himself and his own work. It is a complete reversal of his stance in *S.*1.4, where he claimed people had nothing to fear from his work. However, as previously discussed, Horace fails to deliver the promised ferocity against particular individuals and instead his iambic invective remains targeted at

---

[100] Watson 2003: 255.
[101] Bowie 2001: 11.
[102] Harrison 2001: 177.
[103] Watson 2003: 256.
[104] Dickie 1983: 196.

stock characters and dinner dishes. The emphasis on the devastating effects of Archilochus' and Hipponax's poems serves to highlight the changes Horace has made to the genre and the gulf between his iambic verse and the verse of his predecessors, as he refashions it in the same way he refashioned Lucilian satire.

The stance adopted by Horace in the sixth epode has more in common then with the first poem from his second book of *Satires* than with the programmatic *S.* 1.4 and looks across to the position Horace takes at the start of that satiric collection. However, as will be discussed in the following chapter, I would agree that the position Horace takes in 2.1 is a disingenuous one and, as the second book goes on, it becomes clear that Horace will not live up to the boasts he makes about retaliation in the opening work. Although Horace claims in his *Epodes* to follow the ferocity of Archilochus and Hipponax, the same accusation could be levelled at him here, where he fails to follow up his threats and instead delivers "a dilution of the extreme virulence for which Archilochus was notorious".[105] Horace's aggressive wolf in epode six proves to have more bark than bite. Despite showing his teeth, the poet fails to sink them into a satisfying target.[106]

After attacks on lecherous old women, wicked witches and the unnamed posing parvenu linked to the poet himself, Horace finally provides a named victim for his invective in the tenth epode: Maevius. In what Harrison describes as an "inverse propempticon",[107] Horace wishes death and disaster on his enemy as he heads to sea. The poem stands in stark contrast to the sea journey which opens the book of *Epodes*, where Horace is concerned with the safety of his friend Maecenas. Now, the poet wishes a very different sort of sea journey for the traveller he is addressing. The tenth epode appears to come the closest to the traditional and expected model of iambic verse, with furious invective aimed at a named individual. Barchiesi describes it as pushing "the relationship with early Greek iambos almost to the point of impersonation" and sees it as forming the zenith in a "crescendo of invective".[108] Horace has moved away from the first epode, where his emphasis is on friendship and concern for Maecenas on his travels, to a complete reversal of the ideas he explored there. Now his focus is on anger and ill-wishing Maevius and his journey. It is not only a reversal of a propempticon but also a reversal of Horace's own opening poem.

---

[105] Watson 2007: 95.
[106] Griffin 1993: 10.
[107] Harrison 1989: 271.
[108] Barchiesi 2001: 160.

The poem's similarities to the so-called 'first Strasbourg epode' (Hipponax, fr. 115), attributed to either Archilochus or Hipponax, have often been noted. In the earlier work, the poet's target is identified as an oath-breaker, who was once a friend of the author. Horace's poem however gives no explanation as to who Maevius is or why he is being attacked so ferociously. Ancient commentators[109] identified Maevius as the same bad poet who is mentioned by Virgil in his third eclogue,[110] seeing him as a genuine figure and "more than a simple fiction".[111] Porphyrio also describes how Maevius wrote about the actor Aesopus' spendthrift son who appears in Horace's *S.* 2.3.239.[112] An attack on a named fellow poet would perhaps fit neatly with the position Horace takes in the *Satires*. As well as the derogatory references to Lucilius in the first and fourth poems of his first book of *Satires*, Horace also takes a swipe at the Lucilian "stand-in"[113] Crispinus (1.1.120, 1.3.139, 1.4.14), the neoterics Calvus, Catullus and M. Furius Bibaculus (1.10.19, 1.10.36), literary show-offs who are too fond of the sound of their own recitations (1.4.74-6) and poets who are content to have their work dictated in cheap schools (1.10.74-5). However, in these attacks Horace makes it clear that it is a poet he is targeting whereas in the tenth epode, as Fraenkel points out, there is no mention of his target's literary activities or any hint that he is a poet, even if Virgil may have inspired the choice of name.[114]

If Horace did have a particular poet in mind, it seems strange that he gives no clue to this and does not include Maevius among the poets he attacks in the *Satires* where he devotes so many lines to criticising the literary efforts of others. Harrison suggests that Maevius was some sort of lecherous character and argues that Horace hints at this through his description of his foul smell.[115] Mankin believes it is possible that Maevius is a *pharmakos* who is being driven out of Rome, and points to the use of his name in legal texts to denote fictitious individuals, similar to the use of 'John Doe'.[116] He argues that this would make it an "appropriate"[117] name, since scapegoats were sometimes referred to by false names.

Instead of being an identifiable individual Horace is attacking, I would argue that Maevius works as an opposite character to Maecenas as Horace shows his reader that he can

---

[109] *Hic est Maeuius inportunissimus poeta, quem et Vergilius consimili contumelia nominat* (Porphyrio on *Epod.* 10.2).
[110] Williams 1996: 103; *Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, maevi, | atque idem iungat uulpes et mulgeat hircos.* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.90-1.
[111] Farrell 1992: 70.
[112]. Porhpyrio on *Sat.*2.3.239.
[113] Gowers 2012: 158.
[114] Fraenkel 1957: 27, 31.
[115] Harrison 1989: 272.
[116] Mankin 1995: 183-4.
[117] Mankin 1995: 184.

summon up the aggressive invective traditionally associated with iambic poetry. I would agree with Fraenkel's claim that Horace was not driven by hatred of an actual person called Maevius in writing the tenth epode, and that he was more concerned with producing "a polished poetic invective reminiscent of Archilochus".[118] Horace takes his opening epode and turns the poem's focus on its head to show that he can summon up ferocity as well as friendship. Choosing an identifiable individual as the target for invective would go against the stance he takes in the rest of the collection. Instead, he gives the reader the antithesis of Maecenas in his Maevius as he presents a reversal of his opening epode. Although Maevius' crimes are not revealed, the echoes of the 'first Strasbourg epode' bring to mind the faithless oath-breaking former friend of that poem. Again, this is the opposite of the friendship Horace stresses in his first epode when he wishes Maecenas well on his journey in a poem that brings to mind the trip they shared in *S.* 1.5. Horace has moved from beginning his collection with a poem far removed from the traditional invective of iambic to a savage curse showing that he can lash out as well as Archilochus. But, just as in the *Satires* and throughout the rest of the *Epodes,* he steers clear of recognisable individuals and continues to aim his aggression against stock figures and characters of his own creation. Identifiable individuals can be praised, such as Maecenas and Caesar, but Horace is much more careful whom he attacks.

The variety found in the *Epodes* is mirrored in the variety of situations which Horace uses as a backdrop to display his use of iambic anger. He shows comic rage in a setting of friendship in *Epod.* 3, shows anger at despised individuals in 6 and 10, as well as the Canidia poems, attacks a hated tribune in 4 and chooses a sexual setting for 8 and 12. Even romantic love cannot escape being used as a source for anger and in *Epod.* 15, Horace ill-wishes Nearea and the lover she has left him for. As in the *Satires*, Horace's love-life is not a successful one.

As the poet of the *Epodes*, Horace shows an aggression and ferocity of invective which is missing from the *Satires* with their emphasis on restraint and moderation. Cucchiarelli points out how Horace changes from the more private poet of the *Satires*, a writer who is happy with a small select audience and no public recitations, to one who depicts himself addressing the whole city in a much more public role, such as in *Epod.* 7 and 16.[119] In the *Epodes* Horace is not afraid to step up and address people in public and there is more direct anger and invective from the poet as he takes on his new role. The *Satires*, as their formal

---

[118] Fraenkel 1957: 30-1.
[119] Cucchiarelli 2001: 121.

generic label *Sermones* suggests, are presented more like conversations with a friend where advice and anecdotes are shared. Cucchiarelli also highlights Horace's greater use of the first-person voice in the *Epodes* than in the *Satires*,[120] which again adds to the more aggressive tone of the iambic poems. The moments in the *Satires* which do show the greatest aggression do not involve the poet speaking as himself, rather they occur in the stand-off between Sarmentus and Messius Cicirrus in 1.5, and between Persius and Rupilius Rex in 1.7, where Cucchiarelli describes Horace as removing the aggression by having it delivered by other characters.[121] I would also include Priapus' hatred of the witches in 1.8 in this category, as discussed above. This use of other speakers means that, when aggression is displayed in the *Satires*, there is a distance and detachment from Horace himself. However, in the *Epodes* we see Horace delivering ferocious attacks himself, with no third party to dissociate him from the invective.

Yet while the *Epodes* do contain more aggression than the *Satires*, the two collections still share clear similarities in how this feature is handled by the poet. In the *Satires*, Horace prefers to concentrate on attacking particular faults and failings, rather than recognisable individuals. He targets stock characters or includes the occasional swipe at a literary rival, with Lucilius standing out as the most common identifiable recipient of his attacks. The earlier satirist provides a safe target to aim at – he can no longer answer back. Horace himself reassures his reader that they will have nothing to fear in his *Satires* (1.4.101). Although Horace appears to have taken a more aggressive position in the *Epodes*, vowing to bite back with ferocious force (*Epod.* 6.11-15), a closer reading reveals that his position is not so different to that in the *Satires*, and the use of safe targets continues. Horace may now be showing aggression himself, rather than safely distancing himself from it by placing it in another character's mouth, but he is still careful where he unleashes his attacks. The tribune on whom Horace turns bears more than a passing similarity to the poet himself, his invective is aimed at garlic, and the lecherous old women and scheming witches are safe targets whom no one would rush to defend. Horace proves he can produce invective fit for iambic but, just as in the *Satires*, he treads a careful path between exploiting the traditional features of his genre and creating something more suitable to his own times. Horace also looks forward to the use of anger and aggression in his second book of *Satires*, where again he will fail to live up to his promised ferocity and he will again use anger as a comic device, just as in his rant against garlic in *Epod.* 3.

---

[120] Cucchiarelli 2001: 124.
[121] Cucchiarelli 2001: 124.

CHAPTER 3

Satire's New Standard: Lucilius and Horace's Satires *Book 2*

Horace returns to writing satire with a second collection of poems showing a shift in tone and style that reflects the change in the poet's own position. In his first book, Horace has faced the challenge of establishing himself as satirist who is taking his first steps into literary territory which has previously been ruled by Lucilius. But by the time he reaches his second collection of poems, Horace appears to be more sure of himself as an established writer and rival to Lucilius.[1] I would argue that this increased confidence is reflected in how Horace uses Lucilius and his poetry in his second set of satires, compared with the first book, and that the later collection reveals Horace asserting himself as the poet who now wears satire's crown. Horace has acknowledged and addressed the inescapable issue of Lucilius' position as the inventor of his genre in his first book of *Satires*. Mock modesty sees him shrink from any efforts to take the literary laurels from his predecessor as he presents himself as a poet who is not really a poet. But by the second collection, Horace has stepped out of Lucilius' shadow and he now puts his predecessor in the shade. Unlike in the first book, it is no longer Lucilius who Horace turns to for most of the allusions woven into his work, but his own satires instead. Horace's second book of *Satires* is filled with repeated echoes of his first collection of poems as he brings the same topics, ideas and characters back on to his satiric stage. It is Horace's own book which has now become the main source of his references. By using his work in such a way, Horace reflects the position he now sees himself as occupying in the literary landscape. Lucilius is no longer the satirical standard: instead, Horace draws on his own work as the major reference point for his new poems.

By using his own work in this way, Horace asserts his independence from Lucilius' poetry and affirms his own position – in his eyes at least – as Rome's leading satirist, whose work has now become the standard in the genre. This effect becomes even more pronounced in poems such as 2.3, where even Damasippus, who I would argue is presented as an admirer of Lucilius' style of satire, is shown repeatedly to refer back to the themes and ideas of Horace's first book of *Satires.* Horace no longer needs to rely on references to Lucilius to

---

[1] Muecke dates Book 2 to between 30 and 33 BC (1995: 1) with Günther (2013a: 34) arguing for a date of around 30 BC ("more or less" the same time as the *Epodes*) and Courtney agreeing the second book was published around five or six years after Book 1's publication in 35 BC (2013: 64, 126).

reassure readers that this is still satire. By the time of his second collection, Horace sees himself as having supplanted Lucilius as the genre's major writer and assumes that his readers will be familiar with his first book in the same way he previously assumed their familiarity with Lucilius. The poems can be read as a statement of how Horace is distancing himself from Lucilius, while at the same time asserting the prominence of his own work.

As well as echoes of his own poetry, there are also echoes of the poet himself in the characters Horace introduces in his *Satires*. Harrison identifies the similarities between the other speakers in each of the poems and Horace's own presentation of himself, from Ofellus mirroring "the part-time rustic in Horace"[2] to the *captatio* campaign of Ulysses and its echoes of Horace's own rise through the favour of powerful others.[3] Cucchiarelli also points to the way in which Davus mirrors Horace's role by acting like a satirist himself, which would perhaps be an appropriate Saturnalian switch.[4] I would agree that through these other characters Horace alludes to the persona he has already presented in the first book of *Satires*, strengthening the link to his previous work and using his own self-presentation, as well as his own satire, as a repeated reference point. The use of characters who bear a resemblance to Horace himself is not confined to the *Satires* and, as previously discussed, I would agree that the unnamed target in *Epodes* 4 shares similarities with the poet. In that poem, Horace emphasises his target's supposed negative qualities with unflattering remarks which appear to echo allegations which may have been levelled at Horace himself. This focus on the negative continues in the *Satires* as Damasippus fires accusations of madness at Horace throughout 2.3 before narrowing the attack to more specific vices such as living beyond his means (2.3.323-4) and lust for countless boys and girls (2.3.325).[5] Davus then performs the same role in 2.7, pointing out the poet's flaws using examples which echo themes from Horace's earlier book. But despite sharing aspects of the persona Horace presents in the *Satires*, I would not argue that any of the other characters in the poems are intended to stand as complete and perfect copies of the poet himself. They reflect parts of the personality that has been revealed in the *Satires* and I do not believe that they are supposed to be wholly Horace. Again, this provides another echo of the target in epode 4: while the unnamed man shares attributes with the poet, he also retains sufficient non-Horatian features to avoid being seen as a carbon copy of Horace.

---

[2] Harrison 2013:158.
[3] Harrison 2013: 163.
[4] Cucchiarelli 2001: 157-8.
[5] The attack by Damasippus however obviously differs from the criticism in *Epodes* 4, as the target is clearly identified as Horace himself.

Horace's own work and self-presentation thus play a key role in his second book of satires. But for all that Horace uses his previous poems to claim his place as Rome's leading satirist, his relationship with Lucilius and his use of his predecessor to define his own work can still be found as a striking thread running through the second book. Whereas in the first book (most notably in 1.4 and 1.10) Horace seems more concerned with Lucilius' style of composition and technical skill, in the second book Horace focuses more on his predecessor's notoriously fierce spirit.[6] He sets Lucilius up as a role model in the opening poem of the collection, only to reveal the gulf between himself and his generic predecessor by undercutting this presentation with irony, ambiguity and subtle similarities in the sound of his language that are used to reveal further layers of meaning.

Horace opens his second book of *Satires* with an immediate glance back to his earlier poems as he reveals to the reader what has happened since their publication. He begins the first poem with claims he has faced criticism for his earlier work's content and style – a stance which recalls the start of 1.10, where Horace suggests that he has provoked unhappiness from Lucilius' admirers with his criticism of his work. Already, the opening lines of the second book provide a link back to Horace's previous collection. In the first book, Lucilius was not named until the fourth poem, but here he is introduced early in the opening satire of the book. Having already dealt with the issue of his generic predecessor and his work in the first collection, Horace has no need to wait before naming him in his second book. I would argue that the way in which Horace presents Lucilius in the opening poem provides a vital backdrop to the whole book that should be kept in the reader's mind. Horace begins by apparently holding Lucilius up as his example and role model, praising his work and vowing to follow faithfully in his footsteps. After the abuse and the criticism he has levelled at Lucilius in Book 1, Horace appears to have had a drastic change of opinion. He insists he will copy his predecessor's ferocious style in taking revenge on anyone who attacks him. But this apparent praise is immediately undermined and Horace then continues to show the disingenuousness of his stance in 2.1 throughout the rest of the book. After boldly proclaiming his position at the outset, Horace continually erodes it. Instead of the fierce poet who vows to take revenge against any and every slight or insult, the Horace we meet is a somewhat toothless target of others' abuse. Insults and accusations fly from Damasippus and Davus, but none of the promised vengeance appears. The poet who has warned that his pen will be a weapon can only splutter a reply.

---

[6] Also touched upon in 1.4 with Horace's allegation concerning Lucilius' reliance on Old Comedy and in the description of him 'scouring the city' in 1.10.

Horace's presentation of himself as someone who promises to fight back but is powerless in the face of insult and attack is consistent with the poet the reader meets in the *Epodes*. In *Epodes* 5, Horace makes the same vow of vengeance on his enemies where the satirist's horns, so feared in 1.4.34, are ready for action. The animal imagery from *Epodes* 4 and 5 is echoed again with the description of the wolf that follows his nature by attacking with his teeth. But the poet of the *Satires* takes care to distance himself from some aspects of the poet we meet in the *Epodes*. He tells Trebatius that he is not capable of recording Caesar's deeds or matters of war in his poetry, a statement that the reader of *Epodes* 7, 9 and 16 would disagree with. Even the opening epode with its pledge of friendship to Maecenas is set against the backdrop of conflict and supporting Caesar at war. Horace has kept explicitly political matters out of his first book of *Satires* and he signals to the reader that this will continue, despite his use of such topics in the other strand of his poetry. Such matters are not suited to his conversational satirical compositions.[7] Horace's *Satires* will continue to focus on the private side of life as he continues to use his *libertas* to live a life of poetry and conversation. The emphasis in the second book of *Satires* is on dialogues rather than diatribes, and Horace's first person voice takes a back seat as he shares the stage with a series of interlocutors who seem to have more to say than he does. This dialogue structure again reflects the different routes he has taken with the *Satires* and the *Epodes*. The *Satires* continue as private conversations between friends with none of the public addresses and proclamations found in poems such as *Epodes* 7 and 16.

Throughout Book 2, Horace shows that his stance in the opening poem cannot be trusted as his boasts of ferocity are not backed up by his actions. And if his promises of satiric vengeance prove to be empty pledges, then Horace's praise of Lucilius, which was a central part of this original position, also starts to have a hollow ring. By lauding his predecessor as he launches his second book and vowing to follow in his footsteps, Horace can then show his differences to Lucilius by failing to live up to those claims. The opening poem acts as a comic reversal of a programmatic statement and the undermining of Horace's position is a constant thread running through the book.

Any reader approaching Horace's second book of *Satires* who was familiar with his first collection (and I would argue that Horace assumes that this is the case) would already be well aware of his clever use of ambiguity and irony and would know to be careful of taking statements in his satire at face value. With this, as well as with Horace's previous assessment of Lucilius, in mind, I would argue that they would not take seriously the

---

[7] Cucchiarelli 2001: 184.

apparent shift in Horace's professed attitude towards his predecessor. Whether either position – scathing critic or ardent fan – reflected Horace's feelings about Lucilius is a different issue. However, the persona he presents in his *Satires* would lead readers to question the veracity of the praise of Lucilius with which he begins his second book.

Horace has highlighted Lucilius' savage spirit as something to be admired in 2.1, but in the poem which immediately follows, Horace distances himself from the swipes he takes by passing responsibility for his words to someone else and revealed that he is reciting the wisdom of Ofellus. In 2.3, the poet gives himself hardly any lines of his own to speak as he faces Damasippus' long lecture on madness, culminating in attacks on Horace's own lifestyle. In his criticism of Horace's poetic work, Damasippus emerges as the sort of reader who would prefer Lucilius' style of satire, yet the examples and ideas he uses throughout his lecture contain more references to Horace's own work than Lucilius'. Even fans of Lucilius are now alluding to Horace's poems instead of the earlier satirist in their tirades. Again in 2.4, most of the words are put into the mouth of someone else, this time Catius, although, as will be discussed, the recipe he recites includes Horace's own ingredients for satire. And while Horace removes himself entirely from the stage in 2.5, he leaves Ulysses and Tiresias to debate a subject which I will argue could be seen as particularly relevant to Horace and his relationship to Lucilius, whose literary inheritance he appears to be chasing.

It is only when the reader reaches 2.6 that Horace appears to present himself as putting forward himself and his own opinions as he counts his blessings and he details his life in the city and as a friend of Maecenas. Lucilius has also turned to the topic of urban life in his satire. But in his use of the idea, Horace lacks the biting attacks of Lucilius, as the former poet still finds some pleasure in the bustle of the city as well as in his peaceful country retreat. Again, Horace shows the exploitation of his form of *libertas*, a freedom to live as he wishes rather than attack who he wants with his words. In 2.7, Horace again shows himself on the defensive, this time in the face of the slave Davus' diatribe. The poet who pledged to strike back at any insult throws a few lines in reply to Davus but for most of the poem he stays silent as he is harangued. The book ends with a meal that is as much Horace's satiric banquet as it is Nasidienus' feast. To show how far Horace has fallen from the promises that began the book, his guests do not merely leave the meal, they increase the insult to their literary host by fleeing without swallowing what they have been offered. Just as in the *Epodes*, Horace does not even give himself the last word as he brings the book to a close. Whereas the *Epodes* finished with Canidia's final threats, Horace's

nemesis appears again in the closing lines of his *Satires* Book 2 as the narrator describes how the food was ignored as if the witch had breathed poison on to it. Her surprise reappearance from *Satires* 1.8 and *Epodes* 5 and 17 closes the book and provides a link to all three collections.

As with the first book of Satires, I have chosen to look at the *Satires* in the second book in sequence, rather than thematically. I believe that this is a more effective way of showing Horace's development throughout the collection, particularly with regard to his relationship with Lucilius. As the book opens, Lucilius is given a prominent position as a poetic role-model whose influence will be felt throughout what is to come. But in the same way in which Horace undermines his praise of his predecessor, what actually follows is a gradual decrease, rather than increase, in Lucilius' presence in the poems. The echoes of his work become fainter as the book progresses, and by the time the collection closes, it is Horace's own poems – both the first book of *Satires* and the *Epodes* – which are in the reader's mind. The three collections are joined in a cloud of Canidia's poisoned breath as the curtain falls on both Nasidienus' feast and Horace's satires.

Satire 2.1

Horace opens his second collection of *Satires* with a justification of his decision to write satire, vowing to continue his literary efforts despite the apparent criticism he has already received for his work. He is driven by his passion to write poetry and will turn his pen against anyone who dares to attack him. Horace's first poem signals a new side to the satirist and it soon becomes clear that it is not only his tone which seems to have changed since Book 1. Unlike the previous poems, the satirist does not have the stage to himself and is now joined in a discussion with the lawyer Trebatius, who is on hand to offer legal advice over literary endeavours. But although the format of Horace's poems has changed, the second book is still scattered with repeated reminders of the earlier *Satires*, with references to characters and ideas the satirist has already discussed. And prominent among these links with Book 1 is the continued presence of the influence felt through so many of Horace's previous poems – Lucilius. As Horace explains and justifies his poetry, he returns again to the generic ancestor and the dialogue form he adopts also has a precedent in Lucilius' satire.[8] However, Horace's presentation of Lucilius has shifted and the poet he now depicts is a daring scourge of the city, blessed with talent – and riches – with which Horace claims he cannot hope to compete.

---

[8] Muecke 1995: 216.

Horace uses Lucilius as an example of poetry's power as he reveals his plans for his second book in a programmatic opening poem. He will follow in his predecessor's footsteps, he will be bold and fearless in taking vengeance with his poetry and no one will be allowed to attack him with impunity. The reader will soon discover exactly to what extent Horace's grand declaration actually matches the satirist's actions in the poems which follow. Horace's vow of vengeance is continually undermined as throughout the book he shows himself failing to retaliate against the repeated criticism of others and acting in the opposite manner to how he has depicted Lucilius. In his first book, Horace showed how his carefully worked compositions differed from his garrulous predecessor's style of poetry. Now, he reveals the difference in their satiric characters by setting the fierce Lucilius up as the example he then fails to live up to in the rest of the book.

At first glance, the years between the two Books appear to have softened Horace's view of Lucilius. The poet who was once attacked for carelessly pouring out unpolished verses (1.4.11) and clogging up his listeners' ears with muddy lines (1.10.9-10) is now presented as a daring and talented role-model, a better man than either Horace or his companion (2.1.29). Fraenkel argues that this new attitude is driven by a greater understanding of Lucilius,[9] and describes the discussion of the earlier satirist as a "correction" of what has gone before.[10] Fiske sees the change as the reflection of a more mature and experienced poet who is now ready to give a "more dispassionate statement" about his predecessor's talent.[11] However, this is still satire, where taking any statement entirely at face value can be a risky decision. Horace may appear to have altered his attitude towards Lucilius, but a closer examination reveals an ambiguity and irony beneath which the same accusations against his careless predecessor can be revealed.[12]

For this ambiguity and irony over the revised presentation of Lucilius to work, the reader of the poem must be familiar with Horace's earlier book of *Satires* and have the poet's previous assessment of his predecessor in mind. To ensure that this is the case, Horace scatters repeated references to his first book throughout the poem. Pantolabus and Nomentanus (1.1.101-2 and 1.8.11) are mentioned by Trebatius as he quotes Horace's earlier work (2.1.22), the witch Canidia reappears from 1.8 (2.1.48) and Horace's vow not to let himself down (*haud mihi dero* 2.1.17) is exactly the same phrase used by the pest

---

[9] Fraenkel 1957: 152.
[10] Fraenkel 1957: 148.
[11] Fiske 1920: 369.
[12] Anderson 1982: 31.

who plagued him in 1.9 and appears in the same place in the line (1.9.56).[13] I would argue that the number of deliberate references to Book 1 strongly suggests that Horace's apparent praise of Lucilius should not be read as entirely sincere. They work as signposts, pointing the reader's mind back to what has been said before and to the criticism levelled at Lucilius in Book 1. If Horace's apparent praise of Lucilius was intended to be read as a genuine compliment, then it seems a strange move to include so many reminders of Horace's earlier work and its repeated criticisms of his predecessor.

Horace then opens the first poem of his second book of *Satires* by detailing the attacks he claims his previous work has attracted, referring to his poems as *satira* for the first time (2.1.1) and revealing allegations that echo those he himself had made against Lucilius.[14] The image of the poet spinning out a thousand unremarkable lines in a day (*similisque meorum | mille die uersus deduci posse* 2.1.3-4) soon brings to mind the description of Lucilius' hundreds of lines in an hour (*in hora saepe ducentos, | ut magnum, uersus dictabat* 1.4.9-10), and the reader who is familiar with Horace's first book would be likely to recall this attack on "facile prolixity",[15] which has now been turned on Horace himself. Right from the beginning of the book's opening poem, Horace is foreshadowing the criticisms of himself that he will put into the mouths of his characters in later poems. Harrison also sees an echo of Horace's criticisms in his description of how his own work has been branded *sine neruis* (2.1.2). He argues that this refers to the "flaccidity of his verse-style" with the implication that it "lacks concision and strength...precisely the same criticisms that Horace himself had levelled against Lucilius".[16] The charges that Horace now turns on himself remind the reader of his previous poems and earlier attitude towards Lucilius, perhaps leading them to expect more of the same here. But, as the poem develops, it seems (at first glance at least) to be a different Lucilius who is now presented to the reader. Instead of being depicted as the careless composer of Book 1, he is now feted as a poetic role model.

It is Trebatius, and not Horace, who first mentions the earlier satirist's name, using him as an example of someone who has praised a powerful man through poetry. The description of Lucilius as wise (*sapiens* 2.1.17) may seem surprising to a reader familiar with Horace's previous views of his predecessor, but the adjective is put in Trebatius' mouth, not in Horace's. However, although this is the first mention of Lucilius by name, it has been

---

[13] Muecke 1993: 104.
[14] Cucchiarelli (2001: 147) suggests that Horace's use of *satira* here implies that there could be some confusion about which poems Horace is referring to, the *Satires* or the *Epodes*.
[15] Muecke 1993: 101.
[16] Harrison 1987: 50-51.

argued that the preceding lines also hint at the earlier satirist through the description of the ranks bristling with spears (*horrentia pilis | agmina* 2.1.13-14). Freudenburg claims that these lines bring to mind "a passage of Ennius that had been famously criticized by Lucilius, and thus ... they allude to both of Horace's forerunners in the genre of satire".[17] He suggests that the original line was from Ennius' *Scipio*, which is quoted by Macrobius:[18]

sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret

In his remarks on the use of *horret ager* in *Aeneid* 11.602, Servius tells how Lucilius poked fun at Ennius' line, saying that he should have written "trembles and shivers" (*horret et alget* Lucil. 413).[19] Horace had already mentioned Lucilius' lampooning of Ennius in 1.10.54,[20] and Freudenburg argues that he now appears to echo the line Lucilius views as "Ennius at his worst" [21] in his rejection of writing epic. Freudenburg suggests that Horace uses the line to show how "thankless and unforgiving" writing panegyric poetry could be.[22] But if the line is supposed to remind the reader of Horace's mention of Lucilius' ridicule of Ennius, then it could also serve as another reminder of Horace's attitude to Lucilius in his first book of *Satires*, as well as authors' use (and abuse) of their literary predecessors.

Following another reference to his earlier work through Trebatius' mention of the scoundrel Pantolabus and the playboy Nomentanus (*Pantolabum scurram Nomentanumve nepotem* 2.1.22), Horace goes on to explain how his pleasure is to enclose words in feet, in the manner of Lucilius (*me pedibus delectat claudere uerba | Lucili ritu* 2.1.28-9). Horace uses the same phrase he employed in 1.10.59 to describe Lucilius' compositions, where it had a distinctly disparaging tone, implying that Lucilius was more interested in merely cramming words into hexameters than producing carefully polished poems that Horace would approve of. As Muecke points out,[23] Horace appears to no longer differentiate himself from his predecessor's style, despite his previous insistence in 1.10 on giving careful attention to compositions. He claims he is now happy to content himself with "the same minimal accomplishment" as Lucilius.[24] For readers familiar with Horace's use of

---

[17] Freudenburg 2001: 87.
[18] Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.6.
[19] See previous note on this passage on p107.
[20] "Does he not laugh at Ennius' verses that fall short of dignity?" (*non ridet uersus Enni grauitate minores* 1.10.54).
[21] Freudenburg 2001: 90.
[22] Freudenburg 2001: 91.
[23] Muecke 1993: 106.
[24] Oliensis 1998: 43.

the phrase to describe Lucilius, it would be hard to take the humble Horace's apparent modesty and downgrading of his own talents seriously with his earlier criticism of his predecessor still ringing in their ears.

Despite placing himself in the Lucilian tradition and apparently identifying himself with the earlier satirist, at the same time Horace also manages to subtly distance himself from Lucilius. The use of *olim* (2.1.30) and his description of Lucilius as *senex* (2.1.34) emphasise the gap in time between them, possibly recalling Horace's allegations that Lucilius wrote poetry that would not be suitable in Horace's day (1.10.67-71). Horace may follow him (*sequor hunc* 2.1.34) but he does so at a distance. The use of *sequor*, which, as Muecke highlights, is commonly employed to describe "literary dependency",[25] , also recalls his description of Lucilius' reliance on the writers of Old Comedy (*hosce secutus* 1.4.6-7), revealing another link to his previous poems.

Horace labels Lucilius a better man than either himself or Trebatius (*nostrum melioris utroque* 2.1.29), and goes on to describe how the satirist used his books like faithful friends to whom he could entrust his secrets (*ille velut fidis arcana sodalibus olim | credebat libris* 2.1.30-31) and how he laid out his whole life in them as if on a votive tablet (*omnis | uotiua pateat ueluti descripta tabella | uita senis* 2.1.31-33). However, a closer reading of this apparently respectful description reveals how it appears to be undercut by a rather more critical tone. Anderson points to the ambiguity in Horace's description of whether things went badly or well for Lucilius (*si male cesserat...si bene* 2.1.30-31), pointing out how this could refer either to circumstances or to the satirist's poems turning out to be good or bad, suggesting that "Lucilius did not know how to make a distinction between good or bad".[26] Horace presents Lucilius' work as being like a diary, a type of writing which, as Harrison highlights, "by definition lacks artistic finish".[27] A similar extra layer of meaning can be revealed in the comparison of Lucilius' work to a *uotiua tabella*. Anderson describes votive art as "art at the lowest level", which shows a "poor version of life, distorted by the incompetence of the artist".[28] Taken in this sense, Horace's statement appears to be a thin veneer of apparent praise covering the same opinions of Lucilius which are expressed in his first book.

I would also argue that Horace drops his own hint to the reader about whether his attitude towards Lucilius can be taken entirely at face value with his description of himself as

---

[25] Muecke 1993: 107.
[26] Anderson 1984: 39.
[27] Harrison 1987: 44.
[28] Anderson 1982: 31-32.

anceps ("I follow this man, although doubtful whether as a Lucanian or Apulian", *sequor hunc, Lucanus an Apulus anceps,* 2.1.34). As well as referring to his geographical background and the fact he comes the border of two places, the word's other meanings include 'ambiguous' and 'untrustworthy'.[29] Horace himself uses *anceps* in this way when he mentions an 'ambiguous law' in 2.5.34 (*ius anceps*). Viewed in this light, Horace could be admitting that the reader should be wary of taking his statements at face value, and may have been subtly pointing to the double meaning in his apparent praise of Lucilius.

Horace returns to Lucilius after telling Trebatius how his words are his weapons, although he will wield his pen only if provoked. His focus moves from the confessional style of his predecessor's poetry to the fierce invective associated with his verses. Horace describes how Lucilius dared to strip away the respectable facade presented by those who were inwardly repulsive and how he turned on the people's leaders, as well as the people themselves (2.1.62-70). But as well as the obvious explicit references to Lucilius in these lines, there also appear to be more subtle allusions to the satirist at work. Horace's use of elision, a prominent feature in Lucilius' work,[30] is more sparing in this poem than in many of the satires of his first book;[31] however, in this passage there appears to be a cluster of lines which include this feature.[32] The repeated 'p' sounds of line 69, along with the polyptoton *populi … populum,* seem more typical and reminiscent of Lucilius' poetry than of Horace's work.

Horace's mention of Lucilius' love of virtue in line 70 has also been linked to the early satirist's lines on the subject (1196-208) with its constant repetition of *uirtus*.[33] Fraenkel describes Horace's line as an "unmistakable hint at Lucilius' famous definition of *uirtus*"[34] and Fiske calls it a "direct allusion" to the Lucilian fragment.[35] A single use of the word *uirtus* may not perhaps be enough evidence to prove that Horace had Lucilius' line in mind when composing this part of his own poem; however, *uirtus* is soon repeated in line 72. This repetition, along with the word's position at the beginning of the line, where it frequently appears in Lucilius' poem, does seem to lend weight to the argument for a

---

[29] *O.L.D.* s.v. 9 & 10.
[30] Rudd 1966: 106.
[31] Out of the 86 lines in 2.1, 20 lines contain one instance of elision, three lines have two instances (40, 67, 73) and two lines have three examples (70, 71). Statistics compiled by Nilssen (1952: 201) show that the rate of elision in this poem is 37.2 per cent, compared to Book Two's average of 47 per cent.
[32] In Horace's speech to Trebatius from 2.1.62-79 there are eight lines which include one elision (62, 64, 69, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77), two with two instances of the feature (67 and 73) and two which have three examples (70 and 71).
[33] See n365.
[34] Fraenkel 1957: 151.
[35] Fiske 1920: 378.

Lucilian influence. It could also be argued that the same ambiguity which is found in Horace's earlier descriptions of Lucilius and his work is seen again here. Horace describes how a certain Lupus was overcome by Lucilius' *famosisue uersibus* (2.1.68). The different definitions of *famosus* mean that the verses could be well known and defamatory to Lupus, or that the poetry itself has a bad reputation. *Famosus* is also a word used by Lucilius himself in a description of the consul Quintus Opimius as a man both infamous and attractive (*et formosus homo fuit et famosus* 451), although in this case the word is used to refer to a person, rather than to poetry.

As well as the explicit references to Lucilius, and the more ambiguous allusions, Horace's poem also covers several themes which can also be found in the earlier satirist's work, and in Book 26 in particular. Freudenburg claims that Horace's dialogue with Trebatius shares "several significant details" with a Lucilian model, and the similarities between the Horatian poem's ideas and fragments 713 and 714 have been well noted.[36]

> May you take up this task which will bring you praise and profit.
> *Hunc laborem sumas laudem qui tibi ac fructum ferat.*
>
> 713

> Speak loudly of Popilius' battle, sing of Cornelius' deeds.
> *Percrepa pugnam Popili, facta Corneli cane*
>
> 714

Trebatius also uses *labor* to describe the effort of writing poetry (2.1.11) and also includes a distinctly alliterative line (*Scipiadam ut sapiens Lucilius* 2.1.17), although this is not as pronounced as the repeated 'p' and 'c' sounds of 714. Despite a lack of stronger linguistic echoes in Trebatius' words, these fragments do reveal similar advice to that which the lawyer issues to Horace. Celebrate the deeds of the powerful and choose a poetic path that will bring you advantages. The reader will soon discover whether Horace has decided to follow this advice in the poems which are to come.

---

[36] For example, Fraenkel (1957:150), Freudenburg (2001: 75).

Horace's opening poem shares similarities not only with his first book of *Satires*, but also with the *Epodes*, and links between the collections are scattered throughout the work. The witch Canidia reappears (2.1.48), providing an echo of both 1.8 and *Epodes* 3, 5 and 17. The *Epodes* closed with her spells and sorcery and she now returns to make her first of two appearances in Horace's second book of *Satires*, which will also end with her. The idea of the poet's promise of vengeance also features strongly in the *Epodes*, with Horace making similar vows in the sixth and fifteenth poems of the collection. Horace again employs animal imagery to make his point, using the wolf and the bull as examples of those capable of attack. The two creatures are also paired in *Epode* 6, where Horace promises to bite back like the wolf (6.1-4), while his horns are raised like a bull's (6.12). Just as in the *Epodes*, the poet of the *Satires* will turn out to be just as powerless to deliver the promised retaliation. It could be argued that the first poem of the book also contains a hint at the public and private divide that separates the *Epodes* and the *Satires*, where the iambic poems contain bold proclamations and use civic issues for subject matter while the satiric works continue with a tone suggesting a conversation between friends and an emphasis on Horace's avoidance of reciting to large audiences and insistence on not targeting the masses. In the opening poem of Book 2, Horace talks about Lucilius' light-hearted larking around with Laelius and Scipio when they are away from their public roles (2.1.71-4). The *Epodes* may be the place for public matters, but Horace's satires will continue to focus on friendship and life away from politics. With his opening poem of the second book, Horace gathers up strands from his previous collections and weaves them into the new work, reminding readers of what has gone before and setting the scene for what will follow.

Satire 2.2

In his second satire of Book 2, Horace returns to some of the themes he has dealt with in his first book as he again discusses moderation – this time in relation to dining – and warns against the dangers of excess. Food is an issue that Horace will return to repeatedly in this book, with five of the eight poems featuring food or dining. The theme is much more prominent here than in Horace's first satiric collection, where it is confined to mentions of burnt birds and bad bread on the poet's journey in 1.5 and the simple meal enjoyed at the end of a comfortable day in 1.6. However, food does begin to feature more strongly in the *Epodes*. Alfius extols the supposed virtues of country fare in the second poem and the third is a tirade against garlic. The theme becomes more prominent as Horace moves towards his book of *Satires*. Horace opens *Satire* 2.2 by distancing himself from the sentiments that will be expressed, as he stresses at 2.2.2 that this *sermo* (also the word he uses for the title

of his poems themselves) belongs to the rough and rustic philosopher Ofellus. Muecke describes this attribution of opinions to another as a "Platonic distancing device", which is perhaps appropriate given the Platonic echo in Horace's address to the good men of the opening line (*boni*).[37] However, despite the care Horace takes to point out that he is repeating someone else's thoughts, Ofellus does not appear to differ greatly from the poet whom the reader has met in previous satires with his recommendation of modest dining and simple moderation.[38]

Horace soon begins explaining Ofellus' opinion on dining and the first possible links with Lucilius emerge. The theme of extravagant eating habits is one that the earlier satirist also dealt with and swipes at lavish luxury piled up on tables appear in several fragments that will be discussed below. However, despite the two satirists sharing the same subject matter, they are both dealing with a theme which had already been covered before Lucilius' time and was by no means exclusive to the earlier satirist. Fiske highlights Horace's use of "commonplaces of Cynic asceticism"[39] which are also found in Lucilius' work, thus raising the suggestion that both authors could have been drawing on a separate common source for their theme, rather than Horace relying on Lucilius for his topic. Discussion and debate about extravagant dining were not confined to satire, and laws brought in to try to curb expenditure on sumptuous feasts prove that this was a subject which had also attracted attention elsewhere.[40] With this in mind, the apparent links between the ideas in Horace's poem concerning food and those in Lucilius' satires may perhaps be viewed somewhat cautiously.

As he sets out the subject of his satire, Horace lists some of the delicacies associated with extravagant dining – honeyed Falernian wine (2.2.15), fish (2.2.16, 2.2.22), oysters (2.2.21) and the foreign ptarmigan (2.2.22). Some of these fine foods are also found in Lucilius' poems, with oysters in particular appearing several times in the fragments. As in Horace's line, the first instance in Lucilius is as part of a list of dishes used as examples of highly regarded food. Describing a meal where simple fare is served, Lucilius recounts that there was "no oyster, no purple shellfish, no mussel" (*ostrea nulla fuit, non purpura, nulla peloris* 126). Horace also includes oysters as the first example in a list of fine foods, in his case a description of delicacies that cannot be enjoyed by one who has indulged to excess

---

[37] Muecke 1993: 114.
[38] Anderson 1982: 44.
[39] Fiske 1920: 381.
[40] Pliny describes how M. Scaurus, consul in 115 BC, brought in a law banishing shellfish as well as dormice from Roman tables (Pliny *NH* 8.82), and Lucilius also refers to the *lex Fannia* of 161 BC (*Fanni centussis misellus* 1241) which tried to control spending (Warmington 1938: 405).

(*pinguem uitiis albumque neque ostrea | nec scarus aut poterit peregrina iuvare lagois* 2.2.21-2). The link between oysters and luxurious dining is stressed again by Lucilius when he describes the spoilt palate of the glutton Cerco, who now finds that oysters taste of the mud and filth of the river (*Quid ergo si ostrea Cerco | cognorit fluuim limum ac caenum sapere ipsum?* 357-8). This association with luxury is apparent again in another use of *ostrea* by Lucilius, this time where he describes how a host will give his dinner-guests oysters which have cost thousands of sesterces (*Hoc fit idem in cena: dabis ostrea milibus nummum empta* 465-6). Both Lucilius and Horace then make the connection between oysters and lavish fare. However, this association appears to be a common connotation of the shellfish rather than something specific to Lucilius. Oysters were viewed as "a delicacy of the first rank"[41] and were therefore perhaps an obvious choice to represent fine dining. Horace and Lucilius both mention oysters, but there is no unusual adjective or specific description common to both writers that would provide evidence for the direct influence of the earlier satirist's work on the later poem.

Horace then goes on to describe the gourmet's preference for peacock over chicken, accusing him of being swayed by the bird's appearance, even though it has no bearing on its taste (2.2.23-30). Fiske[42] rather unconvincingly calls these lines "a close verbal imitation" of an idea expressed by Lucilius, who describes how a cook does not care if a bird has a particularly distinctive tail, as long as it is fat (*Cocus non curat cauda insignem esse illam, dum pinguis siet* 761). The normally concise Horace makes his point in a more drawn out way with a more detailed description of the bird's appearance and without the heavy alliteration of Lucilius' line, although he does pepper line 25 with repeated 'p' sounds (*picta pandat spectacula cauda*).

Horace then continues by challenging the fussy diner's claim that he can identify whether a bass was caught in the open sea or a specific spot along the Tiber (2.2.31-3).

> *unde datum sentis lupus hic **Tiberinus** an alto*
> *captus hiet, **pontisne** inter iactatus an amnis*
> *ostia sub Tusci?*

---

[41] Andrews 1948: 299. On the subject of oysters, Pliny claims that "nor can it seem that enough has been said about these, since for a long time they have been the glory of our tables" *(nec potest uideri satis dictum esse de iis, cum palma mensarum diu iam tribuatur illis NH* 32.59).

[42] Fiske 1920: 383.

From what evidence do you know this bass was caught gaping in the Tiber or the
sea,
Or whether it was thrown about between the bridges,
Or under the mouth of the Etruscan river?

Fiske describes this boast as being a "direct imitation and expansion of a Lucilian
passage".[43] The link between where a fish was caught and its taste appears in a line from
Book 20 of Lucilius, which appears to contain several other references to dining:

Fingere praeterea, adferri quod quisque volebat;
Illum sumina ducebant atque altilium lanx,
Hunc **pontes Tiberinus** *duo inter captus catillo.*

Besides this, he ordered what each wanted to be produced and brought out;
Sows' udders and a tray of fattened poultry drew that man,
While this man wanted the plate-licker fish of the Tiber, caught between the two
bridges.   (601-3)

Horace has the more detailed description of the two poets and talks more specifically about
where the bass could have been caught. As well as mentioning the bridges of the Tiber
where the fish may have been thrown, he also includes the mouth of the river, referring to
its source in Etruria (*pontisne inter iactatus an amnis | ostia sub Tusci?* 2.2.32-3). Both
satirists refer to fish from the Tiber, but again there are differences. In Horace's passage it
is a bass which is being discussed, while Lucilius refers to an edible fish known as a "plate
licker", which Macrobius explains as "one which goes after excrement near the river
banks".[44] Muecke describes how there was a fad for fish caught between these two bridges
during Lucilius' time, although the actual bridges themselves cannot be identified.[45] The
inclusion of this association between a specific part of the Tiber and taste in both Horace

---

[43] Fiske 1920: 384.
[44] "But Lucilius, a harsh and fierce poet, shows that he knows this fish of particularly good flavour which
was caught between the two bridges, and he calls it 'plate-licker', like a glutton…which seeks out excrement
near the riverbanks." (*Sed et Lucilius acer et violentus poeta ostendit scire se hunc piscem egregii saporis qui
inter duos pontes captus esset, eumque quasi ligurritorem* 'catillonem' *appellat… qui proxime ripas stercus
insectaretur* Macrob. *Sat*. 3.16.17).
[45] Muecke 1993: 120.

and Lucilius is not enough evidence on its own to show that the later writer was thinking of his predecessor's lines since the idea of a fish's taste being dependent on where it was caught could well have been a common belief.

While the link between the two satirists' use of fish from a particular spot may be hard to prove, a more distinct echo can perhaps be found in the form of Gallonius, the gluttonous auctioneer. Horace uses him as an example of how fashions in food change, pointing to the fact that it was not so long ago that his table was notorious for sturgeon (*haud ita pridem | **Galloni** praeconis erat **acipensere** mensa | infamis* 2.2.46-4). As Muecke points out, greedy Gallonius and his love of food and lavish spending on dining also appears three times in Cicero[46], including one passage where Cicero quotes Lucilius. In this fragment, Lucilius puts the attack on Gallonius into the mouth of Laelius:

> *"O Publi, o gurges **Galloni**, es homo miser" inquit*
> *"Cenasti in vita numquam bene, cum omnia in ista*
> *consumis squilla atque **acupensere** cum decimano."*

> "O Publius, O glutton Gallonius, you are a wretched man" he says
> "You've never dined well in your life, not when you're wasting everything
> on that shrimp and a number ten sturgeon"

> (Lucil. 203-5, Cic. *de Fin*. 2.8.24)

Fiske describes Horace's use of Gallonius as "a direct allusion to the famous Lucilian scene"[47] quoted above, and the two satirists do appear to be making the same point about the auctioneer. It is his taste for sturgeon in particular which is highlighted, with Lucilius pointing to the size of the fish he prefers. Cicero's use of the auctioneer could suggest that Gallonius was a well-known example of gluttony associated more with greed and extravagance in general rather than as a specifically Lucilian character. However, the apparent lack of any surviving reference to Gallonius anywhere else lends weight to the argument that Horace had Lucilius' lines in mind when using the auctioneer in his warning against excess and extravagant dining.

---

[46] Cic. *Quinct*. 94 "They have chosen to follow both the profit and the extravagance of Gallonius" (*et quaestum et sumptum Galloni sequi maluerunt*); Cic. *Fin*. 2.90 "But I do not listen to the man who lives like Gallonius, judging everything by pleasure, but talks like frugal Piso" (*sed qui ad uoluptatem omnia referens uiuit ut Gallonius, loquitur ut frugi ille Piso, non audio nec eum*).
[47] Fiske 1920: 384.

Just as in the opening poem of his first book of *Satires*, Horace then moves on to warn of the danger of falling foul of one fault while trying to escape its opposite (1.1.101-4). He advises avoiding a diet that is either too extravagant or too miserly and illustrates his point with the example of the stingy Avidienus, who dines on five-year-old olives and sour wine (2.2.55-62). Horace sums up the problem of deciding which course to follow with a proverb about being "caught between the wolf and the dog" (*hac urget lupus, hac canis, aiunt* 2.2.64), a proverb that is also found in Plautus.[48] If, in Horace's use of the poem, Avidienus is "the dog",[49] then, as Houghton claims, it could be argued that "the wolf" has a Lucilian link.[50] He suggests that Horace's *lupus* refers to L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, who is found in Lucilius' council of the gods in Book 1,[51] as well as at 1138-41,[52] and argues that this link would have occurred to Horace's readers because of the mention of Lupus as one of Lucilius' targets in the previous poem (*aut laeso doluere Metello | famosisque Lupo cooperto uersibus?* 2.1.67-8).[53] As Houghton argues, the identification of Horace's wolf as Lucilius' Lupus depends on the traits attributed to him by the earlier satirist. There is no association with lavish dining at 1138-41, where the link is instead to perjury and corruption, and there are no obvious references to dining habits throughout most of the fragments connected with the council of the gods. However, there is a link made between Lupus and various species of fish in the pun Lucilius makes on his name:

> *Occidunt, Lupe, saperdae te et iura siluri!*
> They kill you, Lupus, the shabar fish and juices of the perch!   (46)

Houghton points to the exotic nature of the fish mentioned and claims that this fragment is evidence that Lupus "could well have appeared in the earlier satirist as a perpetrator of the kind of ludicrous innovation in contemporary cuisine attacked by Horace".[54] Houghton

---

[48] *Cas*. 971 *hac lupi, hac canes,* MacCary and Willcock point to its use in Horace and describe it as "another proverb" (1976: 206).
[49] Rudd (1966: 143) suggests that Avidienus could have been a real person who had the nickname Canis.
[50] Houghton 2004.
[51] Servius on *Aen*. 10.104: "The whole of this passage is transferred from Lucilius' first book, where the gods are brought in holding a council and dealing first with the death of a certain Lupus, a leading man in the state, and afterwards giving their verdicts" (*Totus hic locus de primo Lucilii translatus est, ubi introducuntur dii habere concilium, et agere primo de interitu Lupi cuiusdam ducis in re publica, postea sententias dicere*).
[52] "If ever Lucius Tubulus or Lupus or Carbo or Neptune's son" as Lucilius says "had thought that there are gods, would he have been such a perjurer" or "so vile"? (*"Tubulus si Lucius umquam si Lupus aut Carbo aut Neptuni filius" ut ait Lucilius "putasset esse deos, tam periurus" aut "tam impurus fuisset?"*).
[53] Houghton 2004: 302.
[54] Houghton 2004: 303.

also suggests it is "not too great a leap" to ascribe the words in fragment 50 to the same Lupus.[55]

> *Ad cenam adducam, et primum, hisce abdominal tunni*
> *aduenientibus priua dabo cephalaeaque acarnae*

> I'll bring them to dinner, and first, as they are arriving,
> I'll give them tunny's belly each and the heads of perch.

If these words are indeed from Lupus, then it would provide an association between him and fish served up for dinner. However, the lack of further context for the line makes it impossible to definitely attribute the words to him. The link between Lupus and more exotic species in fragments 50-51 must also be treated with caution. The inclusion of fish in the pun could well be motivated solely by Lupus' name and its meaning of 'bass',[56] and not necessarily have any connection with his dining habits. Horace himself could also be playing on this other meaning of *lupus* in his use of the proverb *hac urget lupus, hac canis*, with *lupus* representing feasts of fish.

Houghton argues that the possible reference to Lupus occurs in a passage "suffused with Lucilian echoes",[57] and another potential link to the earlier satirist appears with the names which follow: Albucius and Naevius. Muecke suggests that Albucius has been "speculatively identified" with the T. Albucius who appears in Lucilius' second book as the accuser of Quintus Mucius Scaevola, whose trial is parodied by the satirist.[58] Horace's old man Albucius is a cruel master to his slaves (*hic neque seruis, | Albuci senis exemplo, dum munia didit, | saeuus erit* 2.2.65-7), allegations that are not found in the fragments of the Lucilian satire in which he features. Instead it is his Hellenism that is highlighted by Lucilius and is absent from Horace's depiction of Albucius.

Horace uses another name which could have a possible link to Lucilius in line 68, where the easy-going Naevius and the greasy water he hands to his guests are mentioned (*nec sic ut simplex Naeuius unctam | conuiuis praebebit aquam* 2.268-9). A Naevius has already featured in Horace's first book of *Satires* at 1.1.101, where, as a few lines earlier in 2.2, the

---

[55] Houghton 2004: 303-4.
[56] *O.L.D.* s.v. 3a.
[57] Houghton 2004: 302.
[58] Warmington 1938: 18.

poet points to the opposing lifestyles of extravagance and extreme thrift. In his comment on Horace's line in 1.1, Porphyrio refers to Naevius as someone Lucilius rightly regards as a miser (*Naeuius autem fuit in tantum parcus ut sordidus merito haberetur ut Lucilius ait*). Rudd argues that Porphyrio "must have misread the lines", as Naevius is portrayed as the opposite of stingy in Horace *S.* 1.1; he is, in fact, presented as the antithesis of the miser who is speaking. Rudd also describes Naevius' behaviour in 2.2 as "a sign of slackness" by a "careless host" rather than a reflection of spending habits.[59] This raises questions over whether Horace's Naevius is actually the same person as the one found in Lucilius; Muecke agrees that "doubt therefore remains about whether Naevius was a Lucilian character".[60] Whether or not Horace is referring to the same character as Lucilius, the mention of Naevius reinforces the idea of the danger of getting caught up in one vice while fleeing from another fault.

The image of the wolf and the dog also echoes another Horatian passage – the opening two lines of the sixth *Epode*. There, Horace accuses the dog of annoying innocent passers-by while being frightened of wolves, with the satirist himself cast in the role of ferocious wild animal. This could give an extra layer of literary meaning to the proverb about being caught between the wolf and the dog. Just as men must avoid falling into one vice while avoiding another, so the satirist must also tread a careful path. He should not become an excessively savage wolf, like the *nimis acer* accusations Horace repeats in the opening of the book (2.1.1), nor should he shy away and be too timid or *sine neruis* (2.1.2) like the cowardly dog of *Epode* 6. The opening satire of Book 2 and the *Epodes* may also come together to form another link to the advice given in this section of the poem. Ofellus stresses how the example of Albucius must be avoided and the identification of Albucius is discussed above. However, an Albucius also appears in the opening satire of the book in connection with Candidia, Horace's nemesis who turns on him so savagely in the *Epodes*. His name is placed prominently next to hers as the second word in the line and is linked to her role as a poisoner (*Canidia Albuci quibus est inimica venenum* 2.1.48). Muecke identifies the Albucius of 2.1.48 as a different individual to the man who features in the second poem.[61] However, the shared name brings a reminder of the opening poem and of

---

[59] Rudd 1966: 141-2.
[60] Muecke 1993: 124.
[61] Muecke 1993: 109.

Canidia, who plays such a striking role in the *Epodes* as well as appearing in Horace's first book of *Satires*.[62] Once more, a link between all three collections can be traced.

Horace continues his discussion by extolling the health benefits of modest dining before comparing the banqueters of his day to the hosts of the past. He warns of the financial ruin and threat to reputation that extravagant dining brings, chastising the gourmet who would rather spend money on food than more admirable projects. Horace then introduces the idea of the uncertainty of fortune, a subject that also appears in Lucilius. The idea is first presented in 2.2, when Horace compares how the glutton and the man who is happy with less will cope with changes like these (*uterne | ad casus dubios fidet sibi certius* 2.2.107-8). The idea also underpins Ofellus' speech (2.2.116-136), where he describes how his own fortunes have changed and how Fortune gives no one their own land forever (*nam **propriae** telluris erum Natura neque illum |nec me nec quemquam statuit* 2.2.129-30). The same focus on the vagaries and vicissitudes of fortune can be found in Book 27 of Lucilius and the idea that nothing is given as a permanent gift appears in this book:

> *Cum sciam nihil esse in uita **proprium** mortali datum*
>
> Since I know that nothing in life is given to a mortal as his own
>
> <div align="right">777</div>

However, although the same idea is found in both poets, it is not enough evidence of a direct debt to Lucilius. The impermanence of fortune's gifts is a "commonplace of popular morality"[63] and by no means confined exclusively to Horace and Lucilius.

Like the closing lines of Ofellus' speech, where he recommends living bravely and facing adversity with a strong heart (*quocirca uiuite fortes | **fortiaque** aduersis opponite pectora rebus* 2.2. 135-6), Lucilius also issues similar advice:

> *Certum est quidquid sit, quasi non sit ferre aequo animo ac **fortiter***
>
> I am determined, whatever it is, to bear it bravely and with a calm mind, as if it were nothing.
>
> <div align="right">781</div>

---

[62] Hahn (1939: 215) suggests that Albucius is Canidia's husband and that the two names could be pseudonyms for M. Clodius Aesopus, the son of the tragic actor, and Caecilia Metella, with Horace referring to Aesopus' famous father at 2.2.67.

[63] Muecke 1993: 129. Muecke also points to examples of the same sentiment which can be found in Bion fr. 39 and Cicero *Tusc.* 1.93 ("What 'time', I ask you? Nature's? But she indeed has given the use of life like loaned money, without setting a day for repayment" *Quod tandem tempus? Naturaene? At ea quidem dedit usuram vitae tamquam pecuniae nulla praestituta die*).

Both poets stress the importance of bravery in facing trouble, with the polyptoton *fortes fortiaque* in Horace's line emphasising this quality. Fiske argues that the conclusion of Horace's poem is "certainly modelled on corresponding passages in Lucilius Book 27", although he admits that this can only be seen through the "general nature" of the earlier satirist's verse, rather than through a line-by-line analysis.[64] The link between Horace's poem and Lucilius Book 27 is perhaps strengthened by the fact that, as well as dealing with the fluctuations of fortune, it also addresses dining. It is in this book that Lucilius' lines on not judging a bird's taste by its appearance (761) – advice stressed by Horace in 2.2.26-30, as discussed above – are found. It is also in this book that Lucilius describes people drawn to delights by their appearance (*illo oculi deducunt ipsi atque animum spes illuc rapit* 776), just like Horace's diners who are dazzled by delicacies at 2.2.4-6.

Horace's second satire of the book is sprinkled with possible allusions to Lucilius' poems and ideas discussed by the earlier satirist which, taken on their own, do not seem to be sufficient evidence for a direct association between the two poets. The world of dining perhaps seems a natural target for satire, bringing with it the opportunity to make points about manners, morality and moderation. However, although taken individually the possible allusions to Lucilius do not appear particularly strong, when viewed altogether they are perhaps slightly more persuasive. It has been suggested that Horace's poem is perhaps more indebted to Plato and Virgil[65] than directly influenced by Lucilius, but it could be argued that the cumulative effect of the scattered similarities is enough to give the poem a perceivable hint of Horace's satiric predecessor.

Although Horace is careful to point out that the ideas expressed in 2.2 belong to Ofellus, a fact which is stressed by the use of direct speech for the final lines of the poem, it is difficult not to be reminded of Horace's own changes of fortune when reading Ofellus' story. The poet has survived being on the losing side at Philippi and has now risen to a comfortable position where, in a reversal of Ofellus' fortunes, he has gained land in the form of his Sabine estate. However, he uses Ofellus to remind the reader that he knows how fickle fate can be with his emphasis on the idea that fortune only loans her favours.

Ofellus' final lines could even be seen to be referring to more than just land. If the similarities with Lucilius' lines in 2.2 are deliberate allusions to Horace's predecessor, then the concluding idea could be seen to be also referring to the genre Horace has taken over from him. What once belonged to one person (Lucilius) has now been passed to another

---

[64] Fiske 1920: 385.
[65] On the influence of Virgil's *Eclogues* on the final lines of 2.2 see Flintoff 1973.

(Horace), and will one day be in the hands of someone else. If Ofellus stands for Lucilius in these closing lines, then Horace is presenting himself as the better poet by arriving as the "new settler" who has taken the shine off his predecessor and his poems and made them look dull in comparison (*quanto aut ego parcius aut uos, | o pueri, nituistis ut huc nouus incola uenit?* 2.2.127-8). But although Horace has now taken satire's crown, there is perhaps an acceptance of the fact that he too will suffer the same fate as his predecessor. By either his own failings, or through a more spirited successor, he too will in turn be replaced. I would not argue that Ofellus is supposed to be a direct representation of Lucilius throughout 2.2. The rustic presentation of him does not fit well with the depiction of Lucilius which is found elsewhere in Horace's poems and, although Horace discusses Ofellus' views on ideas that are also found in Lucilius, those ideas are by no means specific to the earlier satirist. However, the ambiguity that so often hides below the surface of Horace's poems could perhaps be present again in the final lines of the country philosopher's speech.

With the exception of Priapus' tale in 1.8, Horace's choice of placing his words in another speaker's mouth is much more prominent in his second book than in his first as he plays with the dialogue form and brings other speakers on to his stage. However, it is also a device he uses to great effect in the *Epodes*, and in particular in the second poem. There, the speaker also extols the virtue of the simple life, albeit while showing a remarkably good knowledge of the delicacies he purports to reject (*Epod.* 2.49-60).[66] But while Horace is clear from the beginning of 2.2 who is speaking, the revelation that it is Alfius delivering a lecture in *Epode* 2 is kept until the very end. The sting in the tail, perhaps predicted by hints throughout the epode that the speaker is not really the modest countryman he appears to be,[67] is that the simple rustic is really a moneylender. Horatian irony is not reserved for the *Satires* alone.

Satire 2.3

Horace's third poem is the longest of the book by far, and yet despite its size – an ironic twist since the poem begins with criticism of Horace's lack of poetic output – the satirist gives himself few lines. The opening words, and most of those that follow, are put into the mouth of Damasippus, a failed dealer who has lost his fortune.[68] He berates Horace for the slowness of his composition (2.3.1) and tells how the satirist has fled the drunken revels of

---

[66] Mankin 1995:82.
[67] Mankin 1995: 63.
[68] Damasippus is mentioned three times by Cicero: *Fam.* 7.23.203, *Att.* 12.29.2, 12.33.3.

Saturnalia in the city in favour of sobriety at his Sabine estate (2.3.4-5). It is not the first time Horace has presented himself as facing criticism for his lack of output after he bemoans the effects of love on his ability to finish the *Epodes* in the fourteenth poem of that collection. In the epode, the usual effects of love are reversed and instead of inspiring a poet they make Horace's efforts grind to weary a halt. The same idea of reversal can be seen in the opening of the satire. It may be Saturnalia, but Horace seeks sobriety and quietness, and the poet presents himself as being stuck for words in a poem that actually lasts for 326 lines.

But although the poem begins with an apparently damning verdict on Horace's poetic skills, the way in which the character of Damasippus is presented throughout the poem leaves the reader unsure as to whether this is a man whose judgment we should be willing to trust. After beginning his poem with apparent criticism of his poetic style, Horace then undercuts the authority of the critique by showing its author to be riddled with his own failings. Freudenburg argues that the "central quest"[69] of Horace's second book of *Satires* is the question of how best to write satire, and I would argue that in 2.3 Horace uses references to his first book and a portrayal of Damasippus as an admirer of Lucilius' style to explore the same idea. What begins as an apparent attack on Horace's style by a fan of the fluency linked to Lucilius gradually becomes a statement of Horace's own position in satire's competitive hierarchy and an assertion of the poet's literary confidence, displayed through a careful exploitation of select poems from *Satires* Book 1. Now, even those who appear to be critics of Horace are shown to have been influenced by his work.

The poem is placed against the backdrop of the topsy-turvy world of the celebration of the Saturnalia and, in keeping with the spirit of the festival, Horace presents a reversal of what the reader might expect from satire. Instead of having a particular vice or victim in his sights, Horace now turns the attack on himself. Damasippus reels off Horace's perceived poetic shortcomings, branding him a disappointment who has failed to deliver what he has previously promised (2.3.5-15). The suggestion that Horace has not lived up to his original boasts reminds the reader of the first poem in the book, where he holds up Lucilius as his fierce model (2.1.62-79), in contrast to the picture Damasippus paints of Horace, showing him as a particularly un-Lucilian writer. The Saturnalian setting, a time when masters and servants switched place, brings to mind the idea of reversals and opposites, and the obvious opposite of the Horace presented here is Lucilius.

---

[69] Freudenburg 1996: 196.

It could also be argued that Horace uses this Saturnalian backdrop to highlight further his differences from Lucilius. The annual winter festival was a time of "general jollity"[70] which was associated with an increased licence and drunken banquets, and Evans describes one of its main characteristics as "the freedom ... to speak as one wished".[71] This is the same setting in which Horace presents Lucilius as being most at home. But instead of staying in the city at a time when he could be exploiting the increased licence in his satire and using the freedom of speech his predecessor was so well known for, Horace is shown as soberly retreating to the country. Through this behaviour, Freudenburg describes Horace as "neglecting his sworn charge as satirist to get good and drunk and rail away at the vice he spies all around".[72] However, Horace's decision may have been motivated by political reasons. Bearing in mind that Horace had powerful friends, such as Maecenas, it is possible to interpret his retreat from the Saturnalian licence as a tactful way for him to show once again his discretion and to prove that he can be trusted not to turn his satire on the wrong people, even during such a relaxed holiday.

The first criticism Horace puts into the mouth of Damasippus concerns the lack of speed with which Horace composes his satirical poems. Horace has previously explained how creating verses should be a careful process that requires repeated erasing and editing to produce something worthy of the reader's attention (1.10.72-4), and he has "made a virtue of writing little...especially in comparison with the fluent Lucilius".[73] However, it is this Lucilian style that Damasippus appears to admire more, as he rebukes Horace for the length of time he takes to work and rework his lines, leaving his readers waiting while he perfects his poem. Horace's work is the opposite of the rough and ready lines Lucilius describes himself as creating (*qui schedium fa<cio>* 1131).[74] The irony of this attack would be apparent to a reader familiar with the fourth and tenth poems of Horace's first book of *Satires*, where he explains how he believes poetry should be produced. Horace's carefully composed brevity is the antithesis of the Lucilian style, where, according to Horace, lines are thrown out in a torrent of carelessly strung together words (1.4.9-13).

In his description of how writing should be done, Horace has talked about the importance of writing what is worthy (*digna*) of being read,[75] and this idea of literary worth is used

---

[70] Scullard 1981: 206.
[71] Evans 1978: 307 .
[72] Freudenburg 2001: 114.
[73] Muecke 1993: 132.
[74] See p59 on *schedium*.
[75] "You must often turn over the pen if you're going to write something that is worth reading again" *(saepe stilum uertas, iterum quae digna legi sint | scripturus* 1.10.72-3).

twice by Damasippus in his opening speech. In one instance he urges Horace to say something worthy of what he has promised (*dic aliquid dignum promissis* 2.3.6). But it is his other use of the adjective *dignus* that is perhaps more interesting for the purpose of this argument. Damasippus berates Horace for saying nothing worthy of *sermo* (*nil dignus sermone canas* 2.3.4), a deliberately chosen word which indicates not only anything that one says, but also Horace's own *Satires*, which the poet himself calls *Sermones* (*Ep*. 2.2.60). By bringing to mind Horace's previous advice on the correct satiric style, the reader is reminded of his earlier poems and their attacks on Lucilius' way of writing. Through Damasippus' criticism of him, Horace can again present himself as a much different sort of poet than his famously fluent predecessor.

Lucilius is then brought to mind again through Horace's choice of reading material for his trip, despite his name being an obvious omission from the list of authors packed by the poet. Despite vowing to follow in his footsteps in the first poem, Lucilius is notably absent from Horace's travelling library. Along with Plato and Menander, Damasippus reveals he has chosen Eupolis, one of the comic playwrights Horace has previously accused Lucilius of depending on entirely, and whose name is the opening word of the fourth poem in his first book of *Satires* (1.4.1-7). Damasippus wonders what the point is of Horace taking one of Lucilius' models with him to his country retreat, if he will produce nothing remotely similar to his predecessor's work. Horace's reading list also contains a nod to the *Epodes* with the inclusion of Archilochus. In the same way he shows the roots of satire by taking a writer of Old Comedy with him, he also acknowledges the history of iambic verse.

Horace has boldly boasted in 2.1 that no one who attacks him will escape unscathed, and he has threatened to use his words as weapons, citing Lucilius as his example (2.1.44-79). Yet, he opens 2.3 with an attack on himself by Damasippus, where, instead of hitting back with some savage retort, Horace appears to agree with him and accept his accusations (2.3.16-18). Horace's invitation for Damasippus to explain how he knows him so well prompts Damasippus' explanation of how he came to be converted to the teachings of the "eighth-sage" Stertinius (2.3.296).

Damasippus has clearly not listened to the advice offered by Ofellus at the end of the previous poem, where he (Ofellus) recommended facing adversity with a brave heart (2.2.136).[76] Instead, desperate Damasippus is moments away from suicide, when he is saved by the teachings "rattled off" by Stertinius: *si quid Stertinius ueri crepat* (2.3.33).

---

[76] *Quocirca uiuite fortes | fortiaque aduersis opponite pectora rebus* 2.2.135-6; Muecke 1993: 130.

The use of *crepo* in this line not only reinforces the idea presented in the opening lines of 2.3 that Damasippus is more impressed with lengthy ramblings than with the concisely crafted offerings associated with Horace's work, but is also a rather unflattering description of the Stoic's teaching. A word with such a "disrespectful tone",[77] which can also mean 'to break wind',[78] is not the most deferential choice to describe a master's wisdom, and makes the reader think twice about the extent of Damasippus' conversion to these teachings. Is he a genuine believer in Stoicism, or has he just found a convenient way of turning the argument on those who would call him mad by learning to recite the lessons of Stertinius by heart? The idea that he is merely repeating someone else's teachings without understanding them or thinking for himself casts doubt in the reader's mind as to whether the poetic judgement the "unintellectual" Damasippus[79] displays at the start of the poem should carry any weight.

The poem continues with a long discussion of madness and the different types of insanity affecting men. The concept of madness was a subject with which Lucilius had also concerned himself, as Porphyrio reveals in his note on 2.3.41.[80] Rudd states that the "description of madness probably owes something to Lucilius"[81] and to the allusion which Porphyrio "tantalisingly"[82] made to the earlier satirist. Lucilius' lines on the subject do not survive; however, there are similarities between some of the ideas Horace presents in 2.3 and topics which do survive in Lucilius' fragments.

A large part of Damasippus' discussion is devoted to Stertinius' views on avarice and the insanity of excessive desire for money, which is a subject also found in Lucilius' poems (as well as a common theme in Horace's *Satires*). Fiske argues that the final line of Horace's description of the miser lying on straw while his bedding rots in a chest has "much in common"[83] with Lucilius 1104.

A feast for insects and moths, it rots in the chest

blattarum ac **tinearum** *epulae, putrescat in arca*   2.3.119

---

[77] Muecke 1993: 137.
[78] *O.L.D.* s.v. *crepo* d.
[79] Muecke 1993: 137.
[80] 'For first I shall investigate what it is to be mad'. Like Lucilius, he shows what madness is (ad Hor., *S.* II, 3, 41 '*Primum nam inquiram quid sit furere.' Ostendit quid sit furor ut Lucilius*).
[81] Rudd 1966: 182.
[82] Muecke 1993: 131.
[83] Fiske 1920: 390.

> The wool, all the work is ruined; mould and moths devour everything
>
> *Lana, opus omne perit; pallor **tiniae** omnia caedunt*   1104

Both Lucilius and Horace use the noun *tineae* or *tiniae* to refer to insects destroying cloth. However, the *OLD* defines this word's usual meaning as referring specifically to fabric-eating moths, and this would suggest that *tinea* was the obvious word for both poets to use rather than a deliberate literary echo of Lucilius in Horace.

Like Horace, Lucilius warns his readers against being seen as miserly and urges people to appear to be generous and kind to their friends (*Munifici comesque amicis nostris uideamur uiri* 657). Lucilius, too, includes a description of a miser, during what Warmington believes to be a passage on how philosophy can overcome avarice.[84] Lucilius' miser is a gloomy-looking man, who hooks in his coins (*at qui nummos tristis inuncat* 530), a description that highlights different characteristics to those found in Horace's character. Rudd also points to another fragment of Lucilius which he claims provides evidence of the satirist's treatment of the theme of "senseless hoarding" ("I enjoy things as much as you", *atque fruniscor ego ac tu* 583).[85] Courtney argues that this fragment occurred near 581-2 ("You take away 200,000 bushels of grain | and a thousand jars of wine", *milia ducentum frumenti tollis medimnum, | vini mille cadum*) and provides an echo of Horace's miser in 1.1.45-6.[86]

As with all the types of madness he lists, Damasippus links avarice with foolishness, and quotes the "so-called Stoic paradox 'all fools are mad'"[87] (2.3.32). However, the idea that the fool is never satisfied with what he has is likewise found in a fragment of Lucilius, who also uses *stultus* to describe his greedy target.

> *Denique uti **stulto** nil sit satis, omnia cum sint*
>
> And then that nothing is enough for a fool, although there is everything.
>
>   591

Damasippus then moves from the madness of extreme penny-pinching to the insanity of extravagant spending and *luxuria*. During this discussion he twice mentions the example of

---

[84] Warmington 1938: 167.
[85] Rudd 1966: 183.
[86] Courtney 2013: 68.
[87] Muecke 1993: 136.

Nomentanus, a name already familiar to readers of Horace and Lucilius. To Horace, he is the "standing example of the spendthrift"[88] and appears in the first book of *Satires* as a profligate playboy (1.1.101, 1.8.11) before becoming the subject of another derogatory reference in the second book (2.1.22).[89] A person called Nomentanus is also mentioned twice by Lucilius in relation to a court case, although there is no suggestion in either of Lucilius' fragments that the person referred to as Nomentanus had a reputation for being a spendthrift.[90] Rudd however raises questions over the identity of the Lucilian Nomentanus and argues that "no certain connexion has been established between the Horatian and Lucilian Nomentanus".[91] I would agree that the evidence for a direct link between Horace's character and the Lucilian Nomentanus is weak, and has further doubt cast upon it by Horace's use of the same name in 2.8, which will be discussed below.

As well as those whose madness is linked to money, Damasippus discusses the insanity of those who are in love (2.3.247-80). Muecke describes how such infatuation is "commonly designated 'mad'"[92] and points to Lucilius' description of his supposed mistress Hymnis stealing from those who are in love with her ("Hymnis, I persuade my mind of this, that what you take from the crazy..." *Hymnis, ego animum sic induco, quod tu ab insano auferas* 889).

As he continues his speech, Damasippus uses the example of the zealous conversion of Polemo (2.3.254), a figure who also appears in Lucilius.

> Would you do what Polemo once did, after he had changed
> *Faciasne quod olim | mutatus Polemon*
>
> > 2.3.253-4

> "And Polemo loved him, and at death bequeathed him his school, as they say"
> "*Polemon et amavit, morte hic transmisit suam scolen quam dicunt*"
>
> > 822-3

---

[88] Muecke 1993: 156.
[89] See p45, 93.
[90] "Now I shall say those things which I worm out of Nomentanus' witnesses by asking him myself" (*"Nunc Nomentani quae ex testibus ipse rogando exculpo, haec dicam"*) 80-1; "Would that you, Nomentanus, the gods-" and he proceeded on to the rest (*"Qui te, Nomentane, malum di-" ad cetera pergit*) 82.
[91] Rudd 1966: 142.
[92] Muecke 1993: 159.

Although both poets mention Polemo, they focus on different aspects of his story, with Horace referring to his conversion and Lucilius mentioning his death.

From Polemo, Damasippus moves on to describe the plight of the locked-out lover (2.3.259-71) in a passage noted for its similarity to the first scene of Terence's *Eunuchus*. Muecke describes Horace's lines as being "as close to a word for word citation of Terence as is possible given that they were writing in different meters",[93] and Fiske calls it a "paraphrase"[94] of the play's opening scene.[95]

"She locked me out. She calls me back. Shall I go? Not if she were to beg."
Here's the slave, wiser by far. "O master,
A matter which has neither measure nor judgement
Does not want to be dealt with by reason or measure"

"Exclusit; revocat. redeam? Non si obsecret." ecce
seruus non paulo sapientior: "o ere, quae res
nec modum habet neque consilium, ratione modoque
tractari non uult.   2.3.246-67

She locked me out. She calls me back, Shall I go? Not if she were to beg.
Exclusit: revocat. Redeam? non, si me obsecret.   Ter. *Eun*. 49

So then! While there's time, think again master:
You cannot rule with reason a matter
which doesn't have any reason or measure in it itself

Proin tu! Dum est tempus, etiam atque etiam cogita,
ere: quae res in se neque consilium neque modum
habet ullum, cum consilio regere non potes

                                        Ter. *Eun*. 56-8

[93] Muecke 1993: 160.
[94] Fiske 1920: 393.
[95] Fraenkel (1957: 349), Leon (1952: 212) and Rudd (1966: 182) also highlight Horace's borrowing of this scene from Terence.

In these lines Fiske argues that Horace is not only drawing on Terence, but also following Lucilius, who, he argues, was inspired by the same scene from *Eunuchus*. Fiske links Horace's lines to fragment 737 of Lucilius ("When I seek peace, when I calm her, when I approach her and call her mine", *"Pacem cum peto cum placo, cum adeo et cum appello meam"*) which, he argues rather unconvincingly, "stood in the same context" as *Eunuchus* 53-4[96]. Fiske also cites another line of Lucilius, fragment 740, which he claims corresponds with Horace's poem and Terence's work.[97]

> "But shall I ever succeed in making it worth her while to love me?"
> *"Ego enim an perficiam ut me amare expediat?"*   741

I believe Fiske is going too far in arguing for a link between the three texts and I do not agree that Horace is echoing Lucilius through his use of Terence. The similarity of Horace's lines to those found in *Eunuchus* is obvious, but I would argue that Fiske is stretching the evidence rather too far to find a link to Lucilius' lines as well.

After tackling the madness of love, Damasippus' discussion moves on to another form of insanity that can also be found in Lucilius' poems: the madness of superstition. Horace's lines berate the overanxious freedman and the mother who would risk her recently recovered son's life, both of whom are driven by excessive fear of the gods (2.3.281-95). Although the same examples are not found in the fragments of Lucilius, the earlier poet does also target the superstitious by poking fun at those who believe that images are actually gods.

> The bogeymen and witches, which Fauns and Numa Pompiliuses set up,
> He trembles at these and thinks they are everything.
> Just as little boys believe that all bronze statues are living and are men,
> Thus they reckon that these dream fictions are true,
> They believe that a heart lives inside bronze statues.
> They are a painters' gallery, nothing real, all a fiction.

---

[96] Fiske 1920: 394; (*Infecta pace, ultro ad eam venies, indicans | Te amare et ferre non posse, actum est: ilicet* Ter. *Eun.* 53-4).
[97] Fiske 1920: 395.

> *Terriculas Lamias, Fauni quas Pompiliique*
>
> *instituere Numae, tremit has hic omnia ponit.*
>
> *Ut pueri infantes credunt signa omnia aena*
>
> *uiuere et esse homines, sic isti somnia ficta*
>
> *uera putant, credunt signis cor inesse in aenis.*
>
> *Pergula pictorum, ueri nil, omnia ficta* 524-9

Lucilius' lines focus on images of the gods, rather than on the actual rituals or acts carried out by the believers that Horace mentions; however, both poets do target the superstitious. Lucilius also compares foolish adults with children, just as Horace does in Damasippus' description of the madness of lovers.

Damasippus' speech is therefore scattered with ideas and themes that also appear in Lucilius' work; none the less, it is not Lucilius' satires that are immediately brought to mind but Horace's own first Book of *Satires* instead. As with previous poems in Book 2 (for example, 2.1.21-2, 2.1.48, 2.2.53-5), the lines in 2.3 are full of allusions to the author's earlier work. Freudenburg describes how these later poems "effectively recall and reify the dominant literary themes developed in Book 1", pointing in particular to 2.3 and 2.4.[98] The topics Damasippus chooses to discuss are ones that Horace's readers would already have been familiar with from Book 1.

Damasippus starts his speech with two examples of madness connected to fear – the man who fears all, and he who fears nothing (2.3.53-62). Straight away he uses a device already employed frequently by Horace, namely the presentation of two opposites to stress the importance of moderation and of finding the right balance. And as he calls his audience towards him, he warns them that they are all mad too (2.3.77-81); in this respect too he is using a similar tactic to how Horace turns on his reader at 1.169.[99]

Damasippus then devotes the majority of his speech to avarice, and the same theme can be seen in Horace's first book, particularly in its opening poem. The miser guarding his cash (1.1.70-2 $\approx$ 2.3.142-57), the fear of spending even a tiny sum (1.1.43 $\approx$ 2.3.104-28) and the judgment of a man's worth by his material worth (1.1.62 $\approx$ 2.3.94-8), are all found in both

---

[98] Freudenburg 1996: 198.

[99] "Why are you laughing? The story being told is about you but with the name changed" (*quid rides? – mutato nomine de te | fabula narratur* 1.1.69-70).

poems. The madness of love described by Damasippus brings to mind the perilous erotic adventures Horace details throughout 1.2, and the idea of superstition could be seen to echo the antics of the witches who plague Priapus in 1.8.17-50. As discussed above, the character of Nomentanus is also brought back on to Horace's satiric stage once more. The opening comments on poetic style bring to mind the discussions (in 1.4 and 1.10) of how satire should be written and how verses should be composed. And Damasippus' parting shot at Horace with its accusations that the poet has perhaps given himself ideas above his station and with other people's view of his friendship with Maecenas (2.3.312-30) echoes the same themes found in 1.6 and 1.9 (1.6.45-8, 1.9.43-60). Damasippus' speech works almost as a paraphrase of Horace's previous discussions and places his first Book of *Satires* firmly in the mind of the reader. While Horace has used these ideas and his examples to make a case for moderation, Damasippus employs them in an attempt to prove the exaggerated generalisation that very many people are insane. By showing Damasippus as missing the point of his poems and presenting them in this way, Horace again presents him as a person whose judgement is questionable at the very least, and so Damasippus' criticism of Horace loses some of its force.

Muecke argues that the similarity between the teachings of Stertinius which Damasippus recites and Horace's earlier work is partly down to the fact that the poet's 'diatribe' satires "draw on the same tradition of popular philosophy ... and partly because a parody of a prolix speaker cannot afford to be boring as well as long".[100] However, I would argue that Horace is deliberately recalling his own work also to help his characterisation of Damasippus and to make a statement about his own place in the contemporary literary landscape. Throughout his second book of *Satires*, Horace appears to be moving away from Lucilius as a source of inspiration and he refers to his own work instead. It is perhaps a reinforcement of his own self-perceived position as Rome's leading satirist that he no longer draws quite so extensively on his predecessor and now turns more towards his own poetry. Whereas in Horace's first book of *Satires* Lucilius was the satirical standard and the author of the major works in the genre, by the time of the composition of Book 2 Horace feels that he has created his own version of satire, and it is on this that he now draws for allusions and references. Although Lucilius' influence is still present in *Satires* Book 2, Horace is showing the shift towards his own particular brand of satire and its importance by using his previous work as one of his main reference points.

---

[100] Muecke 1993: 131.

The fact that the references to *Satires* Book 1 are put into the mouth of someone other than the poet, in this case Damasippus, a man of unreliable poetic taste, is surely a deliberate and significant strategy on Horace's part. Horace is showing that it is not just he himself who thinks of his work as a well-known standard, but it is now the place where others draw inspiration and find examples. Horace is portraying his work as having an influence beyond the poetic sphere and as being quoted by would-be philosophers as well. Damasippus' use of Horace's first book of *Satires* is made more amusing by the fact that it is being quoted by someone who has started the poem by criticising Horace's poetic technique and by showing himself to be an admirer of Lucilius' style instead. Damasippus appears to reveal this admiration of Lucilius' style not only in his opening remarks to Horace but also in the style of his own lengthy speech. Freudenburg highlights the frequent use of elision in 2.3, a device which was commonly employed by Lucilius[101] and which Horace did not seem to approve of (1.10.59). Freudenburg points out that there is a "near Lucilian" rate of elision in 2.3, which is the "highest by far of all the *Sermones*".[102] But although Damasippus is speaking in Lucilian style, it is Horace's ideas he is presenting. Now, even the admirers of Lucilius' poetry, the same ardent fans and devoted *fautores* that Horace spoke of in 1.10.2, are using Horace and his work to make their point.

The fable about the frog (2.3.314-20) can perhaps be seen not only as a flattering admission by Horace that he could never be as great as his friend Maecenas, but also as another tongue-in-cheek literary comment. No matter how many lines Horace can write – and 2.3 is the longest of his *Satires* by far, despite the complaints about his lack of poetic output at the start of the poem – he still will not equal the fluent Lucilius. To someone like Damasippus, this is a fault; however, Horace's earlier arguments in favour of carefully worked brevity demonstrate that the poet himself would see this as a compliment rather than a criticism.

Horace ends his poem by showing the inconsistency and hypocrisy of Damasippus with his remarks on Horace's poetry. At the beginning of the poem, Damasippus reproached Horace for his lack of poetic output, but by the closing lines he insists that all poets must also be mad (*adde poemata nunc, hoc est, oleum adde camino, | quae si quis sanus fecit,*

---

[101] Rudd 1966: 106.

[102] Freudenburg 1996: 199. Freudenburg reveals that Horace's average rate of elision throughout Books 1 and 2 is 40.1 per cent "that is, about four elisions for every ten verses" compared to the Lucilian average of 84.8 per cent. However, he points out to statistics compiled by Nilsson (1952: 201) that show this rises to 69 per cent in 2.3. The poem contains 164 lines which include elisions (with a total of 225 elisions), and, of those lines, 38 have two elisions (16, 31, 32, 40, 43, 50, 52, 55, 56, 61, 67, 73, 74, 82, 83, 97, 117, 119, 131, 132, 133, 134, 152, 155, 189, 198, 204, 205, 216, 221, 224, 232, 235, 236, 244, 250, 251, 306), 10 have three elisions (41, 81, 156, 180, 197, 201, 213, 217, 246, 276) and one line has four elisions (86).

sanus facis et tu 2.3.213-2). Damasippus taunts Horace for suffering from the forms of insanity about which he has spent so many lines discussing, and Horace ends by following Damasippus' example – branding mad the one who has just called him insane as he asks him to spare him (*o maior, tandem parcas, insane, minori!* 2.3.326). The character of the greater madman can perhaps be projected not only on Damasippus but also on the poet whose style Damasippus seems to admire, with Horace amusingly casting himself as the lesser madman to Lucilius.

Damasippus has started the poem by berating Horace for being unlike Lucilius, but Horace then shows how Damasippus' judgement cannot be trusted, thus undermining the early criticisms of Horace's work. This is not a man whose literary criticism would be taken seriously by anyone with the correct – according to Horace's standards – taste in poetry. Horace refers back to his own work in *Satires* Book 1 to show how Damasippus has failed to understand him and is taking his words to the extreme. Horace deliberately sets Damasippus up as an admirer of Lucilius' poetic style at the beginning of the poem and reinforces this characterisation with the frequent use of elision in his speech. Horace then has Damasippus use his own ideas and examples to show that it is now Horace and not Lucilius who has become the satiric standard. Through this Horace suggests to his readers that he now sees himself as Rome's leading satirist and not merely an imitator of the genre's inventor. Even those who appear to be the defenders and admirers of Lucilius' style are now turning to Horace for their reference points.

Satire 2.4

In the fourth satire of his second book, Horace serves up another discourse on dining as he plays the attentive listener to Catius' recitation of an unnamed gourmet's rules for the perfect feast. Horace presents himself interrupting the impressed Catius as he races off to write down what he has learned from the mystery expert. At first glance, the rules and recipes that Catius recites are a guide to good practice for hosts wanting to provide their guests with the very best. But it can be argued that behind the culinary advice lies another layer of meaning, where it is the work of the satirist rather than the chef that is really being discussed. Horace plays with the shared language of the kitchen and of literary/satirical composition to create ambiguity and irony, and to show that Catius' banqueting advice is based on his own ideas about writing satire and suggest how he (i.e. Horace) will cook up something with a distinctly different flavour to what his predecessor Lucilius had presented to his audience. The idea that in 2.4 Horace is describing his own literary recipe for satire

composition has already been put forward by Emily Gowers, who also argues that a string of references to Lucilius and his work can be found scattered throughout Catius' speech.[103] I would agree with Gowers' interpretation and argue that there are further allusions that can be uncovered in the poem that strengthen the case for reading it as a discussion of Horace's treatment of satire.

Horace begins by bursting in on Catius with a colloquial question about what he is up to, prompting Catius' reply that he has been listening to new teachings (*novis praeceptis* 2.4.2), which he is now keen to write down. In these opening lines there is already a hint of the ideas about Horace's own writings, which are to come. The rush to write them down could be seen to have a slight echo of Horace's command at the close of 1.10 (*i, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello* 1.10.92), and the idea of new teachings that will outdo the work of previous masters could be seen to have a parallel in Horace's adaptation and, in Horace's eyes at least, improvement of his predecessor Lucilius' work. Straight from the beginning of the poem Horace sets up a juxtaposition of the old and the new that will continue as he contrasts his style of satire with that of Lucilius.

Catius then describes the lessons he has been learning with what appears to be another allusion to Horace's poetic preferences. He calls the subject matter "finely drawn" (*tenuis*) and this idea is emphasised through the repetition of *tenuis* in the centre of the line, as well as through the similar-sounding *tenerem*, which ends the preceding line (*tenerem | upote res tenui tenui sermone peractas* 2.4.8-9). As well as its more general definition of 'fine' or 'slender', *tenuis* also has a specifically literary meaning when used to describe writers and their style,[104] and Gowers highlights the contrast between *tenuis* and its opposite *pinguis* as a theme which is repeated throughout the poem.[105] She argues that *tenuis* and *pinguis* "are often programmatic metaphors for style",[106] where *pinguis* means "in literary terms, turgid and bombastic".[107] Horace's previous descriptions of Lucilius' work as muddy over-stuffed creations, compared with his own finely worked compositions, invite the reader to identify Horace and Lucilius with *tenuis* and *pinguis* respectively.[108] Gowers

---

[103] Gowers 1993: 143.
[104] *O.L.D.* s.v. 12.
[105] Gowers 1993: 147-49.
[106] Gowers 1993: 148.
[107] Gowers 1993: 147.
[108] According to *O.L.D.* s.v. 7b, the use of *pinguis* with reference to literary style does not appear to be attested until Cicero's *Pro Archia* in 62 BC and Horace himself uses it in this sense in *Epistle* 2.1.267 ("Nor do I wish to be honoured with badly made verses, lest I blush at being given a coarse gift", *nec praue factis decorari uersibus opto, | ne rubeam pingui donatus munere Ep.* 2.1.266-7).

also points to the importance of *tenuis* and *pinguis* as "vital metaphors for the neoterics",[109] claiming Catius' words "cannot fail to remind us of Horace's own Callimachean principles",[110] which fits with Freudenburg's description of 2.4 as a "thoroughly neoteric" work.[111] The fact that *tenuis tenui* are immediately followed by *sermo*, Horace's own word for his *Satires*, increases the literary flavour of the line. Although Catius has not revealed his subject, the ambiguity of Horace's language hints at the literary subtext to come.

Horace continues by urging Catius to reveal the name of the man whose teachings he has been listening to and where this man is from (2.4.10). But Catius insists on staying tight-lipped about the source of his newfound wisdom. I would argue that Catius' avoidance of naming his teacher is another clue that Horace is actually presenting his own ideas about satire in Catius' speech. By making sure Catius does not name his teacher or give any details about him, Horace increases the ambiguity of the words, as well as the humour of the poem. The character of Catius cannot attribute the teachings to anyone else because the real author of them is there in front of him. The poet presents himself listening to a version of his own ideas served up as dining advice. Catius may not want to share the name of his teacher, but any of Horace's readers who are familiar with his previous poems should still be able to identify the source of these *novis praeceptis*. Catius proclaims he will recite the teachings from memory (*memor* 2.4.11), which is perhaps another hint that the reader should cast their mind back to what has gone before – not only in Horace's poems but also in his predecessor Lucilius' work – to fully understand what is to come.[112] The links between the language of satire and the culinary vocabulary that will follow also help build the different layers of meaning that can be traced in 2.4, and Gowers highlights how "the vocabulary of taste, intelligence, pleasure, wholesomeness and corruption, adequacy and excess has a culinary base".[113]

Catius reflects the traditional series of courses at a banquet by beginning with a description of the finest eggs before moving on to talk about cabbages, where he urges the discerning diner to shun washed-out leaves from waterlogged fields (*irriguo nihil est elutius horto* 2.4.16). In this description of the over-watered produce, Gowers sees another allusion to poetry, where "excessive wateriness in food is another transformation of Callimachus' flooding rivers".[114] Horace has used the image of Lucilius' work as being like a river (*cum*

---

[109] Gowers 1993: 147.
[110] Gowers 1993: 143.
[111] Freudenburg 1996: 199.
[112] See Hinds (1998) for discussion on the use of similar words to allude to previous works.
[113] Gowers 1993: 132.
[114] Gowers 1993: 147.

flueret lentulus 1.4.11)*,* where the rushing water stands for the overflowing and anti-Callimachean style of his poetry. In criticising his predecessor Horace draws attention to the mud the river carries with it, rather than an excess of water, and it would perhaps be stretching the evidence rather too far to argue for a strong link between 1.4.11 and the soggy cabbage fields. However, the washed-out image does still appear to fit with Horace's general approach to composing poetry and the style he shuns in his satire. Although the allusion does not appear to be to Lucilius directly, references to a poetic style that is the opposite of the one Horace advocates could well bring the earlier satirist to the reader's mind.

After his warnings about watery greens, Catius turns his attention to the problems of potentially tough poultry (2.4.17-20), and here the evidence for a possible link to Lucilius is perhaps slightly stronger. The chicken is described as *dura* (2.4.18), a word which Horace has already applied to Lucilius in respect of his composition style (*durus componere uersus* 1.4.8).[115] Gowers highlights this previous use and also identifies the contrast between *durus* and its opposite *lenis* as another theme that is repeated throughout the poem. She points to the use of *palatum* in the description of how to treat the tough chicken and argues that it is "another word that can be used metaphorically of critical discrimination".[116] In her opinion the lines can be read as advising the would-be Callimachean poet to avoid harshness. The *durus* style of Lucilius is to be avoided if the writer wishes to prove he is *doctus* to his audience, another term Gowers describes as being "used specifically of neoteric learning or subtlety".[117] The argument can perhaps be taken further by looking at the instruction to drown the chicken in Falernian wine (*musto mersare Falerno* 2.4.19). The wine is one of the finest varieties, and described as *musto*, which is used in particular to refer to young, fresh wines.[118] Something that is *durus* must be transformed by something fresh and refined to make it easier to stomach – the same treatment that Horace claims must be applied to Lucilius' poetry to make it palatable.

Following mentions of mushrooms and mulberries, Catius moves on to discuss Aufidius, who makes the mistake of mixing honey with strong wine and filling empty veins with something strong (*Aufidius forti miscebat mella Falerno | mendose, quoniam uacuis committere uenis | nil nisi lene decet* 2.4.24-6). His name recollects the rushing river

---

[115] Cicero also uses the adjective *durus* to refer to another writer in a disparaging way, branding the poet Atilius *poeta durissimus* (*Att.* 14.20.3). In his discussion of the *Epodes*, Goh (2016: 71) argues that "things that are *durus* in early Horace inevitably remind one of Lucilius".
[116] Gowers 1993: 149.
[117] Gowers 1993: 149.
[118] *O.L.D.* s.v.

Aufidus which drags everything away in 1.1 (*cum ripa simul auulsos ferat Aufidus acer* 1.1.58), suggesting yet another watery image to add to the ones already introduced.[119] Catius insists on something *lenis*, the word which, as mentioned above, Gowers pairs as a significant contrast to *durus* throughout the poem, and *durus* does appear in the following line to describe constipation (*si dura morabitur alvus* 2.4.27). If Lucilius and his work are *durus*, then the suggestion is that Horace's poetry is the smooth, polished product implied by *lenis*. By placing the two words close to each other in the poem, with *lenis* also repeated in line 26, Horace emphasises their differences. Horace's avoidance of the sharp invective often associated with Lucilius would also fit into this idea of *durus* versus *lenis*, with *lenis* also having the meaning of restraint and moderation – concepts which Horace has dealt with several times so far in his satires.[120] Catius insists that only a mild wine must be used to wash what Muecke translates as lungs, using *praecordia* to describe the organs (*leni praecordia mulso | prolueris melius* 2.4.26-7).[121] The word *praecordia* is also found in Lucilius, where the satirist uses it to describe the seat of emotions[122] and the place where poetry comes from.

> *Ego ubi quem ex praecordiis | ecfero uersum*
> When I bring out verse, | which is from my heart
>
> 670-1

Horace also uses *praecordia* in this way in his first book of *Satires*, where he describes how wine can reveal hidden feelings (*post hunc quoque potus | condita cum uerax aperit praecordia Liber* 1.4.88-9). The word on its own is obviously not enough evidence of a link to Lucilius or to Horace's ideas on writing satire, but its double meaning and Lucilius' reference to it as the place where poetry comes from do help to add to the sense that it is not only food that Horace is referring to with Catius' speech.

Another of Catius' recommendations also appears in Lucilius; the small sorrel he suggests as a remedy for bowel problems, which is described as *brevis* (*lapathi brevis herba* 2.4.29). Gowers notes how Horace has already advocated brevity in satire in the final poem of his

---

[119] Muecke (1993: 170) also highlights the fact that Varro mentions a M. Aufidius Lucro (*Rust.* 3.6.1), who became rich by selling fattened peacocks.
[120] *O.L.D.* s.v. 6.
[121] Muecke 1993: 61, 170.
[122] *O.L.D.* s.v. 3.

first book (*est brevitate opus* 1.10.9) and that brevity is one of the key ingredients in his recipe for poetry.[123] Lucilius also mentions the herb sorrel when he describes Laelius recommending its worth to gluttons in a passage quoted by Cicero.[124]

> *o lapathe, ut iactare, nec es satis cognitus qui sis!*
>
> *in quo Laelius clamores sophos ille solebat*
>
> *edere, compellans gumias ex ordine nostro*

> O sorrel, how you are thrown about, nor is it well enough known what you are!
>
> That wise man Laelius used to shout about it,
>
> As he was rebuking our gluttons one by one.

<div align="center">200-2</div>

The recommendation may be based on the herb's taste or other medicinal properties (Muecke describes it as "a symbol of rustic frugality, despised but good for you"[125]), but Laelius may also be thinking of its qualities as a laxative, just like Catius does.[126] The fact that Lucilius' lines were quoted by Cicero could also suggest that they were more likely to be recognised and linked with Horace's use of the same ideas in his poem.

Perhaps a stronger argument for a Lucilian flavour to Horace's poem can be found a few lines later, where Catius describes how the new moon makes slippery shellfish grow.

> *lubrica nascentes **implent** conchylia lunae*

<div align="center">2.4.30</div>

---

[123] Gowers 1993: 150.

[124] Cic. *de Fin*., 2.8.24.

[125] Muecke 1993: 171.

[126] Pliny (*Nat.* 20.231) also includes a description of its medicinal properties, which includes its role in treating stomach problems, as well as its use against a great number of complaints ranging from scorpion stings to malformed nails.

Horace's line bears a distinct similarity to a description of the same effect found in Lucilius.

*Luna alit ostrea et **implet** echinos, muribus fibras*
et iecur addit.

The moon nourishes oysters and fills sea urchins
and adds guts and a liver to the globefish.

1222-3

Both Lucilius and Horace use *impleo* to describe the effect the moon has on the shellfish, with Horace's line adding the extra description that it is a new moon in particular. Both poets identify shellfish as being affected by the moon, although they choose different types to include in their lines. Lucilius mentions oysters and sea urchins, and although they do not feature in Horace's description of the moon, both creatures do appear together in the same line very shortly afterwards, as Catius discusses the origins of the finest foods (***ostrea** Circeis, Miseno oriuntur **echini*** 2.4.33). Fiske claims that Horace's "piece of gastronomic lore is directly imitated from Lucilius"[127] and Classen also argues that Horace's words echo his predecessor's lines.[128] However, Muecke suggests that the idea of the moon's effect on shellfish is "a widely attested belief" and points to Cicero's mention of the theory.[129] Although there is similarity between Lucilius' line and that of Horace, it is impossible to say for certain if Horace intended the reader to think specifically of the Lucilian words. Fiske sees another Lucilian reference in the comparison of the quality of mussels from different areas, arguing that, in Catius' preference for the Lucrine variety over those from Baiae, he is equating the lesser variety with the *murex marinus* mentioned by Lucilius.[130]

Catius continues by proclaiming that no one can claim to know the art of dining unless they have turned their attention to the subtle science of flavour (*nec sibi cenarum quivis temere arroget artem | non prius exacta tenui ratione saporum* 2.4.35-6). In the word for flavour - *sapor* - Horace again uses the ambiguity of language to hint at a poetic subtext to his feast. As well as referring to the taste of food, *sapor* can also describe the particular

---

[127] Fiske 1920: 400
[128] Classen 1978: 341
[129] Muecke 1993: 171; Cic. *Div.* 2.33
[130] Fiske 1920: 400; Warmington (1938: 419) includes *murexque marinus* among the list of words not included in his text or notes.

style or character of a person,[131] and Cicero uses it in a discussion about Granius, who is identified as the subject of several stories told by Lucilius.[132] Horace's line also includes another occurrence of the word *tenuis*, which, as discussed above, carries allusions to literary style and adds to the ambiguity of the language. The host should not only know which food has the finest taste, but must also be able to identify the dishes that can have the appropriate effect on their guests. Catius refers to the diner who is drooping on his dinner couch and to ways of reviving him – perhaps in the same way Horace's satire will sit more easily on weary ears than clogged-up verses like those written by Lucilius (*ut currat sentential neu se | impediat uerbis lassas onerantibus auris* 1.10.9-10). Catius highlights the importance of choosing the correct sauce for the dish, and the multiple meanings of *ius*, as a sauce for food or as the law or as what is correct, have been exploited by Horace previously, for example in 2.1.82-3. Gowers describes this pun as a "favourite ... of convivial literature"[133] and Horace will return to it in 2.8 where he once again uses the language of food as the basis for his satire.

The recipe for a successful dinner continues with a call for an Umbrian boar, raised on acorns and heavy enough to bend its silver salver (*Umber et iligna nutritus glande rotundas | curvet aper lances carnem vitantis inertem* 2.4.40-41). Catius insists that this is the perfect choice for someone who would avoid bland meat, but it could be argued that the similar sound of *carnem* to *carmen* suggests that it is not only insipid dishes that must be shunned, but also poetry of that type. Rather than referring to food, the word *iners* is more commonly used as a description of someone or something lazy and lacking skill, and a reluctance to put in the effort required to write correctly is one of the charges Horace has already levelled at Lucilius (*piger scribendi ferre laborem, | scribendi recte* 1.4.12-13). Again, although ostensibly about dining, I would argue that it is easy to read Catius' advice here as guidance on the correct way to serve up satire. The similar-sounding *carnem* and *carmen* add to the ambiguity created by Horace about what Catius is actually discussing.

The lesson in good taste continues with an emphasis on the newness of the advice and the fact that Catius' teacher is the first to present these ideas (2.4.45-7). This concept fits with Horace showing his audience a different type of satire, something different and better to

---

[131] *O.L.D.* s.v. 2b.

[132] Cic, *Brut*. 172 "I remember T. Tinca of Placentia, a very witty man, who had a battle of words with our friend Q. Granius, the crier." "Do you mean that man", said Brutus, "who Lucilius said so much about?" "The very same. But although Tinca said no fewer amusing things, Granius overwhelmed him with I don't know what sort of vernacular flavour." *(ego memini T. Tincam Placentinum hominem facetissimum cum familiari nostro Q. Granio praecone dicacitate certare. Eon', inquit Brutus, de quo multa Lucilius? Isto ipso; sed Tincam non minus multa ridicule dicentem Granius obruebat nescio quo sapore vernaculo;).*

[133] Gowers 1993: 39.

what his predecessor Lucilius has produced. Just as Catius' teacher has created something new through his refined palate, Horace has come up with a more tasteful version of what his audience had previously been served. He stresses his role in the invention of this innovation, using his talent to move along the art from what was previously viewed as the best. The mention of "new cookies" (*nova crustula* 2.4.47) also brings to mind Horace's previous words on how satire should work. In the opening poem of his first book he uses the word *crustula* as he compares satire's style of speaking the truth with a smile to coaxing teachers offering biscuits to their pupils (*quamquam ridentem dicere uerum | quid uetat, ut pueris olim dant crustula blandi | doctores* 1.1.24-6). The novelty of the gastronomic lore reflects the novelty of Horace's laws for satire. Gowers points to another possible allusion to Lucilius' style here, where the satirist must take care over every detail, not just one thing, and avoid the laziness that Lucilius is guilty of in his poems.[134]

Gowers sees another reference to the contrast between *tenuis* and *pinguis* in Catius' advice on thinning down wine at 2.4.51-3, and argues that "the *sapor*, flavour, exuded by poetry is of a rarefied Callimachean kind".[135] By using the word *sapor*, Horace once again plays with the idea of tasteful verse and tasty wine. Gowers also points to Catius' warning about how straining wine through linen can ruin its flavour, highlighting this as an example of the writer being reminded that they "must strike a balance between coarse flavouring and flavourless over-refinement".[136] Muecke notes that treating wine in this way was a "well-known form of clarification".[137] However, I would argue that the advice on straining wine contains another example of Horace skilfully exploiting the sound of words to add to the literary subtext of the line. It is only a short step in pronunciation from *līno* to *līmo*, meaning that the phrase "ruined by linen" (*lino uitiata* 2.4.54) sounds not too dissimilar to "ruined by mud" (*limo uitiata*). Once more, the muddiness Horace has linked to Lucilius must be avoided. The phrase *limo uitiata* is also found in Ovid[138] in a letter from exile to the poet Cornelius Severus. Ovid is obviously writing several decades after Horace; however, the same combination of words in the same cases appears in a similar position in the line. As mentioned above, muddiness is the quality Horace has previously associated with Lucilius' poetry. The advice on wine can also be read as an instruction to a poet to keep away from turgid lines and not ruin his verses by clogging them up. There is more *limus* to be found two lines later where Catius advises scooping out the sediment from

---

[134] Gowers 1993: 152.
[135] Gowers 1993: 149.
[136] Gowers 1993: 149.
[137] Muecke 1993: 173.
[138] "My heart has been injured by the mud of misfortunes" (*pectora sic mea sunt limo uitiata malorum*): Ov. *Pont*. 4.2.18.

wine with a pigeon's egg (*columbino limum bene colligit ovo* 2.4.56). Once more Horace uses the idea of removing what is unwanted and unpalatable, so that an improved version can be presented, exactly the same approach he has followed in taking Lucilius' genre and subtracting the elements he believes are wrong. Gowers sees the difference between the muddy and the clean, *lutulentus* and *purus,* as another of the themes running throughout the poem. Horace returns to the image of sediment later in the poem, where he describes the deposits clinging to an old wine bowl (*sive gravis ueteri creterrae limus adhaesit* 2.4.80), something Gowers sees as "an image of the old-fashioned conviviality of Lucilius' writing, with all its attendant dross".[139]

More advice follows on reviving the flagging guest (or listener) by tempting them with the correct dish. The diner's acid stomach is described as *acri*, another word that can be applied to both the sharp flavour of food and the sharp sting of satire. Horace himself has used it in the latter sense both in the opening poem of his second book, where he reveals the accusations levelled against him and his poetry (*Sunt quibus in satira uidear nimis acer* 2.1.1), and at the closing poem of the first book, where he describes the harsh abuse that is sometimes found in satire (1.10.14). This sharper side of satire is also the side associated with Lucilian invective and the attacks that Horace is careful to avoid in his own poems. This is perhaps hinted at again when Catius talks about the preferences of the stimulated stomach (*perna magis et magis hillis | flagitat immorsus* 2.4.60-1). The literal meaning of *immorsus* is 'bitten in to' and *mordeo* also has the meaning of to criticise and attack.[140] The uncomfortable diner who must be served something suitably soothing perhaps echoes the satirist's audience who want a gentler form of poetry than the attacks of Lucilius.

Catius then moves on to relate a recipe for sauce that he insists the gourmet must master (2.4.63-9). Gowers claims that it is here where "we should expect to discover the flavour of the new satire", but admits that "many of the subtleties of this recipe are lost on us".[141] Horace again returns to the pun on *ius* meaning both sauce and law, and the recipe for the right kind of sauce contains echoes of Horace's prescription for satire. Horace has already described the different tones and styles the satirist must adopt in 1.10.11-14, and this variety is reflected in the mix of flavours dictated by Catius' unnamed master. He advises using a combination of different tastes to create the perfect sauce, including sweetness (*dulci oliu*o 2.4.64), strong tastes and the saltiness of brine (*quod pungui miscere mero muriaque decebit* 2.4.65). The variety of flavours reflects the variety Horace strives for in

---

[139] Gowers 1993: 146.
[140] *O.L.D.* s.v. 8.
[141] Gowers 1993: 155-6.

his poetry. The different tastes that are suggested, from mild to sharp, "reflect[s] the satirist's need to vary *ridiculum* with *acre*, jokes with pointed criticism".[142] Although Catius mentions two types of sauce, only one recipe is provided. If the recipes are instructions for satire, then perhaps only Horace's kind is needed and the other type, that of Lucilius, is deliberately omitted.

The allusions to Horace's satiric style appear to continue with the gourmet's boast about the feats that he was first to accomplish. Muecke points out that naming the originator of a skill was "obligatory in the histories of all ancient art and sciences",[143] and here Horace lays claim to his form of satire, a distinct shift from the style of Lucilius, the original inventor of the genre. One of these firsts is the sprinkling of white pepper and black salt into clean little bowls (*inuenior piper album cum sale nigro | incretum puris circumposuisse catillis* 2.4.74-5), and the word for salt is another term with different layers of meaning. As well as a seasoning for food, it is also used to mean wit,[144] and Horace himself has used it in this way in a description of Lucilius employing an abundance of this quality to scour the city (*sale multo | urbem defricuit* 1.10.3-4). It also appears in Horace's *Epistles* when the poet describes the 'black wit' of his own *Sermones* (*sale nigro*, *Ep.* 2.2.58), and Gowers describes Horace's use of *sal* in 2.4.74 as "the single most suggestive hint that 2.4 is an encoded recipe for *satura*".[145] With the use of *sal* putting the idea of satire's – and perhaps in particular Lucilius' – wit in the reader's mind, Catius then presents the image of a fish too large for the vessel in which it is served. The idea of cramming something which is too large into an unsuitable form echoes once again Horace's ideas about Lucilius' overstuffed and overflowing poetry. Gowers highlights *magnus* and *angustus* as another of the contrasts in the poem, where the "*angustus catinus* looks like an appropriate image for Horace's small-scale satire".[146]

It is not only the food of the feast that Catius' teacher is concerned with, but also the presentation of the dishes and the standards of the dining room. Again, the emphasis is on paying attention to all the details, unlike the lazy Lucilius described by Horace. Hosting a dinner, like writing satire, requires a combination of skills. Catius warns the host to be on his guard against the slave sneaking a taste of the wine (*dum furta ligurrit* 2.4.79) and a similar image is found in Lucilius, where he describes a slave boy licking up all the good cakes (*Iucundasque puer qui lamberat ore placentas* 629). Horace and Lucilius choose

---

[142] Gowers 1993: 153.
[143] Muecke 1993: 175.
[144] *O.L.D.* s.v. 6b.
[145] Gowers 1993: 155.
[146] Gowers 1993: 151.

different verbs to describe the slave's actions and the target of their illicit tasting also differs, but the idea of a servant sneakily sampling something they should not is the same in both poems. Immediately after the surreptitious slave, the image of *limus* returns with the filthy wine cup (2.4.80). Once more Catius presents the idea most associated with Lucilius, that of the muddy and messy composer of satire. This allusion is strengthened just a few lines later with the description of the grubby broom (*lutulenta ... palma* 2.4.83). The word used to describe the broom, *lutulentus*, is exactly the same term Horace applies to Lucilius at 1.4.11. Once more, Catius presents the idea of clearing out the extraneous and unwanted material, just as Horace would cut the mud from Lucilius' lines to present his own refined and reworked style of satire.

If, as Gowers argues[147] and I would agree, Horace is indeed the unnamed teacher whose precepts have been presented by Catius, then there is an amusing irony in Horace's closing words to the *docte Cati*. Horace describes how, despite his wonderful memory, Catius can only pass on this wisdom as an interpreter (2.4.91), an apt description since Horace is using him to put forward his own theories on the correct recipe for satire. Now that the reader has been able to identify the real teacher behind the lessons Catius recites, Horace's closing comments to him bring the poem to an amusing end. Throughout the poem, Horace plays on the similarities between the vocabulary of the culinary world and his own composition to weave ambiguity and irony into what is ostensibly a discussion on hosting the perfect dinner. On one level, links to Lucilius can possibly be traced through both poets' focus on dining and food advice, such as the shared belief about the moon's effect on shellfish. But Lucilius is also there in the satiric subtext that runs through Catius' advice. This is not merely a recipe for a meal, it is a recipe for writing poetry, and if Horace is stating his principles for satire, then they must be thought of in comparison to what has gone before: his predecessor Lucilius. As Gowers argues, "the sloppy cooks chastised by Catius' master should be seen as transformations of Lucilius, the disorganized creator of messy *saturae*".[148] In his description of matters of taste, Horace is showing how to make Lucilius' genre more palatable to his own audience.

Satire 2.5

In his fifth poem of his second book, as in 1.8, Horace removes himself from the satiric stage. However, unlike 1.8 the setting is no longer contemporary Rome, but the Homeric

---

[147] Gowers 1993: 157.
[148] Gowers 1993: 143.

underworld. Horace takes Ulysses' encounter with Tiresias from Book 11 of the *Odyssey* and with a comic twist he transforms the Greek epic into a satiric swipe at Rome's rapacious legacy hunters and the practice of *captatio*.[149] The use of a Homeric setting was part of the satiric tradition by the time Horace employed the device, and Muecke points to Lucilius' description of the Council of the Gods in Book 1, as well as to his account of a conversation with Penelope at 565-6.[150] The character of Tiresias also appears in Lucilius' work and is mentioned twice, in fragments 228-9 and 230,[151] but in both of the Lucilian passages Tiresias is used as an example of old age rather than as a character like the one whom the reader meets in Horace's poem.

Despite its mythical and foreign setting, Horace's poem remains "firmly rooted in the social life of Rome".[152] Muecke argues that, although legacy hunting was a concept which only emerged in the late Republic, Plautus describes how relatives target a childless bachelor in a similar fashion in his *Miles Gloriosus,*[153] and she adds that "it cannot be excluded that Lucilius ... noticed it, or that it was a topic of public moralising".[154] The allegation of avaricious exploitation of the wealthy and the use of profitable flattery may also have been one which was levelled at Horace himself. He had risen to a position where he could (and often did throughout the *Satires*) boast of having rich and powerful friends and a comfortable lifestyle, and he admits that this had made him a focus of jealousy (2.1.77). In *Epode* 4, the criticisms that the speaker makes about their target appear to echo the sort of jibes Horace himself may have faced because of his fortunate rise.[155] Mankin suggests that in this epode, as in 1.8 and 2.5, the speaker could be someone other than Horace, since their attitude towards ex-slaves appears to differ from that shown by the poet elsewhere.[156] This hypothesis is tempting as it would mean that each collection – both the two books of *Satires* and the *Epodes* – contained one poem where Horace takes himself out of the picture and leaves others to speak for him.

---

[149] Muecke (1993: 182) suggests that Horace may have "coined the terminology" himself with his choice of words in this poem.
[150] Muecke 1993: 179; "Married, you deny that you will be married, because you hope that Ulysses is alive" (*"Nupturum te nupta negas, quod uiuere Ulixen speras"* 565-6).
[151] "But before the door and the dining room's threshold an aged and lost Tiresias was groaning with a cough" (*Ante fores autem et triclini limina quidam perditus Tiresias tussi grandaeuus gemebat* 228-9); "But nevertheless it is agreed that one the same age as Tiresias fell" (*Verum unum cecidisse tamen senis Tiresiai aequalem constat* 230-1).
[152] Rudd 1966: 232.
[153] Pl. *Mil*. 705-15.
[154] Muecke 1993: 177.
[155] See p134.
[156] Mankin 1995: 100.

In the fifth satire, by taking a step back from his poem and putting the words into the mouths of other characters, Horace can reveal "the new rules for insinuating oneself ... without openly endorsing them".[157] If Horace had faced jibes about working his way into the favour of the rich and powerful for his own advantage, then it would give an extra edge to a satire on legacy-hunting. Oliensis claims that Horace "knows that others may accuse him of being a Ulysses", who has achieved his position through similar *captatio* tactics.[158] However, I would argue that throughout the poem Horace provides hints about how he is chasing a different sort of inheritance and that he is fighting to stake his claim as the heir to a particular type of bequest – the literary legacy of Lucilius. Using subtle allusions to the first poem of his second book of *Satires*, he appears to scatter hints about how he claimed his place as Lucilius' heir and Rome's most prominent satirical voice.

As in 2.1, the fifth satire of Book 2 opens with more reminders of Horace's first book of poems, as the question "Why are you laughing?" (*Quid rides?* 2.5.3) and the reference to what is enough (*non satis est* 2.5.5) echo some of the earlier lines in Book 1 (1.4.54, 1.10.7). After Ulysses has complained about his poverty, Tiresias offers his advice to him on how to become rich. Tiresias reveals that the target he has in mind is an old man (*sene* 2.5.12), described with the same word that Horace had applied to Lucilius in 2.1.34. This is a common word and an obvious choice for Tiresias to use, but it is perhaps a slightly unexpected word for Horace to apply to Lucilius. On one level, as discussed above with reference to 2.1.34, it places a temporal distance between the two poets, characterising Lucilius as perhaps being outdated and old-fashioned; however, it is not a word Horace uses to describe Lucilius elsewhere, nor does he depict him as being elderly or old in the sense of his personal age. Admittedly, the fact that *senex* is a common word does weaken the argument for a deliberate echo of 2.1 in 2.5. The use of *senex* in 2.1 may be merely to emphasise the gap between Horace and Lucilius, or it may be a hint of what is to come.

Tiresias introduces his plan to Ulysses and explains to the horrified hero what he must do to escape poverty. Appearing shocked at the advice, Ulysses reacts with outrage at the idea he should act as a social inferior to the filthy Dama (*utne tegam spurco Damae latus?* 2.5.17),[159] describing the slave as *spurcus*. Muecke points out that this use of the word is "the sole instance in Horace", but it does appear twice in Lucilius' work.[160] In one

---

[157] Gowers 2005: 60.
[158] Oliensis 1998: 57.
[159] Muecke (1993: 182) describes this "unusual expression" as meaning that a person walks on the street side of someone else to protect them from the danger posed by traffic and crowds, which "amounts to a public display of inferior status".
[160] Muecke 1993: 182.

fragment, it is used in the description of things which are foul in sight and smell (*quaeque aspectu sunt spurca et odore* 851). However, it is the other Lucilian fragment which may have held more interest for Horace.

> In the **Flacci's** games was a certain Aeserninus,
> A Samnite, a foul fellow, fit for that life and place.

> *Aeserninus fuit **Flaccorum** munere quidam*
> *Samnis, spurcus homo, uita illa dignus locoque.*
>
> <div align="right">172-3</div>

Lucilius was not the only author to use to word *spurcus* before Horace,[161] but the later poet's decision to use an unusual word which his generic predecessor had employed in a line which also includes Horace's cognomen appears to make his choice of word an interesting one.[162] It is also followed by Ulysses' statement about vying with better men (*certans...melioribus* 2.5.19), perhaps recalling Horace's description of Lucilius as the better man in 2.1.29.

Tiresias goes on to explain his strategy, urging Ulysses to take the side of the scoundrel, so long as he is rich and childless. He describes this sort of man as unprincipled (*improbus* 2.5.28), using the same word that Lucilius applies to himself when he describes others' reactions after hearing he has been invited somewhere by a friend (*Amicos hodie cum inprobo illo audiuimus | Lucilio advocasse* 929-30). With his reckless character and outspoken boldness, I would argue that Tiresias' mark appears to share some of the characteristics Horace associates with Lucilius. As he continues his advice, Tiresias explains to Ulysses how to treat his target, telling him to ask the old man to look after himself. For this he uses the phrase *pelliculam curare iube* (2.5.38). Muecke points out that Horace's usual wording of this idea is *cutem curare* (*Epist.* 1.2.29, 1.4.15), and argues that

---

[161] It is also found in Cato *Agr.*157.3, Titinius *com.* 8 and *Rhet. Her.* 4.12. Cato uses it to describe the diseased blood or fluid emitted by a black ulcer (*Cancer ater, is olet et saniem spurcam mittit*); Tinitius, like Horace and Lucilius, uses it of a person, in this case one who is roused by anger in battle (*ita spurcus animatur <ira> in proelium*) and in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* it is used to refer to the wicked domination of the most foul enemies (*hostium spurcissimorum dominatu nefario*). Kaiser (1950: 187) suggests that Aeserninus was described as *spurcus* for fighting dirty and biting off his opponent's ear.
[162] Horace was identified as a Samnite himself by Sonnenschein (1898: 305), who translates *Sabellus* as Samnite and also points to the Sabellian crone mentioned in connection with Horace's childhood at 1.9.29.

the use of the diminutive *pellicula* "has a sarcastic tone".[163] Lucilius also uses the word in

his description of an anecdote about a ram with unusually large testicles,[164] also placing it

at the beginning of the line, although the expression is not unique to the satirist before

Horace.[165] Tiresias then compares the other targets who will be drawn to the legacy-

hunting hero to tunny and describes how his fish-ponds will grow with the lucrative catch

(*plures adnabunt thynni et cetaria crescent* 2.5.44). The same fish are also found in

Lucilius, where they appear in two fragments.

"I'll bring them to dinner and first, as they are arriving

I'll give them tunny's belly each and the heads of perch"

"ad cenam adducam et primum hisce abdomina tunni

advenientibus priva dabo cephalaeaque acarnae"

50-51

Because when a tunny's been caught, they shut out the gudgeon outside.

quod thynno capto cobium excludunt foras

937

As in Horace's line, the second Lucilian example uses *thynnus* to stand for someone who is

a desirable catch, and also features a form of the same verb Horace uses (through Tiresias'

mouth) to refer to the legacy hunter's aim of ensnaring a person (*capto*). The fish in the

first Lucilian fragment appear to be actual fish, but the repeated 'ad' sounds may have an

echo in Horace's use of *adnabunt* (2.5.44) although it is probably stretching the evidence

too far here to argue for a link between them.

As he continues with his advice on how to secure legacies, Tiresias discusses the correct

way to act when handed a will to read (*qui testamentum tradet tibi cumque legendum*

2.5.51). As well as having the meaning of "to hand something over to someone", *trado*

---

[163] Muecke 1993: 184.

[164] "There happened to go a ram" he said "and of what a type, and with what large testicles! You would think that they were barely held on by one thread, that the great weight was hanging tied to the outside of his skin" (*"Ibat forte aries," inquit, "iam quod genus, quantis | testibus! uix uno filo hosce haerere putares, | pellicula extrema exaptum pendere onus ingens."* 559-61).

[165] Before Horace's use of *pellicula*, the word is also found in Cicero's *pro Murena*, where it used to refer to goatskins spread on a couch (*strauit pelliculis haedinis lectulos Punicanos* 75) in Varro's *de Lingua Latina*, where it used in a description of how countrymen in Atelline farces are more likely to say *pellicula* than *scorta* , which can also mean a skin or a hide as well as a prostitute (*in Atellanis licet animaduertere rusticos dicere se adduxisse pro scorto pelliculam* 7.84).

also has the sense of something being handed down or bequeathed.[166] This extra layer of meaning is perhaps appropriate and a clever choice in a line referring to wills, but it could also be argued that there is perhaps a hint at how Horace has inherited his genre from Lucilius, and how this readable (*legendum*) legacy has been passed down to him. As he continues his explanation, Tiresias urges Ulysses to catch a glimpse of the second line of the first page with a sideways glance (*sic tamen ut limis rapias quid prima secundo | cera uelit uersu* 2.5.52-53). Here again, it could be argued that there is an ambiguity in Horace's language. The opening line could be read with *līmus* as an adjective meaning sidelong, or with *līmus* as a noun, and the phrase would then refer to snatching something from the mud. The word is made more ambiguous by the omission of *oculis*, an ellipsis which Muecke describes as "vulgar", pointing to the same construction in other authors.[167] In Horace's previous poems, there is one person whose work is strongly linked with muddiness, and that is Lucilius (1.4.11). The use of *uersu* in his advice at 2.5.53 could perhaps remind the reader again of the idea of a literary and poetic legacy.

Ulysses reacts with confused surprise at Tiresias' advice and demands to know what he is talking about. Tiresias switches to a suitably epic style to deliver his oracular reply, before Horace comically lowers the tone again. Tiresias tells Ulysses how to tailor his tactics to suit his target, illustrating his explanation with the example of praising a poet's bad verses (*scribet mala carmina uecors? | laudato* 2.5.74-75). It could be argued that this advice provides one of the strongest hints that Horace has been chasing Lucilius' literary legacy. In his first book, Horace has been ready to criticise Lucilius' work with a string of allegations against the apparently careless and sloppy poet. But by the time his second book begins, the reproach has, at first glance at least, been replaced by respectful praise and a humbly deferential tone. Just like Tiresias' advice to Ulysses, Horace now appears to praise the author of poetry he once pilloried. And in the same way that anyone following Tiresias' advice would not be expressing their true feelings about the poet's work, Horace's supposed admiration of Lucilius can, as discussed above, be read as less than genuine. The description of the bad poems as *mala carmina* also reminds the reader of the first poem of Horace's second book, where Trebatius warns him of the danger of writing exactly that type of verse (2.1.82). The two poems do not appear next to each other in the Book, so 2.1 would perhaps not be as fresh in the reader's mind as other satires, but their

---

[166] *O.L.D.* s.v.4.
[167] Muecke 1993: 187. She points to a similar omission of *oculis* in Plaut. *Mil*. 1217, Ter. *Eun*. 601 and Varro, *Sat. Men*. 260B.

shared form of a dialogue does provide a connection between them which could bring 2.1 to mind while reading 2.5.[168]

Horace's choice of subject matter, the grasping money-grabber worming his way into the affections of a wealthy target, is a clever and challenging one for someone who may well have been accused of employing the same tactics to secure his own social position. The juxtaposition of the epic Greek setting and the squalid subject-matter provides a comic contrast that Horace further exploits with the changes in tone of Tiresias' speech. However, the use of a mythical setting also allows Horace to distance himself from the opinions expressed by his characters and from possible allegations that he would encourage or engage in this behaviour himself. He is neither the impoverished Ulysses hoping to get rich quickly, nor is he the wily Tiresias instructing others how to increase their fortunes through suspect means. But although Horace does not appear directly on his own stage, as the author of the poem it would be impossible for him to absent himself from it entirely, nor do I think this was his intention. The poem appears to be scattered with hints about the type of legacy Horace is actually chasing, not a straightforward financial advantage but perhaps a literary inheritance from Lucilius, to confirm his place as the rightful heir to his predecessor's genre and Rome's new master of satire.

<center>*Satire 2.6*</center>

In his sixth poem of the book, Horace turns to the contrast between country and city life in lines described as "the most accomplished of all Horatian satires".[169] The gratitude Horace shows in 2.6 for his life in the country, made possible by the Sabine farm gifted to him by Maecenas, echoes the same thankfulness found in *Epode* 1, although Maecenas is not addressed directly by Horace in the satire, despite being mentioned by name. In both poems Horace expresses the same contentment at having all he could wish for, stressing in the epode how he hopes for no reward for his loyalty to Maecenas (1.25-30), as his kindness has already provided him with more than enough (*satis superque me benignitas tua | ditauit* 1.31-2). As he starts his satire, Horace again highlights how he has no wish to increase what he already has, and how he is content – unlike those he targets in *Satire* 1.1 – with what he has got. Muecke highlights the links between this poem and the sixth satire of Horace's first book, where the beginning of the poet's cherished friendship with Maecenas is revealed.[170] However, whereas in 1.6 the presence of Lucilius could be felt

---

[168] Muecke 1993: 8.
[169] Fraenkel 1957: 142.
[170] Muecke 1993: 194.

running through the poem as the unnamed third influence on Horace, along with Maecenas and the poet's father, allusions to the earlier satirist are more difficult to pin down in the sixth poem of Horace's second book. Fiske describes 2.6 as "an expression of gratitude to Maecenas", which "appears to be free from Lucilian influence",[171] and the satire does appear to lack the more striking references to Horace's predecessor found elsewhere in the book. However, although these allusions are rare, Horace does seem to use some of the same ideas as can be found in Lucilius.

The grateful speaker opens his poem with thanks for what is commonly assumed to be Maecenas' gift of a Sabine estate[172] and a prayer for his flocks to stay fat but not his mind (*pingue pecus domino facias et cetera praeter | ingenium* 2.6.14-15). Rudd points out that this is because Horace's poems "are a product of his *ingenium tenue*",[173] and the emphasis here is on his slender style. In a poem which deals with so many opposites – town vs country, simplicity vs extravagance, business vs leisure – then perhaps we should think of the opposite of Horace's brevity and of the packed and overflowing lines of Lucilius.

Horace then calls on the "Father of Morning" to start his song (*Matutine pater* 2.6.20) in an "ornate stylistic flourish with a measure of parody to lower the tone".[174] Muecke suggests that this line may "simply be jocular" or could be a play on the name of the fertility goddess Mater Matuta.[175] This use of "father", where it would not usually be applied, also appears in Lucilius' Council of the Gods in Book 1, where he pokes fun at the use of the title for so many different deities including, as in Horace's line, Janus, but evidence for a direct link between the two poets here is not strong.[176] Horace then shows the reader the struggles he faces in city life as he must wrestle through throngs of people and fend off abuse at every turn (2.6.23-31). A similar picture of crowds and chaos is presented by Lucilius in his description of the busy forum:

---

[171] Fiske 1920: 423.
[172] Bradshaw (1989) disagrees and argues that Horace could have received the estate by other means and says that if 2.6 is a thank-you letter to Maecenas then it is "one of the oddest and most inept specimens of the genre" (1989: 163).
[173] Rudd 1966: 244.
[174] Coffey 1976: 87.
[175] Muecke 1993: 199.
[176] "So that there is not one of us who is not called father, the best of the gods is father, or father Neptune, Liber and Saturn are father, Mars, Janus, Quirinus are father, all of them to a man" (*ut nemo sit nostrum quin aut pater optimus diuum, aut Neptunus pater, Liber Saturnus pater, Mars Ianus Quirinus pater siet ac dicatur ad unum* 24-7)

Nunc uero a mani ad noctem festo atque profesto

totus item pariterque die populusque patresque

iactare indu foro se omnes, decedere nusquam;

uni se atque eidem studio omnes dedere et arti –

uerba dare ut caute possint, pugnare dolose,

blanditia certare, bonum simulare uirum se,

insidias facere ut si hostes sint omnibus omnes.

But now from morning to night, on holiday and working day,

The whole city and the senators too, all the same,

Parade themselves in the forum and never leave;

They all devote themselves to one and the same interest and art –

That they can deceive without danger, fight cunningly,

Battle with flattery, give the appearance they're good men,

And lay traps as if they all were enemies to everyone.

<div align="right">1145-51</div>

Like Horace, Lucilius presents a busy and bustling environment full of unpleasant characters. While Horace must face the city struggle no matter what the weather, Lucilius too emphasises the non-stop nature of the continual chaos. Lucilius' picture of city life is an entirely negative one, where everyone is to be feared like an enemy (*hostium*) who is craftily laying traps for their fellow citizens (*insidias*) and there is an emphasis on trickery and deceit (*dolose, simulare*). However, the same cannot be said for Horace's description of his life in the city of Rome. Despite the taunts about rushing back to Maecenas (2.6.30-1), Horace admits he finds being marked out in this way pleasant and as sweet as honey (*hoc iuuat et melli est, non mentiar* 2.6.32). Horace's description of the chaotic city is also a more personal one, where he uses the first person to describe his own experiences and confrontations, rather than the general sense in Lucilius' account. Lucilius' forum may be full of enemies, but Horace's famous friends make him enjoy some aspects of his life in Rome more than his predecessor claims to have done. Horace then goes on to discuss the nature of his friendship with Maecenas, revealing only the small-talk they swap during journeys and thus proving that his discretion can be relied upon and he is worthy of the trust placed in him. The easy relationship with his powerful patron could perhaps bring to mind the friendship between Lucilius and Scipio which has already been mentioned by Horace at 2.1.71-4.

After listing the questions and assumptions he faces in the city, Horace switches the scene to his country home with an idealised description of his relaxed rural life. He presents a world away from city gossip and the restrictive rules of dining, where he and his friends can discuss philosophy over simple food and drink to suit each diner. The importance of their conversation fits with Lucilius' description of what it means to dine well, with both satirists highlighting *sermo* as a vital part of their preferred meal.

> *bene cocto et*
> *condito, sermone bono et, si quaeris, libenter*

> With well cooked and seasoned food,
> With good conversation and, if you ask, willingly
>
> 206-7

Horace finishes his satire with the story of the town mouse and country mouse, where West argues that both creatures reveal a side of the persona presented by Horace.[177] This animal fable does not appear to have a parallel in the fragments of Lucilius, but similar elements to some of the details Horace uses to illustrate his story can be found in the earlier satirist. In the description of the town mouse carrying out his duties like a home-born slave (*nec non uerniliter ipse | fungitur officiis* 2.6.108-9), Muecke points to the rarity of *uerniliter* and suggests that it could "refer to the pilfering habits of slaves" such as those described by Lucilius:[178]

> *Iucundasque puer qui lamberat ore placentas*
> The boy who had licked up the pleasing cakes with his mouth
>
> 629

The idea of licking food also occurs in Horace's next words where he describes how the mouse tastes everything before offering it to his guest (*praelambens omne quod affert* 2.6.109).

Direct references and allusions to Lucilius in this poem do appear to be less frequent than elsewhere in Horace's *Satires*, and, as in the case of 2.2, potential links must be treated with caution because of the subject matter of the poems. Both 2.2 and 2.6 deal with food

---

[177] West 1974: 78.
[178] Muecke 1993: 211.

and dining, and Gowers argues that "food is in the guts of Roman satire".[179] Shared references to particular aspects of dining may not necessarily provide evidence that Horace was directly and deliberately borrowing ideas from Lucilius. And while similar ideas appear in 2.6 and Lucilius' fragments, I would argue that they are too general to contain themes that can be specifically attributed to Lucilius alone. However, the links to Horace's previous book of *Satires*, as well as the *Epodes*, continue. After highlighting the plight of those who are unhappy with their lot in *Satires* 1.1, Horace shows the opposite of this discontent as he lives a contented life without envy of others or any wish to increase what he has. The same idea is found in *Epode* 1 where, as in 2.6, Horace's fortune is linked to Maecenas, and 2.6 focuses strongly on friendship, one of the major themes running throughout the *Epodes*.

The poem perhaps also shows how Horace's life has changed since his first Book when viewed in comparison with 1.6. In the earlier poem, Horace's life in the city is a less troubled one, where he reveals no negative side to his walk through the forum (1.6.111-15). Now, Horace presents himself as being accosted by people who know who he is and know who his friends are. He may have turned his back on ambition, but others have not and his rise has attracted less welcome side effects.

Just as *Epode* 4 could be argued to be reflecting the jealousy and abuse Horace's position has brought him, *Satire* 2.6 shows the other downsides to his success. But Horace is happy to endure these irritations as the price of being taken into Maecenas' circle of friends. The loyalty and discretion Horace has shown in 1.5 and 1.9 continues as he refuses to reveal political issues (49-58) and only shares the sort of small talk that is safe for leaking ears (2.6.45). Horace presents himself as being unaware of and far removed from political matters, but the reader of 1.5 and the *Epodes* would know this was not the case.

Satire 2.7

The arguments and examples that previously filled 2.3 reappear in the seventh poem of Horace's second book of *Satires*, as the poet presents what Hooley describes as a "tidied up, Callimachean, even 'Horatian' follow-up" to the earlier work.[180] The 326 lines of 2.3 may have now been condensed into 118 lines, but the Saturnalian setting and many of the ideas operating in 2.3 still remain in 2.7. This time Horace faces a lecture from his slave Davus, perhaps a more appropriate choice of speaker than Damasippus, given that the

---

[179] Gowers 1993: 109.
[180] Hooley 2007: 81.

festival of Saturnalia was a time when slaves could poke fun freely at their masters.[181] Muecke points to the echoes of comedy in the relationship between Horace and his slave, as well as in the language they use.[182] Rudd describes 2.7 as the "most inclusive of the diatribes",[183] and indeed the poem is packed with echoes of, and allusions to, Horace's previous satires. As he approaches the end of his second book of *Satires*, Horace presents a tighter and tidier version of 2.3, as well as a "grand reintroduction"[184] of the themes and ideas that have filled his earlier poems. There are still some hints of Lucilius to be found in Davus' discussion; however, unlike in some previous poems, there is only "scant evidence"[185] of the earlier satirist's influence and, as in 2.3, the strongest reference point again seems to be Horace's own work. As the book goes on, the echoes of Horace's satire gradually drown out the Lucilian references. The focus is on Horace's own work as he uses Davus to anticipate some of the accusations he could face over his poetry.

Davus opens his speech with a reference to how he has now been listening for a long time and, given that he will go on to echo so many of the poems in *Satires* Books 1 and 2, I would agree with Evans' analysis that Davus' comment suggests that the slave is supposed to have heard all of Horace's poems so far.[186] Davus begins with an attack on inconsistency (2.7.6-20), recalling Horace's discussion of the same fault in 1.3.1-75. In Davus' description of how Horace would decline a god's offer to change his circumstances (2.7.22-27), he echoes the same idea from 1.1.15-22. The town and country contrast that Davus discusses repeats Horace's description of his rural retreat and city life in 2.6, while the different styles of dining and Horace's perceived subservience to Maecenas have also been mentioned before (2.2, 2.4 on dining and 1.6, 1.9, 2.3 on Maecenas). Davus' outburst continues with yet more themes borrowed from, and alluding to, Horace's earlier poems – his discussions on gluttony and adultery, as well as Horace's use of his leisure time and his freedom (or apparent lack of it), all have precedents in previous poems in *Satires* 1 and 2. Horace puts into Davus' mouth a speech that gathers up the thematic threads of the poems which have gone before, and brings them together, as he nears the end of Book 2 in "a sort of summary statement of Horatian satire...not at all unsuitable as one of the final poems within the collection".[187] The content of Horace's earlier poems therefore appears to be the

---

[181] Evans 1978: 307.
[182] Muecke 1993: 212-13.
[183] Rudd 1966: 194.
[184] Evans 1978: 308.
[185] Fiske 1920: 408.
[186] Evans 1978: 309-10.
[187] Evans 1978: 312.

strongest intertext or intratext regarding 2.7; however, this does not mean there are not any similarities to Lucilius' work in the poem.

One of the examples Davus uses to show how masters and slaves are not really so different after all is in the admiration of art. Davus claims that Horace is hailed a connoisseur for his appreciation of works by the fourth-century Greek painter Pausias, yet he himself is derided for his admiration of pictures of gladiators (2.7.95-101). One of the fighters Davus names is Pacideianus (2.7.97), who can also be found in the fragments of Lucilius. The lines by Lucilius (also mentioned earlier) may perhaps have held particular interest for Horace, because they describe a show put on for the people by the Flacci.[188]

> *Aeserninus fuit Flaccorum munere quidam*
> *Samnis, spurcus homo, vita illa dignus locoque.*
> *Cum Pacideiano conponitur, optimus multo*
> *post homines natos gladiator qui fuit unus.*

> A certain Aeserninus was in the games given by the Flacci,
> A Samnite, a shameful man, worthy of that life and position.
> He was put with Pacideianus, who was by far
> The single best gladiator since men were born.   172-5

Horace's decision to make Davus mention this gladiator in particular may well have been influenced by the link to his family's name. However, it could be argued that Pacideianus was perhaps a well-known fighter and this particular bout was still spoken of in the Rome of Horace's day. Cicero compares himself to Pacideianus in a letter to his brother Quintus, where he also refers to Aeserninus, the same Samnite opponent who is mentioned by Lucilius.[189] Therefore, the connection with Lucilius may not be as strong as it appears at first sight.

Fiske argues that there are more similarities to be found with Lucilius in Horace's discussion of love as a type of slavery, claiming that his handling of the idea "seems to

---

[188] See p000.
[189] Cic. *Q.fr*. 3.4.2 "I should seem like Pacideianus matched with Samnite Aeserninus" (*cum Aesernino Samnite Pacideianus comparatus viderer*).

depend on the Lucilian treatment of this same theme",[190] a suggestion I find rather far-fetched. However, it could be argued that there is a similarity between Horace's lines 48-50 and Lucilius 361, where *clunibus* also appears, as well as in 302.

> *sub clara nuda lucerna*
> *quaecumque excepit turgentis uerbera caudae*
> *clunibus aut agitavit equum lascivia supinum*

> Whoever, naked under the bright light,
> Has received the strokes of my swollen tail,
> Or has wantonly ridden me with her buttocks like a horse as I lie back
>
> 2.3.48-50

> *Crisabit ut si frumentum clunibus uannat*
> She'll jerk like she's winnowing grain with her buttocks.   361

> *hunc molere, illam autem ut frumentum uannere lumbis*
> He grinds, but she winnows with her loins as if it were corn   302

In both fragments the lovers' actions are compared to the movements involved in winnowing grain, which suggests a jerking, up-and-down motion, and this could in turn imply a similar sexual position to the one described by Horace. Muecke points out that this was seen as "an act of perversity and immodesty",[191] and Adams describes the position as being "regarded as slightly abnormal and one which a woman would only concede as a special favour".[192] Horace's description of this sexual behaviour does not contain the same emphasis on agricultural imagery as is found in Lucilius, but he may still have found inspiration for the scene in his predecessor. However, if this position was generally regarded as something particularly unusual for a woman to adopt or as something only

---

[190] Fiske 1920: 407.
[191] Muecke 1993: 220.
[192] Adams 1982: 165.

agreed to as a favour, then it would make sense for Davus to use it as an example of the sexual freedom he is able to enjoy and the lack of restrictions imposed on his pleasure.

During his speech, Davus does not show the same long, rambling and more Lucilian style of Damasippus, and this is perhaps to be expected. As Horace's slave, it makes sense for him to be familiar with Horace's own works, given, as he points out at the start of the poem, the amount of time he has spent listening to the poet. A familiarity with, and admiration for, Lucilius would be rather more unbelievable in Davus than in Damasippus. Furthermore, a second lengthy lecture in exactly the same style would also risk boring Horace's readers and waste the chance to show more variety in his book. While 2.3 serves to reinforce Horace's place as Rome's leading satirist, 2.7 has a different role to play. Coming near the end of the book, I would agree with Evans' suggestion[193] that it works as a summing up of Horace's previous work. Evans also argues that Horace could be "announcing his intentions to leave the Roman literary genre which he had inherited from Lucilius and had already transformed".[194] With this poem, Horace uses Davus to deliver a synopsis of his *Satires* before the final feast which will be served up to the reader in 2.8.

Satire 2.8

In the final poem of his second book, Horace again chooses the theme of food and feasting as the framework for his satire. However, in addition to working as one of a string of satires involving dining, Satire 2.8 has another important role to play as the poem that finishes Horace's second and final book of *Satires*. The reader would perhaps expect to find some sort of wrapping-up or closure, where the satirical threads of the previous poems are gathered up, as Horace brings his *Satires* to an end. The poem does indeed include both frequent references to what has gone before and reminders of themes and ideas that Horace has repeatedly returned to. Furthermore, I would argue that the poet himself has an extra role in 2.8, aside from the lines he attributes to himself in the conversation with Fundanius. The host Nasidienus contains many echoes of Horace himself, who has presented his readers with a varied and carefully chosen menu and now anxiously awaits their reaction. While Nasidienus is perhaps not intended to be a direct representation of the poet, I would agree with Gowers' description of him as "a transformation of Horace".[195] The poet takes his place as the father of the satiric feast, while he prepares for his audience's final reaction, just like Nasidienus presiding over his banquet.

---

[193] Evans 1978: 312.
[194] Evans 1978: 312.
[195] Gowers 1993: 167.

The identity of Nasidienus has been the subject of some debate, with Fiske seeing a Lucilian influence on the character's creation. Fiske tentatively suggests that Book 20 of Lucilius could perhaps have been Horace's model for 2.8, in which a banquet given by the auctioneer Granius is described.[196] Fiske argues that Lucilius' Granius is an "appropriate companion" to Horace's Nasidienus in terms of his social position, but also points to how Granius is distinguished from Horace's host through his "clever and overpowering wit".[197] Fiske also points to the "inept and stupid host" Gallonius, who features elsewhere in Lucilius (200-7), and is mentioned by Horace at 2.2.46-8, as another possible inspiration for the portrayal of Nasidienus, describing him as "in some respects closer to Nasidienus than the witty Granius" and pointing to the similarity between Horace's "unhappy riches" (*divitias miseras* 2.8.18) and the description of Gallonius as unhappy (*es homo miser*, Lucil. 203).[198] Evidence for a direct link between Nasidienus and Granius however appears to be weak, and Rudd argues that there is only a "superficial likeness" between the "humourless ass" who hosts Horace's dinner and the auctioneer in Lucilius who was "renowned for his agile wit".[199] Rudd also dismisses Shero's suggestion that Nasidienus' dinner is "a *contaminatio* of the picture of lavish entertainment at Granius' dinner-party with a picture of meanness and bad taste in connection with a dinner party which occurred elsewhere in the satires of Lucilius, perhaps in Book 14".[200] For this to be correct, argues Rudd, there would need to be evidence of Nasidienus' stinginess and no such suggestion is made in 2.8.[201] Although Lucilius' satires do include less than perfect hosts, I would argue that Horace's main inspiration for Nasidienus was not drawn from his predecessor's banquet poems. Instead, I would agree with Gowers' description of Nasidienus as a version of the satirist himself, where he is presiding over a banquet where the "food served...must somehow be representing the satirical product that is being sampled".[202] The feast is as much about serving up satire as it is about food and many of the ostensibly culinary references also contain a distinct literary flavour.

---

[196] Fiske 1920: 408.
[197] Fiske 1920: 409.
[198] Fiske 1920:411.
[199] Rudd 1966: 215.
[200] Shero 1923: 129-30.
[201] Rudd 1966: 216.
[202] Gowers 1993: 170. The similarities between Nasidienus' choice of food and the style of eating recommended by Catius from 2.4 have also been noted, for example by Rudd (1966: 220) and O'Connor (1990: 24-5). Calston (1997: 239) points to a potential link between Nasidienus and Catius through the use of *beatae* as the final word of 2.4 and in the first line of 2.8. Berg (1995: 149) also points to the suggestion by Pseudo-Acron that Nasidienus and Catius are the same person, noting at 2.8.1 *Quaerit nunc a Fundanio amico suo poeta, quemadmodum eum Nasidieni iuverit cena, quem praecepta cenae dedisse superius Catius demonstravit, et quidem sine nomine. Nam hoc ex sequentibus apparet, quod idem sit Nasidienus Epicureus.*

Horace begins his description of the meal by calling Nasidienus *beatus*, a word which can mean both happy and rich.[203] Whether the host fits both these descriptions the reader will decide for themselves as the account of Nasidienus' meal is revealed. Fundanius begins his description of the meal, and his acerbic observations are "typical of a satirist",[204] as he takes obvious delight in detailing the dishes and disasters that make up the meal. Fundanius is mentioned as a comic poet in *S.* 1.10.42, forming a link to Horace's previous book.[205] He starts by relating how a boar was served surrounded by a selection of sharp things, then goes on to describe how this meal was cleared away. I would argue that in this opening to the dinner there is also a deliberate allusion to Lucilius. Gowers describes the dish as one that "seems designed to excite hostility" and observes that the sharpness of flavours and the ferocity of the boar "cannot fail to remind us of the dangers of satirical acerbity".[206] I would add that the ferocity and the acerbity of the dish are designed to reflect Lucilius' own ferocity in his satire. But with the clearing away of what is sharp (*acria* 2.8.7) and could cause offence (*quodque | posset cenantis offendere* 2.8.12-13), Horace sweeps away the Lucilian aspects of satire to replace them with his own more palatable offerings. Taken on its own, the image of something being removed is not enough to provide evidence that it is a particularly Lucilian feature of satirical composition that is being taken away. However, I would argue that Horace includes a deliberate hint of his satiric predecessor with his description of a slave wiping down the table, where he uses a phrase that bears a striking similarity to one found in a fragment of Lucilius.

Gausape purpureo mensam pertersit

He wiped the table thoroughly with a purple cloth

Hor. *S.* 2.8.11

Purpureo tersit tunc latas gausape mensas

Then he wiped the wide tables with a purple cloth

Lucil. 598

---

[203] *O.L.D.* s.v. 1 and 3. Mankin (1995: 65) points to Horace's "great interest" in the difference between the two meanings of *beatus* in his discussion of the first line of *Epode* 2.
[204] Gowers 1993: 167.
[205] Caston (1997) points to Fundanius' status as a comic poet as evidence of the poem's particularly strong links to comedy.
[206] Gowers 1993: 170-1.

The similarities between the two lines are obvious. Both writers employ *gausape* to describe the woollen cloth used to clean the table. In each case, the cloths are also the same colour, with both described as *purpureus*. However, there are also some differences in the descriptions of the scene. Lucilius' line includes more detail of the tables (plural in his case unlike the singular noun used by Horace) by calling them wide. And although both writers choose a form of *tergeo* for the wiping action of the slave, Horace uses the intensified *pertergeo* instead. Rudd states that Lucilius' line "leads at once to a comparison" with that of Horace[207] and Baker suggests that the "obvious echo" gives a "Lucilian perspective" to the dinner.[208] Shero argues that, through their use of the lines, both poets are "holding up the use of purple cloths as a piece of unusual and unnecessary extravagance".[209] The idea of extravagance is perhaps more prominent in Lucilius than in Horace, because the adjective *purpureo* occurs at the beginning of the line and before the noun it accompanies. In spite of these differences, however, I would argue that Horace deliberately uses this line to bring Lucilius to his readers' minds to enable him to make a point about the position of his own book of *Satires* and his literary identity as composer of satirical poetry.

Shortly after this very Lucilian phrase, Horace describes how a slave removes anything that could cause offence to the diners. Since this comes so soon after an echo of Lucilius, I would suggest that Horace hoped that his reader would have Lucilius in mind and connect his poetry to what is now being taken away. Horace begins the poem that will finish his new form of satire with a sweeping away of what has gone before and what is now of no use (*inutile* 2.8.12). Lucilius' satire must be removed to make way for Horace's more palatable poetry. By deliberately echoing Lucilius' lines, Horace delivers a strong hint to the reader about exactly what must be taken away before his own satiric dish can be presented and appreciated. The mention of Maecenas also strengthens the idea that it is Horace's own poetry that is now being offered. The poet has already shown other characters in previous poems who have been mocking him for being too eager to please his powerful patron (2.3.311-12; 2.6.30-31). Nasidienus' offer of a selection of fine wines for Maecenas to choose from fits with the idea of Horace striving also to provide him with what is most suited to his taste poetically. Now that Lucilius' style of poetry has been cleared away, Maecenas is urged to make the most of what Horace has to offer.

Horace then asks Fundanius to tell him with whom he was dining, and the list of fellow guests is another clue that the dinner has as much to do with Horace as with Nasidienus.

---

[207] Rudd 1966: 215.
[208] Baker 1988: 218.
[209] Shero 1923: 129.

Gathered at the table is an assortment of characters, both real and imagined, who have appeared throughout Horace's poems. Representing his poetic friends and the people he wishes to impress are Fundanius, Viscus, Varius and, of course, Maecenas. But the targets of his previous poems are also at the feast to give his satires a final send-off, some identifiable by their names and others by their characters. The playboy Nomentanus has already appeared several times throughout Horace's *Satires*[210] and is a name which, as discussed previously, is also found in Lucilius.[211] The Nomentanus presented by Horace is a spendthrift who is described squandering his inheritance on feasting and luxuries in 2.3. The mention of Nomentanus in Lucilius is in relation to a court case, where there appears to be no reference to his spending habits or characterisation of him as one who has wasted his wealth (Lucil. 80-1, 82). The other characters named by Horace are either real people, such as the poet's literary friends, or are presented as identifiable types who can be found in contemporary society. If the reader is supposed to see Nomentanus as the same character who appears in Lucilius, it would seem strange to resurrect someone who must have been dead for many years and introduce him to a feast where the other guests are contemporaries of the poet. Horace may be using a character with the same name as one found in Lucilius, but evidence for a direct link between the two Nomentani seems weak in this instance.

As Fundanius recalls the seating arrangements for the dinner, he uses the phrase "if I remember" (*si memini* 2.8.21). The idea of casting the mind back fits with 2.8's role as a poem which looks back over all of Horace's satires and references what has gone before. Fundanius' mention of memory reminds the reader to remember as well. Just as Fundanius recalls that Varius, Viscus and Maecenas were at the dinner of Nasidienus, so the reader should remember them from their previous appearances in Horace's poems.[212] As well as Nomentanus, the reader will also have met the buffoon, the glutton and the parasitic hanger-on who now reappear in this final poem. It is perhaps interesting that it is Nomentanus, who has featured in Horace's previous poems more often than the others, who is given the role of pointing out what might otherwise have been missed (2.8.25-6). Horace uses a character he has repeatedly referred to throughout his poems to draw attention to what is happening now, emphasising the link between the dinner and what has

---

[210] 1.1.102; 1.8.11; 2.1.22; 2.3.224.
[211] See p45, 93,157, 159 and 179.
[212] Varius appears on the journey to Brundisium at 1.5.40 before leaving at 1.5.93, he recommends Horace to Maecenas at 1.6.55, he is paired with Viscus in the pest's discussion at 1.9.22, is praised for his skills in epic at 1.10.44 and, along with Viscus and his brother at 1.10.83, is included in Horace's ideal audience at 1.10.81. Maecenas appears frequently in the *Satires* and is mentioned specifically by name at 1.1.1, 1.3.64, 1.5.27, 1.5.48, 1.6.1, 1.6.47, 1.9.43, 1.10.81, 2.3.312, 2.6.31, 2.6.41, 2.8.16 and 2.8.22.

gone before. Freudenburg argues that Nasidienus' dishes "resemble intricate literary productions in being painstakingly arranged and so sophisticated that they require immediate, exhaustive commentary from someone in the know".[213] Like Nomentanus highlighting the otherwise hidden intricacies of the meal, by using the image of hard-to-please guests and the effort of producing a dinner which will be admired, so Horace amusingly points out the perils of being a poet that his audience may otherwise have not considered.

Nasidienus is at pains to present his guests with something that has never been seen before, and Fundanius comments on how he sampled a fish with an unfamiliar taste (*piscis | longe dissimilem noto celantia sucum* 2.8.27-8). The focus on presenting something seemingly familiar (in this case the fish) but in a different and new way again ties in with Horace's presentation of his own work. The word used to describe this novel taste is *sucus,* which can also be used to refer to the vitality of people and in particular with reference to style.[214] Horace's audience may be familiar with satire in its Lucilian form, but his attempt at the genre will show them something updated and reworked. This difference between Horace's style and that of Lucilius can perhaps be seen again a few lines later.

As the guests prepare to drink their host into ruin, the caterer fears that their intoxication will result in them being rather too free with abuse (*nil sic metuentis ut acris | potores, uel quod maledicunt liberius* 2.8.36-7). It is the targets of his previous satires, the bad-mannered *scurrae*, who lead the way in indulging in this impolite behaviour, living up to Horace's previous presentation of them. The loose-tongued and licentious style of the vengeful boozers is perhaps the characterisation Horace would identify with Lucilius and the bad-mannered banquet guests of 1.4. Just as the host does not want this tone at his dinner, so Horace takes care to avoid it in his satire. Another hint that the description refers to poetry as well as to dining and drinking habits can perhaps be found in the following line, where the host's second fear is that too much wine can dull a subtle palate (*feruida quod subtile exsurdant uina palatum* 2.8.38). Gowers argues that, as well as describing the ability to appreciate the flavour of food, it is "another word that can be used metaphorically of critical discrimination".[215] An audience of drunken revellers will not be able to appreciate properly Horace's subtle style of poetry.

---

[213] Freudenburg 1995: 218.
[214] *OLD*, s.v. 3c The word *sucus* is also found in Lucilius, where he uses it to describe the vitality in a woman's delicate upper arm (*tamen tenero manet cui sucus lacerto* 168).
[215] Gowers 1993: 149.

With the presentation of the fish course comes another recipe for sauce which, like in 2.4, can also be read as a recipe for satire. Again, Horace prescribes variety and just the right amount of sharpness in his mixture, and there are echoes of the *ius* found in 2.4 with the mention of Venafran oil. The white pepper this recipe calls for could be seen as the opposite of the black salt, with its additional meaning of a particular type of wit, which has previously featured at 2.4.74. Once more there is emphasis on the novelty of the dish and its inventor (*erucas uiridis, inulas ego primus amaras | monstravi incoquere* 2.8.51-2). *Amarus* can be used to refer to a bitter taste or particularly biting words, as Horace himself uses it in 1.7.7 (*sermonis amari*).[216] Like Horace showing he knows how to deal with the caustic words of Lucilius, the clever chef comes up with a new way to treat bitter ingredients. Muecke claims that the speech "displays the gourmet host's obsessive desire to produce something unique to his own table",[217] and it could be argued that this is Horace's position in relation to his satire and his desire to produce a new and updated form of the Lucilian genre.

Despite the conscientious host's careful preparations, disaster soon strikes as tapestries come tumbling down, throwing up clouds of dust around the dazed diners (2.8.54-6). But while Nasidienus holds his head in his hands in despair, Nomentanus is on hand to lift his spirits. He delivers a speech on the vagaries of fortune before Balatro describes the trials and troubles of a host trying to please his guests. Their reassuring words appear at first glance to refer to the effort required in staging a dinner, but there is a subtext to their speeches that applies not only to the host of a banquet but also to the satirist who strives to entertain with his poetry. The hints that this is as much about satire as it is about satisfying guests begins with Nomentanus' words on how Fortune enjoys playing with human affairs (*semper gaudes illudere rebus | humanis* 2.8.62-3). This is one of the things that Horace has been doing throughout his *Satires*, using his poetry to amuse himself and his readers as he plays with and pokes fun at human life. He has turned his satire on human concerns ranging from love and sex (1.2.37-134, 2.3.247-75, 2.7.46-71) to the accumulation and use of money (1.1.38-119, 2.3.82-246), as well as basic needs such as eating (2.7.29-45, 2.7.102-111 and the main topic of 2.2, 2.4 and 2.8). Just as Fortune finds fun in human matters, so Horace has used them to provide amusement throughout his poems, following his principle of using laughter to talk about the truth (*quamquam ridentem dicere uerum | quid uetat* 1.1.24).

---

[216] *O.L.D.* s.v. 1, 5b.
[217] Muecke 1993: 236.

As Balatro picks up the thread from Nomentanus, he sympathises by stating that effort is never rewarded with the corresponding amount of fame (*responsura tuo numquam est par fama labori* 2.8.66), an idea that again echoes Horace's attitudes towards his own poetry, particularly in relation to Lucilius and his work. One of the major failings Horace has highlighted in Lucilius' work is the lack of effort he put into his poetry (1.4.12-3) while stressing the care he himself takes over his own repeatedly reworked compositions (1.10.72-4). Horace has also pointed to the small audience his own work attracts (1.4.22-3; 1.4.71-4; 1.10.74) and presents his own fame as modest, with only a limited reach. The anxiety that Balatro claims plagues the host can also be seen in Horace's presentation of his poetry and his eagerness to please his audience – an audience which is also present at Nasidienus' dinner in the form of Maecenas and Horace's literary friends (1.10.81-91). Just like in Balatro's speech, the effort Horace portrays himself as putting in does not reap the reward of widespread fame. This may not accurately reflect the actual success of Horace as a poet; however, it does reflect the humble and modest presentation of himself and his fame in his *Satires*.

In the final lines of his consolation of Nasidienus, Balatro describes how the host's genius is only truly revealed in adverse circumstances and stays hidden in favourable times (*sed coniuuatoris, uti ducis, ingenium res | aduersae nudare solent, celare secundae* 2.8.73-4). Once more, I would argue that the same reasoning could well be applied to the work of the satirist. When things are favourable and as they should be, then there is no need for the censorious poet to wield his pen. However, when the satirist feels forced into action by the faults found in the society that surrounds him, then his talent can be revealed in the swipes he takes at these perceived failings.

The banquet now descends into mocking laughter as the guests prepare to deliver the ultimate insult to their host by fleeing. Horace gleefully asks Fundanius to tell him what the guests laughed at, describing the events so far as shows or games (*ludos* 2.8.79). This could be seen as another reference to satire itself, *as ludus* is a word Lucilius uses to refer to his compositions (1039). Horace appears to take delight in the mockery Fundanius tells him about, and by drawing out more details of the disastrous dinner Horace "assumes the role of the treacherous fellow poet of 1.9.65-66".[218] However, the fact that Horace himself was not one of the laughing guests and the way he has distanced himself in this way from the dinner could also be seen as a reflection of his views on satire. In 1.4, Horace has used the image of badly behaved guests at a dinner party as an example of nastiness and unkind

---

[218] Baker 1988: 227.

wit (1.4.85-91). This is the sort of humour that he insists will not be found in his own satire, as he steers away from the "ink of the black cuttlefish" (*nigrae sucus lolliginis* 1.4.100), described with the culinary-sounding *sucus*. In 2.8, Horace can now prove this point. He is not one of the guests laughing into their napkins at the host; instead he can be identified more with Nasidienus than with the diners.

The idea that it is Horace himself who is being targeted also fits with the poet's presentation of himself throughout his second book of poems. He has already been branded mad by Damasippus (2.3) and lectured at on double standards by Davus (2.7). Lucilius may have scoured the city with his wit (1.10.3-4), but in Horace's final poems the person who most often faces satire's sting is the satirist himself. With this presentation of himself, Horace finally reveals to the reader that they cannot take seriously the bold and defiant vows of retribution through poetry that he made in the opening poem of the book. He began with the assertion that he would follow in Lucilius' footsteps and use savage satire to take revenge on anyone who dared to slight him (2.1.44-6), holding up his predecessor's audacity as an example (2.1.62-70). But throughout the book, Horace has gradually undercut these claims by allowing his characters to turn on him instead. The culmination of this is seen in 2.8, where the reader is led to associate Horace with the host Nasidienus, rather than with those who describe themselves as taking their revenge on him (2.8.34, 2.8.93). Through this, Horace can prove his differences from Lucilius, whatever he may have claimed in the opening poem.

While the mentions of Lucilius in Horace's earlier book focused more on his technical skill as a poet, here the emphasis appears to be more on his spirit. By the end of the second book, Horace has demonstrated his difference from his predecessor in both of these areas. The only people taking their revenge are the guests leaving both Nasidienus' feast and Horace's *Satires*. After setting himself up as someone who will not be slow in striking back, Horace has shown the reader that they were wrong to trust his apparent stance in 2.1. To complete the undermining of this position, Horace finishes his poems not, as first promised, as an avenger, but instead as the person upon whom others take their revenge as the guests flee satire's feast. Just as in the *Epodes*, Horace presents himself in a position of powerlessness in the face of the actions of others.

It could be argued that, if Nasidienus is indeed a "transformation of Horace"[219] and the banquet does share features with Horace's poetry, then perhaps the guests would be

---

[219] Gowers 1993: 167.

expected to stay and enjoy the meal, with their enjoyment of it a sign that the era of Lucilius' nasty invective is over for good and the audience can now appreciate Horace's new approach to satire instead. However, I would argue that the guests' rejection of what has been put before them is part of Horace's presentation of the difference between his poetry and what has gone before and the benefits he sees for those who appreciate his work. Horace has previously compared the contented man who has reached the end of a happy life to a satisfied dinner guest who has eaten well (*inde fit ut raro qui se uixisse beatum | dicat et exacto contentus tempore uita | cedat uti conuiua satur reperire queamus* 1.1.117-19). This is the opposite of the diners at Nasidienus' (and Horace's) banquet. They rush to leave without tasting anything which has been offered to them (*nihil omnino gustaremus* 2.8.94) and, if the dishes served up do reflect Horace's own satire, then the escaping guests miss out on more than just a meal. By fleeing without appreciating what Horace has offered them in the form of his new and updated satire, they are denying themselves the chance of learning from the examples Horace has presented to them throughout his *Satires*. Without tasting what he has to offer, they cannot be like the rare *beatus* man (whose description also includes the adjective used at the beginning of 2.8 to refer to Nasidienus) who reaches the end of his days contented to be leaving life's feast.

After Horace's prompting, Fundanius then reveals the final delights served up by their eager-to-please host Nasidienus. In Fundanius' reply to Horace, I would argue that there is perhaps another hint that the host is meant to be identified with the poet himself. Fundanius addresses Nasidienus directly when he describes how he returns to the dinner with a changed expression (*Nasidiene, redis mutatae frontis* 2.8.84), and this use of a vocative and of a second-person-singular verb so soon after Horace's contribution to the conversation suggests that Fundanius could be addressing not only Nasidienus but also Horace himself. The description of the changed appearance could also apply to Horace as well if Nasidienus is intended to be a version of the poet. The following line too could be used to describe what Horace has managed to do by improving his own fortune through his skill as a poet (*ut arte | emendaturus fortunam* 2.8.84-5). A selection of dismembered dishes - a crane's disjointed limbs (2.8.86-7), the detached wings of a hare (2.8.89) and carefully removed cuts of blackbirds and wood pigeons (2.8.90-1) – is then served up to the guests, bringing with it an image from Horace's earlier poems. The liberal sprinkling of salt (*sale multo* 2.8.87) again hints at satire's wit, and, as Gowers argues, "the cook or host,

for so long a parallel for the poet, fulfils Horace's joking prophecy in another context: *invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae* (1.4.62)".[220]

As tasty and tempting as the latest dishes may appear to be, the detailed descriptions leave a bad taste in the guests' mouths and they decide to flee the dinner, taking revenge on their host by tasting nothing at all. It is unlikely to be a coincidence that the diners leave at the same time as Horace's readers, who have now come to the end of his *Satires*. Nasidienus' detailed description of the dishes "caricatures Horace's own programmatic writings and brings about the end of Book 2 with the premature departure of the guests".[221] With the guests' departure, and a final look back to one of his previous poems with a mention of the witch Canidia (1.8), Horace brings both Book 2 and the whole collection of his *Satires* to an abrupt close. Hooley describes Horace's final poem as "Horace's signing off from satire", where "he presents satire's mixed plate so egregiously overdone that the only sane reaction is to walk away coldly".[222]

But as well as closing the book, Horace's final line provides a link to his previous collection of *Satires* as well as his *Epodes* through the mention of the witch Canidia. The same terrifying hag who closes the *Epodes* and who has plagued Priapus in 1.8 returns again with the image of her breathing poison on the dishes. Her surprise reappearance echoes the description of her as a poisoner in 2.1.4 as well as her ability to ruin food in *Epod*. 3.7-8. I would agree with Carrubba's suggestion that Canidia's sudden return at the end of the poem – and the book – is designed to remind the reader of *Satires* 1 and 2 and of the *Epodes*.[223] She closes the book just as she closed the collection of *Epodes* while at the same time providing a link to *S*. 1.8. The inclusion of Canidia, who plays such a prominent role in the *Epodes*, links Horace's three collections of poems as he signs off from satire. Freudenburg argues that there is a "quasi-magical, incantational quality" to Nasidienus' feast, where recipes can be read as love-spells for winning over the diners.[224] As well as highlighting the possible magical subtext to Nasidienus' feast, which culminates in the appearance of Canidia, Freudenburg also draws attention to the similarity between Horace and his own scapegoats.[225] In this case, there are parallels between Horace and Nasidienus but I would also argue that this is extended to Horace's unnamed target in *Epod*. 4. The

---

[220] Gowers 1993: 178.
[221] Gowers 1993: 170.
[222] Hooley 2007: 82-3.
[223] Carrubba 1969: 42-43.
[224] Freudenburg 1995: 209.
[225] Freudenburg 1995: 217.

echoes of Horace in the epode provide a precedent for a target in Horace's poetry sharing unflattering similarities with the poet himself.

Horace's final poem acts as a summary of what has gone before, where ideas, characters and themes from the previous poems appear on the satiric stage one last time. Moderation, the theme which has permeated so many of Horace's poems, is reflected in the correct balance of ingredients needed and "the dishes live up to the two criticisms levelled against Horace's work at the start of 2.1: that he was either *nimis acer* or *sine nervis*".[226] Food, like life and like satire itself, must have the right balance. The distinction between Horace's form of satire and what has gone before is echoed in the emphasis on the novelty of the chef's creations. Like Horace, Nasidienus' cook is presenting people with something different and unlike what they have had before. Horace's presentation of himself as an outsider can also be seen in 2.8 with the description of a dinner he was not invited to. Horace has previously stressed the modesty of his own fame and refused to reveal the secrets of his powerful friends. He takes the same position here, where it is Fundanius who is describing the behaviour of the literary-minded guests at the dinner.

Throughout the second book of poems, Horace has played with the shared language of food and satire to say as much about his writing as about dining itself. He draws his predecessor Lucilius to mind straight away in the opening poem, making sure that, as he continues to explore the theme of writing satire, the earlier poet is always in mind. Horace begins his final poem by sweeping away the useless and outdated work of Lucilius, only for his own readers to desert him at the close of the poem. As his audience, in the form of Nasidienus' guests, leave, Horace shows that he is following his own advice on moderation and knows when to bring his work to a close. The speed of the guests' departure mirrors the haste found in the ending of Horace's first book, where he demands his words are quickly written down as he signs off (*i puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello* 1.10.92).

The open ending creates a sense of "satire's moral ambivalence",[227] where Horace holds back from summing up his work with instruction or advice for his audience. While "for Lucilius, the feast is always on; for Horace, subtle, ironic, self-doubting, a thinker, satire's feast begins to cloy".[228] The final poem looks back to the themes and ideas discussed in Horace's first book, but the reader must also bear in mind how this second book began.

---

[226] Gowers 1993: 170.
[227] Muecke 1993: 239.
[228] Hooley 2007: 83.

After opening with bold promises of vengeance and a satiric savaging for anyone who dared to cross him, Horace has sent up his own claims by presenting himself as being on the receiving end of the treatment more usually meted out by the satirist himself. The powerlessness and impotence of the poet presented in the *Epodes* is brought to mind once again, with the unexpected appearance of Canidia in the book's finale providing another reminder of and link to Horace's iambic collection.

The fact that the guests in 2.8 flee the feast, rather than just leave it, makes the undercutting of Horace's original position in 2.1 yet more pronounced and complete. To merely leave would not be as much of an insult to their host as escaping with such a hasty departure. As in so many other places in Horace's satires, the reader is again shown the two extremes that Horace has warned against as he advises moderation. Horace has moved from boldly vowing to not let anyone get away with any sort of insult, to bearing the brunt of attacks by Damasippus and Davus before finally not even giving himself the last word in his own *Satires*. This undercutting of his own apparent original position adds to the humour of his poems and only serves to emphasise the difference between his own work and that of his predecessor. After promising to live up to Lucilius, Horace shows throughout his second book of *Satires* that his intentions are somewhat different to what he has proclaimed. By the time the reader reaches the end of Nasidienus' feast and the final lines of Horace's book, the apparent praise of Lucilius which was found in the first poem can now be seen in a different light. Once again, Horace keeps Lucilius positioned firmly in his readers' mind to say as much about his own poetry and where he has taken satire as he does about the inventor of the genre.

Horace announced his arrival on the literary stage of the Late Republic with three collections that presented both himself and his approach to poetry. He chose genres that had the potential to be politically problematic but by applying the same polish that he used to refine Lucilius' rough edges, he smoothed away anything likely to cause offence. In Book 1 of the *Satires*, Horace introduces his careful approach to both poetry and politics. He updates and adapts the genre of satire by producing a more concise and refined style of poetry than Lucilius' work, which is better suited to the tastes of Horace's own times. Personal attacks on powerful targets are, on the whole, removed and replaced with a celebration of moderation, laughter and friendship. This approach continues in his second book *of Satires*, where Horace brings on stage a cast of characters who deliver ideas that echo those encountered in his earlier work. At the same time, Horace produced his *Epodes*, switching genre from satire to iambic verse. But although the genre has changed, the voice of the poet of the *Satires* can still be recognised throughout the book.

This thesis has shown how Horace's reworking of Lucilian satire in the first book and the persona and position he presents there provide a key backdrop and reference point for Horace's second collection of *Satires* and also for his *Epodes*. As well as standing alone as individual poems and individual collections with their own narratives running through the separate books, the three volumes also engage with each other to create a dialogue that can be traced throughout the trio. The later collections constantly look back to Book 1 through shared subject matter, language and attitudes. Horace's reworking of Lucilian satire provides a foundation that the following two books build on, making each volume more effective through its relationship with the others and adding to the layers of meaning and ambiguity that run through all three collections.

I have restricted my focus to the Lucilian aspect of Horace's *Satires* and to the relationship of the *Epodes* to the satiric collections, but the three books provide countless other avenues of exploration. Each reading of the collections seems both to uncover more possible links between the individual poems that they contain and to suggest more ideas about their arrangement in the books. In the *Epodes*, I have touched only very briefly on the relationship between Horace and his generic predecessors Archilochus and Hipponax. Similarly, in the *Satires,* Lucilius is by no means the only influence on Horace's poems and the echoes of genres such as comedy and mime would make an intriguing starting

point for another analysis of the two books. Horace's later work in the *Epistles* also provides another interesting area for possible further research since it shares its hexameter form and conversational tone with the *Satires*.

As Horace sets out as a satirist in Book 1 he is critical of Lucilius, naming and shaming him for his sloppy style in the fourth and tenth poems of the book. But despite this professed disdain for his predecessor, through echoes of Lucilius' language and through allusions to his work the earlier satirist is a constant presence in Horace's collection. The references to Lucilius, whom Horace credits with the invention of the genre, help to root Horace's poem in the tradition of satire and also call attention to the differences between the two satirists as they highlight the changes Horace has made to the genre. But Horace is not only making a poetic point. He also uses the book to profess his lack of political ambition. This stance is repeatedly emphasised throughout the collection, with details of the difficult diplomatic mission in which Horace is involved overlooked in *S.*1.5 in favour of light-hearted travellers' tales and the celebration of living a simple and private life that appears in *S.*1.6. The poet who was on the wrong side at Philippi now presents himself as having no interest in matters of state or in increasing his own power, despite being friends with Rome's leading men. He can be trusted not to betray his friends' secrets or to turn satire's spotlight where it is not welcome. The genre's notoriously savage attacks on named individuals have been removed by Horace and replaced with generalised swipes at faults and failings and an emphasis on friendship and moderation.

Horace's adaptation and adoption of Lucilius' genre in Book 1 also has a further political aspect, through Lucilius' association with *libertas*. For the earlier satirist, *libertas* meant free speech and the freedom to turn on whomever he chose. But for Horace, it means freedom to live the untroubled, peaceful life he extols in *S.*1.6. Horace not only refashions Lucilius' literary work to make it more suitable for his own day, but also presents a reworked version of his *libertas* that is appropriate for the politically turbulent times in which he is writing. By doing this, Horace shows that it is not only the Republic that preserves and celebrates *libertas* since he too presents *libertas* as still being able to thrive and flourish under the changing power-structure in Rome. The importance of Maecenas is also a key factor in this presentation as Horace places himself and his poetry on the side of his powerful patron. *Libertas* is reclaimed from Republicans and allied with Octavian's supporters instead.

In his second book of *Satires*, Horace uses his first collection to show how far he has come as a satirist and to assert his poetic superiority over Lucilius. No longer is his generic predecessor the main source of allusions and echoes in his satire, instead it is his own work to which Horace repeatedly refers. Even characters who are presented as the sort who would be fans of Lucilius' work, such as Damasippus in 2.3, echo the ideas found in Horace's satiric debut. Horace drowns out Lucilius with references to his own work as he positions himself as Rome's leading satirist. Horace now assumes his audience's familiarity with his own earlier work and begins to put it to good use. A reader who has encountered Horace's criticisms of Lucilius in *S.*1.4 and *S.*1.10 would know better than to take at face value the apparent praise of the poet found in *S.*2.1.

In the *Epodes*, Horace switches from satire to iambic poetry, choosing another genre notorious for its invective and abuse. The reader familiar with *Satires* 1 would perhaps know what to expect as Horace applies the same treatment to the work of Archilochus and Hipponax as he did to Lucilius' poems. Gone are the named attacks that could cause offence, with one of Horace's targets, the posing upstart in *Epod.* 4, looking suspiciously like the poet himself. Throughout the *Epodes*, Horace employs a variety of voices to cover an assortment of subjects spanning sex, sorcery and serious matters of state. But despite the shift in genre and the variety found within the collection, the reader can still recognise the poet of the *Satires* behind the words. Horace uses echoes of the other books to tie all three volumes together. Horace's friendship with Maecenas continues to play a prominent role, along with the consequences of this association. The poet's powerless persona can be recognised, and former foes such as Canidia return to torment him once again. Horace also continues to choose his targets carefully as he keeps clear of named individuals and turns on types with whom no one would wish to identify themselves or defend. Horace's former emphasis on his lack of political ambition also enables him to step forward in the *Epodes* and deliver an address to the citizens of Rome in *Epod.* 7 and 16. His previous position means that he can present himself as being interested only in what is best for Rome and not in furthering his own position.

Viewed as individual poems, the works allow Horace to reveal different sides of his persona, taking on a variety of voices as he switches character and plays different parts. The *Epodes* in particular contain a wide range of voices and styles, from the love-sick lover's lament in 14, through comic anger at a friend's joke in 2, to the bitter ill-wishing of a hated individual setting sail on a sea journey that appears in 10. In the *Satires*, the echoes of Lucilius vary in strength as Horace uses allusions to his predecessor in different ways,

sometimes drawing attention to his style of satire with echoes of the earlier poet's language and at other times drowning him out almost completely with references to his own work instead. The individual poems still work effectively as separate and distinct works, even without knowledge of the rest of the book in which they are contained. But the poems in all three collections are made more effective by their relationship to the other poems in the same book as well as to the poems in the other two volumes.

Taken as individual books, each collection shows another stage in Horace's literary journey. In Book 1, the reader meets Horace the fledgling satirist who works up to the issue of confronting his generic ancestor Lucilius in the fourth poem, reveals his version of one of the earlier satirist's compositions in the following work and continues to use allusions to Lucilius' language to highlight why he is different from the inventor of his genre. Horace closes the book with another swipe at his predecessor and in the final lines of his last poem drops some weighty literary names such as Virgil, Plotius and Varius, to reveal how far he has come.

In the second book, Horace's literary journey has taken him past Lucilius to claim satire's crown. He opens the volume with apparent praise for his predecessor but the compliments are immediately undercut by both the memory of Book 1 and what is to come in Book 2. It is not to Lucilius whom Horace looks as his model, but himself. He draws on his own previous work for references and allusions in his second collection. Just as in the first book he looked back to Lucilius as the major author of his chosen genre, Horace now looks back to his own work to show that he has taken Lucilius' place.

In the *Epodes*, the reader is given glimpses of different parts of the poet's persona than those that are seen in the *Satires*. The political issues Horace carefully sidestepped in the *Satires* are now addressed explicitly, along with less salubrious matters such as Horace's encounters with a lecherous old woman in *Epod.* 8 and 12. Here, Horace summons up the invective expected in iambic verse but applies the same approach as he did with Lucilius' notorious attacks, ensuring that he aims at safe targets rather than at named and recognisable individuals. He builds on the persona already revealed as he repeatedly looks both back to *Satires* 1 and across to *Satires* 2.

Taken altogether as a trio of works, the three books are engaged in a constant dialogue. The links that individual poems share with other poems across the collections weave extra layers into the separate works and provide a sense of continuity and connection throughout the three volumes. Ideas and themes reappear and are explored again, language is echoed

and attitudes return and can be recognised. The three books are tied together to create a trio of works which enhance and echo each other, building on the foundations that began with Horace's refashioning of Lucilian satire. Horace uses his first three literary collections to present himself and his poetry to his readers and the literary scene of Rome, as he projects different sides of the same persona throughout all three collections. Despite working in a potentially problematic political landscape, Horace shows that satiric and iambic poetry can still flourish in the Triumviral period – just as long as there is a suitably skilful poet now wielding the pen.

ADAMS, J.N. (1982) *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London

ADAMS, J.N. (2003*) Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge

ADAMS, J.N. and MAYER, R.G. (eds) (1999) *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford

ANDERSON, W.S. (1956) "Horace the Unwilling Warrior", *AJP* 77: 148-166

ANDERSON, W.S. (1963a) *Pompey, His Friends, and the Literature of the First Century BC*, Berkeley

ANDERSON, W.S. (1963b) "The Roman Socrates: Horace and his *Satires*" in Sullivan (1963) 1-37

ANDERSON, W.S. (1972) "The Form, Purpose and Position of Horace's *Satire* 1.8",

  American Journal of Philology 93: 4-13

ANDERSON, W.S. (1982) *Essays On Roman Satire*, Princeton

ANDERSON, W.S. (1984) "Ironic Preambles and Satiric Self-Determination in Horace *Satire* 2.1", *Pacific Coast Philology* 19: 35-42

ANDERSON, W. S. (2010) "Horace's Friendship: Adaptation of a Circular Argument" in Davis (2010) 34-52

ANDREWS, A.C. (1948) "Oysters as Food in Greece and Rome", *CJ* 43: 299-303

ARENA, V. (2012) *Libertas and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge

ARMSTRONG, D. (1964) "Horace *Satires* 1.1-3: A Structural Study", *Arion* 3: 86-96

BAIN, D. (1986) "Waiting for Varus?", *Latomus* 45: 125-131

BAKER, R.J. (1988) "Maecenas and Horace II.8", *CJ* 83: 212-32

BALDWIN, B. (1970) "Horace on Sex", *AJP* 91: 460-5

BARCHIESI, A. (2001) "Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian" in Cavarzere, Aloni and Barchiesi (2001) 141-164

BARCHIESI, A. (2009) "Final Difficulties in an Iambic Poet's Career: Epode 17" in Lowrie (2009) 232-246

BATHER, P. and STOCKS, C. (eds) (2016) *Horace's Epodes: Context, Intertexts and Reception*, Oxford

BERG, D. (1995-6) "The Mystery Gourmet of Horace's 'Satires 2'", *The Classical Journal* 91: 141-151

BOWIE, E. (2001) "Early Greek Iambic Poetry: The Importance of Narrative" in Cavarzere, Aloni and Barchiesi (2001) 1-27

BRADSHAW, A. (1989) "Horace *in Sabinis*" in Deroux, C. (1989) (Ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History V*, Brussels

BRAUND, S.H. (1988) *Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's third Book of Satires*, Cambridge

BRAUND, S.M. (2004) "Libertas or Licentia? Freedom and Criticism in Roman Satire" in Sluiter and Rosen (2004) 409-428

CARRUBBA, R.W. (1969) *The Epodes of Horace: A Study in Poetic Arrangement*, The Hague

CASTON, R. R. (1997) "The Fall of the Curtain (Horace *S*.2.8)", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127: 233-256

CAVARZERE, A., ALONI, A. and BARCHIESI, A. (eds.) (2001) *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire,* Lanham

CHAHOUD, A. (2004) "The Roman Satirist Speaks Greek", *Classics Ireland* 11:1-46

CHAHOUD, A. (2011) "The Language of Latin Verse Satire" in Clackson, J. (2011) 367-383

CLACKSON, J. (ed.) (2011) *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Blackwell, Malden MA and Oxford

CLACKSON, J. and HORROCKS, G. (2007) *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*, Malden MA and Oxford

CLASSEN, C.J. (1978) "Horace – A Cook?", *CQ* 28: 333-345

CLAYMAN, D.L. (1975) "Horace's Epodes VIII and XII: More Than Clever Obscenity?", *CW* 69: 55-61

COFFEY, M. (1976, reprint 1989) *Roman Satire*, Bristol

COURTNEY, E. (1980) *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London

COURTNEY, E. (1994) "Horace and the Pest", *CJ* 90: 1-8

COURTNEY, E. (2010) "Problems in the Satires of Horace", *Hermathena* 188: 15-27

COURTNEY, E. (2013) "The Two Books of Satires" in Günther (2013) 63-168

CUCCHIARELLI, A. (2001) *La Satira e il poeta: Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones*, Pisa

CUCCHIARELLI, A. (2002) "'Iter satiricum': le voyage à Brindes et la satire d'Horace" *Latomus* 61: 842–51.

CURRAN, L.C. (1970) "Nature, Convention and Obscenity in Horace, *Satires* 1.2", *Arion* 9: 220-245

DAVIS, G. (ed.) (2010) *A Companion to Horace*, Malden

DE MELO, W.D.C. (2007) *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence and Beyond*, Oxford

DE MELO, W.D.C. (2011) "The Language of Roman Comedy" in Clackson (2011) 321-43

DESSEN, C. (1968) "The Sexual and Financial Mean in Horace's *Serm*. 1.2", *AJP* 89:200-8

DICKIE, M. (1983) "The Disavowal of *Invidia* in Roman Iamb and Satire", *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3: 183-208

DUFALLO, B. (2000) "Satis/Satura: Reconsidering the 'Programmatic Intent' of Horace's *Satires* 1.1" *The Classical World* 93: 579-590

DUQUESNAY, I.M. le M. (1984) "Horace and Maecenas" in Woodman and West (1984) 19-58

DUQUESNAY, I.M. le M. (2002) "*Amicus certus in re incerta cernitur*: Epode 1" in Woodman and Feeney (2002) 17-37

EVANS, H.B. (1978) "Horace. Satires 2.7: Saturnalia and Satire", *CJ* 73: 307-312

FARRELL, J. (1992) "Literary Allusion and Cultural Poetics in Virgil's Third Eclogue", *Vergilius* 38: 64-71

FERRISS-HILL, J.L. (2011) "A Stroll with Lucilius: Horace *Satire* 1.9 reconsidered", *American Journal of Philology* 132: 429-455

FERRISS-HILL, J.L. (2015) *Roman Satire and the Old Comic Tradition*, Cambridge

FISKE, G.C. (1920) *Lucilius and Horace. A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*, Madison

FITZGERALD, W. (2009) "Power and Impotence in Horace's Epodes" in Lowrie (2009) 141-159

FLINTOFF, E. (1973) "Lines 116-136 of Horace *Satire* II.2", *Latomus* 32: 814-817

FRAENKEL, E. (1957) *Horace*, Oxford

FREUDENBURG, K. (1993) *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton

FREUDENBURG, K. (1995) "Canidia at the Feast of Nasidienus", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 125: 207-19

FREUDENBURG, K. (1996) "Verse Technique and Moral Extremism in Two Satires of Horace (*Sermones* 2.3 and 2.4)", *CQ 46*: 196-206

FREUDENBURG, K. (2001) *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*, Cambridge

FREUDENBURG, K. (ed.) (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*, Cambridge

GERBER, D.E. (ed.) (1999) *Greek Iambic Poetry*, Cambridge, Mass

GOH, I. (2013) "Trebonius' Allusion to Lucilius (Cic. *Fam* 12.16.3)", *Symbolae Osloenses* 87: 79-89

GOH, I. (2015) "The Campanian Case of Gaius Lucilius; Downtrodden Satire from Suessa Aurunca", *Illinois Classical Studies* 40: 92-120

GOH, I. (2016) "Of Cabbages and Kin: Traces of Lucilius in the First Half of Horace's *Epodes*" in Bather and Stocks (2016) 63-84

GOWERS, E. (1993) *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford

GOWERS, E. (1994) "Horace, *Satire* 1.5: An Inconsequential Journey", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39: 48-66

GOWERS, E. (2002) "Blind Eyes and Cut Throats: Amnesia and Silence in Horace *Satire 1.7*", *Classical Philology* 97: 145-161

GOWERS, E. (2003) "Fragments of Autobiography in Horace *Satires* 1", *CA* 22: 55-91

GOWERS, E. (2005) "The restless companion: Horace, *Satires* 1 and 2" in Freudenburg (2005) 48-61

GOWERS, E. (ed.) (2012) *Horace, Satires Book 1*, Cambridge

GRATWICK, A.S. (1982) "The Satires of Ennius and Lucilius" in Kenney and Clausen (1982, reprint 1995) 156-171

GRIFFIN, J. (1993) "Horace in the Thirties" in Rudd (1993) 1-22

GRUEN, E.S. (1993) *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, London

GÜNTHER, H.C. (ed.) (2013*) Brill's Companion to Horace*, Leiden

GÜNTHER, H.C. (2013a) "Horace's Life and Work" in Günther (2013) 1-62

GÜNTHER, H.C. (2013b) "The Book of *Iambi*" in Günther (2013) 169-210

HABASH, M. (1999) "Priapus: Horace in Disguise?" *CJ* 94: 285-297

HAHN, E.A. (1939) "*Epodes* 5 and 17, *Carmina* 1.116 and 1.117", *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 70: 212-230

HARDIE, P. and MOORE, H. (eds.) (2010) *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception*, Cambridge

HARRISON, S.J. (1989) "Two notes on Horace, Epodes (10, 16)", *CQ* 39: 271-4

HARRISON, S.J. (ed.) (1995) *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford

HARRISON, S.J. (2001) "Some Generic Problems in Horace's Epodes: Or, On (Not) Being Archilochus" in Cavarzere, Aloni and Barchiesi (2001) 165-186

HARRISON, S.J. (ed.) (2007) *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge

HARRISON, S.J. (2010) "There and Back Again: Horace's Poetic Career" in Hardie and Moore (2010) 39-58

HARRISON, S.J. (2013) "Author and Speaker(s) in Horace Satires 2" in Marmodoro and Hill (2013) 153-74

HARRISON, S.J. (2014) *Horace*, Cambridge

HARRISON, G. (1987) "The Confessions of Lucilius (Horace *Sat.* 2.1.30-34): A Defense of Autobiographical Satire?" *CA* 6:38-52

HENDERSON, J. (1993) "Be Alert (Your Country Needs Lerts): Horace, *Satires* 1.9", *PCPS* 39: 67-96

HENDERSON, J. (1994) "On Getting Rid of Kings: Horace, *Satire* 1.7" *CQ* 44: 146-170

HENDERSON, J. (1999) "Horace talks Rough and Dirty: No Comment (Epodes 8 and 12)", *Scholia* 8: 3-16, repr. in Lowrie (2009) 401-417

HIGHET, G. (1954) *Juvenal the Satirist*, Oxford

HINDS, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge

HOLFORD-STREVENS, L. (1988) *Aulus Gellius*, London

HOOLEY, D.M. (2007), *Roman Satire*, Malden

HOUGHTON, L.B.T. (2004) 'The Wolf and the Dog', *CQ* 54: 300-304

INGERSOLL, J.W.D. (1912) "Roman Satire: Its Early Name?", *CP* 7: 59-65

JOHNSON, T.S. (2012) *Horace's Iambic Criticism: Casting Blame (Iambike Poiesis)*, Leiden

KAISER, L.M. (1950) "Lucilius and Galdatorial Repartee", *The Classical Association of the Middle West and South* 45: 187-88

KASTER, R.A. (1995) *Suetonius, De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, Oxford

KENNEY, E.J. and CLAUSEN, W.V. (eds.) (1982, reprint 1995) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, ii, *Latin Literature,* Cambridge

KORFMACHER, W.C. (1935) "Grecizing Lucilian Satire", *CJ* 30: 453-462

LOWRIE, M. (ed.) (2009) *Horace: Odes and Epodes*, Oxford

LYNE, R.O.A.M. (2005) "Structure and Allusion in Horace's Book of 'Epodes'", *The Journal of Roman Studies* 95: 1-19

MacCARY, W.T. and WILLCOCK, M.M. (eds.) (1976) *Plautus: Casina*, Cambridge

MANKIN, D. (1987) "Lucilius and Archilochus: Fragment 698 (Marx)", *AJP* 108: 405-8

MANKIN, D. (1988) "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue", *Hermes* 116: 63-76

MANKIN, D. (1995) *Horace, Epodes*, Cambridge

MANKIN, D. (2010) "The Epodes: Genre, Themes and Arrangement" in Davis (2010) 93-104

MANNING, C.E. (1970) "Canidia in the Epodes of Horace", *Mnemosyne* 23: 393-408

MANUWALD, G. (ed.) (2001) *Der Satiriker Lucilius und Seine Zeit*, Munich

MARMODORO, A. and HILL, J. (eds.) (2013) *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, Oxford

MARIOTTI, I. (1960, reprint 1969) *Studii Luciliani*, Florence

MARX, F. (1905) *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquae*, Leipzig

MAYER. R. (2005) 'Sleeping with the enemy: satire and philosophy' in Freudenburg (2005) 146-59

MORRISON, A.D. (2016) "Horace and the Greek Iambic Tradition" in Bather and Stocks (2016) 31-62

MUECKE, F. (ed.) (1993) *Horace Satires II*, Warminster

MUECKE, F. (1995) "Law, Rhetoric and Genre in Horace *Satires* 2.1" in Harrison (1995) 203-218

MUECKE, F. (2007) "The Satires" in Harrison (2007) 105-120

NILSSON, N. (1952) *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz*, Uppsala

NISBET, R.G.M. (1984) "Horace's Epodes and History" in Woodman and West (1984) 1-18

O'CONNOR, J.F. (1990) "Horace's '*Cena Nasidieni*' and Poetry's Feast", *CJ* 86: 23-34

OLIENSIS, E.S. (1991) "Canidia, Canicula and the Decorum of Horace's Epodes", *Arethusa* 24: 107-38, repr. Lowrie (2009) 160-188

OLIENSIS, E. S. (1998) *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge

PANAYOTAKIS, C. (2010) *Decimus Laberius: The Fragments*, Cambridge

PETERSMANN, H. (1999) "The Language of Early Roman Satire" in Adams and Mayer (1999) 289-310

PLAZA, M. (2006) *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse Satire*, Oxford

PORTER, D.H. (1995) "*Quo, Quo Scelesti Ruitus*: The Downward Momentum of Horace's Epodes", *Illinois Classical Studies* 20: 107-130

POWELL, J.G.F. (1999) "Stylistic Register in Juvenal" in Adams and Mayer (1999) 311-334

PUELMA PIWONKA, M. (1978) *Lucilius und Kallimachos*, New York and London

RICHLIN, A. (1983), *The Garden of Priapus*, New Haven

RICHLIN, A. (1984) "Invective Against Women in Roman Satire", *Arethusa* 17:. 67-80

ROSEN,R.M. (2007) *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*, Oxford

ROTSTEIN, A. (2010) *The Idea of Iambos*, Oxford

RUDD, N. (1961*a*) "Horace's Encounter with the Bore", *Phoenix* 15: 79-96

RUDD, N. (1961*b*) "Horace, Satires 1.6", *Phoenix* 15: 196-212

RUDD, N. (1966) *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge

RUDD, N. (1993) (ed.) *Horace 2000: A Celebration, Essays for the Bimillennium*, London

RUFFELL, I.A. (2003) "Beyond Satire: Horace, Popular Invective and the Segregation of Literature", *The Journal of Roman Studies* 93: 35-65

RUTHERFORD, R. (2007) "Poetics and Literary Criticism" in Harrison (2007) 248-261

SCHEGEL, C. (2000) "Horace and his Fathers: Satires 1.4 and 1.6", *American Journal of Philology* 121 93-119

SCHEGEL, C. (2010) "Horace and the Satirst's Mask: Shadowboxing with Lucilius", in Davis (2010) 25-270

SCULLARD, H.H. (1981) *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, London

SHACKLETON BAILEY, D.R. (1982) *Profile of Horace*, London

SHACKLETON BAILEY, D.R. (1983) "Cicero and Early Latin Poetry", *Illinois Classical Studies* 8: 239-249

SHERO, L.R. (1923) "The Cena in Roman Satire", *Classical Philology* 18: 126-43

SOMMERSTEIN, A. (2011) "*Hinc omnis pendet*?: Old Comedy and Roman Satire", *Classical World* 105: 25-38

SONNENSCHEIN, E.A. (1898) "The Nationality of Horace", *The Classical Review* 12: 305

SKUTSCH, O. (1985, reprinted 1986) *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford

SLUITER, I. and ROSEN, R.M. (eds.) (2004) *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden

SULLIVAN, J.P. (ed.) (1963) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire*, London

SVARLEIN, J. (1994) "Lucilianus character", *The American Journal of Philology* 115: 253-267

WARMINGTON, E.H. (1938) *Remains of Old Latin Vol III: Lucilius and The Twelve Tables,* Cambridge, Mass.

WATSON, L. (2003) *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford

WATSON, L. (2007) "The Epodes: Horace's Archilochus?" in Harrison (2007) 93-104

WELCH, T. (2008) "Horace's Journey Through Arcadia", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 38: 47-74

WEST, D. (1974) "Of Mice and Men: Horace *Satires* 2.6.77-117" in Woodman and West (1974) 67-80

WILLIAMS, G. (1995) "*Libertino Patre Natus:* True or False?" in Harrison (1995) 296-313

WILLIAMS, R.D. (1996) *Virgil: The Eclogues and Georgics*, Bristol

WIRSZUBSKI, C.H. (1950) *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome During the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge

WOODMAN, T. and FEENEY, D. (eds.) (2002) *Traditions and Context in the Poetry of Horace,* Cambridge

WOODMAN, T. and WEST, D. (eds.) (1974) *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge

WOODMAN, T. and WEST, D. (eds.) (1984) *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge

ZETZEL, J.E.G. (1980) "Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity", *Arethusa*, 13: 59-77

ZETZEL, J.E.G. (2002) "Dreaming about Quirinus: Horace's Satire and the development of Augustan poetry" in Woodman and Feeney (2002) 38-52

ZIMMERMANN, B. (2001) "Lucilius und Aristophanes" in Manuwald (2010) 188-195